الأمم المتحدة

EP

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/11/Rev.1
15 November 2017

ARABIC
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**اللجنة التنفيذية للصندوق المتعدد الأطراف**
**لتنفيذ بروتوكول مونتريال**
الاجتماع الثمانون
مونتريال، 13-17 نوفمبر/تشرين الثاني 2017

# مشروع برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم لعام 2018

**مقدمة**

1- تعرض هذه الوثيقة مشروع برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم لعام 2018 لتنظر فيه اللجنة التنفيذية. واقتُرحت أنشطة الرصد والتقييم الواردة في خطة العمل بناء على مناقشات اللجنة التنفيذية بشأن مسائل ذات صلة بالرصد والتقييم لاجتماعات سابقة؛ واستعراض التقارير المرحلية للمشروعات الجارية وتقارير إنجاز المشروعات؛ ومناقشات مع الوكالات المنفذة والأمانة.

2- وبناء على ذلك، يتكون مشروع برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم مما يلي:

أنشطة التقييم

- المرحلة الثانية من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد
- الدراسة النظرية لتقييم أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي
- الدراسة النظرية لتقييم تعميم مراعاة المنظور الجنساني في مشروعات وسياسات بروتوكول مونتريال

أنشطة الرصد

- التقرير الموحد عن إنجاز المشروعات للاتفاقات المتعددة السنوات والمشروعات الإفرادية

3- قد تنشأ قضايا أخرى ذات أهمية خلال تنفيذ برنامج عمل 2018 قد تتطلب أن تتناولها اللجنة التنفيذية. ولذا فإن الأمر يحتاج الى قدر من المرونة خلال تنفيذه فضلا عن تخصيص ميزانيته من أجل استيعاب أي من هذه القضايا.

**أنشطة التقييم في عام 2018**

المرحلة الثانية من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد: البعثات الميدانية

4- يتمثل الهدف من هذا النشاط في الانتهاء من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد الذي بدأ مع الدراسة النظرية المقدمة إلى الاجتماع الثمانين[1] والذي يقترح عينة من البلدان لزيارتها. والهدف من البعثات الميدانية هو جمع وتحليل المعلومات لمعالجة المسائل والقضايا التي أكدت عليها الدراسة النظرية. واستنادا إلى النتائج، ستصاغ الدروس المستفادة وستسهم في إعداد المشروعات في المستقبل وتنفيذها في قطاع خدمة التبريد. وسيتم إعداد تقرير قطري لكل بلد وسيوجز تقرير تجميعي النتائج ويستخلص الاستنتاجات والتوصيات. وترد الاختصاصات في المرفق الأول بهذه الوثيقة.

دراسة نظرية لتقييم أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي

5- ستعرض الدراسة النظرية لتقييم أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية في الاجتماع الثاني والثمانين. وسوف تحلل الأنشطة المختلفة الممولة في إطار إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية التي أدت إلى إنشاء نظم التراخيص والحصص لتمكين رصد واردات وصادرات المواد المستنفدة للأوزون والسياسات الأخرى التي تدعم الامتثال لبروتوكول مونتريال، مثل استقصاءات البيانات وإنشاء نظم إدارة المعلومات، وإنشاء آليات التشاور الحكومية الدولية وإعداد الخطط الأولية. وسيقدم هذا التقييم معلومات قيمة عن الخيارات والأفكار المتعلقة بالأنشطة التمكينية والدروس المستفادة لكي تضع بلدان المادة 5 سياسات ونظم مماثلة للتخفيض التدريجي للمواد الهيدروفلوروكربونية. وستُعرض الاختصاصات على الاجتماع الحادي والثمانين.

دراسة نظرية لتقييم تعميم مراعاة المنظور الجنساني

6- ستعرض الدراسة النظرية لتقييم تعميم مراعاة المنظور الجنساني في مشروعات وسياسات الصندوق المتعدد الأطراف في الاجتماع الحادي والثمانين. وستتناول الدراسة تحليل الجهود المبذولة لإدراج المنظور الجنساني في الأنشطة والمشروعات المتعلقة بتنفيذ بروتوكول مونتريال، والمساهمة في تعميم المنظور الجنساني في المشروعات ذات الصلة، وتشجيع أصحاب المصلحة في الصندوق المتعدد الأطراف على استكشاف طريقة أكثر منهجية لإدراج المنظور الجنساني في أنشطتها. ولن يُطلب أي تمويل لإجراء هذه الدراسة. وترد اختصاصات الدراسة النظرية في المرفق الثاني بهذه الوثيقة.

التقارير الموحدة عن إنجاز المشروعات للاتفاقات المتعددة السنوات والمشروعات الإفرادية

7- سيعمل كبير موظفي الرصد والتقييم عن كثب مع الوكالات الثنائية والمنفذة المعنية من أجل تقديم جميع تقارير إنجاز المشروعات المعلقة المتعلقة بالاتفاقات المتعددة السنوات والمشروعات الإفرادية إلى الاجتماعين الحادي والثمانين والثاني والثمانين.

[1] UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/10.

8- وسوف تزود التقارير الموحدة عن إنجاز المشروعات اللجنة التنفيذية بنظرة عامة على النتائج والدروس المستفادة علي النحو المبين في تقارير الإنجاز.

**الجدول الزمني للتقديم**

9- يعرض الجدول 1 نظرة عامة على الأنشطة الواردة في مشروع برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم المقترح لعام 2018.

**الجدول 1: الجدول الزمني لتقديم الأنشطة الواردة في برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم لعام 2018**

| الاجتماع الحادي والثمانون | الاجتماع الثاني والثمانون |
|---|---|
| التقرير الموحد عن إنجاز المشروعات المتعددة السنوات والإفرادية | التقرير الموحد عن إنجاز المشروعات المتعددة السنوات والإفرادية |
| الدراسة النظرية لتقييم تعميم مراعاة المنظور الجنساني في مشروعات وسياسات بروتوكول مونتريال | التقرير النهائي للمرحلة الثانية من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد |
| اختصاصات الدراسة النظرية لتقدير أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي | دراسة نظرية لتقييم أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي |
| تقرير أولي للمرحلة الثانية من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد | |

**الميزانية**

10- يعرض الجدول 2 الميزانية الخاصة ببرنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم لعام 2018. وتتضمن أتعاب وتكاليف سفر الخبراء الاستشاريين فضلا عن كبير موظفي الرصد والتقييم الذين سيشاركون في دراسات الحالة ويحضرون الاجتماعات الإقليمية، حسب الاقتضاء.

**الجدول 2: الميزانية المقترحة لبرنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم لعام 2018**

| الوصف | المبالغ (بالدولار الأمريكي) |
|---|---|
| **المرحلة الثانية من تقييم قطاع خدمة التبريد** | |
| زيارات ميدانية (9 بلدان، 7 أيام في كل بلد) | |
| الموظفون : | |
| • السفر(4 × 6,000 دولار أمريكي) | 24,000 |
| • بدل الإعاشة اليومي (28 × 350 دولارا يوميا) | 9,800 |
| الخبراء الاستشاريون | |
| • الأتعاب (7 أيام × 9 بلدان × 500 دولار يوميا) | 31,500 |
| • السفر (9 × 3,000 دولار) | 27,000 |
| • بدل الإعاشة اليومي (350/63 دولارا يوميا) | 22,050 |

| الوصف | المبالغ (بالدولار الأمريكي) |
|---|---|
| كتابة التقرير (9 × 7 أيام × 500 دولار يوميا) | 31,500 |
| التقرير التجميعي (12 يوما × 500 دولار يوميا) | 6,000 |
| **الدراسة النظرية لتقييم أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي** | |
| كتابة التقرير (30 يوما × 500 دولار يوميا) | 15,000 |
| **الدراسة النظرية لتقييم تعميم مراعاة المنظور الجنساني في مشروعات وسياسات الصندوق المتعدد الأطراف** | |
| كتابة التقرير | 0 |
| **عرض قاعدة بيانات الدروس المستفادة على اجتماع الشبكات السنوي لبرنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة*** | |
| • السفر(1 × 2,000 دولار) | 2,000 |
| • بدل الإعاشة اليومي (5 × 386 دولارا يوميا) | 1,930 |
| **المجموع الفرعي** | **170,780** |
| مصروفات متنوعة** | 4,000 |
| **المجموع** | **174,780** |

* عملا بالمقرر 5/75(و)، أعدت الأمانة محرك بحث عبر الإنترنت للوصول إلى الدروس المستفادة من تقارير إنجاز المشروعات الإفرادية والاتفاقات المتعددة السنوات، حتى يتسنى لأصحاب المصلحة الوصول إليها بسهولة عندما يكونون على سبيل المثال يقومون بإعداد أو تنفيذ مشروعات مماثلة.[2] ومن أجل نشر المعلومات وضمان الاستخدام العام لهذه الأداة، سيقدم كبير موظفي الرصد والتقييم قواعد البيانات إلى اجتماع الشبكات السنوي لبرنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة، الذي سيجمع جميع موظفي الأوزون في باريس في عام 2018.
** من المقرر تخصيص أموال متنوعة لتغطية تكاليف السفر الإضافية غير المتوقعة أثناء البعثة، والاستبدال غير المتوقع لمعدات مكتب الرصد والتقييم.

## الإجراء المتوقع من اللجنة التنفيذية

11- قد ترغب اللجنة التنفيذية في:

(أ) مطالبة كبير موظفي الرصد والتقييم بعرض اختصاصات الدراسة النظرية لتقدير أنشطة إعداد خطة إدارة إزالة المواد الهيدروكلوروفلوروكربونية للمساعدة في تنفيذ تعديل كيغالي على الاجتماع الحادي والثمانين،

(ب) والموافقة على برنامج عمل الرصد والتقييم المقترح لعام 2018 بميزانية قدرها 147.780 دولار أمريكي على النحو المبين في الجدول 2 من الوثيقة UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/11/Rev.1.

[2] يمكن الوصول إلى محركات البحث الخاصة بتقارير إنجاز المشروعات الإفرادية والاتفاقات المتعددة السنوات عن طريق الرابط التالي: http://www.multilateralfund.org/pcrindividual/search.aspx و http://www.multilateralfund.org/myapcr/search.aspx

**Annex I**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SECOND PHASE OF THE EVALUATION OF THE REFRIGERATION SERVICING SECTOR**

## Background

1. At its 79th meeting, the Executive Committee approved the terms of reference for the evaluation of the refrigeration servicing sector. The importance of the servicing sector as one of the largest consumer of ODS as well as one that will significantly be affected by the HFC phase-down, called attention on the opportunity of such evaluation. The evaluation was planned in two stages: stage one consisted of a desk study, and stage two country evaluations reports following the field visits, which would be based on the findings and recommendations of the desk study.

2. The desk study examined selected projects in the refrigeration servicing sector in both low-volume consuming (LVC) and non-LVC countries[3], in various geographical regions and implemented by various bilateral and implementing agencies (IAs). It concluded that the HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) were in majority successfully implemented, with only 2.8 per cent of cases of non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol and levels of consumption well below the control targets of the Montreal Protocol. Smaller ODS consuming countries may need a more focused assistance concerning HCFC consumption monitoring and reporting. The desk study also tackles the causes of delays in project implementation; the institutional strength in the legislative area; the attitude towards safety issues concerning technology based on flammable refrigerants; the impact of demonstration projects and the need for disseminating results; issues related to refrigerant containment in terms of recovery, recycling and reclamation; and energy efficiency.

3. The field visits will focus on key issues stressed in the desk study and will collect updated information about the project implementation, based on direct observation and discussions with various stakeholders.

## Objective of the evaluation

4. The objective of the second stage of the evaluation is taking into account the issues identified in the desk study: (a) to provide a thorough analysis of the project implementation in the refrigeration servicing sector in a sample of countries; (b) to formulate lessons learned for improving future similar projects; and (c) to further assess potential issues that could be related to the phasing-down of HFCs in the servicing sector. Furthermore, the evaluation will strive to provide quantitative data on the impacts and the costs of the activities in the servicing sector to the extent possible.

5. The evaluation will address the following issues:

## Project implementation

6. It will analyze the main activities in the servicing sector under the HPMPs as well as their impact on HCFC phase-out and energy efficiency improvements to the extent possible.

[3] The countries included in the study are: Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Ghana, Nigeria and Senegal in the African region; Bahrain, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia from the Middle East region; Cambodia, China, Fiji, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Maldives from the Asia and Asia-Pacific region; Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia from the Eastern European region; Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Grenada, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay from the Latin American and Caribbean region; and the Cook Islands, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu all englobed under one single project for the so called Pacific Island Countries (PICs).

7. How did they contribute to the transition to low-global warming potential (GWP) alternatives and what were the key barriers or success factors? How can HFC phase-down activities in the servicing sector build on this experience? Were technical assistance and capacity building taken into consideration to address safety issues associated with low-GWP and zero-GWP alternatives and if so, what kind of activities were undertaken and to what extent where they effective?

8. How, if at all, did activities address the risks associated with retrofitting HCFC-based equipment with flammable alternatives?

9. What were the issues related to availability and affordability of spare parts and refrigerants and how have they been addressed?

10. What were the main issues encountered in the project implementation in LVC countries as compared to non-LVC countries?

11. All the countries covered by the desk study presented delays with various causes, such as the reorganization of the Government institutions, complexity of activities, communication with the stakeholders. The field visits will gather more in-depth information about these delays, their causes and how to avoid them in the future.

12. According to the desk study, the refrigeration associations have been key in the design and implementation of all the activities directed to the refrigeration servicing sector. What have been the roles of local refrigeration associations in implementing phase-out activities? How did the major stakeholders coordinate and communicate? What can be learned relevant to the phase-down of the HFCs?

13. Was reporting on the implementation of activities regularly done? Is the reporting providing relevant information on challenges encountered and lessons learned?

14. How have the tools developed by UNEP CAP for the refrigeration servicing sector been used? Have they proved useful and adaptable locally? What can be learned relevant to the phase-down of HFCs?

15. To what extent activities being implemented have contributed or could potentially contribute to HFC phase-down in applications not covered in the HPMPs (e.g., domestic refrigeration, commercial refrigeration based on R-404A and R-407C, and mobile air-conditioning)? What could be modified in the project design and implementation to facilitate this?

**Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks**

16. Countries have adopted various legislative and regulatory measures to control HCFC supply through imports including licensing and quota system for HCFC-based equipment. Several countries have also banned imports of all used HCFC-based equipment, among others. Was there a delay in adopting this legislation and why? Can the enforcement procedures and monitoring tools developed be applied to HFC use and HFC-based equipment?

17. What have been the most common regulatory measures adopted by the countries in relation to the refrigeration servicing sector?

18. To what extent the following measures related to the refrigeration servicing sector have been established and implemented in Article 5 countries as part of the HPMPs: mandatory reporting by refrigerant importers and exporters; bans on “non-refillable” (disposable) refrigerant containers; extension of import/export licensing system to all refrigerants; HCFC emissions control measures (e.g., compulsory recovery); ban on the use of HCFC-141b for flushing systems during servicing; ban on imports of

second-hand HCFC based equipment; and, predetermined schedules for leakage check by certified personnel for systems with charges above certain limit; and large systems record-keeping (e.g., HCFC logbooks and HCFC-based equipment log books)? Which have been the main barriers to introduce these measures?

19. What measures have been taken to enable the safe introduction of low-GWP, flammable or toxic refrigerants and which were the main barriers in introducing them? What were the impacts? Were there interactions with national, regional or international standards setting bodies related to the safe use of flammable or toxic alternatives?

20. Have activities been undertaken to support inspections and certifications, standardized technical testing, and enforceable technical standards for alternative technologies and if so, what was their impact? To what extent can activities for the phase-down of HFCs build on these activities?

21. How is the country addressing illegal trade of refrigerants and what can be learned relevant to the phase-down of HFCs?

22. Were there new enforcement procedures and monitoring tools developed to control HCFC use in the sector as well as HCFC-based equipment imports? If so, can they be applied to HFC use and HFC-based equipment?

**Technology-related issues**

23. In each country the evaluation team will inquire about what technology is being implemented and what challenges were encountered to service equipment with alternative technologies? Were alternatives technologies as well as related equipment and tools available in the local markets? Have alternatives to HCFCs that sustain the operation of HCFC-based equipment until the end of life been promoted? If so, which alternatives have been used and what were the results**,** including on energy efficiency and refrigerant use?

24. Did these projects influence technology selection during the assembly, installation, initial charging and commissioning of new refrigeration equipment by servicing enterprises and technicians? What were the main factors influencing the choice of technology? What can be learned relevant to the project design?

25. What was the role of international companies in introducing alternative technologies and to what extent has this influenced the refrigeration servicing sector, HCFC phase-out and introduction of low-GWP alternatives?

26. How does reducing the refrigerant charge size in the design of systems impact the amounts of refrigerants emitted and how does it impact energy efficiency?

**Retrofitting HCFC-based equipment with flammable alternatives**

27. The desk study implied that for the general public, and even some of the refrigeration servicing sector, the risk of using and servicing equipment containing flammable substances was assumed to be negligible. To what extent is information made available to the end users and relevant stakeholders in the servicing sector on how to manage the risks associated with flammable or toxic substances accessible to the users?

28. How, if at all, did servicing activities address the risks associated with retrofitting HCFC-based equipment with flammable alternatives?

**Demonstration projects for the servicing sector**

29. How did demonstration projects contribute to the servicing sector? Did they serve as proof of the feasibility of technology solutions under local conditions? What were the lessons learned from demonstration projects?

**Energy efficiency**

30. What are the initiatives related to obtaining better energy efficiency? Were there improvements of energy efficiency through servicing activities? What were the key factors relevant to achieving these energy efficiency improvements and how were they sustained?

**Refrigerant containment (recovery, recycling, reclamation)**

31. What activities have been undertaken to promote the recovery of refrigerants and what was their impact? What strategies were developed to enhance recovery, recycling and reclamation? What measures have been taken to sustain these activities in a cost-effective manner? Can recovery and reclamation tools and techniques for HCFCs be transferred to the HFC phase-down?

32. Which institutions are responsible for the management of refrigerant containment practice and how were they involved in the activities?

33. Were there refrigerant reclaiming facilities established? Were stockpiles of used or unwanted controlled substances managed cost-effectively?

34. What measures are in place to prevent leakage and are they successful? Can this be emulated to other subsectors?

35. What measures were taken to manage waste recuperation (e.g., empty refrigerant cylinders)? Is it mandatory to use reusable cylinders? If not, what is the percentage of one-time cylinders use?

36. What is the rate of recycling or reclamation? What is the percentage of new refrigerants substituted?

**Training and sustainability of training results**

37. The evaluation will further inquire on how training programmes for refrigeration technicians have managed to build their own sustainability by ensuring that the curricula of technical training institutions are appropriately modified with such training.

38. How did the Multilateral Fund resources help in enhancing the capacity of national vocational/training centres and other local institutes involved in training of refrigeration technicians?

39. How many technicians were trained since the beginning of the project and what percentage of the total pool of technicians does it represent? To what frequency must the training be renewed, to be effectively up-to-date?

40. Have the curricula of the training programmes been updated regularly? Do they integrate information on safe handling of flammable refrigerants and an understanding of related regulations and standards? Do they address issues related to the consequences of poor installation and servicing of equipment that uses flammable refrigerants? Do training programmes include a module on good practices and standards in refrigeration services? To what extent are they relevant to the phase-down of HFCs**?**

41. Is the importance of low-GWP alternatives emphasized in the training programmes for refrigeration technicians?

42. What types of certification schemes have been established in different Article 5 countries and how effective are they to ensure good practices in refrigeration? Are these made mandatory through regulations? Was there any obstacle in making the certifications mandatory? Is there widespread adoption of formal codes of practices? Were good practices included in the curricula of technical training schools? Are the curricula adapted to address, among other: good practices, proper handling/management of refrigerant including flammable alternatives and low-GWP and zero-GWP alternatives, and mandatory training for technicians?

43. What lessons in training in good practices can be applied for long-term strategies to be implemented?

**Awareness-raising and dissemination of information**

44. What are the main channels to disseminate updated information on technically and economically feasible alternative technologies to be applied by local refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturers?

45. How did technical assistance projects address awareness-related challenges? What awareness-raising strategy was used and what were the results?

46. Are there awareness campaign tailored to a specific target audience? How did the servicing community change following these activities?

47. Was there any collaboration with the customs departments in raising awareness on the handling of the new refrigerants?

**Funding**

48. What was the level of co-funding leveraged by the MLF activities?

49. How did countries identify sources of co-financing? What were the obstacles, opportunities and challenges to identify such sources of co-financing and what lessons can be learned from there? Were there delays due to obtaining co-funding?

50. Related to the adequacy of funding, the evaluation will look into the issue raised by the desk study that some funding was inadequate or excessive.

51. How the flexibility, granted to Article 5 countries through their Agreements with the Executive Committee, was used to optimize the allocation upon implementation of the HPMP?

52. How will the increase in the funding available for the servicing sector under decision 74/50, affect the ongoing projects and acceptance of alternatives to HCFCs and HFCs with low-GWP and zero-GWP?

**Other sustainability-related issues**

53. The field study will assess the sustainability of activities in the servicing sector, taking into account the findings of the desk-study, and identify the key factors relevant to sustaining the activities' impacts.

54. What activities could be implemented to reduce emissions during the operation of equipment, while maintaining energy efficiency?

55. What was the impact of the project on small servicing businesses?

56. How will the servicing sector be affected by the phase-down of HFCs?

57. How did IS, CAP and HPMP activities impact on the HCFC phase-out in the servicing sector, and what are the possibilities to increase synergies to effectively address the servicing sector?

58. Have servicing activities contributed to improving the energy efficiency of the equipment? If so, were such improvements in energy efficiency monitored or assessed?

**Monitoring**

59. What indicators are monitored? What is the leakage rate and reuse of refrigerants? What structures are in pace for continued monitoring?

**Methodology**

60. A team of consultants will be recruited based on their experience and knowledge of the subject matter and of the functioning of the Montreal Protocol and the Multilateral Fund. The team will analyse the existing documents as well as the conclusions and recommendations of the desk study and collect additional information from field visits. As much as possible, reliable quantitative information will be collected together with qualitative information. Discussions with the Secretariat staff, the National Ozone Unit (NOU) and the bilateral and IAs will be organized as needed.

61. Each field visit will yield a country evaluation report which will be shared with the Secretariat, the bilateral and IAs and the NOU for comments. At the 81st meeting, a short report with key findings from countries visited until this period will be presented. A synthesis report will summarize the findings from the country evaluation reports and formulate lessons learned and recommendations for consideration by the Executive Committee at the last meeting in 2018.

**Sample of countries**

62. The following countries are proposed to be part of the sample of countries to be visited by the evaluation team, based on geographical area, IAs, and specificity of projects:

(a) Chile (Latin American country with servicing in supermarkets; UNDP, UNIDO and UNEP)

(b) Grenada (Caribbean country with 20 recycling and recovery centers and awareness-raising to promote alternative technologies; UNEP and UNIDO);

(c) India (Asian country with the use of R-290; UNDP; UNEP, and Germany);

(d) Kyrgyzstan (Europe and Central Asian (ECA) region with an innovative approach and a phase-out planned for 2020; UNDP and UNEP);

(e) Oman (Middle Eastern country with activities in recovery of refrigerant; UNEP and UNIDO);

(f) Samoa (PIC; UNEP);

(g) Senegal (Western Africa; UNEP and UNIDO);

(h) Turkey (ECA region, demonstration project; UNEP and UNIDO); and

(i) Zimbabwe (Eastern Africa; Germany).

## Annex II

## DESK STUDY ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL PROJECTS AND POLICIES

Introduction and rationale for the desk study

1. The concept of gender mainstreaming[1] was emphasized in 1995 at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. It was included in the Beijing Platform for Action and became an important element of the United Nations (UN) policies and programmes.[2]

2. All UN agencies have a responsibility to adopt a gender perspective and analyze how gender issues are relevant to their mandate. The implementing agencies (IAs) of the Multilateral Fund (MLF) have a gender policy[3], and one agency has prepared a guide for gender mainstreaming into the MLF projects in 2015.[4] During the Inter-agency coordination meeting[5], bilateral and IAs mentioned gender oriented activities including training and workshops. The Kigali Amendment is an opportunity to include gender mainstreaming in the policies and projects of the MLF.

3. The desk study can identify up-to-date information and knowledge products on the linkages of gender and the largely technical activities undertaken under the MLF, including issues germane to the broader environment sector, such as women's representation in decision-making and participation in education and training, are relevant to the implementation of the MLF projects.

Objectives of the desk study

4. To contribute to a more pro-active approach to gender mainstreaming and to explore a more systematic way to include gender relevance in the MLF funded activities the study will examine how a gender perspective is applied in the projects funded by the MLF; and analyze the gender policies of the bilateral and IAs agencies and how they were incorporated into the projects and activities. Based on a sample of countries, it will inquire how gender policies of the IAs are taken into account in MLF activities. It will try to answer the following questions:

(a) How gender mainstreaming is included in the policies and projects of the IAs? Is it taken into account in project design and in the project cycle?

(b) Are there gender advisers and gender focal points in the agencies, and if yes, how are they involved in mainstreaming gender in projects related to the MLF? Are they regularly consulted? Do they participate in project preparation?

(c) What activities are undertaken by the IAs to implement their policies to mainstream gender in their projects under the MLF?

(d) Are existing policies helping women to be represented in the decision-making process on issues related to the implementation of projects funded by the MLF?

[1] The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies and programmes, in all areas and at all levels.
[2] United Nations. Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997. A/52/ 18 September 1997.
[3] UNEP: Policy and Strategy for Gender Equality and the Environment. 2014-2017 (P&S); World Bank Group: Gender Strategy: Gender Equality, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth. 2015**;** UNDP: Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017; UNIDO: Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Strategy. 2016-2019.
[4] UNIDO: Guide on Gender Mainstreaming. Montreal Protocol Projects.
[5] Montreal, 5 – 7 September 2017.

(e) Are actions undertaken to provide men and women equal opportunities to benefit from capacity building activities? Are they equally encouraged to participate in trainings and workshops provided by vocational schools and enterprises?

(f) Are there gender statistics on women participation in the activities related to the MLF?

(g) Are there gender sensitive awareness campaigns?

(h) Are there policies that address the issue of gender balance?

(i) Do IAs promote that project and policies acknowledge gender differences (e.g., men and women are differently affected by toxic substances and are there protective measures recommended)?

Methodology

5. The desk study will undertake a review of existing documents: policies papers, project proposals, progress reports and project completion reports. An electronic survey will be prepared targeting a sample of countries where a variety of projects are implemented and interviews will be carried out by telephone with the bilateral and IAs and NOUs. A report will be prepared and presented to the 81st meeting of the Executive Committee with conclusions on systematic way(s) to include gender relevance in the MLF funded activities, where relevant.