



**Programa de las  
Naciones Unidas  
para el Medio Ambiente**

Distr.  
GENERAL

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

ESPAÑOL  
ORIGINAL: INGLÉS

COMITÉ EJECUTIVO DEL FONDO MULTILATERAL  
PARA LA APLICACIÓN DEL  
PROTOCOLO DE MONTREAL  
Octogésima Reunión  
Montreal, 13–17 de noviembre de 2017

**PROYECTO DE PROGRAMA DE TRABAJO DE SUPERVISIÓN Y EVALUACIÓN  
PARA EL AÑO 2018**

**Introducción**

1. En este documento se presenta el proyecto de programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación para el año 2018 para su examen por el Comité Ejecutivo. Las actividades de supervisión y evaluación en el programa de trabajo se han propuesto de acuerdo a las deliberaciones del Comité Ejecutivo respecto de asuntos relacionados con la supervisión y evaluación tratados en reuniones anteriores; el examen de los informes sobre la marcha de las actividades de los proyectos en curso y los informes de terminación de los proyectos; así como los debates celebrados con los organismos de ejecución y la Secretaría.
2. En consecuencia, el proyecto de programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación consta de lo siguiente:

Actividades de evaluación

- Segunda fase de la evaluación sobre el sector de servicios de mantenimiento de equipos de refrigeración.
- Estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali.
- Estudio teórico para la evaluación de la incorporación de la perspectiva de género en los proyectos y las políticas del Protocolo de Montreal.

Actividades de supervisión

- Informe consolidado sobre la terminación de proyectos para proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y proyectos individuales

3. Durante la aplicación del programa de trabajo de 2018, puede que surjan otras cuestiones de interés que deban señalarse a la atención del Comité Ejecutivo. Por consiguiente, con el fin de tener en cuenta esas cuestiones, podría requerirse un cierto grado de flexibilidad en la aplicación del programa de trabajo, así como en la asignación de su presupuesto.

### **Actividades de evaluación para el año 2018**

#### Segunda fase de la evaluación sobre el sector de servicios de mantenimiento de equipos de refrigeración: misiones sobre el terreno

4. Con esta actividad concluye la evaluación del sector de servicios de mantenimiento de equipos de refrigeración que comenzó con el estudio teórico presentado a la 80ª reunión<sup>1</sup> en el que se proponía la visita a una serie de países. El objetivo de las misiones sobre el terreno es recoger y analizar información para responder a las preguntas y cuestiones planteadas en el estudio teórico. Sobre la base de los resultados, se formularán lecciones aprendidas que contribuirán al desarrollo y la aplicación de proyectos futuros en el sector de servicios de mantenimiento de equipos de refrigeración. Se preparará un informe para cada país y un informe de síntesis en que se resumirán los resultados, se extraerán conclusiones y se formularán recomendaciones. El mandato figura en el Anexo I del presente documento.

#### Estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali

5. Este estudio, a presentar a la 82ª reunión, evaluará las actividades financiadas bajo el concepto de preparación de PGEH que permitieron establecer los sistemas de concesión de licencias y cuotas que hacen posible fiscalizar las importaciones y exportaciones de SAO (HCFC). Se analizarán también otras iniciativas que apoyan el cumplimiento del Protocolo de Montreal, entre ellas los estudios de datos, la creación de sistemas informáticos, el establecimiento de mecanismos de consulta con la industria y los gobiernos, y la preparación de planes iniciales. Este estudio aportará valiosa información sobre posibles alternativas y nuevas ideas para actividades de apoyo y recogerá experiencias que ayudarán al diseño de similares políticas y normas de reducción de HFC en países del artículo 5. Los términos de referencia serán presentados a la 81ª reunión.

#### Estudio teórico para la evaluación de la incorporación de la perspectiva de género

6. El estudio teórico para evaluar la incorporación de la perspectiva de género en los proyectos y las políticas del Fondo Multilateral se presentará en la 81ª reunión. En el estudio teórico se analizarán las iniciativas para incluir la perspectiva de género en las actividades y los proyectos relacionados con la aplicación del Protocolo de Montreal, contribuir a la incorporación de las cuestiones de género en los proyectos conexos y alentar a los interesados del Fondo Multilateral a que busquen una manera más sistemática de incluir las consideraciones de género en sus actividades. No se solicitará financiación para llevar adelante el estudio. El mandato del estudio teórico figura en el Anexo II del presente documento.

#### Informe consolidado sobre la terminación de proyectos para proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y proyectos individuales

7. El Oficial Superior de Supervisión y Evaluación colaborará estrechamente con los organismos bilaterales y de ejecución pertinentes para presentar todos los informes de terminación del proyecto pendientes de los proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y los proyectos individuales a las reuniones 81ª y 82ª.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/10.

8. El informe consolidado sobre la terminación de proyectos ofrecerá al Comité Ejecutivo un panorama general de los resultados y las lecciones aprendidas que se describen en los informes de terminación del proyecto.

### **Calendario para la presentación de documentos**

9. En el Cuadro 1 se presenta una sinopsis de las actividades comprendidas en el proyecto de programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación propuesto para el año 2018.

**Cuadro 1. Calendario de presentación de actividades en el programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación para el año 2018**

<b>81ª reunión</b>	<b>82ª reunión</b>
Informe consolidado de terminación de proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y proyectos individuales	Informe consolidado de terminación de proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y proyectos individuales
Estudio teórico para la evaluación de la incorporación de la perspectiva de género en los proyectos y las políticas del Protocolo de Montreal	Informe final, segunda fase de la evaluación del sector servicio técnico de equipos de refrigeración
Términos de referencia del estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali	Estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali
Informe preliminar, segunda fase de la evaluación del sector servicio técnico de equipos de refrigeración	

### **Presupuesto**

10. En el cuadro 2 se presenta el presupuesto para el programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación para el año 2018. En él se incluyen los honorarios y los gastos de viaje de los consultores y del Oficial Superior de Supervisión y Evaluación, que participarán en los estudios de casos y asistirán a reuniones regionales, según sea necesario.

**Cuadro 2. Propuesta de presupuesto para el programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación para el año 2018**

Descripción	Monto (\$EUA)
<b>Segunda fase de la evaluación sobre el sector de servicios de mantenimiento de equipos de refrigeración</b>	
Visitas sobre el terreno (9 países, 7 días/país)	
Personal:	
• Viajes (4 x 6 000 \$EUA)	24 000
• Dietas (28 x 350 \$EUA/día)	9 800
Consultores	
• Honorarios: (7 días x 9 países x 500 \$EUA/día)	31 500
• Viajes (9 x 3 000 \$EUA)	27 000
• Dietas (63 x 350 \$EUA/día)	22 050
Redacción del informe (9 x 7 días x 500 \$EUA/día)	31 500
Informe de síntesis (12 días x 500 \$EUA/día)	6 000
<b>Estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali</b>	
Redacción del informe (30 días x 500 \$EUA/día)	15 000
<b>Estudio teórico para la evaluación de la incorporación de la perspectiva de género en los proyectos y las políticas del Protocolo de Montreal</b>	
Redacción del informe	0
<b>Presentación de la base de datos sobre lecciones aprendidas en la reunión anual de la red del PNUMA*</b>	
• Viajes (1 x 2 000 \$EUA)	2 000
• Dietas (5 x 386 \$EUA/día)	1 930
<b>Total parcial</b>	<b>170 780</b>
Varios**	4 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>174 780</b>

\* En respuesta a la decisión 75/5 f), la Secretaría desarrolló un motor de búsqueda en línea para acceder a las lecciones aprendidas de los proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales y los proyectos individuales que figuran en sus informes de terminación del proyecto, con miras a facilitar su consulta a los interesados, por ejemplo, en el momento de elaborar o aplicar proyectos similares<sup>2</sup>. Con el fin de garantizar el uso general de esta herramienta y divulgar la información que en ella figura, el Oficial Superior de Supervisión y Evaluación presentará las bases de datos en la reunión anual de la red del PNUMA, que reunirá a todos los Oficiales del Ozono en París, en 2018.

\*\*Los fondos varios están previstos para cubrir viajes adicionales no previstos durante las misiones y la sustitución imprevista de equipos de oficina para la supervisión y evaluación.

### Medidas que se espera adopte el Comité Ejecutivo

11. El Comité Ejecutivo podrá estimar oportuno:

- a) Solicitar a la Oficial Superior de Supervisión y Evaluación se sirva presentar a la 81ª reunión los términos de referencia necesarios para la realización del estudio teórico de evaluación de actividades de preparación de PGEH que permitan apoyar la implementación de la Enmienda de Kigali, y

<sup>2</sup> Los informes de terminación de los proyectos individuales y los proyectos con acuerdos plurianuales pueden consultarse en <http://www.multilateralfund.org/pcrindividual/search.aspx> y <http://www.multilateralfund.org/myapcr/search.aspx>, respectivamente.

- b) Aprobar el programa de trabajo de supervisión y evaluación propuesto para 2018 con un presupuesto de 174 780 \$EUA, como se indica en el cuadro 2 del documento UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/11/Rev.1.

## Annex I

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

#### Background

1. At its 79<sup>th</sup> 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<sup>3</sup>, 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 were 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 place 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 81<sup>st</sup> 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<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>
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<sup>3</sup>, and one agency has prepared a guide for gender mainstreaming into the MLF projects in 2015.<sup>4</sup> During the Inter-agency coordination meeting<sup>5</sup>, 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?

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations. Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997. A/52/ 18 September 1997.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> UNIDO: Guide on Gender Mainstreaming. Montreal Protocol Projects.

<sup>5</sup> 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 81<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee with conclusions on systematic way(s) to include gender relevance in the MLF funded activities, where relevant.

---