



联合国 环境规划署

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/87/42
21 July 2021

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第八十七次会议
2021年6月28日至7月2日，蒙特利尔¹

对体制强化项目包括供资水平的审查 (第 74/51(d)号决定)

背景

1. 在第七次会议上（1992年6月），执行委员会在 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20 号文件基础上第一次核准了体制强化项目²，“体制强化”，指示出体制强化支持方面供资的上限及类别。³
2. 此后，执行委员会及时讨论了与体制强化项目供资相关事项，主要是在缔约方商定《蒙特利尔议定书》项下其它履约承诺的情况下。具体来说：
 - (a) 在第十九次会议上（1996年5月），鉴于为若干第五条国家核准的体制强化项目已经完成，执行委员会讨论了体制强化项目续约的供资水平，并决定除其它外，初步续订的年度供资额应与第一次核准的两年期供资额相同，并以进展报告和明确的未来行动计划为条件；随后的任何续约也将为期两年（第 19/29 号决定）；
 - (b) 在第三十五次会议上（2001年12月），在讨论会议室文件“实施执行委员会第三十二次会议通过的战略框架第一阶段的提案”背景下⁴，执行委员会决定除其它外，所有体制强化项目及续约的核准水平都应比历史商定金额高 30%，以帮助各国实施

¹ 由于 2019 冠状病毒病（COVID-19），将于 2021 年 6 月和 7 月举行在线会议和闭会期间批准程序。

² 核准了针对智利、约旦和墨西哥的体制强化项目。

³ 第一类：高消费量国家（高于 10,000 ODP 吨—最高 400,000 美元）；第二类：中等消费量国家（5,000-10,000 ODP 吨—最高 300,000 美元）；第三类：低消费量国家（低于 5,000 ODP 吨—最高 170,000 美元）。供资水平是指示性的，并且会逐案考虑缔约方的需求和情况。体制强化供资涉及方面为办公室设备、人员费用和运作费用。核准供资期限为三年。

⁴ 讨论载于 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/67 号文件第 100 至 111 段

新的多边基金战略框架，并为公共意识等关键领域提供更多支持（第 35/57 号决定）；

- (c) 在第五十九次会议上，执行委员会决定将对第五条缔约方体制强化资金的财务支持从 2010 年延续到 2011 年 12 月；并允许第五条缔约方以独立项目形式提交其体制强化项目或在其氟氯烃淘汰管理计划内提交（第 59/47 号决定）；
- (d) 在第六十一次会议上（2010 年 7 月），执行委员会决定按现有水平维持对体制强化支持的供资，从第六十一次会议起续约为期两年的体制强化项目⁵，并在 2015 年第一次会议上审查在这些水平上持续的体制强化供资（第 61/43(b)号决定）；以及
- (e) 在第七十四次会议上（2015 年 5 月），执行委员会审议了 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51 号文件，“体制强化项目供资审查（第 61/43(b)号决定⁶）”并且除其它外，
 - (i) 在比历史商定金额高 28%的水平上核准所有体制强化项目及续约，每年最低体制强化供资额为 42,500 美元，以继续支持《蒙特利尔议定书》履约，并依照第 XIX/6 号决的定目的以及过渡到将环境影响降到最低的替代品而解决氟氯烃淘汰相关挑战；
 - (ii) 决定在 2020 年第一次执行委员会会议上⁷审查体制强化，包括供资水平；以及
 - (iii) 决定继续使用第六十一次会议上核准的现有格式进行体制强化续约（第 61/43(c)号决定），对第 10 部分进行修订，指出应包含绩效指标（第 74/51(c), (d)和(e)号决定）。

3. 秘书处制定本文件以响应第 74/51(d)(ii)号决定⁸。

第七十四次会议后体制强化相关事项

4. 从第七十四次会议起，《蒙特利尔议定书》缔约方与执行委员会进行了多次讨论并通过了与体制强化项目直接相关的决定，总结如下。

5. 在缔约方第二十八次会议上（2016 年 10 月），缔约方通过了《基加利修正案》⁹，以及与该修订案逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用相关的第 XXVIII/2 号决定。关于体制强化，第 XXVIII/2 号决

⁵ 依照第 59/17 号决定和第 59/47(b)号决定，允许第五条国家以独立项目形式提交其体制强化项目或在其氟氯烃淘汰管理计划内提交。

⁶ 该文件对体制强化供资的历史进行了回顾；它评估了体制强化支持对促进第五条国家实现《蒙特利尔议定书》履约的相关性，并确定了国家臭氧机构为实现 2015 年以后遵守氟氯烃控制措施而必须开展的活动范围；以及它与通过项目管理机构和联合国环境署履约援助方案提供的其他形式体制支持和能力建设的联系。

⁷ 由于 2019 冠状病毒病大流行，执行委员会同意将原定于 2020 年 5 月 25 日至 29 日举行的第八十五次会议延迟，与 2020 年 11 月的第八十六次会议相继举行。为确保第五条国家履约相关活动的连续性，并减少其在召开会议时的工作量，执行委员会决定对要提交第八十五次会议的项目和活动实施闭会期间批准流程；闭会期间未审议的议程项目将列入第八十六次会议的议程。鉴于疫情的发展，执行委员会将进一步将两次会议延迟。

⁸ 本文件曾提交第八十六次会议。鉴于 Covid-19 大流行，对本文件的审议推迟到了第八十七次会议。

⁹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/28/12 号文件附件一，第 XXVIII/1 号决定。

定要求执行委员会：

- (a) 将下列扶持活动包含于与逐步减少氢氟碳化合物相关的供资中：维修、制造与生产部门处理氢氟碳化合物替代品的能力建设和培训；体制强化；第 4B 条许可；报告；示范项目；以及国家战略制定（第 20 段）；以及
- (b) 根据氢氟碳化合物相关新承诺增加体制强化支持（第 21 段）。

6. 由于通过了《基加利修正案》，在第七十七次会议上（2016 年 11 月/12 月），秘书处就处理第 XXVIII/2 号决定¹⁰的方式向执行委员会寻求指导，注意到在第七十四次会议上，执行委员会已经决定审查体制强化项目，包括供资水平。进行讨论之后¹¹，委员会除其它外要求秘书处根据第 XXVIII/2 号决定中要求执行委员会采取行动的要素，编写一份载有初步信息的文件，并处理协助第五条国家开展其与氢氟碳化合物控制措施相关报告和监管活动所需要的扶持活动以及其它事项（第 77/59(b)(ii)号决定）。

7. 响应第 77/59(b)(ii)号决定，在第七十八次会议上（2017 年 4 月），执行委员会审议了下列两份文件：

- (a) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/78/6 号文件，“与制定第五条国家逐步减少氢氟碳化合物的费用准则有关的信息：扶持活动”，审查了缔约方与执行委员会通过的第 XXVIII/2 号决定第 20 段所载除体制强化外的扶持活动相关的决定和指导；以及
- (b) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/78/7 号文件，“与制定第五条国家逐步减少氢氟碳化合物的费用准则有关的信息：体制强化”，考虑到体制强化与执行《蒙特利尔议定书》的相关性和执行委员会通过的决定数量，与其它扶持活动分开单独审查了体制强化相关事项。

8. 在第八十四次会议上（2019 年 12 月），执行委员会审议了 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/65 号文件，提出“对采用平行还是合并方式开展氟氯烃淘汰活动和逐步减少氢氟碳化合物活动所产生的影响的分析（第 81/69 号决定）”。该文件除其它外分析了 2020 年至 2030 年期间生产、消费制造和制冷维修行业的氟氯烃淘汰活动和逐步减少氢氟碳化合物活动预计在何种程度上用合并或平行方式开展；对于上述每个部门，该分析涵盖了与资源可用性和成本效益、基金机构包括国家臭氧机构能力以及需要委员会制定政策的领域相关的事项。基于分析，文件指出逐步减少氢氟碳化合物活动以及正在进行的氟氯烃淘汰活动预计将扩大多边基金项下工作的范围和复杂性。

本文件的范围和结构

9. 本文件审查和更新了 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51 号文件和 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/78/7 号文件中的信息，特别是关于体制强化活动，并处理与《基加利修正案》相关挑战，考虑到《基加利修正案》通过后执行委员会审议的相关文件以及缔约方和执行委员会通过的决定。它评估了体制强化支持对促进第五条国家实现《蒙特利尔议定书》控制措施履约的相关性，并确定了国家臭氧机构在 2020 年至 2030 年为实现氟氯烃和氢氟碳化合物控制措施所必须开展的活动范围。本文

¹⁰ 《蒙特利尔议定书》缔约方第二十八次会议引起的与执行委员会有关的事项（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/70/Rev.1 号文件）。

¹¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/76 号文件第 205 到 2012 段。

件还审查了体制强化报告和续约请求的格式以及在第七十四次会议上增加的绩效指标¹²；并提出了建议。

10. 本文件包含下列附件：

- I 制定体制强化项目供资规则与政策的概要
- II 体制强化政策主要文件列表
- III. 体制强化每项目标所使用的绩效指标概要

11. 在制定本文件时，秘书处考虑了执行委员会关于体制强化供资的规则和政策；关于体制强化的既往文件；以及与双边和执行机构就审查代表第五条国家提交的体制强化项目续约申请时识别的问题进行的讨论。

12. 鉴于2019冠状病毒病大流行带来的限制，秘书处无法与所有双边和执行机构讨论体制强化项目相关事项，尤其是更新当前报告格式和绩效指标的需求。

2020年至2030年期间体制强化支持的相关性

13. 通过体制强化项目提供的资金支持是第五条国家实现《蒙特利尔议定书》控制措施履约的一项主要促进因素；所有第五条国家都持续提供了国家臭氧机构在其国家政府及报告线中职责和位置的详细情况，以及臭氧层保护方案在国家政府架构中如何定位。此外，体制强化支持使第五条国家得以建设能力并加强其作为《蒙特利尔议定书》正式伙伴的作用。

14. 在2020年至2030年期间，所有第五条国家都将开展活动淘汰氟氯烃（并在2030年实现全面淘汰，除了维修部门扫尾），并开始逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用（并在所有第五条第一组和第二组国家实现冻结，以及第五条第一组国家中实现氢氟碳化合物消费量削减10%）。

15. 表1列出了第五条国家为遵守《蒙特利尔议定书》项下履约义务所需要开展的主要活动。国家臭氧机构将在这些活动的执行中发挥关键作用。

表 1. 2020 年至 2030 年间履约目标及潜在逐步减少/逐步淘汰活动

年份	履约目标 ¹³	潜在活动 ¹⁴
2020 年	从氟氯烃基准降低 35.0% 第一组国家氢氟碳化合物基年	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 15 至 20 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划
2021 年- 2022 年	从氟氯烃基准降低 35.0% 第一组国家氢氟碳化合物基年	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 15 至 20 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告
2023 年	从氟氯烃基准降低 35.0%	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 15 至 20 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划

¹² 每两年使用核准的格式和绩效指标续约体制强化项目的程序只适用于拥有独立体制强化项目的国家，不适用于体制强化纳入其氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的国家。

¹³ 一些第五条国家在其与执行委员会的协定中承诺加速削减氟氯烃消费量。

¹⁴ 针对第五条国家逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用的扶持活动（已核准的和待核准的），以及已核准的提供转换增量成本详细信息的独立氢氟碳化合物投资项目未包含于该表中。同时，国家数量是参考性的。

年份	履约目标 ¹³	潜在活动 ¹⁴
		更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2024年	从氟氯烃基准降低 35.0% 第一组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结 第二组国家氢氟碳化合物基年	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 15 至 20 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2025年- 2026年	从氟氯烃基准降低 67.5% 第一组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结 第二组国家氢氟碳化合物基年	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 10 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2027年	从氟氯烃基准降低 67.5% 第一组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 10 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2028年	从氟氯烃基准降低 67.5% 第一组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结 第二组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 10 个国家的氟氯烃生产纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2029年	从氟氯烃基准降低 67.5% 第一组国家从氢氟碳化合物基准降低 10% 第二组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目
2030年	除维修部门外从氟氯烃基准降低 100.0% 第一组国家从氢氟碳化合物基准降低 10% 第二组国家以氢氟碳化合物基准冻结	所有国家氟氯烃维修纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划 制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 更新氢氟碳化合物许可/配额制度和数据报告 若干国家氢氟碳化合物维修纳入逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用计划 独立的氢氟碳化合物投资项目

国家臭氧机构根据氟氯烃淘汰的职责

16. 体制强化对第五条国家氟氯烃履约义务的持续贡献，无论通过独立项目或是合并于国家计划，可概括如下：

- (a) 协助相关主管部门制定和施行控制和监测氟氯烃消费和生产（适用时）的法律法规；与海关部门密切合作，解决氟氯烃和其它逐步采用的非消耗臭氧层物质统一制度命名法所适用的任何修订等问题；
- (b) 协调《蒙特利尔议定书》第七条下氟氯烃消费和生产数据以及国家方案执行进展报告的收集、分析和提交¹⁵；
- (c) 在国家层面协调氟氯烃淘汰管理计划各阶段的制定和提交¹⁶，并规划、组织、指引和领导高效执行氟氯烃淘汰管理计划所需全部活动的执行；以及
- (d) 确保通过监测、报告和核查所实现的消耗臭氧层物质逐步淘汰的可持续性¹⁷。

国家臭氧机构根据《基加利修正案》的新职责

17. 除了当前促进氟氯烃逐步淘汰以及向对环境影响最小化的替代品过渡的职责（第 74/51(c)号决定）¹⁸，国家臭氧机构将在《基加利修正案》下获取新的职责，概括如下。

《基加利修正案》的批准⁹

18. 国家臭氧机构在批准《基加利修正案》所需的行政程序中起着领导作用，这需要对《基加利修正案》本身有所了解，对本国氢氟碳化合物消费量（和生产量，如适用）进行分析，并对现有监管和政策框架进行评估。国家臭氧机构也协调与政府负责气候、能效和其它相关事项部门以及其他利益攸关方（例如行业、行业协会）的协商，以统一力量并避免《蒙特利尔议定书》与其它环境公约形成潜在矛盾立场（例如联合国气候变化框架公约）。

法律、法规和标准

19. 第五条国家需要通过和实施法律法规以控制和监测氢氟碳化合物消费量（和生产量，如适用），包括将氢氟碳化合物纳入现存进出口许可和配额制度²⁰。将需要新的政策和法规协助逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用，并通过除其它外禁止进口使用氢氟碳化合物的室内空调设备来引入低全球变暖潜能值替代技术。

20. 需要增强国家臭氧机构能力以联络国家标准委员会，通过除其它外制定、更新和/或调整安全规范和标准，以及通过利益攸关方能力建设和培训，来促进低全球变暖潜能值替代技术的采纳和安全使用，尤其是与室内空调部门相关。

21. 具有 HCFC-22 生产设施的第五条国家将需要制定和实施政策和法规控制副产品 HFC-23 的排放，并确保就其进行报告，包括产生和排放的副产品 HFC-23 数量。此外，将要求生产氢氟碳

¹⁵ 国家臭氧机构是收集和审查国家方案数据以提交基金秘书处（每年 5 月 1 日前）的联络点，也是收集和审查第七条数据以提交臭氧秘书处（每年 9 月 30 日前）的联络点。

¹⁶ 当前，113 个国家的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第一阶段和 73 个国家的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第二阶段正在进行中；32 个国家的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第一阶段已经完成。

¹⁷ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/83 号文件，“在多边基金支持下建立的当前监测、报告、核查以及可强制执行许可和配额制度的概述（第 84/85 号决定）”，提供了这方面与体制强化相关的信息。

¹⁸ 这些活动载于 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51 号文件第 15 段。

¹⁹ 截至 2021 年 2 月 17 日，113 个国家（73 个第五条国家）已批准《基加利修正案》。

²⁰ 已批准、核准或接受《基加利修正案》的第五条国家必须在 2019 年 1 月 1 日前建立和实施许可制度，其中将包括附件 F 物质，注意到未能在 2019 年 1 月 1 日前建立和实施许可制度的缔约方可以将采取这些行动的时间延迟到 2021 年 1 月 1 日。

化合物的第五条国家依照《蒙特利尔议定书》说明的履约目标逐步减少生产，并报告其氢氟碳化合物生产量。

在国家方案下以及在议定书第七条下的数据报告

22. 第五条国家将需要进一步制定和实施数据收集、核查和报告的方法²¹，注意到除其它外当前在统一制度中缺乏具体的海关编码，这对建立氢氟碳化合物许可和配额制度以及海关官员正确识别货物的能力构成了挑战²²；许多氢氟碳化合物是用在混合剂中而不是作为纯物质使用，并且混合剂将构成氢氟碳化合物消费量的更大部分；以及拥有 HCFC-22 生产企业的国家将需要处理副产品 HFC-23 的排放。

23. 国家臭氧机构将继续与海关和执法官员密切合作，以实现《蒙特利尔议定书》目标履约。除其它外将需要培训方案，帮助了解不同氢氟碳化合物混合剂的配制、其全球变暖潜能值以及计算用二氧化碳当量表示消费量方法的复杂性。

与政府主管部门和利益攸关方的协调

24. 在制定逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用战略及行动计划以遵守国家在《基加利修正案》下义务以及管理来自多边基金的资金支持时，国家臭氧机构将起到关键协调作用。

25. 与淘汰消耗臭氧物质战略相似，逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用的战略必须纳入国家计划，需要与决策者和相关利益攸关方紧密协商（例如海关和执法部门；制冷技师培训机构/职业学校；制冷协会和行业组织；以及使用受控物质的工业部门）。需要制定和实施政策支持替代技术的选择和安全采用，考虑到国家包括能效和潜在环境影响尤其是气候方面的要求，注意到对于一些应用，可用的替代技术数量仍然有限。

26. 还将需要与负责气候变化与能效的政府主管部门和其他利益攸关方的协商，以确保用简化的方法逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用。国家臭氧机构需要非常了解与能效、标签和标准相关的现有政策与法规；以及国家的温室气体减排战略，以便不仅使《基加利修正案》下的行动符合《蒙特利尔议定书》目标，也符合联合国气候变化框架公约下有关《巴黎协定》的国家确定贡献。

信息和公共意识

27. 国家臭氧机构将继续在提高公众和利益攸关方对于《基加利修正案》的意识方面起到主要作用，包括设计、编制和传播与氢氟碳化合物、低全球变暖潜能值替代品以及能效相关的信息材料和出版物。

国家臭氧机构落实多边基金性别政策的新职责

28. 根据多边基金支持项目性别主流化的政策²³，要求国家臭氧机构确保在多边基金支持的所有项目执行中，制定、整合和衡量性别相关指标。

²¹ 缔约方已核准议定书第七条下报告数据的新格式，执行委员会已核准国家方案数据的新报告格式。

²² 世界海关组织通过其调和审查委员会和科学委员，审议了《蒙特利尔议定书》缔约方第 XXVI/8 号决定中为最常见的氢氟碳化合物指定单独的统一制度编码的要求。

²³ 在第八十四次会议上，执行委员会除其它外核准了多边基金支持项目中性别主流化的业务政策，并要求双边和执行机构在整个项目周期适用性别主流化的业务政策（第 84/92(b)号决定）。

通过联合国环境署履约援助方案和项目管理机构的支持

29. 执行委员会在第八十二次会议上讨论了机构行政费用与项目管理机构之间可能存在的相似性问题，以及机构在何种程度上在国家一级将项目管理资金转给金融中介机构、实施机构或政府²⁴，并在第八十三次会议上讨论了项目管理机构、体制强化和执行机构的相关事项，包括联合国环境署履约援助方案下的活动和资金，行政费用体制的核心单位和其它要素，以及国家层面独立核查的信息²⁵。

30. 注意到国家臭氧机构对于逐步淘汰受控物质并在国家层面贡献于《蒙特利尔议定书》的成功起着核心作用。国家臭氧机构对《蒙特利尔议定书》活动的监测、协调和报告职责比项目管理机构更广泛。国家臭氧机构所协助的法律和体制框架为项目管理机构执行氟氯烃淘汰管理计划奠定了基础，因为它提供了国家臭氧机构内所不具备的技术经验，由此帮助国家遵守议定书下的履约义务。

31. 联合国环境署履约援助方案提供的核心服务包括除其它外，促进信息交流的能力建设机制，能够增强国家臭氧机构和利益攸关方能力的经验和知识，为《蒙特利尔议定书》的执行建立有利的环境。

延长体制强化项目的续约期限

32. 根据第 19/29 号决定，在体制强化项目首次核准的最初三年期过后，双边和执行机构代表第五条国家提交了体制强化项目为期两年的续约申请。制定本文件时，秘书处审查了将体制强化项目续约期限从两年延长到三年可能对国家、双边和执行机构、秘书处以及执行委员会带来的影响。对于四个将体制强化项目纳入其氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的第五条国家，体制强化相关活动已成为氟氯烃淘汰管理计划执行的一部分，因此供资取决于氟氯烃淘汰管理计划付款申请的提交时间。

33. 又及此项审查，秘书处注意到延长独立体制强化项目的续约执行期限可能在国家层面有以下益处

- (a) **减轻处理负担：**所有第五条国家对于执行委员会核准的每个项目都有必须遵守的内部行政程序²⁶。一些程序需要很长时间，但是仍需在项目实际实施开始之前完成；
- (b) **加强对项目执行的关注：**鉴于实施开始前所需采取的行政措施，体制强化项目的实际执行时间少于两年。此外，在执行委员会会议之前八周提交的体制强化项目续约提案中包含一份仅涵盖执行 15 到 18 个月的进展报告，使实现一些绩效指标的时间不足。三年的时间期限可为各阶段的有效执行预留更长时间，也能使国家臭氧机构依照绩效开展活动；以及

²⁴ 行政费用体制审查：与项目管理机构相关的责任和费用（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/63 号文件）。

²⁵ 行政费用体制审查：逐国分析项目管理机构、体制强化以及执行机构，包括履约援助方案下的活动和资金，行政费用体制的核心单位和其它要素，以及国家层面独立核查的信息（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/83/39 号文件）。

²⁶ 例如，获取相关主管部门的批准；非英语国家在批准和协议签署前将体制强化续约文件、法律协定和其它支持文件进行翻译的需求；由于严格的金融监管在需要时开设新的银行账户（新银行账户开设前无法转移资金）。

- (c) *增加国家臭氧机构稳定性以及招聘人员的时间*：第五条国家只能按照体制强化项目的期限承诺员工合同；鉴于更长的合同带来的好处，将期限延长至三年可为员工与国家臭氧机构的合作创造更多激励。

34. 国家层面减轻处理负担也适用于双边和执行机构。此外，秘书处项目审查方面的工作量也将减轻，同样执行委员会在相关文件的审查、审议和核准方面的工作量也将减轻。由于每个双边和执行机构都有自身内部机制定期监管体制强化项目的执行，将期限延长至三年不会降低项目提案的质量，也不会妨碍执行委员会对这些项目的监测。

体制强化的供资需求

35. 从第七次会议起，执行委员会已为体制强化项目核准 151,925,706 美元资金，外加机构支助费用 8,151,770 美元，相当于多边基金项下核准项目和活动总金额的 4.21%。当前，144 个第五条国家收到了体制强化项目资金，其中 140 个国家具有独立的体制强化项目，4 个国家将其体制强化项目纳入其氟氯烃淘汰管理计划。如果所有开展体制强化项目的第五条国家在同一年提出资金请求，144 个第五条国家一年的体制强化项目资金总额将达 10,012,506 美元（在任何一年中都没有针对所有 144 个国家提交的资金请求）。

36. 历史上执行委员会曾两次提高体制强化项目的供资水平：在第三十五次会议上（2001 年 12 月），从历史商定金额提高 30%（第 35/57 号决定），以及在第七十四次会议上（2015 年 5 月），再次提高 28%，最低年度供资额为 42,500 美元（第 74/51 号决定），仅适用于独立的体制强化项目。体制强化项目每年平均供资额约为 7,489,737 美元。当前，61 个国家按每年 42,500 美元的最低额获取资金。

37. 核准用于体制强化的资金相对较少，却极大地贡献于《蒙特利尔议定书》的成功，作为第一个也是唯一被普遍批准的国际环境条约（包括除《基加利修正案》之外的所有修正案），几乎所有第五条国家都遵守了其在《蒙特利尔议定书》下的所有履约义务。对体制强化项目充足的资金支持应继续使尚未批准《基加利修正案》的第五条国家批准该修正案，同时确保其遵守第 XIX/6 号决定下商定的现有氟氯烃淘汰目标和《基加利修正案》下商定的新的逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用的目标。

38. 如上所述，《基加利修正案》的生效将在现有基础上进一步增加国家臭氧机构的职责。截至 2021 年 2 月，79 个第五条国家已批准《基加利修正案》，占第五条国家总数的 50% 以上。氟氯化碳和氟氯烃淘汰的经验显示国家层面支持履约相关的一些最具挑战性的活动发生在有关物质第一个控制措施实施之日前的几年中。

39. 很难量化增加的工作量对所有第五条国家未来工作相关额外的体制强化资金需求将产生的影响，尤其是氢氟碳化合物方面。虽然现有体制能力，包括一部分在淘汰氟氯烃在内的消耗臭氧层物质期间建立的能力，将用于逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用的过程中，其它已有机构将需要增强，以实现氟氯烃淘汰的进一步收益，例如能效和减少向大气排放二氧化碳。此外，执行委员会正在讨论逐步减少氢氟碳化合物计划准备和供资的准则，以及淘汰氢氟碳化合物的费用准则。一旦商定，这些准则将进一步定义每个第五条国家所需要付出的努力和行动程度，以通过逐步减少氢氟碳化合物计划执行《基加利修正案》。

40. 上述分析不仅为继续保持体制强化项目的资金支持提供了强有力的基础，也协助执行委员会探索增加体制强化供资的可能性，考虑到《基加利修正案》履约的复杂需求以及执行逐步减少氢氟碳化合物计划第一阶段所需的支持。

审查体制强化和供资水平的要求

41. 注意到2025年才会订立针对第五条第一组国家的氢氟碳化合物履约基准，逐步减少氢氟碳化合物计划的准备资金尚未核准，以及实际的逐步减少计划可以在准备这些计划的资金核准后大约两年核准，谨建议执行委员会要求秘书处不晚于2025年第二次会议提交一份体制强化项目包括供资水平的分析。

体制强化续约报告格式的审查

42. 尽管包含具体指标的报告新格式在第七十四次会议上才核准²⁷，秘书处对用此新格式书写的报告进行了分析，以确定报告是否包含充足的信息描述体制强化续约项目的执行结果。秘书处还检查了此次会议上决定的绩效指标是否用在了报告中，以及从第八十五次会议开始往后提交的报告是否纳入了多边基金的性别政策。秘书处注意到提交的报告中存在重复出现的问题，包括除其它外控制措施执行理念、对已淘汰的消耗臭氧层物质的监测、非法贸易的避免和对消耗臭氧层物质进出口数据的监测都缺乏清晰度；会议及其目的定义不清晰；以及氟氯烃淘汰管理计划付款申请下报告信息的重复。这些问题一般通过秘书处与相关双边或执行机构的讨论而解决。

43. 在审查与独立体制强化项目续约请求一同提交的报告中所含绩效指标时，秘书处注意到第五条国家为每项目标都选择了广泛的指标，其中很多并不归因于完成体制强化目标。本文件附件三载有一份表格，概述了每项体制强化目标所使用的绩效指标。

44. 基于上述审查，并注意到《基加利修正案》于2019年1月1日生效，秘书处认为有必要：

- (a) 通过纳入与执行《基加利修正案》相关的新目标以及多边基金的性别政策，更新体制强化最终报告和续约请求的格式，包括考虑整合到氟氯烃淘汰管理计划内的项目；并且
- (b) 确定对于体制强化项目每项目标最相关、可靠和贴切的绩效指标，并能被所有第五条国家以一致的方式使用。

45. 对报告格式的拟更新将更加清楚，并使秘书处能够向执行委员会提供关于体制强化供资影响的更全面的分析。然而，由于2019冠状病毒病大流行所带来的限制，秘书处未能与双边和执行机构讨论现有体制强化项目报告格式审查的相关事项，以及选择一套可以被所有第五条国家一致使用的绩效指标。秘书处提出与双边和执行机构讨论这些事项并在未来会议中向执行委员会报告。

建议

46. 谨建议执行委员会：

- (a) 注意到 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/84 号文件所载对体制强化项目供资的审查，包括供资水平（第74/51(d)号决定）；
- (b) 设定体制强化支持的供资水平，考虑到第五条国家执行《基加利修正案》以及在2020年至2030年期间实现第一项控制措施逐步减少氢氟碳化合物使用所需开展的活动，同时继续实施氟氯烃淘汰管理计划；

²⁷ 在第七十四次会议上，执行委员会修订了从第六十一次会议开始使用的体制强化续约请求的报告格式。

- (c) 考虑是否将第八十八次会议以后提交的体制强化续约提案的续约执行阶段期限从当前的两年延长到三年；
- (d) 要求秘书处与双边和执行机构讨论与最终报告现有格式的审查和体制强化供资延长的请求相关的事项，并选择一套可以被所有第五条国家一致使用的绩效指标，并在未来会议中向执行委员会报告；以及
- (e) 要求秘书处不晚于 2025 年第二次会议向执行委员会提交对体制强化项目包括供资水平的进一步审查。

Annex I

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

1. At its 5th meeting (November 1991), the Executive Committee agreed that “Support for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening. 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 institutional strengthening and specific implementation projects”¹.

2. At its 7th meeting (June 1992), the Executive Committee considered the document on institutional strengthening,² 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 institutional strengthening 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 recommendations³ and approved the first funding for institutional strengthening projects:

- (a) Article 5 countries who request it be considered for support for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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.

3. At its 19th meeting (May 1996), the Executive Committee adopted guidelines for renewal of institutional strengthening proposals⁴ (decision 19/29). The guidelines indicated that for new institutional

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

² UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20

³ Paragraph 32 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20

⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52 and Corr.1

strengthening 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 30th meeting, the Executive Committee considered the final report of the 1999 evaluation of institutional strengthening projects⁵ and draft follow-up action plan. In decision 30/7, the Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*:

- (b) To urge all Article 5 countries with institutional strengthening projects to ensure that:
 - (i) The 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening projects which incorporate the elements under (b), while recognizing that the agreements should 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 institutional strengthening agreement;

⁵ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/6 and Corr.1

- (d) To instruct the implementing agency in charge of the institutional strengthening 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 NOUs 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 31st 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 31st meeting of the Executive Committee.

5. In response to decision 30/7, the Executive Committee considered at its 32nd meeting (December 2000) a document on general principles for agreements between governments and the implementing agencies on new and renewed institutional strengthening projects.⁶ 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 33rd meeting (March 2001), the Executive Committee noted the proposed amendments by implementing agencies to their agreements for institutional strengthening projects, as contained in the document on general principles for agreements between governments and implementing agencies on new and renewed institutional strengthening projects (follow-up to decision 32/15)⁷. 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 35th 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)),⁸ 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 32nd meeting.⁹ The proposal included a section on institutional strengthening projects, proposing *inter alia* that those projects and 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

⁶ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/18

⁷ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/16

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

⁹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/CRP.1

to receive institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening funding “should prevail until 2005 when it should again be reviewed. This proposal would also include a clear commitment that this level of institutional strengthening [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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening activities funded in low-volume consuming (LVC) countries.

9. Decision 35/57 also noted that “in addition to this direct assistance in institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 43rd meeting (July 2004), the Executive Committee addressed the situation of very-low-volume-consuming countries¹⁰ and decided to increase the minimum level of institutional strengthening 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 44th 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.¹¹ 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 45th 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 period¹². With regard to institutional capacity, the paper suggested that the Committee should review upcoming compliance 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 47th meeting the preliminary results of an analysis of possible further action

¹⁰ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/43/49

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

¹² UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/47

and policies required to assist compliance with the phase-out requirements for all the ODS covered by the Montreal Protocol, including the review of institutional strengthening projects envisaged under decision 35/57.

14. At the 47th 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 institutional strengthening projects envisaged under decision 35/57.¹³ The issues presented in the document fell into three categories, namely, the adequacy of current institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening might need to be continued after 2010;
- (d) That possible funding arrangements and levels for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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
- (g) To request the Secretariat, in consultation with the implementing agencies, to prepare for the 49th meeting a paper examining the relative merits of replacing the current requirements for submission of requests for renewal of an institutional strengthening 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.

¹³ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/47/53

16. At the 49th meeting (July 2006), the Executive Committee considered the merits of replacing the current requirements for submissions of requests for renewal of an institutional strengthening project with a simplified arrangement.¹⁴ 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening projects;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to continue to examine opportunities to fine-tune the institutional strengthening renewal process and to address any additional findings in the context of the review of institutional strengthening 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 53rd meeting (November 2007), the Executive Committee considered options for possible funding arrangements and levels for institutional strengthening support beyond 2010, and on opportunities to fine-tune the institutional strengthening renewal process.¹⁵ It provided a brief review of the current funding arrangements for institutional strengthening projects, explored opportunities for streamlining institutional strengthening renewal requests and proposed possible future levels of funding to support institutional strengthening projects. It concluded that support from the Multilateral Fund for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening would likely be needed after 2010 and that possible funding arrangements and levels for institutional strengthening 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 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 institutional strengthening activities to

¹⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/38

¹⁵ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/61

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 56th meeting (November 2008), considered the final report on the evaluation of institutional strengthening projects,¹⁶ explained that the evaluation was part of the 2008 monitoring and evaluation work programme approved by the Executive Committee at its 53rd meeting (decision 53/7). The desk study on the evaluation of institutional strengthening projects that had been presented to the 54th meeting of the Executive Committee¹⁷ 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening projects while ensuring that accountability for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening extension requests;
 - (iv) The implementing agencies to monitor implementation of institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening reporting and the importance of requesting renewals on time; and
 - (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 NOU during network meetings.

22. At its 57th meeting (March-April 2009), the Executive Committee considered a review of the current funding arrangements for institutional strengthening,¹⁸ and noted that institutional strengthening

¹⁶ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8

¹⁷ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/54/13

¹⁸ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63

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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening;
- (b) To continue to fund requests for the renewal of institutional strengthening projects up to the end of December 2010 at current levels pending final resolution of the matter by the Executive Committee at its 58th 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 institutional strengthening projects submitted by the countries from the beginning of 2010 onwards.

23. At its 58th meeting (July 2009), the Executive Committee considered the issue of the levels of funding for institutional strengthening projects beyond 2010¹⁹. It was noted that since the adoption of decision 47/49, the Executive Committee had considered several policy papers on institutional strengthening, and that implementing agencies had submitted a number of requests for the renewal of funding for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening renewals up to 31 December 2010 (decision 58/16).

24. At the 59th meeting (November 2009) in discussing the document on the overview of issues identified during project review,²⁰ the Executive Committee noted that the first HPMP submitted to the meeting, included funding in principle for institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening 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 institutional strengthening funding either as part of their HCFC phase-out management plans or separately, as they so choose (decision 59/17).

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

26. At the 60th meeting (April 2010), in the context of the document on the overview of issues considered during project review,²² the Executive Committee considered the policy issue raised on the funding of institutional strengthening renewals. The Committee was invited to consider extending the period of renewal of institutional strengthening projects for those approved at the 57th, 58th and 59th 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:

¹⁹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/48

²⁰ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/59/11

²¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/59/53

²² UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15

- (a) To extend the date for funding of institutional strengthening projects approved at the 59th 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 institutional strengthening projects for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 61st meeting; and
- (c) To consider the issue of the options for funding institutional strengthening projects further at the 61st meeting of the Executive Committee.

27. At its 61st meeting (July 2010), the Executive Committee considered institutional strengthening: options for funding and formats for renewal requests,²³ and decided:

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

28. At its 74th meeting (May 2015), the Executive Committee considered the document on the review of funding of institutional strengthening projects (decision 61/43(b)),²⁵ and decided:

- (a) To note the review of funding of institutional strengthening (institutional strengthening) projects prepared in line with decision 61/43(b), as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51;
- (b) To recall and reiterate the decisions adopted by the Executive Committee regarding institutional strengthening;
- (c) To approve all institutional strengthening projects and renewals at a level 28 per cent higher than the historically agreed level, with a minimum level of institutional strengthening funding of US \$42,500 per year, to continue support for compliance with the Montreal Protocol and to address the challenges related to the phase-out of HCFCs in line with the objectives of decision XIX/6 and the transition to alternatives that minimized environmental impact;
- (d) To review institutional strengthening, including funding levels, at the first Executive Committee meeting in 2020; and

²³ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49

²⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/58

²⁵ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51

- (e) To continue to use the existing format for institutional strengthening renewals as approved at the 61st meeting (decision 61/43(c)) with a modification in section 10, to indicate that performance indicators should be included, as contained in Annex XIX to the present report (decision 74/51).

29. At the Twenty-eighth Meeting, the Parties adopted decision XXVIII/2 related to the amendment phasing down HFCs, where *inter alia*:

- (a) Requested the Executive Committee to include the following enabling activities to be funded in relation to the hydrofluorocarbon phase-down under the Amendment: capacity-building and training for the handling of hydrofluorocarbon alternatives in the servicing, manufacturing and production sectors; institutional strengthening; Article 4B licensing; reporting; demonstration projects; and development of national strategies (paragraph 20); and
- (b) Directed the Executive Committee to increase institutional strengthening support in light of the new commitments related to hydrofluorocarbons under the Amendment (paragraph 21).

Annex II

MAIN DOCUMENTS ON INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

Document number	Month/Year	Title of document
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 and 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 and 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)

Document number	Month/Year	Title of document
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)
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/58/48	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
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51	May 2015	Review of funding of institutional strengthening projects (decision 61/43(b))
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/78/6	April 2017	Information relevant to the development of the cost guidelines for the phase-down of HFCs in Article 5 countries: Enabling activities
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/78/7	April 2017	Information relevant to the development of the cost guidelines for the phase-down of HFCs in Article 5 countries: Institutional strengthening
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/63	December 2018	Analysis of the duties and costs associated with project management units and the extent to which agencies passed on administrative duties to other institutions (decision 79/41(f))

Annex III

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS USED PER OBJECTIVE OF IS

Objectives	Number of indicators used	SMART⁵³ indicators (%)	Incomplete indicators⁵⁴ (%)
1: Adoption/implementation of legislation and regulation to control and monitor controlled substances			
Introduction and implementation of HCFC licensing and quota system	15	60	38
Enforcement of control measures to sustain CFCs and other ODS phased out	11	63	36
Monitoring illegal ODS trade (all ODS)	14	40	52
Ratification of Amendments to the Montreal Protocol	5	70	27
Introduction/revision of legislation to implement the Kigali Amendment	3	83	13
2: Efficient and timely data collection and reporting			
Monitoring customs import/export of controlled substances	15	81	10
Article 7 data reporting	4	99	0
Country programme data reporting	4	99	0
3: Consultations and coordination with national agencies/stakeholders			
Steering committees	7	78	19
Industry associations	7	70	24
4: Supervision of timely implementation of phase-out activities and reduction in ODS consumption			
Implementation of HPMPs	19	86	12
Implementation of enabling activities for HFC phase-down	8	86	8
5: Awareness-raising and information exchange			
Information dissemination to stakeholders	18	55	42
International Ozone Day celebrations	3	86	13
6: Regional cooperation and participation in Montreal Protocol meetings			
Participation in regional network meetings	5	90	9
Participation at meetings of the Open-ended Working Group and the Parties to the Montreal Protocol	6	90	8
7: Implementation of the Multilateral Fund gender policy (*)			
Ensure female participation in Montreal Protocol policy matters and decision making	11	51	47
Ensure female participation in activities supported under the Multilateral Fund	17	58	39
Encourage equal opportunities for female technicians to build a career in the refrigeration and air-conditioning sector	12	58	38

(*) Thirty-nine IS projects had been submitted and approved since the adoption of the gender policy for the Multilateral Fund.

⁵³ “SMART” indicators stand for: Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Relevant; Timely.

⁵⁴ Incomplete indicators contain neither measurable nor time-bound goals.