



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/90/8/Rev.1  
20 June 2022

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Ninetieth Meeting  
Montreal, 20-23 June 2022  
Item 6(c) of the provisional agenda<sup>1</sup>

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE DESK STUDY FOR THE EVALUATION OF ENABLING  
ACTIVITIES FOR HFC PHASE-DOWN**

**Introduction**

1. At its 88<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee approved the monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2022,<sup>2</sup> which included a request for the preparation of the terms of reference (TORs) for a desk study for the evaluation of enabling activities (EAs) for HFC phase-down (decision 88/10). In response to this request, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) has prepared the present document for the consideration of the Executive Committee.

2. A substantive background on the subject matter is summarised in Annex I to the present document. It is based on relevant documents on EAs, including information emanating from the guidance on eligibility and components of the EAs, the funding sources, the timeframe for project implementation, and the reporting requirements.

**Rationale for the desk study**

3. Since a significant number of Article 5 countries have either completed their EAs or are well advanced, the Executive Committee decided, at its 88<sup>th</sup> meeting, that it was time to undertake a preliminary assessment of the implementation of the EA projects to evaluate their performance.<sup>3</sup>

4. The proposed desk study is expected to provide a timely assessment on the achievements resulting from the implementation of EA projects and evaluate to which extent expectations have been met, noting that EAs in many cases were implemented with limited knowledge on issues related to HFCs. The findings and lessons learned could feed in the decision-making process of the Executive Committee in approving forthcoming proposals regarding the preparation and implementation of Kigali HFC implementation plans (KIPs).

<sup>1</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/90/1/Rev.1

<sup>2</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/11/Rev.1

<sup>3</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/IAP/3, para. 51

## Objective, scope, and key evaluation questions

5. The objective of the desk study, in reviewing the implementation of EAs for the phase-down of HFCs delivered in parallel with the implementation of technical assistance activities under HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs), is to assess how effective the EA projects have been in contributing to HFC phase-down and preparedness for KIPs.

6. The study will explore and analyze, *inter alia*, EAs related to data collection for calculation of baselines, customs and reporting mechanisms, certification programmes, training, and capacity building for handling alternatives to HFCs in all relevant sectors. The desk review and analysis will be structured around the components of EAs defined in the Guide for the submission of enabling activities (the Guide) prepared by the Secretariat for use by the implementing agencies.<sup>4</sup>

7. The scope of the desk study will cover, among others, a number of areas regarding the implementation of EAs, their impact, relevance and effectiveness, and other key dimensions (i.e., gender) as per the evaluation questions below:

- (a) **Typology EAs:** What type of activities were most requested and implemented in the countries?
- (b) **Building upon existing framework:** How have the EAs been designed in relation to the already existing institutional, legislative, policy and enforcement systems in place for HCFCs?
- (c) **Impact:** What has been the contribution of the EAs to the status of preparedness for countries to ratify the Kigali Amendment?
- (d) **Effectiveness:** Have the EAs contributed to the objectives for which the funding was approved? Has the implementation of EAs helped countries to implement the Kigali Amendment itself, e.g., their reporting of HFC consumption, updating their licensing and quota system, etc.?
- (e) **Country comparison:** For those countries implementing EAs that had already ratified the Kigali Amendment when funding was approved, how different were the activities designed as compared to those which were yet to ratify?
- (f) **Project design and results framework:** Has the project design facilitated smooth project implementation through the implementing and bilateral agencies supported by a relevant results framework?
- (g) **Adequacy of reporting guidelines:** Have the reporting guidelines and tools been aligned to the results framework for effective and relevant reporting, facilitating the identification of challenges, reasons for delays, and lessons learned?
- (h) **Strengthening capacities:** Has the funding for EAs been used effectively to create an enabling environment for KIPs in the beneficiary countries?
- (i) **Customs preparedness:** Have the EAs contributed to improving licensing and quota systems, and if so, through which measures and what results were achieved?

---

<sup>4</sup> MLF-IACM-2020-1-19, Guide for the submission of enabling activities.

- (j) **Challenges in implementation:** Are there specific issues that were highlighted during EA implementation that posed significant challenges in the respective countries on HFC phase-down?
- (k) **Mapping of relevant stakeholders:** To which extent did the EAs enhance the identification of relevant stakeholders to be involved in the preparation and implementation of the KIPs?
- (l) **National ozone units (NOUs):** What role did the NOUs play during implementation? To which extent did the EAs contribute to enhanced preparedness of the NOUs for the KIPs?
- (m) **Gender dimension:** How did the projects perform regarding the gender indicators included in the reporting guidelines?
- (n) **Lessons learned:** What are the lessons learned, challenges and good practices?

8. In addressing the above questions, the desk study may identify other issues to be looked at which would be added in the analysis to consolidate an integrated approach covering all the components of EAs. The desk study would also report on the role of different stakeholders in ensuring successful implementation of the projects, including implementing and bilateral agencies, NOUs, institutions and associations, training entities, etc.

9. The desk study is expected to provide lessons learned, including the identification of systemic issues and root reasons for delays, if any recurrent pattern, others than those attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## Methodology

10. The desk study will review project documents and analyze data from a representative sample of countries. It will synthesize project-related information available in the Fund Secretariat and assess the results of the analysis against the expected achievements which underlay the undertaking of EAs.

11. The SMEO notes as a methodological constraint that there is a trade-off between the undertaking of the evaluation as early as possible so as to provide relevant timely inputs to the Executive Committee, and the comprehensiveness of available data. As of May 2022, based on the Secretariat's information on progress reports, 22 final reports on EA projects have been submitted.

12. A significant number of final reports are expected to be received in 2022, noting that project extension was requested by a number of Article 5 countries and approved by the Executive Committee.<sup>5</sup> Final reports can be submitted up to six months after project completion, thus they will not be available until end of 2022 or early 2023, in the best scenarios.

13. A consultant will be hired and will examine project submissions by agencies, project and evaluation sheets submitted to the Executive Committee, progress reports and final reports. The desk-review will also take into account relevant evaluation reports as well as Executive Committee documents related to the EAs and any other document relevant to the subject under review identified during the evaluation.

14. Additional information could arise from remote/on-line interviews, the use of targeted questionnaires and surveys to relevant stakeholders (i.e., implementing and bilateral agencies, NOUs, Fund Secretariat). The consultant will work under the close supervision of the SMEO to whom the draft desk study will be submitted for finalization prior to consideration by the Executive Committee.

---

<sup>5</sup> Decisions 87/23(b), 88/13(b), 88/15(b)(i) and (c), and 88/16(b).

15. Noting that funding for EAs was approved for 138 countries, a sampling approach may facilitate the selection of projects to be reviewed to define a manageable, but still relevant, number of cases for the desk study.

16. The sampling will be done in such a way to provide for a proxy representative sample. Selection criteria for the case studies will be made explicit in the final report resulting from the desk study as part of methodological description. The proposed criteria would be based, *inter alia*, on:

- (a) Regional representation;
- (b) Size/type of countries (i.e., level of consumption, servicing only vs. servicing and manufacturing, etc.);
- (c) Funding level and source;
- (d) Representation of implementing and bilateral agencies;
- (e) Status of ratification of Kigali Amendment; and
- (f) Other possible criteria to be identified during the desk study.

17. The sampling would also consider a balanced representation of the different components of EAs, and compare results and impacts from the different categories, which are defined in the reporting guide as follows:

- (a) Legal framework for the ratification of the Kigali Amendment and its implementation;
- (b) Coordination among institutions and stakeholders;
- (c) Licensing systems for HFC and HFC alternatives;
- (d) National strategy for the implementation of the Kigali Amendment;
- (e) Information awareness activities; and
- (f) Other components.

18. As part of the other components, particular attention will be given to gender and energy efficiency. The updated version of the Guide, in 2020, includes a dedicated annex to report on the gender dimension of EAs, in line with the gender mainstreaming policy of the Fund. Reference is also made to decision 82/83<sup>6</sup> which provided flexibility for the EA projects to address energy efficiency issues. These components of the EA projects will be addressed by the desk study.

19. The desk study will provide a synthesis report with findings and key achievements resulting from the aggregated analysis of the case studies. Specific summary factsheets of key achievements for a number of case studies will be prepared as annexes to the desk study. The same methodology as for the desk study will be applied (and therefore no field work will be required). The data analysis will rely both on quantitative and qualitative methods, as it may apply to the different elements under review. The final draft report will be shared with implementing and bilateral agencies for comments, and internally with the Secretariat, prior to the finalization of the report and submission to the Executive Committee, which could be planned for the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting in 2023.

---

<sup>6</sup> See paragraph 14 of Annex I to the present document.

**Budget**

20. A US \$15,000 budget has already been approved at the 88<sup>th</sup> meeting and can be obligated for the recruitment of a consultant to prepare the desk study, should the Executive Committee decide on the undertaking of this desk study under the approved TORs.

**Recommendation**

21. The Executive Committee may wish to approve the terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of enabling activities for HFC phase-down contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/90/8/Rev.1.



## Annex I

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON ENABLING ACTIVITIES FOR HFC PHASE-DOWN

1. After the adoption of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, agreed in October 2016, the Executive Committee accepted with appreciation, at its 77<sup>th</sup> meeting, the additional contributions to the Fund announced by a number of non-Article 5 Parties. They were intended to provide fast-start support for the implementation of the Kigali Amendment, noting that such funding was one-time in nature and would not displace donor contributions.

2. The additional contributions were to be made available for Article 5 countries that had HFC consumption baseline years from 2020 to 2022 and that had formally indicated their intent to ratify the Kigali Amendment and take on early HFC phase-down obligations with the purpose of supporting their enabling activities (EAs) (decision 77/59(d)(ii)). Furthermore, in addition to those EAs funded from the fast-track envelope, a number of countries also received assistance to undertake EAs from the regular Multilateral Fund funding.

#### Requirements

3. At its 79<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee agreed to the guidelines for the funding of EAs to support the phase-down of HFCs for Article 5 countries (decision 79/46). It was decided that funding requests for EAs should meet the following requirements:

- (a) Ratification of the Kigali Amendment by the government submitting the request or a receipt of letter from the government concerned indicating its intent to make best efforts to ratify the Kigali Amendment as early as possible;
- (b) The inclusion of detailed descriptions, in project proposals, of each of the EAs that would be undertaken, including institutional arrangements, the cost breakdown and the schedule for implementation, consistent with Executive Committee guidelines;
- (c) The duration of a project should be no more than 18 months, starting from the time of its approval, and balances should be returned to the Multilateral Fund within 12 months of that end date;
- (d) Bilateral and implementing agencies should include any funding requests for EAs in their business plans, which could be submitted to the 80<sup>th</sup> or subsequent meetings, and subsequently in their work programmes or work programme amendments; and
- (e) Any submission should also include a statement by both the country concerned and the relevant bilateral/implementing agency that implementation of the EAs would not delay implementation of HCFC phase-out projects.

4. EAs, as per decision 79/46, could consist of, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) Activities to facilitate and support the early ratification of the Kigali Amendment;
- (b) Initial activities identified in paragraph 20 of decision XXVIII/2, including country-specific activities aimed at initiating supporting institutional arrangements, the review of licensing systems, data reporting on HFC consumption and production, and demonstration of non-investment activities, excluding institutional strengthening, as addressed in decision 78/4(b); and
- (c) National strategies that contained the activities in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) above.

5. The same decision also refers to the capacity building activities for handling HFC alternatives, investment and demonstration projects, funding for HFC survey (if not already funded through the countries' HPMP). There was also US \$27 million in fast-start contributions from a group of donor countries, intended to be used to fund EAs for Article 5 group 1 countries in 2017, in line with decision 77/59.

## Funding

6. With the purpose of facilitating a fast-start support for the ratification of the Kigali Amendment by Article 5 countries, the Executive Committee approved, at its 80<sup>th</sup> meeting, funding from the additional contributions of non-Article 5 countries for EAs in 59 countries.<sup>1</sup>

7. In total, funding for EA projects was approved for 138 countries, 22 under regular funding and 116 as additional funding, as displayed below in Table 1:

**Table 1: Summary of funding for EAs by source**

Category	Number of Countries	Number of projects	Total funds approved (US \$)	Total support costs approved (US \$)
Additional Funding	116	128	15,112,919	1,057,902
Regular Funding	22	30	3,590,000	251,300
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>18,702,919</b>	<b>1,309,202</b>

8. The maximum funding levels for EAs for individual countries were as follows, noting that no further funding for EAs would be provided prior to the preparation of national implementation plans.

**Table 2: Funding levels by baseline**

HCFC baseline (ODP tonnes)	Maximum funding for EAs (US \$)
Below 1	50,000
Between 1 and 6	95,000
Above 6 and up to 100	150,000
Above 100	250,000

## Timeframe

9. The timeframe for implementation of EA projects was initially decided to be a maximum of 18 months since its approval date. At its 81<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee decided to maintain the 18-month implementation period for such projects in line with decision 79/46(d)(iii) and, if needed, to extend that period by no more than 12 months (totalling 30 months from project approval) when an official request for extension was received by the Secretariat.

10. However, a significant number of countries reported delays related to the pandemic context and requested further extension beyond the initial planned date of completion. Though some continue to be delayed, of which the reasons will be noted in the desk study, the majority of the projects have now been completed and so the desk study would cover a large number of projects. The overall period of implementation for these EAs is from 2017 to end of 2022.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Decision 80/41

<sup>2</sup> Based on maximum extension date.



## Reporting

11. In decision 81/3, the Executive Committee also requested bilateral and implementing agencies to submit a final report of the EAs completed **within six months of the project completion date**, highlighting lessons learned about how the fast-start activities supported early action on implementing the Kigali Amendment.

12. In February 2020, the Secretariat prepared the latest update of the Guide for the submission of enabling activities (the Guide).<sup>3</sup> The Guide includes an outline for the project final report, including the project objectives and expected outputs, the description of implemented activities and results, dates of completion by component as well as a financial report with detailed breakdown by activities. The Guide includes five areas for different components of EAs, and leaves the option to add other components that would not fall under these categories and would still qualify as EAs, as shown in Table 3 below:

**Table 3: Types of components for EAs**

Components for EAs
Legal framework for the ratification of the Kigali Amendment and its implementation
Coordination among institutions and stakeholders
Licensing systems for HFC and HFC alternatives
National strategy for the implementation of the Kigali Amendment
Information awareness activities
Other components, as applicable

Source: Guide for the submission of enabling activities

## Gender

13. Updates to the Guide include a checklist to ensure that the gender dimension is also included in the project final report. The gender mainstreaming policy of the Fund was adopted at the 84<sup>th</sup> meeting, while some EA projects had already been completed and final report submitted. However, all final reports submitted after the issuance of the updated Guide in February 2020 are expected to report on the gender dimension of the implemented EAs.

## Energy efficiency

14. At the 82<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee decided to provide flexibility for the Parties operating under Article 5 engaged in EAs in relation to implementation of the Kigali Amendment, should they so wish, to undertake the following activities using the funding already approved (decision 82/83):

- (a) Development and enforcement of policies and regulations to avoid market penetration of energy-inefficient refrigeration, air-conditioning and heat-pump equipment;
- (b) Promotion of access to energy-efficient technologies in those sectors; and
- (c) Targeted training on certification, safety and standards, awareness-raising and capacity-building aimed at maintaining and enhancing energy efficiency.

15. The desk study will include this dimension in the desk review of components which will inform the preparation of the final report.

<sup>3</sup> MLF-IACM-2020-1-19, Guide for the submission of enabling activities.