



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/8
12 June 2006

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Forty-ninth Meeting
Montreal, 10-14 July 2006

**DESK STUDY ON THE EVALUATION OF THE COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE
PROGRAMME (CAP)**

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issue of the document.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to the meeting and not to request additional copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Background.....	1
II.	Information Base and Methodology used for Preparing the Desk Study	1
III.	CAP Objectives, Budget, Management and Staffing.....	2
	III.1 Overview.....	2
	III.2 Operating and Managing the System.....	4
	III.3 Responsibilities of the CAP Coordination Team in Paris.....	5
	III.4 Staffing of the CAP.....	6
IV.	CAP Activities	7
	IV.1 Assistance for countries in non-compliance	7
	IV.2 Assistance in Policy Development, Ratification, South-South Cooperation and Awareness Raising.....	10
	IV.3 Other Projects Implemented by UNEP.....	10
	IV.4 Interagency Co-operation and Communication	11
V.	Regional Network Activities.....	11
VI.	Information Clearing House and Public Awareness Activities	13
VII.	Capacity Building Activities.....	14
VIII.	Evaluation Issues, Methodology and Workplan	16
	VIII.1 Evaluation Issues	16
	VIII.2 Methodology	17
	VIII.3 Proposed Work Plan for the Evaluation.....	18
IX.	Action Expected from the Executive Committee	18
Annex I	UNEP's Completed Projects by Type and Implementation Delays	

I. Background

1. Following the freeze in CFC consumption that commenced on 1 July 1999, the Executive Committee developed and adopted new policies and procedures designed to assist Article 5 countries to meet their Montreal Protocol obligations during the compliance period. In line with the Executive Committee's strategic planning, UNEP assessed the services needed by Article 5 countries during this compliance regime and in the course of 2001 began to strategically reorient its OzonAction Programme towards the regionalization of its delivery through its regional offices to be headed by the Regional Network Coordinators (RNCs), under the overall supervision of the OzonAction Branch of UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) in Paris. In December 2001, the 35th Meeting of the Executive Committee approved the new approach and funded the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), to be implemented by UNEP (Decision 35/36).

2. The CAP commits UNEP to delivering direct, country-specific assistance to Article 5 countries, especially low volume consuming countries (LVCs) in which UNEP implements most of its projects, to assist them in meeting their compliance commitments under the Montreal Protocol. UNEP's OzonAction Programme started implementing the CAP from January 2002. This approach includes the regional delivery of information exchange, policy and technical advice, compliance assistance such as guidance to prepare legislation and licensing systems, data reporting, training, promoting bilateral and multilateral cooperation and promoting high-level awareness.

3. The first year of CAP implementation concentrated on decentralizing UNEP staff, recruiting additional professionals and reducing the use of external international consultants, while accelerating delivery and completing delayed activities. CAP's main components are the compliance assistance services including: regional awareness raising and country-to-country assistance, the Information Clearing House, regional networks, regionalization of project implementation and monitoring, and direct implementation at the country level.

4. The evaluation of the CAP is part of the 2006 and 2007 Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme. The final report on this issue is scheduled for submission to the 52nd Meeting of the Executive Committee.

II. Information Base and Methodology used for Preparing the Desk Study

5. The following overview of CAP activities was prepared based on UNEP DTIE documents, such as Business Plans and Work Programmes, Progress, Activity and CAP Advisory Group Reports as well as other sources. Comments prepared by the Fund Secretariat on these documents and information contained in databases were also analyzed.

6. Most of the information on CAP is contained in documents prepared by UNEP for the Executive Committee in the context of the planning cycle. The CAP budget and the Work Programme (WP) for UNEP is presented to the last meeting of the year and describes the activities to be implemented during the following year. Relevant WP Amendments are presented during the course of the year. The Business Plan (BP) is presented to the first meeting of the Executive Committee for a given year. It presents the overall objectives for UNEP's activities for a given triennium with particular emphasis placed on the activities to be undertaken during

the first year of the triennium. The BP also contains Logical Framework Analysis (LFAs) which are prepared for all regions and for the Information Clearing House (2003 and 2004 only).

7. A questionnaire for NOUs was developed and tested with some Ozone Officers in the margins of the 48th Executive Committee Meeting, as well as during 4 regional network meetings: Europe and Central Asia, South Asia, South East Asia and the Pacific, and Francophone Africa. In addition, the opportunity provided by the joint SEAP-SA Customs and ODS Officers Cooperation Workshop was used to obtain preliminary feedback from customs officers regarding the contribution of CAP in promoting regional cooperation and information exchange between customs departments in Asia. The information obtained from the questionnaires was complemented by discussions and interviews with other stakeholders and will be consolidated into regional case studies for the evaluation.

8. Interviews were also conducted with some members of the Executive Committee, with staff of the Fund Secretariat and the Ozone Secretariat, representatives of UNEP and other Implementing and Bilateral Agencies. The above mentioned steps allowed a more realistic identification of the evaluation issues which need to be further addressed and analysed during the next phase of the evaluation. Comments received by the CAP team on the draft desk study were taken into account in finalizing the document.

III. CAP Objectives, Budget, Management and Staffing

III.1 Overview

9. CAP activities are either of a global or regional nature and can be placed under the broad headings of compliance support, information exchange and networking. The Paris based CAP team provides the overall coordination of regional networking activities, input for capacity building programmes, coordination of programme planning, budgeting and reporting as well as monitoring and administrative services. The information management team in Paris coordinates global public awareness and information exchange activities under the clearinghouse with the regional teams. The coordinator and the assistant of the ECA network are also based in Paris.

10. The main activities for the CAP during its first year of operation in 2002 were to:

- (a) Initiate the re-orientation;
- (b) Form the Paris based and regional teams;
- (c) Develop a management tool suited to implementation of a regionalized programme;
- (d) Deliver compliance assistance services (policy advice, technical assistance and information services); and
- (e) Improve implementation and performance measurement.

11. The start up of CAP took place further to broad consultations with National Ozone Officers, Members of the Executive Committee, the Informal Advisory Group, the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, UNEP's Regional Directors, the Regional Network Co-coordinators and

existing UNEP staff, as well as DTIE and UNON senior management and external advisors. The CAP was formally presented to high-level officials of the countries through letters. The CAP was also presented during network meetings and a slide presentation, an information leaflet as well as articles in the OzonAction Newsletter and UNEP's website were developed. The programme was successfully regionalized and by the end of 2002 administrative changes and operational adjustments had been made to facilitate project implementation.

12. The overall objectives of UNEP during the 2003-2005 triennium presented in the 2003 Business Plan (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/39/11, p.3) were to:

- (a) Enable countries to achieve and sustain compliance with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol through technical and policy assistance;
- (b) Promote a greater sense of country "ownership" by helping countries integrate the CPs and ODS phase out strategies into their country's national environment plans or strategies;
- (c) Support performance-based national and sectoral phase-out plans through policy and legislation development and enforcement particularly for LVCs.

13. The current objectives of UNEP's activities, as described in the 2006-2008 Business Plan (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/48/9) are to:

- (a) Further build and strengthen capacity of client countries to meet their obligations under the Montreal Protocol and to ensure long-term sustainability of compliance;
- (b) Leverage and improve existing institutional and legislative frameworks and support the development of new policies and legal instruments to enable the implementation of ODS phase-out strategies and help prevent illegal trade;
- (c) Raise the political profile of the Montreal Protocol and thereby increase high level support for its implementation;
- (d) Enhance public awareness of the impact of the ozone layer depletion on human health and the environment and encourage civil society action;
- (e) Improve the access of client countries to a specific level of expertise and knowledge; and to disseminate and publicize good practices, innovative approaches and experiences in phase-out of CFCs, halons, methyl bromide, carbon tetrachloride and methyl chloroform;
- (f) Promote and enhance the inter-regional and intra-regional information exchange and cooperation in the implementation of the Montreal Protocol;
- (g) Enhance direct country-to-country assistance (formerly referred to as South-South/North-South cooperation), especially to those countries facing immediate and long-term compliance challenges;

- (h) Support the development of regional/sub-regional approaches to tackling problems of common concern;
- (i) Pursue universal membership of the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and its Amendments;
- (j) Encourage countries that have recently ratified the Vienna Convention, the Montreal Protocol and its Amendments to put in place and implement appropriate national policies, strategies and programmes to control and reduce the use of ODS in refrigeration and air-conditioning servicing, agriculture, fire-fighting and other relevant sectors;
- (k) Support regional/sub-regional initiatives to combat illegal traffic and trade in ODS;
- (l) Develop a more structured working arrangement with other Implementing Agencies thereby allowing for the provision of a coordinated and holistic service to client countries.

14. The CAP annual budgets evolved as shown below:

Year	Approved Funds (US\$)	Increase from Previous Year (%)	Returned Funds (US\$)	Support Costs (US\$)	
				Approved	Returned
2002	5,351,450	N/A	-1,492,528	428,116	-119,402
2003	5,830,885	8.96	-466,33	466,471	-37,311
2004	6,757,900	15.90	-48,858	540,632	-3,909
2005	7,157,544	5.91	0	572,604	0
2006	7,770,000	8.56	0	621,600	0
Total	32,867,779	39.33	-2,007,769	2,629,423	-160,622

15. The large amount of funds returned in 2002 was due to the fact that CAP staff had not been fully recruited. It should also be noted that, since 2002 IS projects implemented by UNEP do not have Project Support Costs (PSC) and CAP has 8% PSC overall. Some activities previously approved as separate projects such as regional awareness raising, as well as new activities such as the Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ECA) regional network are now incorporated into CAP.

16. The 2005 CAP budget was used for salaries of 43.5 professional and general staff members (see more details in Section III.4 below), more than 550 country-specific compliance services, operation of 9 Regional/Sub-regional Networks and the Information Clearing House. In addition, UNEP supported the operation of the Network of South-East Asia and the Pacific (SEAP), funded by Sweden outside the Multilateral Fund.

III.2 Operating and Managing the System

17. UNEP has refined and streamlined its internal procedures and guidelines to facilitate effective CAP implementation, including monitoring, reporting and approval procedures, guidelines for compliance assistance, guidelines for the transfer of projects to UNEP's Regional

Offices and the corresponding sub-allotment of funds. UNEP DTIE produced a “Launching Guide” for use by CAP staff.

18. The monitoring of CAP activities and implementation of UNEP projects funded by the Multilateral Fund is performed using an internet-based, programme-wide OzoneAction Management Information System (oMIS), which was developed and tested by CAP staff and became operational in 2003. oMIS is a project management database software which allows managers and users, when updated on a regular basis, to identify bottlenecks and delays; its concept is modelled on similar tools commonly used in the private sector. In oMIS each approved project is assigned to a professional staff member (Activity Leader), who is to regularly report on achieved milestones of the project through inputting the relevant information electronically in the system.

19. This system has resulted in clear responsibility and accountability being established for all projects, and improvements in the quality of monitoring and reporting of hundreds of disparate activities under CAP. Additional features are the report functions which allow data and trend analysis, accessibility worldwide via internet thus allowing reports to be up-dated or consulted during missions. It includes data on all projects in the inventory of approved projects, as well as a document section with key documents for easy downloading and detailed budget figures. Another feature is that oMIS not only recognises delays when the planned completion date is exceeded, but also milestone delays, for example when the funds are programmed 2 months after approval instead of 1 month. It is thus also an early warning tool.

20. The bi-monthly CAP Management Briefs are prepared to review the performance of all regional teams and individual staff members and highlight areas that need priority attention, thus creating peer-pressure and competition between the regional teams. CAP Management Briefs are submitted to UNEP’s Regional Directors, the Director of UNEP DTIE, the Director of Regional Coordination and to the regional teams. They are discussed in detail during regular telephone and video conferences between the OzoneAction Staff in Paris and each regional CAP team. UNEP also holds annual coordination and planning meetings for the Regional Network Co-ordinators, and separately for the RMP, MB and Policy Enforcement Officers. In addition, the Network and Policy Manager convenes frequent telephone and video conferencing with each regional CAP team which are deemed to contribute to improved programme management.

21. As part of the review of the performance indicators undertaken by the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, and with resources provided by the Government of Finland, UNEP provided suggestions for revised performance indicators for non-investment activities and CAP which form, with the progress and financial reports, the basis for the Secretariat’s yearly evaluation of the Business Plans.

III.3 Responsibilities of the CAP Coordination Team in Paris

22. The CAP team in Paris is responsible for the overall management of the CAP and performs the following tasks:

- (a) Coordination of the development, review and submission of annual Business Plans, Work Programmes and Work Programme Amendments;

- (b) Development, submission, and monitoring of the overall programme budget;
- (c) Coordination of training/capacity building activities, ensuring consistent methodologies;
- (d) Development, management and reporting on the Information Clearing House function as part of UNEP's mandate under Article 11 of the Montreal Protocol;
- (e) Coordination of RMP/CP/IS activities;
- (f) Coordination of the relationship with other implementing agencies and bilateral partners;
- (g) Coordination and/or preparation of reports for submission to Executive Committee, MOP, OEWG and Implementation Committee;
- (h) Monitoring all projects and activities of the programme, including those in the regions;
- (i) Maintenance of the OzonAction Management Information System (oMIS) as a main monitoring tool of the programme;
- (j) Development of regular CAP Management Briefs;
- (k) Financial and progress reporting to the Executive Committee on all projects and activities of the programme, including those implemented in the regions;
- (l) Identification and facilitation of the exchange of information, ideas, practices, and outputs between the Regional CAP teams.

23. The ECA network coordinator is also based in Paris, as is the GEF funded team working with CEIT countries.

III.4 Staffing of the CAP

24. At the end of December 2002, CAP teams in Paris, the Regional Office for Africa and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific were in place while those of the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean and the Regional Office for West Asia were near completion. In addition to the 12 existing professional staff, UNEP recruited 8 new professional staff. While the new team members were being recruited, key tasks related to CAP implementation in 2002 such as Networking, Information Clearinghouse and Institutional Strengthening were performed by existing staff with support from consultants for the recruitment process and the writing of job descriptions.

25. At the end of December 2003, all CAP teams were complete with the exception of the Halon Officer in ROWA and 2 G-posts. The European Network Coordinator post which was approved in December 2003 was being recruited. In the course of 2004, UNEP finalized the recruitment of the Halon Officer to be based in the Regional Office for West Asia. The recruitment of the RNC for ECA was completed in 2005 through lateral transfer as was the Monitoring and Administration Officer. The post classification of the full time Programme Assistant to the RNC for ECA, approved by the 47th Executive Committee, was initiated and the recruitment of a Clearing House Assistant on an upgraded post was completed.

26. In 2005 the staffing and distribution of the CAP was as follows:

CAP Team in:	Professional staff	General service staff
Ozone Action Branch, Paris	9.5	8
Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (ECA), Paris	1	1
Regional Office for Africa, Nairobi	5	2
Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, Bangkok ¹⁾	4	2
Regional Office for West Asia, Bahrain	3	2
Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, Mexico City	4	2
Total	26.5	17

¹⁾ This team also includes one professional staff member funded through a bilateral contribution from the Government of Sweden.

27. The new CAP staff required specific training. The RNCs, Policy & Enforcement Officers (POs), RMP Officers, and Methyl Bromide Phase-out Officers were trained through custom-designed workshops, to improve their skills and ability to support countries. A distance-training programme was developed for the Halon officer and has been used by the interim staff performing related activities.

IV. CAP Activities

IV.1 Assistance for countries in non-compliance

28. The Desk Study on Non-compliance with the Freeze in Consumption of CFCs, Halons, Methyl Bromide and Methyl Chloroform (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/46/8) specifically identified intervention by the CAP as a factor influencing a country's ability to return to compliance, namely through special assistance sessions at regional network meetings, and a number of high-level joint missions with other Implementing Agencies, South/South cooperation and a contribution to accelerate project preparation and/or implementation. The Desk Study on non-compliance states that "although the overall performance record suggests that the system works [...], the next reduction steps could result in a number of new cases of non-compliance". The table below provides the latest record on non-compliance with respect to phase-out schedules and data reporting obligations.

29. As of 26 May 2006, 79 countries had reported country programme or Article 7 data for 2005. There are currently 5 countries in non-compliance with the 50% reduction and 54 at risk of non-compliance with the 85% reduction in CFCs (defined as being in 2005 above the 85% reduction level required for 2007); 3 with the freeze and 4 with the 20% reduction for MB; 5 with the 85% reduction for CTC; 2 with the freeze and 3 with the 30% reduction for TCA (see

table below). Once complete 2005 data become available, new issues might need to be addressed in the full evaluation.

Status of compliance according to data received by May 26, 2006

Chemical	Year	Total Number of Countries with Data Reported	Number of Countries required to report	Number of Countries in Non-Compliance or at Risk of Non -Compliance with				
				Freeze	20% Reduction	30% Reduction	50% Reduction	85% Reduction
CFC	2002	139	140	12	N/A	N/A	84	126
	2003	141	144	6	N/A	N/A	67	120
	2004	142	144	4	N/A	N/A	47	116
	2005	79	144	0	N/A	N/A	5	54
Halon	2002	139	140	9	N/A	N/A	22	N/A
	2003	141	144	4	N/A	N/A	16	N/A
	2004	142	144	4	N/A	N/A	11	N/A
	2005	78	144	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Methyl Bromide	2002	135	140	20	33	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2003	137	144	9	24	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2004	137	144	10	20	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2005	76	144	3	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carbon Tetrachloride (CTC)	2002	137	140	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30
	2003	139	144	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34
	2004	140	144	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25
	2005	77	144	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Methyl Chloroform (TCA)	2002	137	140	11	N/A	17	N/A	N/A
	2003	139	144	7	N/A	12	N/A	N/A
	2004	140	144	3	N/A	6	N/A	N/A
	2005	77	144	2	N/A	3	N/A	N/A

Source: Article 7 data for 2002 to 2004; for 2005, 42 countries reported already Article 7 and CP implementation data, the remainder only data on CP implementation.

30. UNEP provided assistance to 35 of the 36 Article 5 countries at risk of or in actual non-compliance as identified by the 14th Meeting of the Parties (MOP) in December 2002. As of the 15th MOP in December 2003, 16 out of those 36 countries (i.e. 44%) returned to compliance while 20 remained in non-compliance (or came into non-compliance for other reasons). During 2004, UNEP provided compliance assistance to all 25 countries identified by the 15th Meeting of the Parties (MOP) in November 2003 as being at risk of or in actual non-compliance with phase-out targets for controlled substances.

31. As of the 16th MOP in November 2004, 21 out of those 25 countries (i.e. 84%) returned to compliance while 4 remained in non-compliance (or came into non-compliance for other reasons). The number of Article 5 countries declared to be in non-compliance was reduced from 21 in 2004 to 17 in 2005 and the CAP offered assistance to all of them either through direct communication with the Ozone Unit or through consultation with lead IAs. In some cases, CAP support was not required, as per advice of other IAs. In 2005, 84 countries received specific non-compliance assistance from CAP, that means 81% (instead of 80% planned) of countries in actual or potential non-compliance with phase-out targets, policy measures or data reporting were assisted.

32. This positive outcome can be attributed to a combination of factors, including the efforts of National Ozone Units (NOUs), national stakeholders, the implementing and bilateral agencies

as well as policy and technical support by the UNEP CAP staff through South-South cooperation and reviews/guidance during Network meetings. The different factors, in particular the role of CAP, will be further analyzed during the evaluation.

33. CAP provided assistance to countries that had not reported data under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol or that expressed difficulties with data reporting. This assistance included helping NOUs understand data reporting obligations, data collection and reporting methodologies, and data submission procedures. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of countries with missing data that received specific CAP assistance for data reporting subsequently reported by end 2003. The percentage of countries reporting data in 2003 was 89%, which is significantly higher compared to earlier years. As of 17th MOP, 100% of Article 5 countries had reported their baseline data (except new Party Niue). As of 26 May 2006, 142 of 144 Article 5 countries had submitted CFC consumption data for 2004. For 2005, 42 countries have already submitted Article 7 and CP implementation data, and another 37 only CP implementation data. This is about 10% more of data than had been submitted at the same time in 2004.

34. For 2003 and 2004 UNEP indicated that CAP provided direct policy and technical assistance to countries that have reported zero consumption of methyl bromide, carbon tetrachloride (CTC), trichloroethane (TCA) and halons to help ensure such levels of consumption are sustained. No data is provided in the 2005 Progress Report. The number of Article 5 countries which reported zero consumption in the year 2000 and continued to report zero consumption is as follows:

	2002	2003	2004
Methyl bromide	54	62	62
Halon	87	92	90
CTC	78	77	79
TCA	89	81	82

35. Additionally, as per UNEP's 2003 and 2004 Progress Report (no data provided in the 2005 Progress Report), the number of Article 5 countries which reported insignificant consumption in 2000 and which had decreased their consumption to zero is as follows:

	2002	2003	2004
Methyl bromide	7	8	22
Halon	8	3	12
CTC	9	9	17
TCA	8	20	27

36. In 2003 CAP assisted countries to verify the actual consumption, and provided direct assistance to NOUs, through its regional teams to help them verify data. Particular attention was given to CTC and TCA. Five Article 5 countries provided detailed information on the nature of their small CTC consumption (Bahrain, Croatia, Ecuador, Macedonia, Nepal). Two countries did the same for TCA (Bahrain, Ecuador).

IV.2 Assistance in Policy Development, Ratification, South-South Cooperation and Awareness Raising

37. CAP assists NOUs in the development, implementation and/or enforcement of policies and legislation, in particular of import-export licensing and quota systems, and in understanding the implications of ratifying the amendments to the Montreal Protocol. By 2004, 129 Article 5 countries had prepared, adopted or implemented licensing systems. UNEP maintains an inventory of policy/legislation/licensing systems for all Article 5 countries and regularly provides it to the Implementation Committee and Executive Committee through the Ozone Secretariat and Multilateral Fund Secretariat.

38. UNEP indicates that efforts to minimize illegal trade in ODS, in cooperation with other implementing agencies and bilateral partners, have been enhanced through regional meetings, national workshops, provision of awareness materials, and detection equipment.

39. The fact that the CAP works closely with the Ozone Secretariat, with the support of the UNEP Regional Directors has facilitated the accession of three countries to the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol (Afghanistan, Bhutan and Eritrea). UNEP has also assisted the Ozone Secretariat in promoting the ratification of Amendments to the Montreal Protocol. In 2004, 23 countries and in 2005, 16 countries ratified one or more of the Amendments.

40. UNEP views direct cooperation between countries as a very efficient and cost-effective way to meet technical and policy compliance challenges while at the same time strengthening inter- and intra-regional cooperation. Using resources approved by the Executive Committee as part of CAP's operating budget, UNEP's Regional CAP teams identified needs for such assistance and facilitate the travel of Ozone Officers and experts on missions to countries in actual or potential non-compliance or to those which recently ratified the Montreal Protocol.

41. Regional Directors and the Director of DTIE's OzoneAction Branch raised awareness regarding non-compliance and implementation-related matters during their missions to countries including Cambodia, Côte d'Ivoire, DPR Korea, Mongolia, Nepal and Sri Lanka, as well as in some high-level regional meetings. Several high-level missions were done jointly with other implementing agencies, for example to Albania and Pakistan. The results of these missions will be further analyzed in the regional case studies and subsequent evaluation synthesis report.

IV.3 Other Projects Implemented by UNEP

42. UNEP implements in addition to CAP numerous global, regional and national projects, using the same staff that also implement the CAP. The table below provides an overview of activities by type. The focus is on LVC countries. Since 1991, 939 projects have been approved, and 306 since 2002. 29% of these projects were still on-going at the end of 2005.

Number and Type of Approved Projects - June 1991 to December 2005 and respective completion ratio				
Type	Approved Projects*	On-going Projects	On-going Projects with Delays	Delayed Projects as % of On-going Projects
Country Programme	93	0	0	0
Institutional Strengthening	284	114	46	40.3
Preparation including RMP & TPMP	51	8	3	37.5
Technical Assistance	311	83	28	33.7
Training	194	66	27	40.0
Total	933	271	104	38%

43. Under the CAP, energetic efforts were made to finalize all old projects with long implementation delays and also to eliminate the backlog of project completion reports (PCRs). Close monitoring via oMIS and the CAP management briefs was instrumental in this effort, and there are indeed fewer projects in recent years with delays above 24 months and the backlog of PCRs has successfully been eliminated. However, there are still a number of projects, in particular some institutional strengthening, training and technical assistance projects with delays above 12 and even 24 months (See Annex I). These delays often can not be fully controlled by UNEP, as progress also depends on the NOUs and other institutions in the Article 5 countries, to finalize legislation, for example, or to provide the financial reports required to formally complete a project. The increased number and presence of CAP staff in the regions seems to have had a beneficial effect, as it facilitated contacts with the countries, including training of new Ozone Officers. Further analysis of the synergy effects of CAP and other UNEP projects will be undertaken in the context of the regional case studies.

IV.4 Interagency Co-operation and Communication

44. UNEP DTIE communicates regularly with the other implementing agencies, bilateral agencies, the Multilateral Fund and Ozone Secretariats through, *inter alia*, Regional Network meetings, other national/regional workshops organized by UNEP, the CAP Advisory Group, and inter-agency meetings organized by the Fund Secretariat in Montreal. UNEP DTIE developed Guidelines for Cooperation with other Implementing Agencies. UNEP also cooperated with agencies through a number of joint missions; in its 2005 Progress Report, UNEP included 17 such examples involving between one and seven agencies, and the secretariats. On the other hand, in view of criticism articulated by some implementing and bilateral agencies on the lack of interagency coordination, or a competitive attitude of UNEP with regard to project preparation and acquisition, a more thorough review of the underlying issues will be necessary.

V. Regional Network Activities

45. In 2002, eight regional networks of ozone officers, one of them in South-East Asia and the Pacific being funded by Sweden, were in place for 114 developing countries, including 2 non-parties. Membership increased to 144 developing countries, including 6 non-parties in 2003. By 2004, UNEP facilitated the operation of 10 regional/sub-regional networks; members included 147 developing countries and 14 developed countries and the European Commission.

* Excluding cancelled and transferred projects.

In 2005, the number of developing countries and countries with economies in transition involved rose to 148.

46. Currently operating networks with members from Article 5 and non Article 5 countries are as follows:

- (a) Latin America-South (10 Article 5 countries and as non Article 5 countries USA and Canada);
- (b) Latin America-Central (10 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries USA and Canada);
- (c) Caribbean (13 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries USA and Canada);
- (d) English-speaking Africa (26 Article 5 countries and as non-Article 5 country Germany);
- (e) French-speaking Africa (27 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries France and Switzerland);
- (f) West Asia (12 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries France and Germany);
- (g) South Asia (13 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 country Japan);
- (h) Southeast Asia and the Pacific (11 Article 5 countries including Fiji which is also member of the Pacific Island countries network and as non-Article 5 countries Australia, New Zealand and Sweden. This Network is funded by the Government of Sweden);
- (i) Pacific Island Countries (14 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries Australia, New Zealand and Sweden. This Network is funded through an individual project); and
- (j) Europe and Central Asia (13 Article 5 countries, and as non-Article 5 countries Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovak Republic, Sweden and the European Commission).

47. The Networks are administered by Regional Network Coordinators based in UNEP Regional Offices in Bahrain, Bangkok, Mexico City, Nairobi, and UNEP DTIE Paris, and coordinated by the Network and Policy Manager in UNEP DTIE. Networking comprises annual meetings and follow-up workshops; regular communication between UNEP and the Ozone Officers to provide information and assistance in resolving any difficulties encountered; thematic and contact group meetings; and country-to-country cooperation. UNEP organises meetings inside and outside of network meetings with countries experiencing difficulties with compliance.

48. The regional network meetings are often held in countries in potential or actual non-compliance to raise awareness of high-level decision-makers in those countries about the urgency of returning to compliance. Compliance sessions for countries in potential or actual non-compliance are organised by UNEP in the margins of all regional network meetings since 2003. UNEP states that the participation of the relevant implementing agencies, bilateral agencies and Secretariats has proved extremely useful in resolving problems related to data reporting and in helping the concerned countries to achieve compliance with the 2005 phase-out targets.

49. Responding to the 2001 evaluation of the regional networks and to the request of the member countries in most regions, from 2003 onwards UNEP placed more emphasis on thematic meetings and introduced small group meetings to address specific sub-regional issues. The regional electronic discussion forums to exchange information and experiences between NOUs, implementing agencies and member countries were improved. These measures have made the network meetings more effective by facilitating a focus on specific priority subjects.

50. During 2005, UNEP organised 32 regional network meetings, thematic workshops, small group meetings and national thematic workshops in all regions, and the CAP staff carried out 42 missions to relevant conferences, workshops and meetings.

51. In 2003, the establishment of the ECA regional network covered another important region; it held its first meeting in Macedonia in October 2003. During 2005, the ECA network continued focussing its efforts on facilitating Contact Group Meetings and direct country-to-country assistance, as well as regional awareness raising, training of new NOUs, meeting with UNIDO to coordinate activities, and negotiating the framework agreement on cooperation with the Regional Intelligence Liaison Office – Commonwealth of Independent States (RILO CIS).

52. The creation in 2005 of a Portuguese-speaking sub-group within the African Network has improved communication with Portuguese-speaking countries and the access of those countries to Multilateral Fund assistance. In 2005, the Information Clearing House continued to participate in multi-party cooperation to assist African Portuguese-speaking NOUs in terms of information and awareness, in partnership with the Governments of Portugal and Brazil, UNDP and GTZ. At the Arusha Network meeting in October 2005 all Portuguese-speaking African countries met for the first time and with the participation of Portugal to discuss ozone layer protection issues. In December 2005, the Executive Committee approved, on an exceptional basis, Portugal's bilateral assistance project to support communication activities in the Portuguese speaking Article 5 countries.

VI. Information Clearing House and Public Awareness Activities

53. In 2002, UNEP developed and submitted to the Executive Committee the *Global Communication Strategy for Compliance with the Montreal Protocol*, described as “a major milestone in promoting national compliance through targeted regional and national information, education and communication (IEC) strategies to support specific national compliance objectives”. This document was developed to guide UNEP and inform others about how to design and develop action oriented awareness activities.

54. During 2005 the Information Clearing House services and awareness raising activities were performed by the Paris-located Information Management Team which provided direct and indirect compliance assistance to Article 5 countries through document dissemination, E-news services, the OzonAction Web Site, Halon Trader (B2B) Web Site, MultiMedia Collection, Environmentally Sound Technologies Information System (ESTIS) for NOUs, International Day for the Preservation of the Ozone Layer related activities (Ozzy Ozone booklets, TV and radio spots, children's web site, animated awareness video, Ozone Day web site and press conferences and releases), outreach at Meetings of the Parties, and activities to promote children's awareness.

55. UNEP provides continuous assistance to countries through query response, document dissemination, E-news services, the OzonAction Web Site (www.uneptie.org/ozonaction), the Halontrader Web Site (www.halontrader.org), and Multimedia Information use. In addition, activities were undertaken to improve information services and support for Russian-speaking countries and a new web feature that showcases the achievements, outputs and progress made by the Protocol's "implementation community", which includes NOUs, bilateral agencies, the Implementing Agencies, the Ozone and Multilateral Fund Secretariats was created.

56. The Information Clearing House provided substantial input (guidance, comments and existing audio-visual materials) to the Regional CAP teams to assist in developing information/awareness projects at the regional level. The Information Clearing House also helped publicise and distribute the products at the global level. This included, for example, the Information Clearing House inputs to the ROAP-led publication Guide for National Ozone Officers, which helps build the capacity of new ozone officers and their staff.

57. In 2005, the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) based in Montreal initiated a web-based version of its border training programme for officers in USA, Canada and Mexico. During this development, which was still ongoing at the end of 2005, the CEC used training material developed by UNEP for customs officers and mentioned that 'UNEP-DTIE's products have been extremely useful in the preparation of CEC ODS on-line training'.

58. There is currently a major ongoing feedback collection effort conducted by the Information Clearing House to understand the perception of ozone officers about materials they have received and their future needs in particular with regard to Ozzy Ozone. So far responses from 93 countries have been received. Once completed, this information should complement the evaluation up-date of the Clearing House.

59. UNEP, in consultation with the Halon Technical Options Committee, designed and launched a Business-to-Business web portal, the Online Halon Trader (www.halontrader.org) in 2001. This web site is designed for companies that use halons in "critical" applications and it provides a virtual marketplace where offers can match demand for banked halon. The site contains numerous listings to date of available or sought halon submitted by 65 organisations. In 2005, the combined quantities of halon listed were 2,261 MT of halon 1211 (6,783 ODP tonnes), 2,983 MT of halon 1301 (29,830 ODP tonnes), and 1,599 MT of halon 2402 (9,594 ODP tonnes).

VII. Capacity Building Activities

60. The Capacity Building Team (CBT) is part of the CAP coordination team located in Paris. It consists of 2 professional and 2 general service staff members funded by the Multilateral Fund as well as one professional staff member funded through a bilateral project.

61. The CBT is developing a web-based Capacity Building Centre which takes into account current capacity building needs of client countries. Its objectives are:

- (a) To provide an easy reference tool for monitoring and implementation of capacity building activities;
- (b) To streamline and support continuous information exchange on regional capacity

building activities for implementation and planning;

- (c) To facilitate cross-fertilization between the regional CAP teams, NOUs and other Implementing and Bilateral Agencies; and
- (d) To provide a quick mechanism for addressing emerging issues through adequate technical and policy support.

62. CBT conducted a global bidding exercise for refrigeration and customs training equipment in 2005. This annual exercise facilitates the administrative process for the regional CAP teams in purchasing and delivering training equipment to Article 5 countries, thus ensuring the smooth conduct of training workshops.

63. CBT initiated work on updating the UNEP's Training Manual for Customs Officers and NOUs. Leading experts in the field as well as the Fund Secretariat and regional CAP staff were consulted to develop a concept for the update.

64. In 2005, CBT coordinated and facilitated the organisation of thematic meetings for RMP Officers (March), Methyl Bromide Officers (May) and Policy and Enforcement Officers (November). These meeting allowed the officers to exchange information and share their experiences in project implementation as well as plan and synchronise their annual activities. These meetings proved useful to the CAP teams for better coordination and implementation of activities at the regional/country levels.

65. CBT co-ordinated input of the OzonAction Branch in the Mauritius International Meeting on Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The OzonAction Branch organised a side event in collaboration with the Governments of Saint Lucia and Mauritius, UNEP DEPI and the Secretariat of the Basel Convention on "Lessons Learned in Implementing Multilateral Environmental Agreements in SIDS." This session shared information on the development of innovative approaches and building capacity of SIDS to negotiate, comply with, implement, and enforce MEAs, regional and South-South collaboration and coordination, simplified reporting, and capacity building. The session also highlighted UNEP's initiatives to assist SIDS in implementing MEAs, and discussed the Montreal Protocol as a successful MEA.

66. CBT facilitated the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between UNEP DTIE and the Oceania Customs Organisation based on the mutual interest and concern of both organizations in strengthening cooperation among customs authorities of the Pacific Island Countries in combating illegal trade, particularly in ozone depleting substances.

67. CBT also provided input for the formulation of a project proposal by a GEF funded international expert entitled "Building Capacity of Custom Officers and Judiciaries for Effective Control of Import and Export of Toxic and Hazardous Chemicals". The CBT's input was limited to highlighting the experience of the Montreal Protocol in facilitating training of custom officers.

68. Further, CBT provided input in the development of UNEP DEPI's Draft Manual on Compliance with and Enforcement of MEAs, particularly drawing on the CAP experience in coordinating training of custom officers under the Montreal Protocol.

VIII. Evaluation Issues, Methodology and Workplan

VIII.1 Evaluation Issues

69. Following the analysis of documentation and the interviews conducted so far, the evaluation aims to further review and discuss the following issues:

- (a) the extent to which the objectives of CAP, as defined in Business Plans and other documents, have been realised;
- (b) the assistance requested and received from CAP by Article 5 countries; this will help to understand whether and how the CAP has been focused on the specific needs of these countries;
- (c) the contribution of the assistance provided by CAP to achieving, maintaining or restoring compliance with the phase-out schedules, data reporting and policy requirements under the Montreal Protocol and its amendments; this will require consideration of the impact on different activities, such as networks, Information Clearing House, capacity building, high level visits and joint missions, etc.;
- (d) the added value of CAP beyond and in addition to what was being provided by UNEP's recurring activities prior to CAPs approval in December 2001 to demonstrate whether the focus on compliance assistance and the decentralization of staff made a difference;
- (e) the relation between the activities funded under CAP and individual projects implemented by UNEP, as well as supplementary activities funded by several bilateral donor countries;
- (f) the cooperation and division of labour with other implementing and with bilateral agencies, in order to determine whether there are synergies or competition and overlaps.

70. The ozone officers should, if applicable, provide information on specific problems of their respective countries resulting in non-compliance. This question can be disaggregated as follows to cover:

- (a) Which of the problems hamper compliance;
- (b) Which of these problems have actually been addressed by CAP, and by what specific activity; and
- (c) Which of these problems require new measures.

71. The extent to which the recommendations of the evaluation of regional networks in 2001 (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/7 and Corr.1 and decision 33/3) and of the Information Clearing House in 2002 (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/36/5 and decision 36/2) have been implemented by UNEP will be analyzed.

VIII.2 Methodology

72. Information regarding the effectiveness of the CAP programme will be obtained from:
- (a) National ozone officers, mainly when participating in Regional Network Meetings;
 - (b) UNEP, as the implementing agency of the CAP programme;
 - (c) Other implementing and bilateral agencies;
 - (d) Partners involved in activities organized by CAP, for example customs officers, NGOs, enforcement agencies;
 - (e) Other stakeholders, for example members of the Executive Committee.
73. Tangible effects relating to compliance that are unequivocally attributable to CAP measures are difficult or even impossible to quantify because compliance generally depends on a great variety of closely interrelated factors such as macro-economic conditions, political and administrative structures, performance of the NOU, cooperation of stakeholders, etc. The evaluation will therefore review the results achieved by the activities performed under the CAP as experienced, stated, perceived, and/or assessed by the recipients of a given type of assistance. Such results will be cross-checked with UNEP and other IAs, whenever appropriate.
74. The regional network meetings provide an ideal and cost-effective opportunity to meet the ozone officers from Article 5 countries, members of the regional CAP team, and representatives of the implementing agencies working in the region. The CAP evaluation will therefore be performed primarily in regional network meetings, supplemented by information from the case studies on countries in non-compliance.
75. A standardized questionnaire will be completed by all ozone officers. In view of the experience obtained with the initial questionnaire completed by the participants of the ECA, ROA, SEAP and SA Network Meetings in the first half of 2006, this survey tool will be refined and used in the remaining regions. Some discussions, in particular on the Information Clearing House, will also be held in the margins of the OEWG meeting in July 2006.
76. Complementary information will be obtained in individual discussions with Network participants to get a more complete picture of the overall conditions, specific compliance-related problems, the factors influencing the ODS phase-out process in the individual countries and the assistance received by CAP.
77. UNEP's data records on the assistance requested from and provided by CAP to the individual countries shall be used for cross-checking the information obtained with the questionnaires filled by the network members. Such data are available in UNEP's document "Country-by-Country Activities implemented by CAP Staff" for each year. Additional data has been requested from UNEP such as detailed historical lists of participants in regional network meetings, and reports documenting high level missions which are considered to have played a key role both in new adhesions to the Amendments of the Montreal Protocol, or in return to compliance.

78. Interview guidelines have been developed and used for discussions with UNEP/DTIE staff (Head of the unit, Regional Network Manager and members of some of the regional CAP teams) who participated in the network meetings, or in Paris. Experiences, opinions and assessments by the NOUs will be compared with those of the CAP staff.

79. Guidelines for interviews were used for discussions with staff of implementing agencies and bilateral agencies and have also been developed for customs officers participating in meetings organized by CAP to determine the benefit they get from this participation and subsequent cooperation.

VIII.3 Proposed Work Plan for the Evaluation

- (a) Finalize the evaluation instruments (questionnaires and interview guidelines) in light of the information obtained from the initial series of interviews;
- (b) Collect information at network meetings and also during the preparation of country case studies on non-compliance; other means of communication will also be used, as required, such as fax and e-mail;
- (c) Prepare case studies for all regions;
- (d) Prepare the Synthesis Evaluation Report with findings and recommendations for consideration by the 52nd Meeting of the Executive Committee (or 51st Meeting if possible).

IX. Action Expected from the Executive Committee

80. The Executive Committee may wish to take note of the information provided in the Desk Study on the Evaluation of the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), as presented in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/8, including the proposed evaluation issues and work plan for the second phase of the evaluation.

UNEP's COMPLETED PROJECTS BY TYPE AND IMPLEMENTATION DELAYS

Type	Year Approved	Early Completion	On Time	1 to 6 months	7 to 12 months	13 to 24 months	25 to 36 months	More than 36 months	Grand Total
Country Programme	1991			2	2	2			6
	1992	1	1	2	2	1	1		8
	1993	6	1	3	2	2		1	15
	1994	5	2	2	6	4	2	1	22
	1995	2	3	1	2			4	12
	1996		1	1	1	3			6
	1997	2	2	1		1		3	9
	1998		1			1			2
	1999					1		1	2
	2000					1	3	1	5
	2002		1	1	1	1			4
2004	1				1			2	
	SubTotal	17	12	13	20	17	4	10	93
Institutional Strengthening	1993				3	1	1	3	8
	1994				1	3	2	6	12
	1995					3	5	1	9
	1996			4	2	2		3	11
	1997			7	4	3	1		15
	1998			4	5	1	3	3	16
	1999	1	3	10	2	3	1	1	21
	2000	1	1	7	1	5	3		18
	2001	3	2	6	3	1			15
	2002	4	5	5	4	3			21
	2003	1	13	1					15
	2004	2	4	1	1				8
	2005	1							1
	SubTotal	13	28	45	29	27	12	16	170
Preparation	1997	2	1	2	2	2	1		10
	1998		2	1	3	1	1		8
	1999				2	4		1	7
	2000						1	2	3
	2001		1	1	1				3
	2002					1			1
	2003		2	3	1				6
	2004	2		1					3
2005	2							2	
	SubTotal	6	6	8	10	7	3	3	43
Technical Assistance	1991	1		1					2
	1992		3	1					4
	1993	1	3	1	1		2	1	9
	1994	5	3	1	5	1	1	2	18
	1995	1	12	1	1	1	2	3	21
	1996	3	6	5	1		1	3	19
	1997	1	17	11	3	2		4	38
	1998	1	15	1	3	2			22
	1999		13	4	1	11	1	2	32
	2000		13	2	11	4	3	2	35
	2001	3		3	3	6		2	17
	2002			2	1		1		4
2003	1					1		2	
2004		1						1	
	SubTotal	17	86	33	30	28	11	19	224
Training	1991	1	2						3
	1992	1	1			1			3
	1993	3	5	3	3	1	1	1	17
	1994	1	1		1	1	1		5
	1995	4	1	1			1	1	8
	1996			1	2	3	1	4	11
	1997	1	1	1		1	2	8	14
	1998					4	4	6	14
	1999	1		4	2	4	4	4	19
	2000	1	2	2	3	4	1	1	14
	2001			1		7	1		9
	2002			2	3	1	1		7
2003	2	1			1			4	
	SubTotal	15	14	15	14	28	17	25	128
Grand Total		68	146	114	103	107	47	73	658