



联合国



环境规划署

Distr.

GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63

3 March 2009

CHINESE

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书  
多边基金执行委员会  
第五十七次会议  
2009年3月30日至4月3日，蒙特利尔

2010年以后的体制建设：供资和数额  
(根据第53/39号决定采取的行动)

## 一、导言

1. 本文件是根据执行委员会第 53/39 号决定编制的，执行委员会在该决定中“请秘书处审查针对能力建设可能采取的供资安排和数额，探索供资方面执行委员会可能考虑的任何其他措施的范围、性质和合宜程度，以便根据体制建设活动方面执行委员会商定的准则来安排氟氯烃淘汰活动，并在 2009 年举行第一次会议之前向执行委员会汇报。”本文件所示信息和分析的最初依据是 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/61 号文件“关于 2010 年以后可行供资安排和体制加强支助的程度以及关于调整体制加强更新进程的文件”。

2. 按照执行委员会的要求，秘书处在编制本文件时也参照了提交第五十六次会议的体制建设项目评估的结论。

3. 本文件根据《蒙特利尔议定书》现有的管控措施，审查了体制建设和能力建设目前的供资安排，并分析了继续体制建设支助的需求。此外，本文件还审议了缔约方第十九次会议第 XIX/6 号决定的影响，该决定增加了新的加速氟氯烃淘汰方面的义务，并为执行委员会提供了 2010 年之后体制建设项目供资的备选办法。在本文件编制过程中作为参考审议或使用的其他文件及相关决定载于本文件附件。

## 二、背景

4. 目前执行委员会已核准供资的总额为 68,242,292 美元，外加 5,295,515 美元的机构支助费，用于 143 个第 5 条国家的体制建设项目。在 2004 至 2008 年期间，多边基金用于延长体制建设项目的总支出达 28,951,612 美元，其中未包括平均每年 580 万美元的机构支助费用，平均每个国家有一个已核准的体制建设项目已进入执行的第四阶段。

5. 体制建设项目的供资水平自 2004 年以来保持不变。体制建设支助水平曾经在 2001 年 12 月和 2004 年 7 月经历过两次修改。2001 年 12 月，第 35/57 号决定规定体制建设项目供资整体增长 30%。体制建设项目供资水平最近一次提升是因为 2004 年 7 月的第 43/37 号决定，执行委员会承认了低消费量国家和极低消费量国家的特殊情况，并将体制建设项目的最低供资水平提高至每年 30,000 美元，但前提是相关国家应落实相应的立法并已任命一名全职国家臭氧干事。

6. 鉴于国家臭氧机构目前的氟氯化碳淘汰活动，秘书处在第五十三次会议的 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/61 号文件中就遵守氟氯烃管控措施可能需要的国家臭氧机构活动得出了一般性结论，这些结论促使执行委员会注意到“第 5 条国家为 2010 年后满足履约义务所需的预期行动表明，体制建设的资助可能需要在 2010 年之后继续提供”。该文件的摘要载于附件一，供委员会参考。

### 三、缔约方第十九次会议和执行委员会氟氯烃决定相关的 2010 年后新活动

7. 根据第五十四次会议关于加速氟氯烃淘汰的第 XIX/6 号决定，执行委员会就氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的准则（第 54/39 号决定）及其编制的供资水平（第 56/16 号决定）做出了决定。与这些决定引发的国家臭氧机构活动有关的重要因素包括：

- (a) 依照第 54/39 号决定，启动完整氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的设计和编制，最初由国家臭氧机构负责；
- (b) 继续进行氟氯烃淘汰管理计划第一阶段的设计（涉及 2013 年和 2015 年管控措施），包括业绩承诺；
- (c) 在投资项目核准之前确定生产国家消费量削减的起始点；
- (d) 利用氟氯烃淘汰管理计划编制供资和氟氯烃淘汰管理计划项目供资提供的财政支助制订并实施扩大的立法、条例以及许可制度；
- (e) 对财务奖励和共同出资的可能性展开调查；
- (f) 利用现有国家臭氧机构的体制和能力适当地节省氟氯烃淘汰的费用；
- (g) 转变或扩展行业协会的作用，以推动氟氯烃的淘汰；
- (h) 氟氯烃淘汰管理计划执行期间，国家一级所需活动将在国家臭氧机构和未来的项目管理机构之间进行分配，项目管理机构的供资将由符合现有的已核准的国家淘汰计划和最终淘汰管理计划准则的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划提供。

8. 成功淘汰氟氯烃所必须的许多体制和能力已经具备，这是多边基金的援助下在国家一级建立的，旨在淘汰氟氯化碳/四氯化碳/哈龙。一些满足氟氯烃管控措施所必须的工作可以通过现有的体制能力完成，但氟氯烃淘汰的有些问题却会更加复杂、更具挑战性。重要因素可能包括：

- (a) 尽管 ODP 消费量不高（因为大多数氟氯烃的 ODP 值较低），许多国家需要解决相对较高的氟氯烃实际消费水平，即长吨数；
- (b) 有些国家氟氯烃消费量的增长速度可能很快，而它们需要在不到四年的时间里使增长率降低到零；
- (c) 需要对替代制冷剂的选择进行管理，尤其在需要考虑气候影响的时候；
- (d) 需要制订并实施各项国家政策，以支持按照企业的偏好以具体项目为基础进行的技术选择，并将气候效益考虑在内；

- (e) 在淘汰规划过程中，需要促进和实现利益攸关方的参与，包括氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的编制。

9. 以上因素给国家臭氧机构带来了重大挑战，特别是由于在氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的编制阶段还没有项目管理机构，而在此期间需要制订立法和政策准则。这种复杂性在政策制订活动中得到了体现，向第五十四次和第五十五次会议提交氟氯烃淘汰活动拟订增量成本估计数是政策制订活动 顶峰。在第五十五次和第五十六次会议上，执行委员会核准了向 115 个国家的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划编制提供资金。

#### 四、能力建设供资

##### 目前供资情况

10. 旨在推动《蒙特利尔议定书》目标的体制能力支助已通过多边基金在全球、地区和国家一级提供。在全球一级，执行委员会在其第四次会议中将环境规划署定为专门为第 5 条国家的能力建设提供资料交流和信息交换职能的执行机构。环境规划署的能力发展作用逐步扩展；2002 年 3 月召开的第三十五次会议将该职能正式纳入履约协助方案。该方案包含对国家臭氧干事区域网络的援助，后来扩展为对所有接受基金援助的第 5 条国家国家臭氧机构提供地区性援助。环境规划署 2009 年履约协助方案的供资金额为 849 万美元。作为履约协助方案的重要优先活动之一，应向有剩余四氯化碳/甲基氯仿或甲基溴消费的国家提供特别支助，使其实现履约。

11. 在国家一级，对第 5 条国家与臭氧保护相关的体制能力的发展和部分进行中的维护，基金的支助主要通过各项国家淘汰计划、制冷剂管理计划和最终淘汰管理计划提供，也直接通过各项体制建设项目的供资提供。

12. 消费量较大国家的国家淘汰计划主要关注以消耗臭氧层物质为基础的生产能力的转化。但大多数也纳入了对供资的管理和监管，这些资金最高可达用于支助项目管理机构运营的项目费用的 12%。除了具体的项目管理职能之外，非低消费量国家项目管理机构的职责通常包括，联络国家利益攸关方、管理立法制订以及与国家臭氧机构密切合作来监测淘汰情况。在没有此项供资的情况下，这些活动以及通过项目管理机构获得资助的其他类似活动将由国家臭氧机构全权负责。

13. 许多制冷剂管理计划和最终淘汰管理计划的费用部分，如立法制订、宣传方案和技术援助等，构成了对国家能力的直接支助。在最终淘汰管理计划中，这些部分的供资通常占给予项目管理机构的拨款的 20%。对这些活动的支助通常被编列在体制建设项目下，因此可视作为对体制支助总水平的补充。依照这些比例估算，通过相关国家的已核准的国家淘汰计划、制冷剂管理计划以及最终淘汰管理计划中所编列的项目管理机构活动而获得的体制能力供资大约为 4,500 万美元。

14. 对于通过体制建设项目开展的能力建设，目前这些项目的财务情况已更新，并载入本文件附件三。

#### 未来工作量和供资额预估

15. 对于未来，已核准的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的编制准则和执行委员会在第 54/39 号和第 56/16 号决定中通过的供资标准对氟氯烃淘汰管理计划编制下的体制能力支助做出规定，其中已经考虑了政策和立法方面的援助。当提交完整氟氯烃淘汰管理计划给执行委员会核准时，根据有关国家淘汰计划的准则，可以通过各氟氯烃淘汰管理计划下给予项目管理机构的可能供资提供额外的能力建设资源。在项目机构内部，供资将特别用于监督和扩展监管措施。

16. 由此并根据秘书处所能提供的数据可以断定，针对氟氯烃的额外工作中很多和以下活动相关：了解和量化国家消费模式、与各行业建立联系、扩展监管措施以及完善监督使其纳入氟氯烃。可以看出，在针对其他消耗臭氧层物质的活动中类似活动应该已经实施，或者已纳入氟氯烃淘汰管理计划。

17. 只有当氟氯烃淘汰管理计划开始执行，根据氟氯烃淘汰管理计划得到供资的未来的项目管理机构方能开始运作。在未来 12 至 18 个月，准备在 2013 年实现氟氯烃冻结以及支持氟氯烃淘汰管理计划项目编制所必需的体制工作需要通过国家臭氧机构的资源来执行，并且得到执行机构的支持，通过后者可以获得编制资金。

18. 为实现这一目标，执行委员会已核准的用于每个国家编制氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的供资总额中编列了特定的供资部分，用来支助政策和立法的制订以及各国氟氯烃使用模式的调查和分析。此项供资将作为对各项活动的直接援助，否则这些活动将由国家臭氧机构通过该国体制建设项目的供资全权运作。

19. 从上文可以看出国家臭氧机构和根据氟氯烃淘汰管理计划设立的项目管理机构之间的联系。因此，一旦项目管理机构在氟氯烃淘汰管理计划下成立，将有助于进一步探索国家臭氧机构和项目管理机构之间的关系，以重新调整两个机构之间机构性支助的供资水平，从而使基金资源能够在以下两者之间进行区分，即对国家臭氧机构的持续机构性支助以及那些和淘汰氟氯烃这一未来主要目标更直接相关的支助。

#### 消费量较低的低消费量国家的情况

20. 按照执行委员会目前的政策，具体指第 43/37 号决定，国家臭氧机构体制建设项目的最低供资水平是每年 30,000 美元，前提条件是相应的国家已实施进口管控并任命了全职臭氧干事。目前有 93 个国家以每年 30,000 美元的供资水平接受体制建设项目支助。这些国家也在执行最终淘汰管理计划，并获得了在最终淘汰管理计划下给予项目管理机构的一次性供资，平均金额为每国 50,000 美元。此外，那些氟氯烃淘汰管理计划编制资金获得核准的国家还获得了 20,000 美元或 45,000 美元的一次性供资；该资金作为氟氯烃淘汰管

理计划编制资金的一部分，用于制订政策和立法以及氟氯烃的调查和分析，其金额取决于各自的氟氯烃消费量。

## 五、由提交给第五十六次会议的体制建设项目评估报告所引发的事项

21. 关于体制建设的供资金额，体制建设评估报告的结论包括：

- 有充分证据表明，若没有体制建设项目，消耗臭氧层物质淘汰的时间表就不可能实现；
- 在人员配制、机构地位，以及体制建设预算用于人员工资、顾问和活动费用的比例等方面，不同国家之间存在很大差别；这些差别反映了各国的不同形势和要求，以及通过政府部门和执行机构协商而确立的具体项目模式；
- 在极个别情况下，并非所有体制建设都需要供资；但许多国家的国家臭氧机构称，体制建设供资还不够支付特定方面的费用，比如在某个面积较大的国家的差旅费。此外，不少国家也反映，近年来由于该国的通货膨胀和汇率浮动，体制建设供资的实际购买力已经下降。

22. 上述结论证实了这一传闻：虽然体制建设项目对履约的贡献很难量化，但毫无疑问的使，通过它们所实现的项目和供资已经对《蒙特利尔议定书》履约目标的实现和维持发挥了重要作用。

23. 对于每个国家可获得的供资水平，体制建设评估报告认为，这与执行委员会第七次会议所提供的最初指导方针相关。报告分析指出，三年期以具体情况为基础的供资水平从低消费量国家的 170,000 美元到高消费量国家的 400,000 美元不等，其最初的关注点是该国的基准消费量。

24. 评估报告指出，执行委员会用以确定体制建设供资的具体情况以及各国在供资水平和执行模式方面的差别表明，试图通过把各项费用加起来“自下而上”地分析或确立体制建设的供资水平，这种做法不可行。对于当前供资金额的充足性，有些国家认为绰绰有余，而其他国家的国家臭氧机构则认为不足。

25. 体制建设评估报告还发现许多体制建设项目延期很长，有些是因为缺少完成日期的规划而使体制建设各阶段的时间延长，而有些是由于延期请求提交过迟因而延误了下一阶段的核准日期。报告中的数据表明，因为提交的拖延和体制建设后续阶段核准的拖延，这些国家可能已经“错失”了大约 2,170 万美元的供资，占已核准体制建设供资总额的 33%。

26. 在分析此类提交拖延的数据时报告指出，在 143 个（总数）接受体制建设供资的国家中，有 130 个国家在体制建设更新方面存在某种形式的拖延。报告还明确表示，大多数国家体制建设更新拖延是由于行政原因，即执行机构转拨已核准资金拖延、该国对执行机构财务汇报拖延，或执行机构对秘书处财务汇报拖延，或者是因为受援国政治不稳定。事

实上，在实现《蒙特利尔议定书》履约目标时，这些国家中有许多仍然在项目执行方面面临困难，因此它们需要国家臭氧机构的持续援助。

#### 根据第 56/6 (b)号决定制订的体制建设项目目标、预期结果和可选指标

27. 在由体制建设评估报告得出的第 56/6 (b)号决定中，秘书处正在拟订一套用于未来体制建设延长申请的目标、预期结果和指标，以及一套用于最终报告和延长申请的格式。按计划，这些事项将在和各个国家和执行机构协商之后完成，这样所确定的报告格式就可以应用于在 2010 年提交的体制建设延长申请。这项工作和本文件的编制分开进行。但是，有两个事项作为本文件所提议的体制建设项目的持续供资的可选条件之一需立即审议，请见下文。

#### 进口管控措施的有效性

28. 作为近期氟氯烃政策文件所引发的一个重要事项是，绝大多数第 5 条国家都应遵守 2013 年和 2015 年的管控措施，无任何企业在生产中使用氟氯烃，实现这一点的将取决于这些国家的进口管控。氟氯化碳维修行业的经验清楚地表明，供应端管控对消费量目标的实现至关重要。在本三年期，对有效的进口管控措施进行扩展以纳入各种氟氯烃，将成为国家臭氧机构最重要的任务之一。鉴于氟氯烃进口有效管理对履约的重要性，已经划拨部分氟氯烃淘汰管理计划编制资金，专门用于早期政策和立法的审查及制订，以制订国家氟氯烃消费管理战略。

29. 因此，扩展目前消耗臭氧层物质的管控措施，将氟氯烃纳入各个体制建设项目供资延长申请的目标之中，也许是一项适当的举措。此外，也可以将实现氟氯烃进口的有效管控纳入体制建设成功执行的评估指标之中。注意，氟氯烃消费冻结将于 2013 年开始，在 2012 年底就应该制订并执行各项管控措施。因此，对于 2013 年和以后提交的延长体制建设两年期完整供资申请，将该指标的实现当作核准此类请求的前提条件是合乎情理的。对于这一政策的运作，可以效仿目前适用于延长体制建设项目的未履约政策的运作，后者的运作方式为：由于可能未实现履约，将只核准一年的体制建设供资，并视执行委员会对该未履约事项的决议而定。

#### 维持零消费的各种体制的可持续性

30. 目前仍然是国家臭氧机构的工作内容的和消耗臭氧层物质（不包括氟氯烃）相关的活动，预计在 2010 年后将会减少。但在不同国家或对于不同的具体物质，维持消耗臭氧层物质零消费的难度也将不尽相同。在许多情况下，杜绝所有商业供应将能够保证淘汰成功。但是，为防止未履约以及可能出现的消耗臭氧层物质非法贸易，必须保证为实现淘汰和监测淘汰而实施的各项体制措施持续有效。

31. 尽管执行委员会表示将继续支助体制建设项目（尤其对于氟氯烃管控措施的履约），但可以预料，为发展国家层面的体制能力而从基金的初始阶段就提供的资金，可能不会永久性提供来维持由此建立的机构的运作。例如，国家臭氧机构最终可以完全并入其当前所

在的国家机构，而其运作的资金则可以视作国家预算的一部分。此外，如果适当，这也适用于任何职能，例如通过海关机构对消耗臭氧层物质进口实施的监测。这些机构应该逐渐能够在没有通过体制建设项目而获得的外部供资的情况下，继续此类活动。

32. 为此目的，未来体制建设项目的目标应包括确保监测、执行和汇报活动长期可持续性的各项措施，例如将相关政府某种形式的承诺作为某建设项目更新的一项要求。未来可以制订针对该目标实现的各种指标，如逐渐承担责任为监测、执行和汇报职能供资。

### 通货膨胀

33. 在第五十三次会议审议第 56/13 号文件时，秘书处注意到通货膨胀可能带来的负面影响，并建议在本次审议时考虑这一事项。本评估报告指出，在收集数据时有些国家美国对当地货币的汇率跌了 30%至 40%，这造成了很大的问题。此外，有几个国家称，薪资、材料和服务价格涨幅很高。但是，现在试图量化通货膨胀对体制建设供资的影响，也许并不可行，但在未来会议中可对该事项重新审议。

## 六、讨论和结论

34. 第四节指出了多边基金对能力建设的不同支助模式。这些模式可大致分为全球和地区性举措（主要通过环境规划署的履约协助方案获得基金支助），和国家层面的举措（通过专门用于能力建设的独立的体制建设项目，以及通过制冷剂管理计划、国家淘汰计划、最终淘汰管理计划和最近针对氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的编制资金中的体制部分获得供资）。本文件结论针对的是国家层面的用于能力建设的供资水平。

35. 正如第五节所述，试图通过把各项成本要素加起来“自下而上”地分析或确立体制建设的供资水平，是一种不太可行的做法。对于当前供资水平的充足率，有些国家认为绰绰有余，而其它国家的国家臭氧机构则认为不足。

36. 国家臭氧机构发起并管理第一阶段氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的准备和实施相关的各种活动，其所带来的各种要求将增加国家臭氧机构的工作量和/或工作的复杂性。这个问题部分将被氟氯烃淘汰管理计划本身所提供的额外援助所抵消；以美元估算，一旦该氟氯烃淘汰管理计划被核准且项目管理机构获得资助，这相当于将体制建设援助增加了 60%。在此之前，准备性体制援助活动的实施，将需要依赖国家臭氧机构的资源，以及通过氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的项目编制资金为体制措施（政策、立法、调查）所提供的资金。对于非氟氯烃的活动，大多数国家已建立管理淘汰所需要的体制能力，持续供资与体制性现行活动的完善和/或支助之间的相关性也增强。根据评估，这在财务上会使非氟氯烃活动供资的假设水平总体上下降 10%至 20%。

37. 根据第 XIX/6 号决定，缔约方同意，多边基金通过即将实施的充资为《蒙特利尔议定书》的执行提供的资金将保持平稳并足以满足所有约定的增量成本，从而使第 5 条缔约国能够履行加速的淘汰时间表。



### 延长体制建设项目的可选供资方案

38. 基于上述内容以及第 XIX/6 号决定所约定的供资平稳性，所商议的体制建设项目供资的起始点应该和目前的供资水平保持不变。其他备选方式则可以包括：净增所有体制建设项目的供资、净减所有体制建设项目的供资，或者在体制建设项目供资和其他体制支助（具体指通过氟氯烃淘汰管理计划下建立的项目管理机构而获得的支助）之间进行调整。

#### 供资水平保持不变

39. 如果同意持续提供体制建设支助（暂时按第 XIX/6 号决定所预想的平稳水平），用于保持体制能力并启动此类能力的开发，加速的氟氯烃淘汰将带来新的挑战并产生额外活动，这将逐渐占用淘汰消耗臭氧层物质方面的努力。不同第 5 条国家行政安排方面的巨大差异，增加了准确估算典型国家臭氧机构工作量变化的难度，氟氯化碳淘汰已接近尾声，而氟氯烃的管理活动却在增加。但毫无疑问，现有的国家臭氧机构需要延续各自现有的各种职能。

#### 净增体制建设供资

40. 当氟氯烃淘汰管理计划被核准且项目管理机构获得供资时，体制建设的有效支助水平将会增加，因此净增体制建设项目供资的动议可能与此不完全相符。大多数控制消耗臭氧层物质消费所需要的基本体制能力已经建立，未来体制活动的目标是增强现有监测和管控机制的有效性，并将它们扩展到氟氯烃领域。在氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的项目编制和执行这两方面，都设有专门供资，用于推动并执行对现有体制支助系统的必要扩展。

#### 净减体制建设供资

41. 氟氯烃淘汰相关活动的复杂度可能增加（包括低气候影响替代品在第 5 条国家非常有限，以及需要考虑能源和气候等环境影响），净减体制建设项目供资的动议可能与此信息不完全相符。重要的是，氟氯烃冻结将于 2013 年 1 月 1 日起生效。因此，对于控制氟氯烃的已有体制能力的创建或扩展活动的启动刻不容缓，总体来说，这应早于经核准的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划下建立的项目管理机构开始有效运作的时间，而这在未来 12 至 8 个月内不会发生。氟氯化碳淘汰的经验表明，与国家层面实现履约相关的最具挑战性的活动，有些就是在相关物质第一项管控措施开始之前的几年里进行的。

42. 对于目前通过体制建设项目每年接受 30,000 美元供资的 93 个国家，鉴于执行委员会已做出第 43/37 号决定（即把最低供资提高至这一水平，但前提是接受许可制度和全职国家臭氧机构方面的验证），似乎任何减少体制建设项目支助，或（如下文所述）将支助转给项目管理机构的提案，都不适用于这类国家。

#### 在体制建设和项目管理机构之间调整氟氯烃淘汰管理计划的费用

43. 选择调整这一备选方式将暗示，各种消耗臭氧层物质的“核心”体制活动，如数据

汇报、进口管控和有效监测等，都会逐渐被相关的政府部门所吸收，而且所需要的体制建设支助将会越来越少，并最终消失。在这种假设情景下，对于氟氯烃淘汰管理，体制建设供资将会转移给项目管理机构。体制建设支助作为项目的一部分，将随项目结束而同时结束，而这里的项目指氟氯烃淘汰管理计划。

44. 由此看来，这一备选方式需要更多研究，因为当前仍没有氟氯烃淘汰管理计划，因此项目管理机构的费用及其负责的内容都无法预估。谨建议执行委员会将来进一步审议此事项。

### 建议

45. 谨建议执行委员会：

- (a) 注意秘书处载于 UNED/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63 号文件文件中的关于可能性供资安排方案以及体制建设支助程度的备选方式审核；
- (b) 考虑同意将保持体制建设支助的现有整体水平不变；
- (c) 考虑是否要求秘书处更详细地研究，将体制建设支助转移到根据氟氯烃淘汰管理计划建立的项目管理机构下供资；
- (d) 要求秘书处、相应的执行和双边机构将以下指标列入延长体制建设申请：
  - (一) 控制氟氯烃进口的有效措施的实现，作为 2012 年结束后提交的延长体制建设两年期完整供资请求核准的一个条件；
  - (二) 作为 2009 年结束后所提交的所有延长体制建设的一个目标而指出，制订各项措施，确保在没有体制建设的现行支助下，监测、执行和汇报活动将长期有效，以及逐渐实现这一目标的各项指标；
- (e) 请求秘书处完成关于目标、指标和格式的工作，从而让工作结果能够应用于自 2010 年初起所提交的延长体制建设项目的申请；
- (f) 请求秘书处在未来会议中将按照执行委员会的日程，提议对体制建设供资做进一步的审议。

## Annex I

### **SUMMARY OF THE REPOSIBLITIES OF NATIONAL OZONE UNITS LEADING TO 2010 AND BEYOND (Document 53/61)**

#### Discussion

In reviewing the current arrangements for institutional strengthening in the different countries, the Secretariat described the generic activities that are part of the responsibilities of the National Ozone Unit (NOU) funded under the IS as follows:

- (g) Promulgate effective enforcement of national rules and regulations to limit and eventually prohibit the import of all ODS
- (h) Strengthen the enforcement of the ODS licensing system through coordination and liaison with customs, and other enforcement authorities in the country and the region.
- (i) Collect data for reporting obligations, coordinate and monitor the progress of their existing projects through liaison with project management units, maintaining public awareness and outreach activities, and working towards ensuring that phase-out is sustained through continued dialogue and consultations with key stakeholders.
- (j) Ratify the remaining Amendments to the Montreal Protocol.
- (k) Provide overall advice to the government and stakeholders in the country to accelerate the phase-out of ODS and meet the country's commitments under the Montreal Protocol

In order to understand the implications of the new challenges facing the NOU with regard to the new accelerated HCFC phase-out decision, their activities were classified and described under the following categories:

- (l) Ongoing NOU activities leading up to 2010
- (m) NOU activities after 2010 other than HCFCs

#### *Ongoing NOU activities leading to 2010*

Seventy-nine (79) LVC countries are currently completing implementation of refrigerant management plans and implementing terminal phase-out management plans. Forty NPPs and TPMPs remain to be completed in medium and large consuming countries, with completion dates ranging from end of December 2009 to December 2010. These activities were expected to be the focus of the work of National Ozone Units in the short term for substances other than HCFCs. The work would be supported by the Fund in line with decision 47/49, providing for continuity of institutional strengthening funding until 2010. In addition, each NPP and TPMP contains a funding provision for a Project Management Unit which provides support to the NOUs in the day to day monitoring of project implementation.

*NOU activities after 2010 other than those associated with HCFCs*

Following the final phase-out of CFCs, halons and CTC by 1 January 2010, Article 5 countries would need to take the necessary action to expedite the completion of their ongoing national or sectoral phase-out projects and TPMPs, which extended beyond 31 December 2009. These countries also need to ensure the phase-out of remaining consumption of methyl chloroform and MB by 1 January 2015, as well as manage storage and safe disposal (including possible destruction) of unusable CFCs and halons. Article 5 countries also need to meet continuing Montreal Protocol data reporting obligations and sustain the achieved phase-out of CFCs, halons and CTC and may have to face the challenges of possible illegal traffic in any remaining new CFCs, halons or CTC (noting that CTC will continue to be generated as a by-product in the production of other, non-ODS chemicals). These activities provided a sound basis for continuing to maintain funding support for IS projects after 2010, to which would be added the work associated with interventions to support the phase-out of HCFCs.

## Annex II

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DECISIONS PERTAINING TO INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

#### Decision 47/49

Following a discussion, 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 49<sup>th</sup> 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.

#### Decision 49/32

Following a discussion, 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.

**Decision 53/39:**

Following the discussion, 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 be agreed by the Executive Committee and to report to the Executive Committee by the first Meeting of 2009.

**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 national ozone units during network meetings.





**Annex III**

**FINANCIAL STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS  
(December 2008)**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Cost (US \$)</b>	<b>Support Cost (US \$)</b>	<b>Total Cost (US \$)</b>	<b>Date of Phase I Approval</b>	<b>Most Recent Approved Phase</b>	<b>Date of Latest Phase Approved</b>
Afghanistan	359,987	0	359,987	Jul-04	III	Nov-07
Albania	369,600	5,460	375,060	Dec-01	III	Apr-08
Algeria	901,409	50,311	951,720	Nov-93	IV	Apr-06
Angola	347,700	45,202	392,902	Nov-02	II	Nov-06
Antigua and Barbuda	127,187	4,680	131,867	Nov-98	III	Dec-04
Argentina	1,533,747	165,116	1,698,863	Jul-94	V	Nov-07
Bahamas	153,333	6,500	159,833	May-96	III	Nov-06
Bahrain	287,200	14,300	301,500	Oct-96	V	Nov-07
Bangladesh	610,000	65,000	675,000	Sep-94	V	Nov-07
Barbados	341,950	29,244	371,194	Dec-94	III	Jul-05
Belize	318,600	11,505	330,105	Nov-99	IV	Nov-07
Benin	279,999	15,167	295,166	Nov-95	VI	Nov-08
Bhutan	190,000	0	190,000	Jul-04	II	Nov-07
Bolivia	470,074	27,604	497,678	Nov-95	VI	Nov-07
Bosnia and Herzegovina	200,042	20,741	220,783	Mar-99	II	Jul-04
Botswana	246,546	11,726	258,272	Jul-94	III	Nov-07
Brazil	1,645,100	175,253	1,820,353	Jun-93	V	Jul-07
Brunei Darussalam	150,000	10,400	160,400	Nov-98	II	Jul-04
Burkina Faso	540,240	32,578	572,818	Nov-93	VIII	Nov-08
Burundi	243,200	8,580	251,780	Nov-98	IV	Nov-06
Cambodia	355,334	0	355,334	Mar-02	IV	Nov-07
Cameroon	793,596	48,750	842,346	Nov-93	VI	Nov-07
Cape Verde	135,000	0	135,000	Mar-02	II	Nov-06
Central African Republic	175,520	9,880	185,400	Nov-95	IV	Apr-05
Chad	240,000	7,424	247,424	Jul-98	IV	Nov-08
Chile	1,171,057	126,848	1,297,905	Jun-92	VII	Mar-07
China	2,909,996	313,949	3,223,945	Feb-92	VIII	Nov-08
Colombia	1,568,590	173,601	1,742,191	Mar-94	VI	Jul-07
Comoros	190,426	6,023	196,449	Nov-97	V	Mar-07
Congo	279,401	13,633	293,034	Jul-95	V	Mar-07
Cook Islands	45,000	0	45,000	Dec-04	II	Nov-07
Costa Rica	952,578	100,649	1,053,227	Oct-92	VII	Nov-07
Cote D'Ivoire	416,990	26,560	443,550	Jul-94	IV	Nov-07
Croatia	519,221	21,866	541,087	Oct-96	VI	Nov-08
Cuba	848,525	85,712	934,237	Jun-93	VI	Nov-07
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	614,704	30,888	645,592	Feb-97	V	Nov-07
Democratic Republic of the Congo	225,890	12,585	238,475	Mar-99	IV	Jul-07
Djibouti	168,000	0	168,000	Jul-02	II	Apr-06

Country	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Cost (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase	Date of Latest Phase Approved
Dominica	176,000	3,900	179,900	Nov-98	IV	Nov-08
Dominican Republic	660,998	33,540	694,538	Jul-95	V	Nov-08
Ecuador	621,573	39,169	660,742	Mar-93	IV	Nov-08
El Salvador	289,480	14,495	303,975	May-97	V	Nov-08
Equatorial Guinea	40,000	0	40,000	Jul-06	I	
Eritrea	80,000	0	80,000	Nov-05	I	Apr-08
Ethiopia	213,232	13,104	226,336	Oct-96	IV	Nov-06
Fiji	346,820	14,277	361,097	Mar-94	VI	Nov-08
Gabon	295,520	9,880	305,400	May-97	VI	Nov-08
Gambia	226,773	9,126	235,899	May-96	V	Apr-08
Georgia	298,701	19,721	318,422	Nov-97	V	Jul-07
Ghana	1,051,743	113,792	1,165,535	Oct-92	VIII	Nov-08
Grenada	108,000	3,900	111,900	Mar-00	II	Nov-06
Guatemala	647,200	59,800	707,000	Jun-93	VI	Nov-07
Guinea	279,999	15,167	295,166	Nov-95	VI	Nov-08
Guinea-Bissau	150,000	0	150,000	Apr-03	II	Nov-06
Guyana	164,733	13,887	178,620	Nov-97	III	Apr-06
Haiti	250,000	0	250,000	Nov-02	II	Nov-06
Honduras	287,199	14,300	301,499	Oct-96	V	Nov-06
India	2,409,919	251,706	2,661,625	Oct-92	VII	Apr-08
Indonesia	1,545,465	156,154	1,701,619	Jun-93	VI	Nov-07
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	1,158,439	122,041	1,280,480	Oct-92	VII	Nov-08
Iraq	60,000	0	60,000	Apr-08	I	
Jamaica	331,200	20,020	351,220	Oct-96	VI	Jul-08
Jordan	951,985	77,349	1,029,334	Jun-92	VII	Jul-07
Kenya	862,862	84,113	946,975	Mar-93	VI	Jul-08
Kiribati	60,666	0	60,666	Mar-02	II	Nov-07
Kuwait	332,160	0	332,160	Jul-02	III	Nov-07
Kyrgyzstan	481,140	0	481,140	Jul-02	IV	Jul-08
Lao People's Democratic Republic	243,200	8,580	251,780	Jul-01	IV	Nov-08
Lebanon	918,597	93,829	1,012,426	May-96	VI	Nov-08
Lesotho	136,000	4,985	140,985	Oct-96	IV	Nov-07
Liberia	213,033	0	213,033	Dec-03	II	Mar-07
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	157,000	20,410	177,410	Dec-00	I	
Madagascar	191,400	9,100	200,500	Nov-99	III	Jul-06
Malawi	379,849	23,355	403,204	Mar-94	VI	Nov-07
Malaysia	1,747,910	196,484	1,944,394	Mar-93	VII	Nov-07
Maldives	257,003	5,363	262,366	Mar-94	V	Nov-08
Mali	298,698	15,167	313,865	Mar-98	V	Nov-08
Marshall Islands	94,000	0	94,000	Mar-02	II	Nov-07
Mauritania	145,553	3,360	148,913	Sep-94	IV	Jul-06
Mauritius	170,000	6,500	176,500	Jun-93	III	Nov-07
Mexico	1,756,147	155,569	1,911,716	Jun-92	VIII	Jul-07
Micronesia (Federated States of)	45,333	0	45,333	Mar-02	II	Jul-06
Mongolia	300,398	8,580	308,978	Jul-99	V	Jul-08
Montenegro	90,000	6,750	96,750	Mar-07	I	Jul-08

Country	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Cost (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase	Date of Latest Phase Approved
Morocco	490,000	23,270	513,270	May-96	III	Nov-07
Mozambique	253,280	12,012	265,292	Dec-94	III	Nov-06
Myanmar	76,000	9,880	85,880	Nov-99	I	
Nauru	45,000	0	45,000	Dec-04	II	Nov-07
Nepal	295,733	8,060	303,793	Nov-98	V	Nov-08
Nicaragua	227,200	14,300	241,500	May-97	IV	Jul-06
Niger	369,281	22,724	392,005	Dec-94	VI	Nov-07
Nigeria	1,280,000	123,500	1,403,500	Mar-93	V	Apr-08
Niue	90,000	0	90,000	Dec-04	II	Nov-07
Oman	215,934	20,539	236,473	Dec-00	III	Nov-08
Pakistan	876,456	89,248	965,704	Sep-94	IV	Nov-07
Palau	75,333	0	75,333	Mar-02	II	Nov-07
Panama	586,500	37,375	623,875	Jun-93	IV	Dec-04
Papua New Guinea	205,493	26,714	232,207	May-96	IV	Apr-08
Paraguay	227,960	14,365	242,325	Feb-97	IV	Nov-07
Peru	390,210	27,559	417,769	Jul-95	III	Jul-02
Philippines	1,072,865	82,416	1,155,281	Mar-93	VI	Apr-08
Qatar	151,956	14,914	166,870	Mar-99	II	Jul-06
Republic of Moldova	357,336	10,400	367,736	Jul-98	V	Apr-08
Romania	234,077	22,383	256,460	Jul-95	II	Apr-05
Rwanda	146,600	0	146,600	Mar-02	II	Nov-06
Saint Kitts and Nevis	103,000	3,900	106,900	Feb-97	III	Nov-05
Saint Lucia	243,380	7,927	251,307	Feb-97	VI	Jul-08
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	133,430	3,939	137,369	Jul-98	III	Nov-06
Samoa	176,000	3,900	179,900	May-97	IV	Nov-07
Sao Tome and Principe	130,666	0	130,666	Nov-02	II	Nov-06
Saudi Arabia	300,000	0	300,000	Nov-07	I	
Senegal	1,017,400	53,170	1,070,570	Nov-93	VII	Nov-07
Serbia	282,800	29,538	312,338	Jul-98	II	Dec-04
Seychelles	173,167	6,912	180,079	Jul-94	IV	Nov-07
Sierra Leone	294,490	0	294,490	Mar-02	III	Apr-08
Solomon Islands	57,083	0	57,083	Mar-02	II	Nov-07
Somalia	52,000	0	52,000	Mar-02	I	Dec-04
Sri Lanka	897,144	94,509	991,653	Mar-94	VII	Jul-08
Sudan	538,560	51,051	589,611	Mar-94	IV	Apr-04
Suriname	183,333	0	183,333	Dec-03	II	Nov-06
Swaziland	185,664	8,752	194,416	Dec-94	III	Nov-07
Syrian Arab Republic	618,730	69,181	687,911	Jun-93	III	Apr-05
Thailand	1,706,670	164,667	1,871,337	Mar-93	V	Jul-07
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	621,494	66,209	687,703	Oct-96	V	Apr-06
Togo	312,666	9,100	321,766	Nov-97	V	Nov-08
Tonga	56,266	0	56,266	Mar-02	II	Nov-07
Trinidad and Tobago	281,977	30,057	312,034	Oct-96	V	Nov-06
Tunisia	1,209,219	79,561	1,288,780	Oct-92	V	Jul-08
Turkey	726,843	45,500	772,343	Oct-92	III	Dec-04
Turkmenistan	222,693	1,125	223,818	Jul-05	II	Apr-08
Tuvalu	55,083	0	55,083	Mar-02	II	Nov-08
Uganda	64,515	8,387	72,902	Jul-94	I	

Country	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Cost (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase	Date of Latest Phase Approved
United Republic of Tanzania	183,200	8,580	191,780	Oct-96	III	Nov-06
Uruguay	1,153,785	125,111	1,278,896	Jun-93	VIII	Nov-08
Vanuatu	27,000	0	27,000	Mar-02	II	Apr-08
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	2,238,731	243,931	2,482,662	Mar-93	IX	Nov-08
Vietnam	677,228	41,642	718,870	Jul-95	VI	Jul-07
Yemen	681,609	30,940	712,549	Jul-98	V	Nov-07
Zambia	191,520	16,380	207,900	Mar-93	III	Dec-04
Zimbabwe	695,600	51,885	747,485	Jul-94	V	Nov-06
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>68,353,959</b>	<b>5,306,890</b>	<b>73,660,849</b>			

## Annex IV

### HCFC DECISIONS TAKEN AT THE 19<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE PARTIES AND AT THE MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

#### Decision XIX/6: Adjustments to the Montreal Protocol with regard to Annex C, Group I, substances (hydrochlorofluorocarbons)

The Parties agree to accelerate the phase-out of production and consumption of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), by way of an adjustment in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 2 of the Montreal Protocol and as contained in annex III to the report of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties,<sup>41</sup> on the basis of the following:

1. For Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol (Article 5 Parties), to choose as the baseline the average of the 2009 and 2010 levels of, respectively, consumption and production; and
2. To freeze, at that baseline level, consumption and production in 2013;
3. For Parties operating under Article 2 of the Protocol (Article 2 Parties) to have completed the accelerated phase-out of production and consumption in 2020, on the basis of the following reduction steps:
  - (a) By 2010 of 75 per cent;
  - (b) By 2015 of 90 per cent;
  - (c) While allowing 0.5 per cent for servicing the period 2020–2030;
4. For Article 5 Parties to have completed the accelerated phase-out of production and consumption in 2030, on the basis of the following reduction steps:
  - (a) By 2015 of 10 per cent;
  - (b) By 2020 of 35 per cent;
  - (c) By 2025 of 67.5 per cent;
  - (d) While allowing for servicing an annual average of 2.5 per cent during the period 2030–2040;
5. To agree that the funding available through the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol in the upcoming replenishments shall be stable and sufficient to meet all agreed incremental costs to enable Article 5 Parties to comply with the accelerated phase-out schedule both for production and consumption sectors as set out above, and based on that understanding, to also direct the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund to make the necessary changes to the eligibility criteria related to the post-1995 facilities and second conversions;
6. To direct the Executive Committee, in providing technical and financial assistance, to pay particular attention to Article 5 Parties with low volume and very low volume consumption of HCFCs;
7. To direct the Executive Committee to assist Parties in preparing their phase-out management plans for an accelerated HCFC phase-out;
8. To direct the Executive Committee, as a matter of priority, to assist Article 5 Parties in conducting surveys to improve reliability in establishing their baseline data on HCFCs;
9. To encourage Parties to promote the selection of alternatives to HCFCs that minimize environmental impacts, in particular impacts on climate, as well as meeting other health, safety and economic considerations;

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro.19/7.

10. To request Parties to report regularly on their implementation of paragraph 7 of Article 2F of the Protocol;

11. To agree that the Executive Committee, when developing and applying funding criteria for projects and programmes, and taking into account paragraph 6, give priority to cost-effective projects and programmes which focus on, *inter alia*:

(a) Phasing-out first those HCFCs with higher ozone-depleting potential, taking into account national circumstances;

(b) Substitutes and alternatives that minimize other impacts on the environment, including on the climate, taking into account global-warming potential, energy use and other relevant factors;

(c) Small and medium-size enterprises;

12. To agree to address the possibilities or need for essential use exemptions, no later than 2015 where this relates to Article 2 Parties, and no later than 2020 where this relates to Article 5 Parties;

13. To agree to review in 2015 the need for the 0.5 per cent for servicing provided for in paragraph 3, and to review in 2025 the need for the annual average of 2.5 per cent for servicing provided for in paragraph 4 (d);

14. In order to satisfy basic domestic needs, to agree to allow for up to 10% of baseline levels until 2020, and, for the period after that, to consider no later than 2015 further reductions of production for basic domestic needs;

15. In accelerating the HCFC phase-out, to agree that Parties are to take every practicable step consistent with Multilateral Fund programmes, to ensure that the best available and environmentally-safe substitutes and related technologies are transferred from Article 2 Parties to Article 5 Parties under fair and most favourable conditions;

### **Decision 53/37: Funding HCFC production phase-out**

At the conclusion of the discussion on options for assessing and defining eligible incremental costs for HCFC consumption and production phase-out activities, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) That ratification of or accession to the Copenhagen Amendment was the prerequisite for an Article 5 Party to access Multilateral Fund funding for phasing out the consumption of HCFCs;
- (b) That ratification of or accession to the Beijing Amendment was the prerequisite for an Article 5 Party to access Multilateral Fund funding for phasing out the production of HCFCs;
- (c) That, in the case of a non-signatory country, the Executive Committee might consider providing funding for conducting an HCFC survey and the preparation of an accelerated HCFC phase-out management plan, with the commitment of the government to ratify or accede to the necessary Amendment and on the understanding that no further funding would be available until the Ozone Secretariat had confirmed that the government had ratified or acceded to that Amendment, through the deposit of its instrument in the Office of the United Nations Headquarters in New York;
- (d) That the existing policies and guidelines of the Multilateral Fund for funding the phase-out of ODS other than HCFCs would be applicable to the funding of HCFC phase-out unless otherwise decided by the Executive Committee in light of, in particular, decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties;
- (e) That institutions and capacities in Article 5 countries developed through Multilateral Fund assistance for the phase-out of ODS other than HCFCs should be used to economize the phase-out of HCFCs, as appropriate;
- (f) That stable and sufficient assistance from the Multilateral Fund would be provided to guarantee the sustainability of such institutions and capacities when deemed necessary for the phase-out of HCFCs;
- (g) That the production sector sub-group would be reconvened at the 55<sup>th</sup> Meeting to consider issues pertaining to the phase-out of HCFC production, taking into account decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties and the following issues, as well as further elaboration and analysis of those issues to be prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with technical experts:
  - (i) The continued applicability of the current approach to funding HCFC production phase-out being based on the assumption of plant closures;
  - (ii) The timing of funding HCFC production phase-out in view of the long duration between the HCFC freeze in 2013 and the final phase-out in 2030, taking into consideration that production and consumption phase-out could take place simultaneously;
  - (iii) The eligibility of the CFC/HCFC-22 swing plants in view of the commitment in the CFC production phase-out agreement not to seek funding again from the Multilateral Fund for closing down HCFC facilities that use the existing CFC infrastructure;

- (iv) The cut-off date for funding eligibility of HCFC production phase-out;
  - (v) Other measures that could facilitate management of HCFC production phase-out; and
  - (vi) Other issues related to the HCFC production sector, taking in account subparagraph (g)(ii) above.
- (h) That the Secretariat would work with the implementing agencies to examine the existing guidelines for country programmes and sector plans (decision taken at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee and decision 38/65), and propose draft guidelines to the 54<sup>th</sup> Meeting for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans incorporating HCFC surveys, taking into consideration comments and views relating to such guidelines expressed by Executive Committee members at the 53<sup>rd</sup> Meeting and the submissions to the 54<sup>th</sup> Meeting referred to in paragraph (l) below, and that the Executive Committee would do its utmost to approve the guidelines at its 54<sup>th</sup> Meeting;
- (i) That the Secretariat, in consultation with technical experts with knowledge of experiences in Article 5 countries with different levels of development and non-Article 5 countries, would prepare by 25 March 2008 a preliminary discussion document providing analysis on all relevant cost considerations surrounding the financing of HCFC phase-out, taking into account the views expressed by Executive Committee Members in the submissions referred to in paragraph (l) below, and including:
- (i) Information on the cost benchmarks/ranges and applicability of HCFC substitute technologies; and
  - (ii) Consideration of substitute technologies, financial incentives and opportunities for co-financing which could be relevant for ensuring that the HCFC phase-out resulted in benefits in accordance with paragraph 11(b) of decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties;
- (j) That the current classifications of low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) should be maintained until the cost-effectiveness thresholds of HCFC phase-out had been developed and the potential impact of those thresholds on LVC countries and SMEs had become better known. It would then be possible to review those classifications including a classification for very low-volume consuming countries, and current policies and funding arrangements targeting those countries and enterprises;
- (k) To note that the following cut-off dates for funding HCFC phase-out had been proposed:
- (i) 2000 (Cap of HCFC production/consumption in one major country);
  - (ii) 2003 (Clean Development Mechanism);
  - (iii) 2005 (proposal for accelerated phase-out of HCFCs);
  - (iv) 2007 (Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties);
  - (v) 2010 (end of the baseline for HCFCs);
  - (vi) Availability of substitutes;



- (l) As a matter of priority, and taking into account paragraphs 5 and 8 of decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties, to invite Executive Committee Members to submit their views on the following issues to the Secretariat, by 15 January 2008, with the understanding that the Secretariat would make the submissions available to the 54<sup>th</sup> Meeting:
  - (i) Elements the Secretariat should consider in the draft guidelines for the preparation of national HCFC phase-out management plans;
  - (ii) Cost considerations to be taken into account by the Secretariat in preparing the discussion document referred to in paragraph (i) above;
  - (iii) Cut-off date for funding eligibility; and
  - (iv) Second-stage conversions;
- (m) To approve 2008 expenditure of up to US \$150,000 to cover the costs of consultations with technical experts and other stakeholders required for the preparation of the documents referred to in the present decision.

**Decision 54/39: Draft guidelines for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans incorporating HCFC surveys (decision 53/37(h))**

After having considered the revised text submitted by the contact group, the Executive Committee decided to adopt the following guidelines:

- (a) Countries should adopt a staged approach to the implementation of an HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP), within the framework of their over-arching-strategy;
- (b) As soon as possible and depending on the availability of resources, countries should employ the guidelines herein to develop, in detail, stage one of the HPMPs, which would address how countries would meet the freeze in 2013 and the 10 per cent reduction in 2015, with an estimate of related cost considerations and applying cost guidelines as they were developed;
- (c) The elaboration of stage one of the HPMP and subsequent stages should be developed as follows:
  - (i) For countries with consumption in the servicing sector only:
    - a) To be consistent with existing guidelines for the preparation of RMPs/RMP updates pursuant to decisions 31/48 and 35/57; and, if applicable, with the preparation of TPMPs pursuant to decision 45/54;
    - b) To contain commitments to achieve the 2013 and 2015 HCFC control measures and include a performance-based system for HPMPs based on the completion of activities in the HPMP to enable the annual release of funding for the HPMP;
  - (ii) For countries with manufacturing sectors using HCFCs, HPMPs should contain a national performance-based phase-out plan (NPP) with one or several substance or sector-based phase-out plans (SPP) consistent with decision 38/65 addressing consumption reduction levels sufficient to achieve the 2013 and 2015 HCFC

control measures and provide starting points for aggregate reductions, together with annual reduction targets;

- (d) For countries that chose to implement investment projects in advance of completion of the HPMP:
  - (i) The approval of each project should result in a phase-out of HCFCs to count against the consumption identified in the HPMP and no such projects could be approved after 2010 unless they were part of the HPMP;
  - (ii) If the individual project approach was used, the submission of the first project should provide an indication of how the demonstration projects related to the HPMP and an indication of when the HPMP would be submitted;
- (e) Consideration should be given to providing funding for assistance to include HCFC control measures in legislation, regulations and licensing systems as part of the funding of HPMP preparation as necessary and confirmation of the implementation of the same should be required as a prerequisite for funding implementation of the HPMP;
- (f) In cases where there were multiple implementing agencies in one country, a lead agency should be designated to coordinate the overall development of stage one of the HPMP;
- (g) HPMPs should contain cost information at the time of their submission based on and addressing:
  - (i) The most current HCFC cost guidelines at the time of submission;
  - (ii) Alternative cost scenarios based on different potential cut-off dates for new capacity if a specific cut-off date had not yet been decided, for funding eligibility of manufacturing facilities as specified in decision 53/37(k), as well as the current policy for a 25 July 1995 cut-off date;
  - (iii) Alternative cost scenarios for the operational and capital costs for second conversions;
  - (iv) The incremental costs of regulating import and supply to the market of HCFC dependent equipment once proven alternatives were commercially available in the country and describing the benefits to the servicing sector of associated reduced demand;
  - (v) Cost and benefit information based on the full range of alternatives considered, and associated ODP and other impacts on the environment including on the climate, taking into account global-warming potential, energy use and other relevant factors;
- (h) Countries and agencies were encouraged to explore potential financial incentives and opportunities for additional resources to maximize the environmental benefits from HPMPs pursuant to paragraph 11(b) of decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties;

- (i) HPMPs should address:
  - (i) The use of institutional arrangements mentioned in decision 53/37(e) and (f);
  - (ii) The roles and responsibilities of associations of refrigeration technicians and other industry associations and how they could contribute to HCFC phase-out; and
- (j) HPMPs should, as a minimum, fulfil the data and information requirements, as applicable, listed in the indicative outline for the development of HPMPs, as set out in Annex XIX to the present report.

**Decision 56/16: Cost structure for determining funding levels for preparation of HCFC investment and associated activities**

On the basis of the text proposed by the contact group, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/13 regarding a cost structure for determining funding levels for preparation of HCFC investment and associated activities (decision 55/13(d));
- (b) To define the elements of a cost structure for funding the preparation of an overall HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) in line with decision 54/39 and comprising several components as follows:
  - (i) Assistance for policy and legislation, e.g. to develop new or extend existing legislation regarding HCFC, products containing HCFCs, quotas, and licences;
  - (ii) Survey of HCFC use and analysis of data;
  - (iii) Development and finalization of the HPMP including its stage one to address the 2013 and 2015 control measures, the latter being akin to a terminal phase-out management plan (TPMP) or a refrigeration service sector plan;
  - (iv) Development of investment activities for the HCFC-consuming manufacturing sectors for stage one of an HPMP, if such activities were necessary;
- (c) To provide funding for elements (b)(i) to (iii) above as specified in the table below, based on the countries' HCFC consumption for 2007, while applying decision 55/13(a), (b) and (c):

<b>Group according to consumption pattern</b>	<b>Funding for above components (b)(i) to (iii)</b>
Countries with zero consumption of HCFC	US \$30,000
Countries with consumption only of HCFC-22, or consumption below 6 ODP tonnes/year	US \$85,000
Countries with medium consumption, between 6 ODP tonnes/year and 100 ODP tonnes/year	US \$150,000
Countries with consumption higher than 100 ODP tonnes/year	US \$195,000

- (d) To limit the maximum funding provided for the element (b)(iv) of the HPMP for any country with a manufacturing sector using HCFCs as per the following table based on the countries' HCFC consumption for 2007, on the understanding that those limits represented maximum amounts and requests for project preparation would have to justify the level of funding up to that amount, and on the understanding that preparation costs for demonstration projects according to decision 55/43 paragraphs (b) to (f) were not taken into account when calculating that level of funding;

<b>Consumption limit (ODP tonnes)</b>	<b>Investment preparation limit</b>
Up to 100	\$100,000
101 –300	\$200,000
301-500	\$250,000
501 – 1,000	\$300,000
1,001 and above	\$400,000

- (e) To define five manufacturing sub-sectors as follows: air-to-air air conditioning systems; refrigeration (including all refrigeration, heat pumps and air conditioning sub-sectors except air-to-air air conditioning systems); polyurethane foam; extruded polyurethane (XPS) foam; and solvent uses in manufacturing;
- (f) To provide funding for the element (b)(iv) of the HPMP for countries with manufacturing capacity up to a maximum specified below, to be determined by the total number of enterprises to be converted under HPMP stage one in the relevant sub-sector as defined under paragraph (e) above, excluding those enterprises with demonstration projects that might be chosen by the Executive Committee according to decision 55/43, paragraphs (b) to (f):
- (i) One enterprise to be converted in a manufacturing sector: US \$30,000;
  - (ii) Two enterprises to be converted in a manufacturing sector: US \$60,000;
  - (iii) Three to 14 enterprises to be converted in a manufacturing sector: US \$80,000;
  - (iv) Fifteen or more enterprises to be converted in a manufacturing sector: US \$150,000;
- (g) That in the case where Parties wish to submit requests for preparation of sub-sector plans in the approved sectors, the total funding available for all sub-sector plans in each sector should not exceed US \$150,000;
- (h) Not to apply the provisions in subparagraphs (c), (e) and (f) above to China;
- (i) To request that for demonstration projects, according to decision 55/43 paragraphs (b) to (f), the request for preparation funds should include specification of country, sector, brief description of the project, approximate ODP tonnes phase-out to be achieved, the enterprise(s) to be addressed, if relevant, and the date when they began operation, reference to the relevant sub-paragraph of decision 55/43, and a description of compelling reasons as to why the Executive Committee should choose this project as described in decision 55/43 (b). Funding could be provided up to the following levels:
- (i) Stand-alone demonstration projects (55/43) in a manufacturing sector, per project: US \$30,000;

- (ii) Umbrella demonstration projects (55/43) with three to 14 beneficiaries in one manufacturing sector, per umbrella project: US \$80,000;
  - (iii) Projects addressing 15 or more beneficiaries could not receive preparation funding for demonstration projects related to decision 55/43; and
- (j) To request the Secretariat to apply this cost structure when assessing the eligibility for funding of the different elements of the HPMP preparation, and to propose adjustments to the structure, in particular with regard to investment and associated activities, to the Executive Committee when necessary.