



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/43  
15 April 2014



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Seventy-second Meeting  
Montreal, 12-16 May 2014

**PROGRESS REPORT ON THE USE OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND CLIMATE  
IMPACT INDICATOR (DECISION 69/23)**

Background

1. At the 55<sup>th</sup> meeting, the concept of an indicator on climate impact, taking into account also energy use, had been described<sup>1</sup>. At the 59<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Secretariat informed the Executive Committee on issues related to the “Prioritization of HCFC phase-out technologies to minimize other impacts on the environment”, and introduced the term “Multilateral Fund Climate Impact Indicator” (MCII). Subsequently, the concept of the MCII has been further developed and an MCII tool for the refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors has become operational. In decision 69/23 the Secretariat was requested to provide a report to the last meeting of the Executive Committee in 2014, *inter alia*, on progress made and experience gained, and to provide a progress report at the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting. This document presents the progress report.

Progress report

2. A re-orientation is currently being undertaken to make the MCII more understandable, the results easier to use; and the list of substances to be updated. The related MCII software is being updated, and options to indicate the results of energy-efficiency improvements are being added.

3. The Secretariat has requested specific feedback from implementing agencies regarding their experience in using the MCII, the extent of its use, its potential for wider use, and the list of refrigerants that should be included. It was proposed to also add other refrigerants. One agency reported it had used the MCII for some HCFC phase-out management plans but found that the conclusions were not fully applicable as the MCII considers only thermodynamic properties but not transport properties of the refrigerants. It was suggested by the same agency that the MCII be validated through a rigorous independent review to check its methodology and assumptions. Another agency suggested making use of the MCII obligatory rather than optional since not using it would be the default solely due to time constraints. A third agency found the MCII to be complex. Though the MCII was meaningful, an overall

<sup>1</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/55/47

review of its utility and how it impacts on implementation was suggested. It was also pointed out that the compatibility of the MCII to other indicators/impact determination tools was difficult to achieve.

4. The Secretariat is currently working on the updates indicated, taking into account the insight provided by the implementing agencies.

Recommendation

5. The Executive Committee may wish to note the information presented in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/43.

-----