



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/15
20 May 2022

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Eighty-ninth meeting
Montreal, 7–11 March 2022
Postponed to 16, 18 and 20 May 2022 (part I) and
16–18 June 2022 (part II)¹

**REPORT OF PART I OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING
OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Introduction

1. In view of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic and the related directives of the Governments of Canada and Quebec, on 18 January 2022 the Secretariat informed the Executive Committee that the 89th meeting, planned to be held from 7 to 11 March 2022 in Montreal, could not take place.
2. Accordingly, the Executive Committee agreed that the 89th meeting would be held in two parts:
 - (a) Part I would take place virtually on 16, 18 and 20 May 2022; and
 - (b) Part II would take place in person, in Montreal, on 16 to 18 June 2022.
3. Part I of the 89th meeting was attended by representatives of the following Parties, members of the Executive Committee in accordance with decision XXXIII/11 of the Thirty-Third Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol:
 - (a) Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol (Article 5 Parties): Bahrain (Chair), Brazil, Chad, Cuba, Guyana, India and Zimbabwe; and
 - (b) Parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol (non-Article 5 Parties): Belgium, Canada, Finland, Italy, Japan, Romania and the United States of America (Vice-Chair).

¹ Owing to the coronavirus disease pandemic, part I of the 89th meeting will be held online, while part II will be held in person.

4. In accordance with the decisions taken by the Executive Committee at its second and eighth meetings, representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as both implementing agency and Treasurer of the Multilateral Fund, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank attended the meeting as observers.

5. The Executive Secretary of the Ozone Secretariat, the President and the Vice-President of the Implementation Committee and members of the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel were also present.

6. Representatives of the Environmental Investigation Agency, the Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development, Natural Resources Defense Council and the Refrigerant Gas Manufacturers' Association of India also attended as observers.

AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING

7. The meeting was opened by the Chair, Mr. Hassan Ali Mubarak at 7.00 a.m.² He welcomed the members of the Executive Committee to part I of the 89th meeting, reassuring them that he would serve the Committee to the best of his capabilities. He also welcomed the new Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund, Ms. Tina Birmpili.

8. Speaking first of the progress that the Committee had made in matters related to the Kigali Amendment, particularly its approval of the guidelines for the preparation of Kigali HFC implementation plans (KIPs) for Article 5 countries, he said that the time had come for the Committee to reach agreement on other relevant aspects of the KIPs so that their implementation could proceed smoothly. He hoped that the Executive Committee would be able to report notable progress to the Meeting of the Parties later in the year. Implementation of the Kigali Amendment would be possible thanks to members' dedication, flexibility and willingness to reach consensus.

9. He recalled that, as agreed, the 89th meeting would be dedicated to the discussion of policy documents, with part I covering three items deemed important and urgent: the 2019 Assessment of the Multilateral Fund by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) under the agenda item on the Secretariat activities; the review of institutional strengthening projects, including funding levels; and the analysis of the level and modalities of funding for HFC phase-down in the refrigeration servicing sector. The remaining policy matters on the agenda would be taken up at part II of the meeting, to be held in person in June 2022. In concluding, the Chair thanked participants in advance for their support for, and continued commitment to, the successful management of the Multilateral Fund.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

(a) Adoption of the agenda

10. The Executive Committee adopted the following agenda for part I of the 89th meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/1/Add.1, which comprised a selection of items from the provisional agenda for the 89th meeting as a whole contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/1:

1. Opening of the meeting.

² All times mentioned are Montreal time (UTC - 4).

2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Secretariat activities.
5. Review of institutional strengthening projects, including funding levels (decision 74/51(d)).
7. Matters related to the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol:
 - (c) Analysis of the level and modalities of funding for HFC phase-down in the refrigeration servicing sector (decision 88/76).
9. Other matters.
10. Adoption of the report.
11. Closure of the meeting.

(b) Organization of work

11. The Chair recalled that the agreed contingency plan provided for the Sub-group on the Production Sector to be reconvened at part II of 89th meeting.
12. The Executive Committee agreed to the organization of work proposed by the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 3: SECRETARIAT ACTIVITIES

13. Introducing the item, the Chair noted that the usual report on Secretariat activities would be combined with the report submitted at the 90th meeting, as indicated in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2. At the present meeting, the Committee would consider only the report on Secretariat activities relating to the 2019 Assessment of the Multilateral Fund by MOPAN contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1. The Executive Committee had initiated discussion on the matter during the intersessional approval process for the 88th meeting.

14. The Chief Officer presented document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1, setting out the Secretariat's observations and suggestions in relation to the MOPAN assessment. The document reflected the discussion and the comments made by members during the intersessional approval process for the 88th meeting. After noting that the MOPAN assessment had identified many strengths for the Multilateral Fund, she provided a brief overview of the Secretariat's observations and suggestions relating to the five areas for improvement referred in the MOPAN assessment, namely the evaluation function; the results framework; the information and communications function; gender equality; and sustainability.

15. Members welcomed the Secretariat's revised response and broadly supported the way forward proposed in the document. They nevertheless cautioned that the measures taken to address the MOPAN recommendations, especially in relation to results management and the scorecard, should not place undue additional burden on either Article 5 Parties or the implementing agencies or stray into areas outside the mandate of the Montreal Protocol. Some members suggested that additional resources would be needed to implement the measures responding to the MOPAN recommendations and raised concerns as to whether those resources would be made available. Members also offered a number of specific suggestions and comments on the five areas for improvement identified in the MOPAN assessment, to be taken into

consideration by the Secretariat in developing specific proposals to be considered by the Committee at future meetings.

16. With respect to the evaluation function, several members stressed the importance of an independent evaluation function while recognizing its ties to the Secretariat. Having a standalone annual report on monitoring and evaluation was viewed as a positive development. One member also mentioned the need to look at the organizational structure of the Secretariat in relation to the independence of the evaluation function. Another member took the view that the current two-phased approach, with a desk study and a full-fledged evaluation, had been simple and effective and said that the Committee should take care not to create an elaborate, overly burdensome structure. One member noted that in recent years the Committee had followed a practice of simply noting monitoring and evaluation reports and inviting implementing agencies to take the lessons learned and information in the report into consideration. He recalled, however, a practice that had been in place until 2010 whereby the Committee took decisions on relevant recommendations resulting from evaluation findings, which facilitated the follow-up of their implementation. He suggested that the Committee revert to the pre-2011 practice so that there could be follow-up with regard to how the evaluation recommendations and related decisions fed into the work of the Fund and its bilateral and implementing agencies, as recommended by MOPAN. It was stressed that the number of such recommendations should be limited and concentrate on the most essential findings to avoid cumbersome follow-up processes. The preparation of management responses by the Committee would also contribute to enhancing the use of the evaluation results and strengthening the function's ties with the work of the Fund.

17. The Secretariat's proposal for a results framework demonstrating the wider impact of the Multilateral Fund and the use of a scorecard to communicate results was welcomed by members, although the feasibility of developing specific objectives, deliverables and indicators for the broader environmental, social and economics spheres, and the advisability of doing so given the mandate of the Montreal Protocol, was questioned. Several members also questioned whether such an undertaking would have cost implications in relation to data collection and reporting on indicators, but others noted that the goals of the results framework could largely be achieved by reorganizing the data already available. Several members suggested topics for indicators, including energy efficiency, ODP tonnes, CO₂-equivalent, assistance provided to achieve compliance, institutional strengthening and capacity-building. Overall, members recognized the need to limit the number of indicators and to take into account the indicator-related recommendations of MOPAN. They also expressed a desire to consider the results framework and the scorecard, ideally at the 91st meeting, with a view to their finalization at the 92nd meeting.

18. On the topic of communication, members expressed agreement with the ideas proposed by the Secretariat and noted with satisfaction that an updated information strategy would be presented at the 91st meeting. There was significant support for enhancement of the Multilateral Fund website to facilitate access to information, both for Parties and for a broader audience, and the Secretariat was encouraged to tap into the experience of the Ozone Secretariat in that regard. Communicating the success of the work done under the Montreal Protocol was also cited as important and the Secretariat was encouraged to produce at least one annual communications product on the Fund's key achievements.

19. Regarding gender equality, it was noted that the Committee would consider the Secretariat's report on the review of the implementation of the operational policy on gender mainstreaming at its 90th meeting and could further discuss the response to the MOPAN recommendations on gender equality in that context. One member said that the results reported by the implementing agencies should be incorporated into the global gender equality results for the Fund in the proposed results framework and scorecard.

20. With respect to the sustainability of the results of work supported by the Multilateral Fund, members suggested that the Secretariat explore opportunities to highlight how sustainability would be ensured but acknowledged that sustainability would also be discussed under various items during the upcoming in-person meetings. One member noted that the MOPAN assessment included observations about risk management that were not fully addressed in the Secretariat's report and asked that the Secretariat consider those

observations further when formulating recommendations on sustainability for the Committee's consideration.

21. The Secretariat was also urged to prepare the management response to the MOPAN assessment as early as possible, ideally for consideration at the 91st meeting.

22. The representative of an implementing agency, responding to a query from a member, identified sustainability as the main issue. Pointing out that, particularly in the residential-air-conditioning sector, Article 5 Parties were being asked to move faster than non-Article-5 Parties in absorbing low-global-warming-potential technologies, he called for patience and understanding of the challenges facing Article 5 Parties.

23. Responding to members' comments and questions, the Chief Officer said that the information strategy would be aimed at addressing three issues related to the Fund's data: preservation of the existing data; provision of efficient and user-friendly access to existing data for all stakeholders; and presentation of information to various types of stakeholders. Examples of tools for achieving these goals, which included a revamped website, an online reporting tool for HFCs, a revamped inventory of data, a searchable online collection of the Multilateral Fund policies, guidelines and procedures, would all be covered in the comprehensive plan to be presented at the 91st meeting, which would also deal with funding needs and the timeframe required. On the topic of indicators, the Chief Officer specified that, while the Montreal Protocol had a narrow scope, it had a wide-ranging impact on the ground and its implementation was changing people's lives at the national level; the social, economic and environmental indicators would be designed to demonstrate that broad impact. A lot of information already existed, and it was a question of framing it differently for it to be shared with the public.

24. The Executive Committee agreed that the Secretariat would revise the recommendation in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1 for consideration by the Committee later in the meeting.

25. Subsequently, the Executive Committee considered a revised recommendation prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the discussions at the present meeting.

26. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2 and the report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1 which outlined observations and actions proposed by the Secretariat related to the five key areas of improvement identified in the 2019 Assessment of the Multilateral Fund by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN);
- (b) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, taking into account the discussions on the matter at part I of the 89th meeting, to include, in the monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2023 for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 91st meeting, the actions to enhance the evaluation function outlined in paragraphs 13 to 18 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1;
- (c) To request the Secretariat, taking into account the discussions on the matter at part I of the 89th meeting:
 - (i) To develop a results framework and a scorecard that fit the operations of the Multilateral Fund for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 92nd meeting;
 - (ii) To update the information strategy of the Multilateral Fund, to include a detailed plan for information and knowledge management, the website/information

technology requirements, the resources needed and clear timelines for implementation and to submit the strategy for consideration by the Executive Committee at the 91st meeting;

- (iii) To explore opportunities to further highlight how the sustainability of activities supported by the Multilateral Fund would be ensured, including by further clarifying in the documents submitted by the Secretariat how partner capacity, risks and critical assumptions were considered, and to report to the Executive Committee at its 91st meeting; and
- (iv) To prepare, for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 91st meeting, a draft management response from the Executive Committee to the Secretariat of MOPAN in relation to its 2019 Assessment of the Multilateral Fund.

(Decision 89/1)

AGENDA ITEM 5: REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS, INCLUDING FUNDING LEVELS (DECISION 74/51(D))

27. Introducing document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/4, the representative of the Secretariat recalled that it had been prepared, in response to decision 74/51(d), for consideration at the 86th meeting in 2020. Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, however, discussion of the document had been deferred to the 87th meeting and then to subsequent meetings and was being considered for the first time at the present meeting. The document presented a review of institutional strengthening projects and their related activities, addressing challenges linked to the Kigali Amendment; assessed the relevance of such support in contributing to the compliance of Article 5 Parties with the control measures of the Montreal Protocol; set out the range of activities that national ozone units had to undertake to achieve the HCFC and HFC control measures between 2020 and 2030; and reviewed the format for reporting on institutional strengthening and renewal requests and the performance indicators that had been agreed on at the 74th meeting.

28. The representative of the Secretariat made an oral correction to paragraph 41 of the document, confirming that the HFC baseline for compliance for Article 5 group I countries would be established in 2023, not 2025.

29. In the ensuing discussion, all members who took the floor acknowledged the importance and value of institutional strengthening projects, which had been crucial to the success of global efforts under the Montreal Protocol. Several members from Article 5 Parties reiterated the importance of the support that they had received over the years.

30. The role and work of national ozone units was also recognized. Several members from Article 5 Parties highlighted the increase in the workload of the units in recent times owing to the entry into force of the Kigali Amendment. In addition, this workload was set to increase further as efforts to implement the Amendment picked up pace, including the setting of baselines, enactment of implementing legislation and more complicated data reporting. Members mentioned additional responsibilities for the national ozone units in fields that were new to them, such as energy efficiency, climate protection and the management of end-of-life refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment. National ozone units would also be engaging with a wider array of stakeholders than had previously been the case. At the same time, work on HCFC phase-out would have to continue. The volume and complexity of the work meant that the national ozone units needed to be strengthened. One member said that she expected the workload to increase up to threefold.

31. Several members from both Article 5 and non-Article 5 Parties supported the proposal by the Secretariat that the duration of the renewal of institutional strengthening projects be extended from two to three years in the interests of greater efficiency. Those from Article 5 Parties confirmed that an extension of

the period would provide some respite from administration and reporting and enable the national ozone units to concentrate on the implementation of activities. One member, however, proposed that the Secretariat prepare an overview of the institutional strengthening projects that were currently under way to enable the Committee to have a better understanding of the potential impact of moving from two to three years. It would also shed light on the cost categories that were being funded and on whether there was a need also to reinforce the composition of the national ozone units. One member said that there might be lessons to be learned from the institutional strengthening undertaken during HCFC phase-out, including in terms of how institutions could be strengthened, and there might be some synergies to be harnessed. Another member said that there needed to be further discussion of how institutional strengthening support would contribute to sustained and stable parallel implementation of the HCFC phase-out and HFC phase-down up to 2030 and that opportunities and incentives needed to be taken into account.

32. In response to a request for clarification about the transition from two to three years, the representative of the Secretariat explained that, currently, funding was approved for two years and that, if the Committee agreed to extend the duration of the renewal of institutional strengthening project to three years, then that the annual agreed funding would also be extended to the third year.

33. In relation to the level of funding, a couple of members made proposals for increases of 50 to 100 per cent. One member pointed out that the COVID-19 pandemic had also had an impact on the work of the national ozone units and had led to inflation that had increased the costs that they incurred.

34. Several members wished to discuss further the reporting format for institutional strengthening renewals and the performance indicators. One of them agreed with the Secretariat's proposal that the format and indicators needed to be updated and proposed that the Committee reach conclusions on all the elements related to institutional strengthening as a package as soon as possible to give effect to decision XXVIII/2 and allow the national ozone units to pursue their work. In a proposal that was supported by another member, she suggested that the issue of the format and indicators be settled earlier than the last meeting of 2023. The representative of the Secretariat noted that, as the matter would require discussion with the bilateral and implementing agencies in person, the Secretariat would be able to report back to the Committee at the first meeting of 2023 only. Another member, however, considered that the existing format and performance indicators were comprehensive and that they could continue to be used as they stood. The member also requested the views of the implementing agencies on the issue.

35. One member, noting the heavy workload all round, which stemmed from the simultaneous implementation of HCFC and HFC control measures until 2029, proposed that the subsequent review of institutional strengthening support be undertaken in 2029 or 2030.

36. The Executive Committee agreed to establish a contact group to consider the matter of institutional strengthening projects further.

37. Reporting back, the convener of the contact group said that the group had had productive discussions and had agreed in principle that the duration of the renewal of institutional strengthening projects should be extended from two to three years. When that change should take effect, however, required further discussion. The group had also agreed that the Secretariat should prepare a review of the performance indicators and the reporting formats with a view to streamlining the current formats and developing SMART indicators, but the submission date for such a review remained to be decided; suggestions of the 91st meeting or the first meeting in 2023 had been made. The contact group had also deliberated on the level of funding. There had been overall agreement that the responsibilities of the national ozone units would increase with the implementation of the Kigali Amendment and reporting thereon and that an increase in funding was required. The level of the funding, however, needed further consideration. Among the views expressed by the members of the contact group were the urgency of agreeing on the funding level; that funding should be provided on the basis of countries' compliance commitments; and that the proposal of a package relating to the funding increase should be considered.

38. Following the report of the contact group, the Executive Committee agreed to continue discussing the review of institutional strengthening projects, including funding levels, at part II of the 89th meeting on the basis of the working text contained in the annex to the present report, which had been agreed by the contact group at part I of the 89th meeting and was based on the recommendation proposed by the Secretariat in paragraph 46 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/4.

AGENDA ITEM 7: MATTERS RELATED TO THE KIGALI AMENDMENT TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

(c) Analysis of the level and modalities of funding for HFC phase-down in the refrigeration servicing sector (decision 88/76)

39. The representative of the Secretariat introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/8, noting that it was a reissue of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/72 with the addition of a note by the Secretariat summarizing the discussions by the Executive Committee at its 88th meeting. Describing the modalities and levels of funding proposed by the Secretariat in the document, he drew attention to the fact that, during part II of the 89th meeting, under agenda item 7 (f) of the provisional agenda (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/1), the Committee would likely consider increasing servicing sector funding for low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries, as called for in paragraph 16 of decision XXVIII/2, to support the introduction of low-global-warming-potential alternatives to HCFCs and to maintain energy efficiency. Given the plans to discuss that issue, the Secretariat was asking the Executive Committee, at the present meeting, to consider whether to take account of any such future increase in funds for LVC countries in the funding for stage I of the KIPs, which was being discussed under the present item; doing so would mean, however, that LVC countries that had not yet ratified the Kigali Amendment would not be considered for the increase. He also indicated that the Executive Committee might wish to consider the present document, including the recommendation, in the light of the guidelines for the preparation of KIPs for Article 5 countries approved at the 87th meeting.

40. In the ensuing discussion, one member took the opportunity to reiterate comments made at the 88th meeting, suggesting that the framework and mechanism used during HCFC phase-out might have limited applicability to HFC phase-down given the safety-related challenges of low-global-warming-potential refrigerants. Furthermore, an integrated compliance strategy for the servicing sector should be considered only when needs related to the refrigeration servicing sector were assessed in 2028; by that time HFC baselines would have been established for all Article 5 Parties and the sectoral distribution of HFCs would be known.

41. Another member stressed the importance of arriving at an agreement on modalities and levels of funding for the servicing sector at the 89th meeting, saying that many countries had already received funds to prepare their KIPs and that it was clear that, particularly for LVC countries, taking action in the servicing sector was key to compliance with the 2024 freeze under the Kigali Amendment. Noting that the eligible servicing sector activities were outlined in decision XXVIII/2 and that additional activities could be added later, he recommended that in any contact group that might be established the Committee avoid embarking on a detailed discussion of the activities to be funded and instead aim to address three issues prior to tackling funding levels: first, as requested by the Secretariat, whether the funding agreed for LVC countries should include any additional funding that might be decided as part of the discussions under agenda item 7 (f) at part II of the 89th meeting; second, how to address the issue of avoiding overlap and seeking synergies between HFC phase-down activities in the servicing sector and concurrent HCFC phase-out activities, given the essential similarities of those activities; and third, whether to use HCFC data as a proxy to set funding levels. On the third issue, he was of the view that using HCFC data was the most workable approach for the first stage of the phase-down given the lack of an HFC baseline or reliable data on consumption in the servicing sector for Article 5 countries. He, however, proposed that a review be conducted in 2024 or 2025 on the basis of the baseline sectoral data that would become available by the end of 2023 in order to allow the funding levels to be based on HFC consumption instead of HCFC consumption.

42. The Executive Committee agreed to establish a contact group to pursue the discussion.

43. Subsequently, the convener of the contact group reported back on the outcomes of the group's discussions, which were to be recorded in the present report to serve as the basis for further discussions in a contact group at part II of the 89th meeting. She reported that there had been overall agreement that consideration of the request by the Parties in paragraph 16 of decision XXVIII/2, relating to the introduction of alternatives to HCFCs with low and/or zero global-warming potential and the maintenance of energy efficiency in the servicing/end-user sector, would be removed from the discussion under the present agenda item and be continued under agenda item 7 (f). The group had also agreed to discuss the third modality as proposed by the Secretariat in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/8. Furthermore, a number of other elements had been discussed, with the following outcomes:

- (a) There had been a common understanding of the need to capitalize on existing infrastructure, with several Article 5 Parties emphasizing the additional effort and activities required as a result of HFC phase-down and the need to make sure that that was accounted for in the agreed funding;
- (b) It had been proposed that non-LVC countries be categorized on the basis of consumption and needs; that corresponding funding levels be suggested for further discussion at part II of the 89th meeting; and that a request be made to the Secretariat in that regard; and
- (c) It had also been proposed that the overall value of funding allocated for the servicing sector for all countries be based on the third modality.
- (d) The group had agreed that at present HCFC baselines would be used as a proxy for HFC consumption when considering funding; it had been proposed that funding levels be reviewed, possibly in 2025, once HFC baselines were known, to determine how funding could be adjusted based on HFC consumption levels.

44. Following the report of the contact group, the Executive Committee agreed to continue considering paragraph 16 of decision XXVIII/2, relating *inter alia* to energy efficiency, separately, under item 7 (f) of the provisional agenda for part II of the 89th meeting and to continue discussing the analysis of the level and modalities of funding for HFC phase-down in refrigeration servicing sector at the same meeting, on the basis both of the discussion and outcomes of the contact group on the matter at the present part I of the 89th meeting and of the additional information to be provided by the Secretariat at part II of the 89th meeting pursuant to the proposals outlined in sub-paragraphs 43 (b) and (c) above.

AGENDA ITEM 9: OTHER MATTERS

45. No issues were raised at the time of adoption of the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 10: ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

46. The Executive Committee adopted the present report on the basis of the draft report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/L.1.

AGENDA ITEM 11: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

47. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the meeting was closed at 10.00 a.m. on Friday, 20 May 2022.

Annex I

**DRAFT DECISION ON AGENDA ITEM 5:
REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS, INCLUDING
FUNDING LEVELS (DECISION 74/51(D))
(WORKING TEXT)**

[The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the review of funding of institutional strengthening (IS) projects including funding levels (decision 74/51(d)), contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/4;
- (b) [To establish the level of funding for IS support taking into account the activities that Article 5 countries would need to undertake to initiate activities to implement the Kigali Amendment and meet the first control measures for phasing down HFCs during the period 2020-2030, while at the same time continuing implementation of HCFC phase-out management plans;] [+60 per cent]
- (c) To extend the duration of IS renewal implementation phases from the current two years to three years for IS renewal proposals submitted from the [90th meeting] onwards;
- (d) To request the Secretariat to discuss with the bilateral and implementing agencies matters related to reviewing the existing format of terminal reports and requests for extension of IS funding, and selecting a set of performance indicators that could be used consistently by all Article 5 countries, and to report back to the Executive Committee at [91st meeting][the first meeting in 2023]; and
- (e) [To request the Secretariat to submit a further review of IS projects including funding levels no later than the second meeting in [2025] [2029 taking into account the remaining HCFC obligations].]