



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/13/Rev.1  
19 December 2019

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Eighty-fourth Meeting  
Montreal, 16–20 December 2019

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE DESK STUDY OF THE EVALUATION OF REGIONAL  
NETWORKS OF NATIONAL OZONE OFFICERS**

**Background**

1. At its 82<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) to prepare the terms of reference for the desk study of the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers (NOO) to be presented at the 84<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 82/10).
2. The networks are capacity building mechanisms that promote the exchange of information, experience, and the know-how required to meet the Montreal Protocol (MP) commitments, report data, set and enforce policies, adopt technologies, and effectively manage the national ozone units (NOUs).
3. The objective of the networks is to provide NOOs with regular updates and guidance on the MP compliance requirements and in the implementation of phase-out activities that lead towards meeting and sustaining compliance with the MP.
4. The networks play the role of a forum for continuous communication between NOOs, non-Article 5 countries, the Fund and Ozone Secretariats, and the bilateral and implementing agencies. Annual meetings are conducted and thematic workshops are organized regularly, to discuss *inter alia*, technical, scientific and policy-related information. This allows the NOOs to share knowledge, develop cooperation and strengthen their expertise and capacity.
5. The first network was created in 1993 for the South-East Asia region with support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Between 1994 and 2008 eight other networks were created.<sup>1</sup> Today, there are nine regional networks operating in five regions, with 147 Article 5 countries participating.

<sup>1</sup> Anglophone Africa (1994); Francophone Africa (1994); Mexico and Central America (1994); South America (1994); the Caribbean (1994); West Asia (1996) South Asia (1997); Europe and Central Asia (2003); and Pacific Island Countries (2008).

6. The networks have been evaluated twice in the past: in 1994, an evaluation was conducted on the UNEP/SIDA project that created the first regional network in South-East Asia. The objective of the evaluation was to provide UNEP and SIDA with “assistance in decisions regarding the future funding and format of the project in South East Asia and lessons for the application and development of similar network projects in other regions.”<sup>2</sup> The evaluation concluded that the network played an important role in raising awareness about the MP and its role among a key group of government officials; helped define phase-out priorities; facilitated technology transfer; and engendered a spirit of cooperation in the region. A question was raised regarding the network’s funding capacity to become self-sufficient. The evaluation recommended replicating the network concept in other regions.

7. The final report of the second evaluation of the regional networks was presented at the 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting (March 2001),<sup>3</sup> assessed the functioning and organization of the eight networks and made recommendations for improvement. The findings showed that the networks provided the NOOs with opportunities to learn about the decisions of the Executive Committee and of the Meeting of the Parties; to exchange experiences; and to increase their level of knowledge related to the latest developments of technological alternatives. The network meetings provided a forum to develop personal contacts and learn about success and failures in order to avoid pitfalls. On the other hand, the meeting agendas were often overloaded, the time allocated for presentations was not always adequate and the meeting attendance was irregular.

### **Objectives of the desk study**

8. Noting that the previous evaluation of regional networks was conducted in 2001, the desk study will assess how the role of the different networks has evolved in the implementation of the MP and will assess whether the recommendations made by the previous evaluation were accomplished. It will analyze the relevance of the regional networks in the implementation of the MP requirements at country and regional level, by taking into account the organization, participation, choice of subject of discussion and influence over decision making processes as well as the changes needed to adapt the networks to the new challenges of the MP.

9. The desk study will try to answer the following evaluation questions:

#### Planning and organization

10. What are the lessons and good practices from the regional networks, the regional meetings and the capacity building and information sharing in these networks and how could they be used to improve their functioning?

11. How is the countries’ ownership of the networks and how could this ownership be enhanced? What were the objectives and identified needs for the participating countries of the regional networks? Is there a mechanism to ensure that their needs are met?

12. Were there changes in the organization of the regional networks over time? What were the pros and cons? What types of changes were made and what were their objectives? Were these objectives attained?

13. How was the participation of the individual NOOs in the regional networks (e.g., regular attendance of NOOs to the meetings, active in online training, capacity building and information sharing)? Has the turn out improved over time? How was the turnover in the participation of the NOOs in the networks? How was the knowledge and know-how of the meetings maintained and transmitted (i.e., how was the institutional memory of the meetings built)?

---

<sup>2</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/8

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/7 and Corr.1

14. Are the meeting objectives and topics previously discussed with the NOOs and agreed upon before a meeting? What are the differences between the networks approaches? What is the selection process for the topics for discussions to be held (e.g., are they suggested during the previous meeting; are the NOOs contacted beforehand)? Is the time frame for the presentation of topics adequate?
15. How are the participants prepared before a meeting? Is the documentation provided in advanced to the NOOs (e.g., available on the OzonAction website)? Is there an online forum (e.g., email chain, social media page, website) where discussions can be held between the regional meetings on issues concerning the organization and suggestions for specific topics?
16. Are there facilitators identified to chair or to facilitate the discussions? How are they chosen?
17. How is the impact of networks assessed? Is there a follow-up of the results achieved by the discussions held during the meetings? Are the results of these discussions presented at the following meeting and their successes and failures analyzed?
18. Are the network meetings held back-to-back with other related meetings on the environment (e.g., meetings of the Ministers of Environment) in order to raise political awareness concerning ozone issues in the region and to promote policy discussions on regional approaches?
19. What are the experiences and lessons learned from 2018 and 2019 ozone networks meetings where regional networks participated?

#### Capacity building

20. What capacity building activities are carried out to enhance the performance of the NOUs? Are new NOOs tutored by experienced NOOs? How do Regional Network Coordinators keep track of the new developments in the different NOUs and is it a frequent endeavor?
21. Do regional networks provide support in terms of training and exchange of expertise and know-how in areas such as, *inter alia*: legislation, import/export licensing systems, fiscal incentives, working with the informal sector and small enterprises, technological development, control of illegal trade, recovery and recycling projects and project co-funding modalities? How is this information shared and what are the results?
22. Are resource persons such as, *inter alia*, Customs officers, legal advisers and representative of industry association, invited to the meetings?
23. Are there contacts and information exchanges between the different networks organized? Are experienced NOOs invited in other regional meetings to impart their knowledge? Were monitoring and reporting by the NOUs on consumption and production of controlled substances to the Ozone Secretariat and to the Fund Secretariat addressed during the meetings, and were best practices, challenges, opportunities and shortfalls in monitoring and verification discussed at the regional level? Was there any sign of improvement afterwards?
24. Were the participants able to influence decision-making processes at the country level or at regional level? Were these decisions formulated during the meetings? Were these decisions relevant to address issues of relevance at regional scale, such as standards for safety and energy efficiency, policies for bulk procurement or other measures that can help harmonize the market pricing of alternatives, the possibility to discuss and design regional projects or initiatives, and North-South and South-South cooperation, and how this support to decision-making can be improved within regional networks?

25. What activities demonstrate that regional network meetings are effective platforms to transmit decisions emanating from the Executive Committee and the Meeting of the Parties? How can this be improved? How did the regional meetings address the new challenges for the implementation of new Amendments (i.e., Beijing and Kigali) in their work programme?

#### Coordination with bilateral and implementing agencies (IAs)

26. How do the regional networks contribute to the activities of the bilateral and IAs, the Fund Secretariat and the Ozone Secretariat? Do network meetings help to address the coordination and communication issues between the bilateral and IAs and the NOUs?

27. How important is the bilateral and IAs' and Ozone and Multilateral Fund Secretariats participation in the meetings? What was their role in discussions, cross-fertilization of ideas about issues and projects? What is the role of UNEP in fostering cooperation among participants and the IAs? Are non-Article 5 countries invited to participate in the meetings (other than as bilateral agencies)?

28. How do meetings contribute to strengthen regional cooperation among countries (e.g., addressing common problems)? Are there joint activities organized as a consequence of the discussions held during the meetings?

#### New challenges

29. How will the roles of the regional networks change in the light of the new orientation brought about by the Kigali Amendment? What types of modifications are needed to strengthen the networks and to support their activities? What are the lessons and good practices from the regional meetings and how could they be used to improve their functioning?

30. What role do the networks play in the sustainability of the achievements of the MP?

31. What role do the networks play in incorporating gender issues in the MP?

#### **Methodology**

32. A consultant will be recruited to prepare the desk study. She or he will analyze existing documentation related to, *inter alia*: regional networks, reports of the network meetings, and Executive Committee documents. A questionnaire could be prepared and sent to Regional Network Coordinators and to the NOOs. Discussion will be held with staff from UNEP, the Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders.

33. The draft report will be shared with the Secretariat, bilateral and IAs and NOUs for comments. If needed, a second part including participation at the regional meetings will be suggested, based on the findings of the desk study.

#### **Recommendation**

34. The Executive Committee may wish to approve the terms of reference for the desk study of the evaluation of the regional networks of national ozone officers, contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/13/Rev.1.