



**Programme des  
Nations Unies pour  
l'environnement**

Distr.  
GÉNÉRALE

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/11/Corr.1  
14 mai 2021

FRANÇAIS  
ORIGINAL : ANGLAIS



COMITÉ EXÉCUTIF  
DU FONDS MULTILATÉRAL AUX FINS  
D'APPLICATION DU PROTOCOLE DE MONTRÉAL  
Quatre-vingt-sixième réunion  
Montréal, 2 – 6 novembre 2020  
Reportée : 8 – 12 mars 2021<sup>1</sup>

**Corrigendum**

**ÉVALUATION DES RÉSEAUX RÉGIONAUX  
DES ADMINISTRATEURS DES BUREAUX NATIONAUX DE L'OZONE  
(ÉTUDE THÉORIQUE ET MANDAT POUR LA DEUXIÈME PHASE)**

Ce document est émis afin de :

- **Remplacer** l'annexe V “Terms of reference for the second stage of the evaluation of regional network of national ozone officers”, par l'annexe ci-jointe.

<sup>1</sup> A cause du coronavirus (COVID-19)



## Annex V

### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE SECOND STAGE OF THE EVALUATION OF REGIONAL NETWORK OF NATIONAL OZONE OFFICERS

#### Background

1. In line with decision 84/11, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) prepared the desk study for the evaluation of regional networks<sup>2</sup> of national ozone officers (NOO), which, due to the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) is being presented to the 86<sup>th</sup> meeting. The objectives of the desk study were to analyze the evolution of the role of the networks, as well as their relevance and contribution to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. It considered issues such as 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 Montreal Protocol.

2. The desk study considered the findings of two previous evaluations (1994 and 2001)<sup>3</sup> and analyzed to what extent the recommendations made were pursued. It analyzed various documents pertaining to previous network meetings, such as network meeting reports and agenda; communication materials developed by the networks or UNEP; Executive Committee documents; and UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) evaluations from 2006 and 2007. A questionnaire was also sent out to the Regional Network Coordinators (RNCs), implementing agencies (IAs), the Ozone Secretariat and other key persons (responding in a personal capacity).

3. The desk study concluded that regional networks continue to be useful for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol and help in achieving/sustaining compliance with agreed measures in Article 5 countries. They also play a critical role in maintaining the visibility and importance of national ozone units (NOUs) within countries. The networks have been instrumental, among other things, in exchanging good practices/lessons and developing cooperation between countries of a given region and sometimes between regions; implementing projects successfully; building capacity through training; and more recently preparing countries to implement provisions agreed under the Kigali Amendment. The study made several recommendations. These relate to developing clear performance/impact indicators, at country and regional levels to allow NOOs and the networks to evaluate meeting results further; increasing the number of consultations with NOUs and bilateral and IAs to prepare meaningful agendas; taking a more proactive approach to meetings, engaging new issues and stakeholders, thus providing for new synergies within the networks and with Montreal Protocol stakeholders.

4. The desk study stressed the importance of further investigating the reasons for the high turnover of NOOs in some countries and propose solutions to address the transfer of knowledge to the NOOs. This may be done in concordance with countries and the bilateral and IAs who have dealt with the issue successfully. Similarly, ways of increasing network-to-network collaboration and interaction could also be further analyzed.

5. The Kigali Amendment brings a good opportunity to renew the commitment to network activities via twinning workshops, thematic meetings and other similar activities, to promote better identification and integration of stakeholders. The study, however, raised concern about "advocacy groups" for certain technologies; and how to ensure a balance between the needed expertise and the exposure to technologies, whilst avoiding "lobbying" for specific options or alternatives.

6. The desk study suggests to explore the inclusion, in the network agendas, of issues such as the sustainability of the Montreal Protocol achievements and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (e.g.,

---

<sup>2</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/11

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/8 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/7 and Corr.1.

poverty reduction, gender equality, affordable and clean energy, decent work and economic growth, innovation).

7. The desk study thus recommended a second stage of the evaluation, to evaluate the impact of the networks, that could be achieved through personal interviews with RNCs and key NOOs, IAs and other key persons, possibly during network meetings. Given the evolving situation of the COVID-19 pandemic, the strategy will be adapted to the situation and adapt to the formate of the network meeting (i.e., virtual or in person meetings).

### **Objectives of the second phase of the evaluation**

8. The objective of the evaluation will be to build upon the completed desk study and assess the relevance of the networks to the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. The justification for a second stage is to complement the findings of the desk study with updated information to be collected directly from the meetings, will allow for a wider perspective on the functioning of the networks. This will allow to frame clearer conclusions and practical recommendations to enhance the operation of the networks. A field approach will also give better insight into how the sustainability of the Montreal Protocol achievements can be ensured, and opportunities to identify and address emerging issues and challenges and the specific needs of each network. The second stage will also allow a follow-up with member countries between meetings on how the meetings recommendations were followed and what challenges were encountered, with a view to fully ensure that countries' needs are met and that the networks continue to be a voice where they can discuss issues related to implementation.

9. The second phase of the evaluation of regional networks of NOOs should focus on several main areas:

#### Network objectives and effectiveness of network meetings

- (a) How do the networks assist the countries in achieving MP objectives and how are they being achieved? Is there a follow-up system to assess the achievement of the objectives?
- (b) How are the main performance indicators for providing effective assistance identified and targets defined?
- (c) How did the global and inter-regional network meetings held in 2018 and 2019 compare with the individual network meeting approach, and which concept should be retained or discarded to ensure a more effective way to meet the networks' objectives?

#### Processes for planning and organizing network meetings

- (a) How are the network meeting agendas planned and do the NOUs play an effective role in defining the network agenda? What are the lessons learned on how to keep the meeting focused, the interest high and the ownership of the meetings? Are there mechanisms in place to make sure NOOs are participating and are being included in the planning? What other external participation would benefit in selecting the topics of the agendas and how should this be addressed?
- (b) What are the main challenges observed in planning and coordination of the meeting and how can these issues be addressed (e.g., defining agenda, timing of network meetings, logistics and coordination, participation of NOUs, resource persons/experts and industry associations/representatives)?

- (c) Noting that respondents to the questionnaire mentioned the benefits of shorter and more focused agendas items, with specific case studies and time for discussion, how effective is the time allocation for different agenda items of the network meeting? What format has been the most useful to your network and are there specific suggestions on structuring the network meetings differently in addressing the challenges faced by the countries?
- (d) What were the main aspects that would benefit from replication in the global network meetings? What were the main challenges (e.g., language barrier, broad topics)? How should these meetings be designed to have an effective impact? How often should these meeting occur?
- (e) What measures can be strengthened to use network meetings as a platform for training new Ozone Officers?
- (f) What actions could be taken through network meetings and other CAP mechanisms for implementing training and capacity building in a cost-effective way through electronic platforms?
- (g) In the context of the Kigali Amendment, how can the network activities be designed to maximize knowledge sharing on implementing HFC control measures?
- (h) In the current post COVID-19 context, what aspects can be covered through web-based processes (e.g., through webinars, pre-recorded information sessions, online messaging apps and video conferences)? What are possible shortcomings of these approaches, noting that they can result in greater flexibility and would be more cost-effective? How can these lessons and new approaches be applied to the return to a normal situation?

Process of information outreach and knowledge sharing

- (a) How effectively do network meetings consultations facilitate the sharing of information and knowledge among its members? How can regional policy/technical bodies (e.g., CARICOM, COMESA) play a role in strengthening regional network and implementation of Montreal Protocol activities in network countries?
- (b) What capacity building activities are carried out to enhance the performance of the NOUs through regional networks? What other activities should be considered to strengthen capacity building in the networks?
- (c) Do the networks provide support in terms of training and exchange of information on policy, regulatory and technology aspects, to assist countries in achieving Montreal Protocol objectives (e.g., regulations on controlling and monitoring controlled substances, data collection and reporting challenges relating to controlled substances, fiscal incentives and other measures for smooth programme implementation, technology adoption experiences including supporting informal sector and small enterprises, key policy decisions taken during the Executive Committee meetings and Meeting of the Parties)? Are these training and support sufficient for NOUs and how can it be enhanced?
- (d) How do the regional network meetings support sharing of good practices and experiences, on technical and policy matters, with the country representatives, and what specifically are the roles of agencies during the regional network meetings and technical experts on identified issues?

- (e) What are the main tools/mechanisms used to share information and how effective are these tools/mechanisms (e.g., print and electronic publishing, holding workshops, undertaking training and capacity development)? How can electronic platforms be effectively used for cost-effective information and knowledge sharing?
- (f) In light of the high turnover of NOOs, what mechanisms can be implemented to institutionalize knowledge retention and sharing in networks and how can other stakeholders (e.g., IAs and associations) play a role in these mechanisms?

#### Processes of lessons learning and feedback

- (a) How do the regional networks contribute to the operations of the IAs, the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and the Ozone Secretariat?
- (b) What role do the networks play in the sustainability of the achievements of the Montreal Protocol?
- (c) What measures can be institutionalised to improve feedback on network performance to provide a fair assessment of network effectiveness? What indicators could be used to monitor network effectiveness assessment?
- (d) What mechanism could be used to improve the collection and management of NOUs feedback and incorporate it to network activities?

#### Impact on achieving the United Nations SDGs

- (a) Are the relevant United Nations SDGs included in the meeting agendas or addressed in a meaningful way (e.g., poverty reduction, gender equality, affordable and clean energy, decent work and economic growth and innovation)? If so, how are they addressed and what can be improved? Could the networks serve as a vehicle to report on and share effective ways to address the SDGs? If the SDGs are not part of the process, how can they be included effectively?
- (b) How are gender mainstreaming issues included in the networks? Are actions undertaken to provide men and women equal opportunities, in workshops, training and other activities? Are gender policies for project implementation discussed and favored and good practices shared on gender issues? Are other Montreal Protocol stakeholders' gender policies included, discussed and shared, and if so how has this benefitted the NOOs? What additional actions should be taken to encourage gender mainstreaming and equal representation in the networks?
- (c) What mechanisms or support initiative could be devised to assist the NOUs in recognizing their roles and the opportunities provided by the Montreal Protocol in contributing to the achievements of the SDGs?

#### Structure and organization

- (a) The desk study highlighted the importance of the lessons brought back by the NOOs and the implementation or development of actions and measures that were agreed during the meetings. In this regard, a rotation of the attending staff can have a number of benefits (e.g., training newer member and disseminating/retaining knowledge) and negative impacts (e.g., reduced interest, lower decision-making potential, hinder communication). What can be done to maximize the positive impacts and minimize the negative ones?

- (b) How are networks organized and what is the distribution of power within the network? Who are the main stakeholders? Has the organization changed in time, if so, how?
- (c) How will the role of the networks change in the light of the new orientation brought about by the Kigali Amendment? What type of modifications are needed to the functioning and activities of the networks?
- (d) Is there a mechanism to track the progress of work between meetings? Are there opportunities to improve this mechanism or enhance the work done between meetings?

#### Network efficiency

- (a) What are the costs for organizing activities such as regional networks meetings and others? Does the network have the adequate resources, financial or else, to operate? Were there any impediments in reaching objectives because of scarcity of resources? Where are the resources coming from? Has this change during the years and how?
- (b) Are there opportunities and mechanisms that can be used or created to enhance the sharing of information and capacity building through regional networks and between the networks?

#### **Methodology**

10. The method of analysis will be the comparative case study. A consultant, or a team of consultants, will be recruited to participate in the network meetings. After each meeting a case study will be prepared with the findings of the consultant(s). A synthesis report will summarize the findings, and formulate conclusions and recommendations to conclude the evaluation.

11. The data collection methods include, *inter alia*, participant observation, as the consultant(s) will attend the meetings, open-ended interviews will be carried out with participants and key persons involved in, and invited to, the meeting, and focus group interviews will be organized with the NOOs.

12. In addition, the consultant(s) will read existing documentation, such as the desk study of this evaluation. Telephone interviews can be further organized with staff from the bilateral and IAs and the Ozone and Multilateral Fund Secretariats. The draft report will be shared with the Secretariat, IAs and the NOUs for comments.

13. It is worth taking into account the importance of conducting the second phase of the evaluation in person, which gives invaluable inputs and insight to the evaluation team, in part due to the rich opportunity for the participants to provide direct detailed information. However, due to the evolving situation of the COVID-19 pandemic, the methodology of the second phase could either be adjusted to the network meetings format (i.e., virtual meetings, in person meetings or a combination of both) or the field visits could be postponed until they are feasible.

#### **Timing**

14. The final evaluation will be presented to the first in-person meeting of the Executive Committee to be held in 2022.