



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/8
29 April 2024

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-fourth Meeting
Montreal, 27-31 May 2024
Item 6(c) of the provisional agenda¹

REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTS

Introduction

1. The present document has been prepared in response to decisions 90/28(g) and 91/9 of the Executive Committee requesting the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) to conduct a review aimed at improving project completion report (PCR) processes, formats and related tools. The request arose from discussions held during the 89th and 90th meetings of the Executive Committee in relation to the findings and recommendations made by different oversight bodies in their respective reports: the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) assessment of the Secretariat in 2019² and the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) audit of the Multilateral Fund in 2021.³

2. Both reports from the oversight bodies covered the issue of PCRs in their recommendations. The issues raised by OIOS were resolved in due time, as described in the 2022 Consolidated Project Completion report.⁴ The implementing agencies improved the timeliness of PCR submission. The MOPAN assessment addressed more substantive questions, such as the need for improved data collection on lessons learned from PCRs for their subsequent use in project design, preparation and implementation.

3. The present review has been prepared by the evaluation unit⁵ with the invaluable support of the Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies, which have responded to surveys and participated in consultations during a series of meetings between May 2023 and March 2024, including the inter-agency coordination meetings.

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/1

² UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/2/Add.2

³ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/2/Add.1

⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/90/10

⁵ Senior monitoring and evaluation officer (SMEO) and monitoring and evaluation programme assistant.

4. The analysis of existing processes, formats and tools related to the preparation, submission and use of PCRs is based on the desk review of Multilateral Fund documentation, identifying the first requests for PCRs in decisions 18/20, 19/34 and 21/36 of the Executive Committee. Annex I to the present document presents a summary of decisions related to PCRs. The desk study has been complemented by additional data collection through surveys, a summary of responses to which is presented in annex II. Qualitative data have been collected through written surveys, semi-structured interviews and collective working sessions, as well as bilateral interviews at different stages of the process.

5. The study reviews the preparation and submission processes, as well as the formats, existing tools and final intended utility of PCRs. The proposed improvements address existing or potential duplication of reporting mechanisms and propose changes in PCR processes, tools and formats in order to minimize efforts by all stakeholders while maximizing the utility of the information contained in PCRs.

Objective of the review

6. This review covers questions such as the *raison d'être* of PCRs, what were they intended for when created, what are they used for now, what is involved in the process from preparation until final use by stakeholders and what can be improved to streamline the process and make it more relevant, effective and efficient, to be in line with decision 93/1 requesting Secretariat to prepare a document on the mapping of reporting requirements and the streamlining of reporting on progress across the spectrum of reports, taking into account the ongoing development of the knowledge management system, to be presented at the 95th meeting. Therefore, the proposed adoption of the new PCR format would be subject to further evolution, should the current project reporting framework evolve to include new parameters. Accordingly, the PCR would reflect the changes to consistently align its contents to the overall project life cycle reporting framework.

7. The objective of this review is to report on the current state of affairs related to the preparation, submission and use of PCRs and to identify improvements, revise the outdated formats and optimize submission processes and related tools. The findings support proceeding with the reform and its operationalization in formats and tools, with the endorsement of the Executive Committee. The proposed changes will ensure that the PCRs are better connected as part of the information covering the entire life-cycle of the projects funded by the Multilateral Fund, to be fully captured by the forthcoming knowledge management system, which will provide users with integrated information corresponding to each project. The PCR would be the end-of-pipe element, for those projects for which the Executive Committee is expecting to receive PCRs.⁶ The information generated is expected to be more relevant for evaluation purposes and to feed into project design and implementation for the agencies, with improved use of lessons learned.

Overview of project completion reports

Origin, role, and evolution of project completion reports

8. The requirement to submit PCRs for projects funded by the Multilateral Fund was first discussed at the 18th and the 19th meetings⁷ of the Executive Committee and was covered by decisions 18/20 and 19/34. As a result of those discussions, the first request to develop a format for PCRs was made at the 21st meeting under the item on monitoring and evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund, in decision 21/36(e), which requested the Secretariat to work with the implementing agencies to explore ways in which standardized

⁶ Some projects, such as institutional strengthening (IS) projects, do not require the submission of PCRs.

⁷ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/75 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/64

monitoring and evaluation components could be included in project proposals and to propose standardized guidelines for the content of project completion reports by implementing agencies.⁸

9. The first PCR formats were prepared concomitantly with the definition of other project review reporting formats, as part of the overall reporting framework to ensure accountability through continued monitoring (i.e., progress report) and final reports. The PCR was the final reporting step after full implementation and project completion. The Multilateral Fund's PCR is the equivalent of the terminal report at other funding institutions (i.e., the Global Environment Facility). The GEF's implementing agencies are requested to prepare terminal reports, following GEF guidelines, upon completion of projects implemented with GEF funding.⁹

10. The first projects funded by the Multilateral Fund were essentially investment projects for a limited period of time, usually no more than 36 months. Since then, the types of projects and the complexity of implementation modalities have evolved. The introduction of multi-year agreements (MYAs) added further monitoring requirements, to ensure that the expected results from the implementation of one stage would be achieved before releasing the funding for consecutive stages. The submission of the PCR was introduced as a mandatory requirement between stages of MYAs by decision 81/29, in which the Executive Committee decided that funding requests for the second or subsequent tranches of stage II or for subsequent stages of the HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) submitted for consideration by the Committee would not be considered if there was an outstanding PCR from the previously completed stage that had not been submitted to the Secretariat at least six weeks in advance of the meeting to which the tranche request of the new stage was being submitted.¹⁰

11. The current use of PCRs has evolved towards being an administrative requirement to ensure compliance with reporting requirements, rather than serving as a tool to collect relevant information and important lessons learned to be used for evaluation purposes. The absence of updated guidance and upgraded tools has further diluted the original role of the PCRs. However, the PCR is the only document in the reporting process that gives an overview of all tranches in a single report. As such, users can obtain overall information by consulting the PCR of a particular project.

Roles of stakeholders

12. The evaluation unit is responsible for collecting the PCRs from the bilateral and implementing agencies, and for preparing a consolidated summary report to be considered by the Executive Committee at each meeting. The consolidated report aggregates the information submitted through the different PCR modalities and presents the synthesis of the information in the most succinct and meaningful format for decision-making.

13. The Secretariat prepares the list of PCRs due which is shared with the agencies and the evaluation unit, informing them of which PCRs are expected to be submitted during the ongoing year. The list is prepared after the second meeting of the year and is circulated at the beginning of the following year, so that the agencies can prepare their submissions. The Secretariat identifies the PCRs due through the information contained in its project-related database and in progress reports, and through a screening of ad hoc decisions¹¹ related to specific projects.

14. Bilateral and implementing agencies, together with country national ozone officers are responsible for data collection and for the information included in the submitted PCR. The process by which the bilateral

⁸ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/36

⁹ Implementing agencies for GEF-funded projects have developed specific guidance to prepare the terminal reports for GEF, see for example the "[Guidance for conducting terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported-GEF-financed projects](#)".

¹⁰ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/81/58

¹¹ Some decisions refer specifically to particular projects and define an ad hoc date for the submission of the PCRs; this generates the list of PCRs due by decision.

and implementing agencies organize the preparation of their PCRs internally is not covered in this review, as it may differ from one agency to another, and does not affect the results of this analysis. However, it is worth noting that the preparation of PCRs requires significant effort for all agencies, in terms of time and dedicated human resources.¹²

Processes

Identification of project completion reports due date for submission

15. The Executive Committee requests the bilateral and implementing agencies to submit PCRs within six months of operational completion.¹³ However, in practice, noting that the existing PCR formats must include financial information that is not available within six months of operational completion, most submissions are made at least one year after operational completion of the project. This is despite the fact that existing formats provide the option of submitting provisional financial information that can be updated by the agencies when the final information becomes available.¹⁴

16. Agencies rely on the list of PCRs due prepared by the Secretariat rather than on their internal sources of information on the status of project completion. Since the Secretariat retrieves the information based on the progress reports, the submission of PCRs happens in most cases at least one year or more after effective operational project completion.

17. As part of the planned improvements and new tools, once online submission is available in the knowledge management system, a new functionality will be designed to notify agencies of the need to submit the PCR for a completed project.

Current process of submission of project completion reports for individual projects and multi-year agreements

18. Currently, the PCRs for individual projects are submitted by email, in word and PDF formats, to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and the evaluation unit. The information is extracted manually in order to analyze and summarize it for the consolidated summary report.

19. The PCRs for MYAs are submitted through the online web database maintained by the Secretariat.¹⁵ It is the responsibility of the lead agency to submit the MYA PCR. For jointly implemented MYA projects, the submission is split among the different components as implementers, with one lead agency and one or more cooperating agencies. Each agency has its own access credentials and can obtain technical support from the Secretariat and substantive support from the evaluation unit if non-technical issues are raised. Only when all the agencies have submitted their respective components the lead agency can complete the PCR and submit it to the evaluation unit for the SMEO to consider the information and report to the Executive Committee.

20. Bilateral and implementing agencies have noted that the current platform is not ideal for handling the submission of jointly implemented projects; their suggestions for improvement have been taken into account in the proposed design of the new universal format and its online access, as part of the integration of the PCRs in the overall knowledge management system.¹⁶ The proposed format, details of which is explained in paragraphs 26 to 33, is being called universal because a single format replaces the set of different

¹² One of the implementing agencies has a dedicated consultant to undertake all the work related to PCRs.

¹³ Decisions 23/8 (i), 24/9 (b) and more recently 81/29 and 91/28 (c).

¹⁴ The revised format will continue to include the indication on whether financial information is provisional or final.

¹⁵ <http://multilateralfund.org/hpmpcr/login.aspx>

¹⁶ Implementing agencies responded to the survey with suggestions for improvement. A summary of the suggestions is provided in annex II.

formats which are currently in use. With the PCR integrated at the end of the project reporting cycle, there is no need to differentiate up-front among the different types of projects for which PCRs are submitted.

21. The data extraction is mostly done manually, considering that neither the individual submissions nor the files generated from the web database are ready for consultation without additional work to export and organize the information in excel files. The evaluation unit handles the final files that are used by the SMEO to prepare the consolidated summary for the Executive Committee.

22. The agencies have expressed concerns regarding the existing joint reporting modalities, which sometimes have an impact on the indicators related to PCR submission that help measure agencies' performance.¹⁷ The change in functionalities in the future online system will provide more flexibility to agencies to report on their responsibilities, independently from the co-implementing partners. Online submission will make it easier for an agency to report as soon as its respective component has been completed. On the receiving end, for the Secretariat and the evaluation unit, the PCR will only be considered as fully submitted once all the different agencies' components have been entered in the knowledge management system platform.

Tools and formats

Database of project completion reports for multi-year agreements

23. As mentioned in paragraph 19, the submission is done through a web database. The current process requires the support of the Secretariat in transferring the data from the progress report, once endorsed by the Executive Committee, to the MYA PCR database to update the project information. This manual data transfer will become redundant once the PCRs and all project-related data is handled by the single knowledge management system, to be operationalized for PCRs in 2025. The PCRs will be integrated into the new knowledge management system, becoming the final reporting component in each Multilateral Fund project. The present document will therefore not enter into a detailed description of the existing databases, but rather describe the proposed changes aimed at improving data collection and simplifying processes.

24. The bilateral and implementing agencies have provided very meaningful feedback on the existing limitations of the current online submission system. The desired improvements for a more user-friendly environment for the submission of PCRs are described in annex II to the present document. In agreement with the Secretariat, it has been considered more effective and efficient to take into account the comments received for the design of the new system, rather than investing additional resources on a platform which should be maintained only as a repository, not as a dynamic tool, after the knowledge management system is fully up and running, including phase 3 which will operationalize the functionalities for PCR submission.

Formats

25. The first PCR format was created for investment projects. As the Fund developed a portfolio of different types of projects (i.e., technical assistance), other formats were developed, based on the initial one but requiring different types of information. Currently, there are three active PCR formats: one for individual investment projects, one for non-investment projects, and one for MYAs under HPMP projects.¹⁸ Until October 2023, another MYA database, and its related PCR format, was being used to report on MYAs for projects that addressed substances for CFC phase-out plan, ODS phase-out plans, methyl bromide, refrigerant management plans, and domestic refrigeration, among others. Projects covering these substances

¹⁷ This affects only the lead agency, in case of joint implementation, as it is the one responsible for the submission.

¹⁸ It should be noted that some categories of projects (i.e. institutional strengthening or pilot projects, among others) are not required to submit PCRs. Bilateral and implementing agencies report to the Secretariat on these different types of projects, using other reporting mechanisms, and the information is not submitted to the SMEO. For evaluation purposes, the SMEO can request the Secretariat to share the information, when required.

have now all been completed; their PCRs have been submitted and the database now becomes a repository, no longer available for new submissions.

Suggested format changes

26. After consultation with the Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies, the evaluation unit has consolidated the suggested improvements to reduce overlap and simplify the existing reporting formats. This section presents those suggestions arising from a comparison of existing formats and the proposed simplified universal format resulting from the review.

27. The proposed universal PCR format is applicable for both individual and MYA PCRs for HCFC and HFC projects, namely HPMPs and Kigali HFC implementation plans (KIPs). After endorsement of the proposed universal format by the Executive Committee, the evaluation team would develop guidelines to use the new format, addressing the different sections with particular attention to the reporting on lessons learned.

28. During the consultations to prepare the present review, the implementing agencies noted that they were facing duplication of reporting across the different reports to be submitted to the Secretariat.¹⁹ It was suggested that it would be more efficient to turn the PCR reporting process into a less technical and more qualitative reporting tool, making it possible to provide more relevant information and substantive inputs. There were suggestions to include sections in which the agencies could report on project results (outputs, impact, sustainability of achievements, etc.) and share an analytical summary of the projects' achievements. The information prepared by the agencies for the PCRs could also yield benefits for relevant stakeholders, which could use that information for the future design and implementation of new projects. The PCR information could also be used for other types of reporting needs.

29. The findings of this review and the resulting reform of PCRs could contribute to the ongoing effort to streamline the project reporting process across the Multilateral Fund, with the PCR being at the end of the project life-cycle and reporting. The new format would include the possibility of reporting on issues such as gender, energy efficiency or sustainable development goals, among others, which were not included in existing formats.²⁰ In a nutshell, the PCR and reporting sections would include modules that could help provide useful data for the Secretariat's results framework.

30. The proposed universal PCR format includes a section on gender, for it is mandatory to respond to the Multilateral Fund's operational policy on gender mainstreaming²¹ approved at the 92nd meeting in decision 92/40. The proposed format also includes an optional section to report on aspects related to the sustainable development goals (SDGs). The agencies may choose to provide such information and specify which SDGs the project contributed to or had synergies with.²²

31. The sections on causes of delay includes some categories in line with the reasons for tranche submission delays for MYA projects reported by the agencies to the Secretariat (e.g., government delays, enterprise delays, etc.). The majority of those categories have remained the same in the proposed format with slight changes in merging closely related categories to facilitate the reporting process for agencies.²³ The new format has also eliminated categories which were no longer being used, while allowing agencies to add categories that might not be covered by the proposed list of causes for delay.

¹⁹ Such as information submitted for project review and progress reports.

²⁰ Reporting on gender would be mandatory as it has become a requirement for all projects from the 85th meeting on, as per decision 92/40. Other issues (e.g., SDGs) would be left up to the choice of the reporting entity.

²¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/51

²² For example, they could report on synergies with SDG 13 on climate change.

²³ For example, "policy and regulatory framework" merged with "relevant legislation".

32. For the categories related to lessons learned, the proposed format preserves some of the existing categories, eliminates those no longer used, and proposes a pre-selection of categories that have been updated according to the current priorities of the Fund's projects, taking into account suggestions made by stakeholders during the consultations.²⁴

33. Table 1 presents the outlines of the current sections in the PCR format for individual (investment and non-investment projects) and MYA projects while table 2 displays the outline of the proposed new universal format, applicable to all projects. The full universal format is presented in annex III, including an introduction presenting the rationale behind the proposed changes.

Table 1. Outlines of the current PCR formats

OUTLINE OF THE CURRENT PCR FORMATS (*)		
Individual Projects		HPMP MYA PCR format
Investment Project	Non-investment Project	
Section 1: Project overview Section 2: Criteria and rating scheme for overall assessment Section 3: Descriptive assessment of project performance Section 4: ODS phase-out Section 5: Budget and expenditures Section 6: Implementation efficiency Section 7: Fate of ODS-based production equipment Annex 1: Key data on sub-projects in one company or umbrella project Annex 2: Photographs	Section 1: Project overview Section 2: Achievement of project objectives Section 3: Project schedule Section 4: Budget and expenditures Section 5: Lessons learned, highlights and problems Annex 1: Photographs	Section 1: HPMP overview Section 2: Amount of ODS consumed by year Section 3: Fate of ODS-based equipment Section 4: Budget and expenditure of HPMPs Section 5: Implementation effectiveness Section 6: Lessons learned Section 7: Comments Section 8: Summary of key data on tranches in HPMP

(*) Current formats of the individual (investment and non-investment) and the MYA PCRs are available in the Executive Committee meetings documents below: MYA PCR Format (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/46 (annex VI)); PCR format for investment projects (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/7 (annex I)) and the PCR format for non-investment project (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/47/Corr.1 (annex III)).

Table 2. Outline of the proposed universal PCR format

OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED UNIVERSAL FORMAT FOR PCR
Section 1: Project overview <i>(key parameters of the project such as: total MLF funding, date of completion, HFCs and HCFCs phase-out, financial figures, overall project goals, etc)</i>
Section 2: Project results: overall assessment highlights <i>(assessment of the achievement of activity output, overall assessment achievement of project objective and stakeholder comments)</i>
Section 3: Causes of delays and actions taken <i>(a list of delays categories such as: project design, procurement and suppliers delay, availability of alternative technology, etc)</i>
Section 4: Lessons learned <i>(a list of lesson learned categories such as: energy efficiency, climate benefits, data availability and accuracy, customs and imports, capacity building, etc)</i>
Section 5: Gender mainstreaming <i>(input on gender during the project cycle phase based on gender indicators as per annex II of the gender operation policy of the MLF in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/51. A sub-section with qualitative information to complete the information)</i>

²⁴ For details see the proposed universal format in annex III.

Section 6: Contribution to the sustainable development goals (SDGs) (optional)

(an optional section to report on the MLF 17 SDGs defined in annex II of the results framework and scorecard document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/103)

Section 7: Summary of key data on project implementation and delays in implementation

(detailed information on budget, funds disbursement and tranches, completion date, delays, etc)

Section 8: Other supporting evidence

(to upload or attach additional documents, pictures, links, etc)

Specific utility of PCRs

34. The PCR was conceived as the source of information to be used for evaluations by the SMEO. Over time, it also became a mandatory requirement after the completion of stages of MYAs to allow for the disbursement of tranches, based on decision 81/29. For some projects, it is the only report prepared after the completion of the project. The current review is an opportunity to ensure that the new PCR format presents relevant information not only for evaluation purposes, but also for project managers and reviewers to learn from lessons learned and reasons for delay, and to benefit from an overall final assessment of a projects' results.

35. Some of the information in the PCRs is collected through other monitoring and reporting mechanisms of the Fund Secretariat, in particular through very accurate measurement and continued surveillance of project implementation, in terms of both compliance and the use of financial resources against approved activities. The data from the other reports pre-fill some of the sections of the current PCR formats (e.g., project overview, budget and expenditures, delays in implementation, etc.).

36. As for the lessons learned, online databases for individual and MYA PCRs were developed and approved by the Executive Committee in decisions 75/5(f) and 76/5.²⁵ The intended use of the databases was to provide online information through search engines, so that Executive Committee members and agencies could search and retrieve data on lessons learned as reported in the PCRs.

37. The database of lessons learned from individual PCRs has been consistently updated manually after each meeting of the Executive Committee.²⁶ A database of lessons learned from MYAs was linked to the MYA PCR database. It will be updated and migrated along with the individual lessons learned database to the new overall lessons learned database in the knowledge management system.

38. It is planned that all lessons learned will be processed for all type of projects requiring PCR once the submission will be online through knowledge management system.

39. Data extraction will occur through the system, replacing the current process of manually populating the information in the database of individual PCRs after extracting it from email submissions to the SMEO. As it stands, the existing database allows users to search for information based on country, project title, project code, agency, sector/type and lessons learned reported by the agency.

40. Experience has shown that the manual extraction process is time consuming, requires significant human resources, and is not very user friendly. Furthermore, the way the lessons learned are presented in the current PCR format is neither useful to bilateral and implementing agencies for future project design or other reporting, nor useful to the evaluation unit for evaluation purposes.

41. Information on lessons learned and the causes for delay in project implementation is essentially only collected through PCRs. Agencies have expressed interest in receiving guidelines on how to report on lessons learned meaningfully with qualitative information in their PCR submissions. The proposed revised format

²⁵ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/85 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/66

²⁶ <http://www.multilateralfund.org/pcrindividual/search.aspx>

has deleted outdated sections which were no longer being used and includes new issues in line with the current priorities of the Fund's projects (e.g., gender, energy efficiency, climate benefits, etc.). It also allows reporting entities to provide analytical feedback on the results of the projects. The resulting information is expected to generate better data both for project design and implementation, and for evaluation purposes.

Presentation of the consolidated project completion report

42. It is current practice that the SMEO prepares a report with consolidated findings to be presented to the Executive Committee at each meeting.²⁷ The outline of that report has remained essentially unchanged, over time, very much aligned with the existing PCR formats for individual investment projects, individual non-investment projects and MYAs. It includes summaries which are prepared by the Secretariat on the technical and financial aspects of the projects based on progress report extracts, as well as specific sections prepared by the SMEO on reasons for delays and lessons learned. Since the 89th meeting, the consolidated PCR summary also includes references to gender, although this has been poorly populated so far due to the lack of systematic inclusion of this dimension in final reports. Only projects approved after the 85th meeting are expected to include gender, as per decision 84/92.

43. As a result of the present review, the SMEO considers that the outline and information provided in the consolidated PCR summary could be updated on the basis of the new approved format, once it is fully in use and operationalized. Furthermore, only one consolidated PCR report could be prepared per year instead of two, which would be based on a larger sample of projects. This single consolidated summary could be presented at the first meeting of the year, which is less heavily loaded compared to the second meeting. This would also help reduce the number of documents to be considered by the Executive Committee.

Conclusion

44. The review of PCRs has identified potential improvements which would result from reforming processes, formats and tools to be used for data collection and reporting upon project completion. The integration of the PCR submission at the end of the pipeline of overall project reporting within the knowledge management system will facilitate streamlining with a single universal PCR format. In the case of individual projects, the agencies had to report the same information through different submissions (e.g., progress report, PCR). With the integration of PCRs into the knowledge management system this duplication will be avoided. The revised format will give agencies the opportunity to provide more qualitative information that can be used for project design, implementation and evaluation. The update of the section on lessons learned will facilitate data collection on issues that were not included in the previous formats and are better aligned to the current priorities of Multilateral Fund projects. The increased quality of lessons learned resulting from the new PCR reporting would result in better data being made available for project design and implementation as well as for evaluation purposes.

45. In summary, the approval of the revised format and its future use in the knowledge management system will contribute to the following improvements:

- (a) Lightening the data collection process for the bilateral and implementing agencies;
- (b) Eliminating the duplication of submissions to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and the SMEO;
- (c) Improving the quality of specific areas of information collected only through PCRs;

²⁷ See 2023 Consolidated Project Completion Report (Part II) in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/22

- (d) Facilitating data collection on issues not previously covered, in line with evolving issues covered by Multilateral Fund projects (e.g., gender);
- (e) Facilitating automatic notification to implementing agencies, informing them of PCRs due for submission, instead of the current email notification system;
- (f) Integrating the project completion report into the full project-management reporting cycle; and
- (g) Improving the quality and relevance of lessons learned generated through PCRs for project design, implementation and evaluation purposes.

46. Once the proposed revised PCR format has been endorsed, the evaluation unit intends to complete the design and development of the PCR module in close collaboration with the Secretariat's team in charge of developing and operationalizing the knowledge management system. The evaluation unit would coordinate the migration of the evaluation-related information and contribute to the design and integration of the PCR module into the knowledge management system, in order to facilitate the implementation of the proposed changes as soon as possible so that it can become operational online during 2025.

47. The Secretariat and the SMEO would also ensure that the overall project reporting framework and the PCR are aligned so that there is consistency in the overall reporting workflow on the Funds' projects. The operationalization of the proposed format would preserve some degree of flexibility to adapt to potential changes that may occur during the implementation of the knowledge management system, noting that the PCR is at the end of the pipeline of the reporting framework.

48. The SMEO will monitor the implementation of the PCR reform and report accordingly to the Executive Committee, starting from the 97th meeting in 2025 and on a regular basis after that until the transition has been fully completed.

Recommendation

49. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note the report on the review of project completion reports (PCRs) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/8;
- (b) To approve the universal project completion report format contained in annex III to document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/8, to be used by bilateral and implementing agencies once the knowledge management system provides the required functionalities for online submission of project completion reports by the end of 2025;
- (c) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Secretariat:
 - (i) To coordinate the necessary actions to operationalize the integration of the universal project completion report format and submission process in the knowledge management system, in phase 3 of that system's development as planned, ensuring adequate alignment of the PCR to the project reporting framework across the different milestones of the project life cycle and taking into account, where applicable, the discussions at the 95th meeting resulting from decision 93/1 on the document on the mapping of reporting requirements and the streamlining of reporting across the spectrum of reports;

- (ii) To launch the online submission of project completion reports after the completion of data migration, by the end of 2025; and
- (d) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to report on the status of implementation of the project completion report reform at the 97th meeting, as part of the annual report included in the document on the annual monitoring and evaluation work programme and budget.

Annex I

LIST OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DECISIONS RELATED TO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTS

Executive Committee decision	Executive Committee meeting report reference and agenda item	Relevant documents	Remarks
18/20	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/75 (November 1995) Agenda item 9: Guidelines on monitoring and evaluation	Guidelines on project monitoring and evaluation (Revised) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/64 (November 1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduced the concept of a project completion report (PCR) as an evaluative tool
19/34	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/64 (May 1996) Agenda item 14: Duration of transitional periods for incremental operating costs and savings	Report of the Sub-Committee on Project Review UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/5 (May 1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested implementing agencies (IAs) to consult with the Secretariat to create a consistent format for PCRs
21/36	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/36 (February 1997) Agenda item 9: Monitoring and Evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested Secretariat to work with IAs to explore ways to standardize guidelines for PCRs
23/8	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/68 & Corr.1 (November 1997) Agenda item 5: Report of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance	Report of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4 (November 1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopted the format for PCRs on investment projects, subject to provisions in annex III of document 23/68 (e.g., 6-month timeline following project completion)
24/9	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/47 & Corr.1 (March 1998) Agenda item 5: Report of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance	Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/4 (March 1998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved guidelines and format for non-investment PCRs (annex III of document 24/47) Project completion report should be submitted six (6) months after the completion of the project
30/8	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/41 (March 2000) Agenda item 5: Report of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance	Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/4 (March 2000) Report on the outcome of the workshop on project completion report formats UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/7 (February 2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved the revised PCR format for investment projects (annex I of document 30/7)
32/18	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/44 & Corr.1 (December 2000) Agenda item 4: Report of the sub-committee on monitoring, evaluation and finance	Report on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2000 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/19 (December 2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsed new overall assessment scheme (annex V of document 32/44) contained in section 2 of PCR format

Executive Committee decision	Executive Committee meeting report reference and agenda item	Relevant documents	Remarks
47/6	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/47/61 (November 2005) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation	Issues related to project completion reports (follow-up to decision 47/6) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/48/14 (April 2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested IAs and bilateral agencies (BAs) to work with the Secretariat to establish full consistency of data reported in PCRs. • Requested senior monitoring and evaluation officer (smeo) to develop guidelines for PCRs for non-investment projects and make lessons learned section more relevant and usable
51/13	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/46 (March 2007) Agenda item 8: Programme implementation	Issues related to monitoring and reporting on multi-year agreements (follow-up to decisions 49/6(e) and 50/4 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/14 (February 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted new format for multi-year-agreements (MYAs) (annex VI in Document 51/46)
65/6	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/60 & Corr.1 (January 2012) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation	Completion report format for multi-year agreement projects UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/8 (October 2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Took note of MYA PCR format presented in document 65/8
68/6	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/68/53 & Corrs.1-3 (June 2015) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation - Monitoring and Evaluation	2010 Consolidated multi-year agreement project completion report. UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/68/8 (November 2012) Multi-year agreement database for HCFC phase-out management plans (decision 63/61(e)) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/68/9 (November 2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested BAs and IAs to submit MYA PCRs to the second meeting of the Executive Committee each year
74/6	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/56 (June 2015) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation - Monitoring and Evaluation	Multi-year agreement database report UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/8 (April 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested SMEO to make recommendations on options to reduce the burden on BAs and IAs for the MYA database and enable countries to confirm data
75/5	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/85 (November 2015) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation - Monitoring and Evaluation	Multi-year agreement database report (Decision 74/6) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/8 (October 2015) 2015 Consolidated project completion report UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/7 (October 2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited all parties involved in MYAs to consider lessons learned for future projects. • Approved PCR format for HCFC phase-out management plan in Annex III of document 75/5 • Requested SMEO to develop application for searching and extracting information on lessons learned

Executive Committee decision	Executive Committee meeting report reference and agenda item	Relevant documents	Remarks
76/5	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/66 (May 2016) Agenda item 6: Programme implementation - Monitoring and Evaluation	2016 consolidated project completion report UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/7 (April 2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urged bilateral and implementing agencies to enter clear, well written and thorough lessons learned when submitting their PCRs, as they would appear in their submitted form in the database of lessons learned;
81/29	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/81/58 (June 2018) Agenda item 9: Project Proposals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decided that funding requests for later tranches would not be considered if there were outstanding PCRs for previous tranches
90/28	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/90/40 (June 2022) Agenda item 7: Programme implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requested SMEO to explore ways and means to collect better data, improve database accessibility, and improve access to online information from MYA PCRs
91/9	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/72 (December 2022) Agenda item 6: Evaluation	Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2023 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/11/Rev.1 (December 2022)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved draft monitoring and evaluation programme, including an internal review of PCRs and related formats, processes, and databases in 2023
91/28	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/72 (December 2022) Agenda item 7: Programme implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterated decisions 23/8(i) and 81/29, to encourage BAs and IAs to submit PCRs within six months of the operational completion of the projects
93/25	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/105 (December 2023) Agenda item 7: Programme implementation	2023 Consolidated project completion report (Part II) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/22 (November 2023)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that the submission of a PCR for technical assistance for verification reports would no longer be required from 2024 onwards. Requested BAs and IAs to include relevant information on gender, to report on lessons learned and reasons for delays in the PCRs to improve project design and implementation

Annex II

SUMMARY OF BILATERAL AND IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES' RESPONSES TO SURVEY

<p>PCR format (individual and MYA projects) and guidelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new format should include sections for more qualitative data rather than quantitative data; there should be space for IAs/BAs to report on overall project results. • The information inserted in the PCR should be used in other reports such as implementing agencies' annual reports that are targeted toward a more general audience. • Some sections are already pre-filled from the Secretariat's inventory and other projects; reporting requirements should be streamlined to avoid duplication and overwork on the part of IAs/BAs • Additional sections could be added to the new format: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Other outcomes and impacts</i> ○ <i>Comments</i> ○ <i>Quick assessment of agency performance for countries to add a comment.</i> ○ <i>The new format should report on and assess gender, disposal and energy-efficiency components following the guidelines and list of indicators provided by the Multilateral Fund to avoid duplication of reporting.</i> ○ <i>Environmental acceptability of chemical substitutes: In case of adoption of the new alternative chemical substitutes, detailed consideration of the impacts of substitutes on climate change including the global warming potentials of proposed alternatives/substitutes is necessary. Advantages/disadvantages, toxicity, flammability, public health, and other measures of environmental acceptability of substitutes and alternatives need to be highlighted.</i> ○ <i>Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) with a systematic review of positive and negative effects/consequences of the project (alternative chemical substitutes) on the environment/ecosystem should be included in the PCR.</i> • Guidelines for both individual and MYA PCRs need to be revised to be more narrative about how IA/BA project teams should complete the sections; the guidelines should provide a narrative explanation of how to formulate details to show activities' impacts, and how to report lessons learned and causes for delay
<p>Tools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more digital and user-friendly format with downloadable files to ease the editing offline and populating data. • The new digital format should have access to upload/attach supporting documents as references (e.g., files, photos, etc.) • Sections should be formatted so that they can be edited, tracked and reviewed before submission (more expandable sections for narrative information) • To ensure that the most updated information is inserted into the format, there should be an option allowing users to update PCRs when it comes to information that comes from the progress report. • User feedback mechanism: Implement a feedback mechanism where users can provide suggestions, report issues, or offer comments about the database. This valuable feedback can help identify areas for improvement and address user concerns promptly.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User training and support: Offer user training resources, such as video tutorials or user guides, to help users navigate the database effectively. If possible, provide support channels, such as email or chat, to address user inquiries or technical difficulties. • An online submission for the individual PCRs similar to the MYA PCR
Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MYA PCR is submitted online, and the Secretariat and the evaluation unit were very responsive for any enquiries, either technical or related to the PCR content. • The individual PCR is submitted by email and the evaluation unit always acknowledges the receipt of documents and provides support if needed. • The communication and interaction with the evaluation unit is good communication and fast replies via email or Teams calls. • It may be useful to add a tab in the online platform for contacting the evaluation unit if needed during the PCR preparation process. • Propose to have a six-week or four-week deadline for the submission of the PCR to the Secretariat, since the 8-week deadline coincides with the submission deadline for other projects and all preparatory funding requests, so it is a busy time for agencies and the countries. • To have the flexibility to consider that the PCR has been submitted even if it is a bit after the eight-week deadline, taking into account the preparation process required to collect all the information needed for the PCR. • For the evaluation unit to consider separating submissions of MYA PCRs by lead and cooperating agencies. Some projects are already done but cannot be submitted because the lead or cooperating agency has not completed the activities.
Dissemination/ using lessons learned in project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make more use of the database of lessons learned from the PCRs when undertaking the design of new projects. The Multilateral Fund evaluation unit could have a report on an annual basis on lessons learned categorized by project types and issues. Such a report would help share different experiences among the IAs and would facilitate the work of the programme officers and the NOUs. • To categorize the lessons learned into three groups: general, regional, and national. This would make it possible to identify lessons that could be used globally and highlight issues of common interest, and at the same time, to figure out the regional situation and specify the national context.

Annex III

UNIVERSAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT FORMAT FOR INDIVIDUAL AND MULTI-YEAR AGREEMENT PROJECTS (PROPOSED)

Rationale for the proposed project completion report format

The proposed universal format for project completion reports (PCRs) consolidates in one single report the core information previously addressed in three formats (two for individual projects and one for multi-year agreements). The proposed changes were made according to the following rationale:

- Deletions were made based on the analysis of what was not being used by the agencies in their PCRs and on the suggestions made during the consultations. Deletions were also made where the same information was requested in different sections of the report, so that it is now only requested in one place.
- Modifications were made to align relevant information with current priorities, such as no longer referring to ODSs, but rather to new substances, namely HCFCs and HFCs, as follows:
 - The rating criteria are no longer used as part of reporting; the agencies indicated that it would be more useful to have the possibility of providing an analytical report rather than a rating.
 - The categories in the lessons learned section have been revised to make them more relevant by updating the proposed categories.
 - The categories in the causes of delays section have been revised and have been merged with other relevant categories.
 - Additions categories have been made in the form of updated information based on the suggestions received, such as including the possibility of geographical comments (regions/countries), new issues such as gender or energy efficiency, climate benefits, SDGs, etc.
- Two new sections have been added to be in line with current Multilateral Fund priorities and policies: a section on gender mainstreaming and a section on the project's contribution to the sustainable development goals (SDGs), the latter being optional.
- New functionalities have been added based on the requests made by the agencies to facilitate better submission of information (user-friendliness).

Furthermore, the new PCR format will be integrated into the overall project reporting cycle within the knowledge management system, which will pre-fill many of the corresponding sections of the new PCR format using previous Secretariat reports. This will help streamline the reporting process and lighten the burden that PCR submission represents for the agencies, while facilitating better use of the information collected upon project completion.

SECTION 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1	COUNTRY	Country name		
1.2	PROJECT:	Number (as per inventory): Agreement title:		
1.3	EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING:	Relevant Decision(s):		
1.4	ADDRESS(ES) OF ENTERPRISE(S) AND PROJECT SITE(S), IF APPLICABLE:			
1.5	DATE OF APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT:			
1.6	DATE OF COMPLETION:	APPROVED	ACTUAL	
1.7	HCFCs PHASED-OUT (ODP TONNES):			
1.8	HFCs PHASED-DOWN (CO2 eq-tonnes):			
1.9	MLF FUNDING:	APPROVED	DISBURSED	RETURNED
a.	Lead Agency name:			
b.	Cooperating Agency (ies) name:			
c.	Total MLF funding:			
1.10	INDICATE WHETHER THE FINANCIAL FIGURES ARE:	<input type="checkbox"/> Provisional		<input type="checkbox"/> Final
	Explanations if needed:			
1.11	CONVERSION/ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY USED:	From:	To:	
a)	Number of enterprises			
1.12	TOTAL NUMBER OF TRAINEES (e.g. TECHNICIANS) (*)	Male	Female	
1.13	ALL PROJECT GOALS ACHIEVED (**):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No
	If no, please provide a brief explanation:			
1.14	PROJECT COMPLETION DELAY (MONTHS):			
1.15	COMPLETION REPORT DONE BY:	Agency Name	Date	
a.	Lead Agency:			
b.	Cooperating Agency			
c.	National coordinating agency/NOU:			
d.	Local executing agency:			
e.	Other:			

(*) Details available in section 2.1

(**) Details available in section 2.2

SECTION 2: PROJECT RESULTS: OVERALL ASSESSMENT HIGHLIGHTS

Section 2.1: Implementation effectiveness (achievement of activity output)

Agency Name	Type of activity Type of sector*	Planned output(s)	Actual activity output(s)	Additional remarks, if applicable:

*Add sectors and activities as defined in the project proposal and planned outputs

Section 2.2: Overall assessment (achievement of project objective)

Please select your assessment of the overall impact of the project from the list below, explain the rationale for your assessment and provide a summary highlighting the key project results in relation to overall outputs, impact, sustainability of achievement, and other criteria.

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	Choose from list	Please explain your rating
	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory as planned <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory but not as planned <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify	

Section 2.3: Comments

- Implementing agency
- Government/NOU
- Stakeholders if applicable (there would be a scroll-down list of possible partners to be considered), such as:
 - Enterprises
 - Consultants
 - Project management officers in the Multilateral Fund Secretariat
 - Other, please specify.

SECTION 3: CAUSES OF DELAYS AND ACTION TAKEN

Select two or more from the list of causes of delays and describe the causes of implementation delays and actions taken:

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	Cause of delay	Description of cause of delay	Action taken
	Implementing/cooperating agency		
	Due to governmental delays (NOU structure changes, ministry/institution structure changes)		
	Project design, preparation and implementation process (timeframe, beneficiaries' profile (e.g., gender participation, beneficiaries' skills, etc.)		

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	Cause of delay	Description of cause of delay	Action taken
	Procurement delay (Enterprise and supplier delays)		
	Policy and regulatory framework (e.g., relevant legislation, etc.)		
	Exogenous factors (beyond the control of the implementers, such as natural disasters, political instability, pandemics, etc.)		
	Availability of alternative technology		
	Funding process (delays in funding following tranches, low disbursement of funds)		
	Other (describe)		

SECTION 4: LESSONS LEARNED

Section 4.1: Select two or more from the list of lessons learned and provide a succinct description of the lessons learned indicating their utility for project design, project implementation and evaluation.

Lead agency/cooperating agency	Lessons learned	Description
	Regional context	
	National policy framework	
	Engagement of national stakeholders (civil society, private sector, etc.)	
	Technical aspects: <input type="checkbox"/> Technical/equipment issues <input type="checkbox"/> Availability of alternative technologies	
	Sectoral lessons	
	Customs and imports	
	Capacity-building and training	
	Project design and impact on implementation	
	Energy efficiency	
	Climate benefits	
	Disposal	
	Recovery, recycling and reclamation	
	Data availability and accuracy	
	Sustainability of achievements (factors to ensure it)	
	Exogenous factors (beyond the control of the implementers, such as natural disasters, political instability, pandemics, etc.)	
	Contribution to sustainable development goals (SDGs)	
	Gender (as per the Multilateral Fund's operational policy)	
	Other (please specify)	

Section 4.2: As part of the lessons learned from the challenges/good practices identified during project implementation, please suggest recommendations for future project design and implementation (no more than 600 characters).

SECTION 5: GENDER MAINSTREAMING

Referring to the required indicators in annex II of the Operational policy on gender mainstreaming for the Multilateral Fund²⁸ and to streamline reporting requirements, please describe how the different phases of the project cycle met the gender mainstreaming indicators.

Section 5.1

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	Project cycle phase	Based on indicators as per Annex II in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/51
	Project preparation	
	Planning/Formulation	
	Implementation	
	Monitoring and Reporting	

Section 5.2

Please provide the narrative supportive information to complement section 5.1.

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	Project cycle phase	Qualitative Description
	Project preparation	
	Planning/Formulation	
	Implementation	
	Monitoring and Reporting	

SECTION 6: CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs) (Optional). Please select from the scroll-down list below and describe the project's contribution:

Lead Agency/Cooperating Agency	SDGs (MLF ²⁹)	Description of contribution

²⁸ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/51

²⁹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/103

SECTION 7: SUMMARY OF KEY DATA ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION

Agency	Project number	Sector	Tranche (s)*	Date approved	Planned date of completion	Funds approved	Funds disbursed	Planned duration (months)	Actual duration (months)	Delay (months)
Additional remarks, if applicable:										

*Please indicate if several tranches were approved at the same time, e.g. Tranches: 1, 2.

SECTION 8: OTHER SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Upload/attach documents, photos, files, or link addresses to websites or repositories of information. Each piece of supporting evidence will also have a space for indicating the rationale for its inclusion and the section of the PCR to which it is related.