

**Decisions relevant to Monitoring and Evaluation at 91<sup>st</sup> Executive Committee Meeting (extract from Final Report of the Meeting [UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/72](https://www.unep.org/ozonaction/91/9172))**

| DECISION       | AGENDA ITEM   | RELATED DOCUMENTS  |
|----------------|---|--|
| Decision 91/9  | Evaluation 6 (c) Monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2023 | <a href="https://www.unep.org/ozonaction/91/9111">UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/11/Rev.1</a> |
| Decision 91/28 | Programme implementation 7 (c) 2022 consolidated project completion report  | <a href="https://www.unep.org/ozonaction/91/9119">UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/19</a>       |

**AGENDA ITEM 6: EVALUATION**

**(b) Update on the status of the second phase of the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers**

43. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/10.

44. The Executive Committee took note of the update on the status of the second phase of the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/10.

**(c) Monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2023**

45. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/11.

46. Members of the Committee thanked the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for the document and the proposed work programme, but stated that they would like to discuss some of the proposals in more detail. One member commented that it was important not to place excessive burdens on the various institutions of the Multilateral Fund. The purpose of the monitoring and evaluation function was not to audit projects but to learn from them for the benefit of future activities.

47. With regard to the proposals for the assessment of the monitoring and evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund following the MOPAN assessment, several members queried the need for an internal self-assessment followed by an external evaluation to validate it. They said that they were not clear about the added value of this two-stage process, particularly given that the MOPAN assessment had been very thorough. Some added that they would like to discuss further the proposed terms of reference for the external evaluation and the timelines for each of the two steps.

48. With regard to means of improving the lessons learned from project completion reports (PCRs), one member commented that she had understood from document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/89/2/Add.1 that the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer would work with the implementing agencies to deliver more meaningful outputs, including improving database accessibility and access to online information. She was not convinced that this warranted a full year-long evaluation and believed that the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer could update the relevant formats and data access procedures by herself, in collaboration with the implementing agencies.

49. Some members queried the relations between PCRs and verification reports. As the verification reports were part of the project review process and were subject to review by the country concerned, and then by the Secretariat, there seemed no need for yet another review of them, by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, who should rather focus on deriving lessons to be learned from completed projects. One member believed that the formats for PCRs needed to be simplified and streamlined to improve access to the information they contained; this should be done in collaboration with implementing and bilateral agencies.

50. Members also commented that they were open to considering the proposal for a biennial monitoring and evaluation work programme and budget for 2024 and 2025, on a trial basis. They recognized that the intention was to create more predictability in the use of resources over time. They were not clear, however,

about the implications of that proposal for the process of approving evaluation activities through two successive stages – a desk study followed by a more in-depth evaluation.

51. One member observed that the work programme seemed to be very internally focused and suggested that she could put forward proposals for more substantive issues for 2023. Another commented that he looked forward to seeing the results of the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers at the following meeting of the Committee.

52. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer thanked members of the Committee for their comments and stated her readiness to discuss them in more detail. Her aim was always to strengthen and streamline the monitoring and evaluation procedures, not to create additional burdens. When she had started her work in the Secretariat, she had discovered that many of the guidelines and procedures for monitoring and evaluation were outdated and incomplete and needed improvement.

53. She understood Committee members' concerns about the proposed two-stage process for assessing the monitoring and evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund following the report on the MOPAN assessment and explained that this was in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group Guidelines for Professional Peer Reviews. Given the special circumstances of the Multilateral Fund, however, she could understand the rationale for adapting the procedures and potentially moving to consider the terms of reference for the external evaluation at the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee rather than the 93<sup>rd</sup>, where the Committee would have the opportunity to discuss them in full.

54. The PCRs were intended to assist the process of project evaluation, but in practice the information they contained did not prove particularly helpful, and the reporting formats needed to be updated and improved. Verification reports were meant to feed into the PCRs, but in practice some of the substantive information they contained was not included. The proposals of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer had thus not been intended to change the verification reports but to better connect them with the PCRs and to streamline the whole process.

55. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer also observed that in the coming months she would be finalizing two substantive evaluations, on the regional networks of national ozone officers and on enabling activities, on top of the other proposals contained in the work programme. The Executive Committee might wish to consider priorities among the tasks.

56. The Executive Committee agreed to establish an informal group to enable interested parties to discuss the issues directly with the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

57. Subsequently, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer informed the Committee that in the light of the discussions, a revised document, UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/11/Rev.1, had been prepared.

58. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To approve the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2023 contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/11/Rev.1 and the related budget of US \$85,000;
- (b) To reallocate, from the provisional unspent balance of US \$63,357 from the year 2022 to the 2023 budget, the amount of US \$15,000 for the completion of the final stage of the second phase of the evaluation of the regional networks of national ozone officers;
- (c) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare:

- (i) Terms of Reference for an external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, aligned to the recommendations to the assessment by the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network, for the consideration of the Executive Committee at its 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting; and
- (ii) On a trial basis, at the 93<sup>rd</sup> meeting, a biennial monitoring and evaluation work programme and budget for the years 2024 and 2025, and to report annually on its status of implementation and achievements, starting from the 95<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**(Decision 91/9)**

## AGENDA ITEM 7: PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

### (c) 2022 consolidated project completion report

106. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/19.

107. The Executive Committee decided:

(a) To note:

- (i) The 2022 consolidated project completion report (PCR) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/19;
- (ii) That UNIDO had completed its update of the PCR for the refrigeration servicing sector in China in line with decisions 90/28(f) and 88/30;

(b) To request:

- (i) Bilateral and implementing agencies to submit, at the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting, outstanding PCRs for multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects or to provide reasons for failing to do so;
  - (ii) Lead and cooperating implementing agencies to continue coordinating closely their work in finalizing their respective portions of PCRs to facilitate the timely submission of the reports by the lead implementing agency;
  - (iii) Bilateral and implementing agencies, when filling in the data for PCR submissions, to ensure the inclusion of relevant and useful information about the lessons learned and reasons for any delays, beyond anecdotal evidence, with a view to enabling the formulation of actionable recommendations for improvements in future project implementation or the replicability of good practices;
- (c) Reiterating decisions 23/8(i) and 81/29, to encourage bilateral and implementing agencies to submit PCRs within six months of the operational completion of the projects to avoid a situation whereby submitted funding requests for the second or subsequent tranches of stage II or for subsequent stages of HCFC phase-out management plans were not considered; and
- (d) To invite all those involved in the preparation and implementation of MYAs and individual projects, in particular the Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies, to take into consideration the lessons learned from PCRs, where applicable.

**(Decision 91/28)**