



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/36/5
17 February 2002



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Thirty-sixth Meeting
Montreal, 20-22 March 2002

**REPORT ON THE EXTENDED DESK STUDY ON CLEARING
HOUSE EVALUATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE.....	4
1.1 Mandate and objectives of the clearing house.....	4
1.2 Focus and approach of the review	6
2. UNEP INFORMATION EXCHANGE SERVICES	8
2.1 Overview	8
2.2 Staff Time.....	9
2.3 Changing Information Needs	10
2.4 Document Distribution.....	11
2.5 Database Management.....	11
2.6 OzonAction Newsletter.....	12
2.7 Query-Response Service	12
2.8 OzonAction Web Site	14
2.9 Assessing Effectiveness	14
3. USER FEEDBACK	16
3.1 General Comments	16
3.2 Utility of the information	17
3.3 Volume of Information	17
3.4 Focus of Information.....	17
3.5 Information Content of Products	18
3.6 Understanding of Information	20
3.7 Format of Information.....	21
3.8 Feedback on Information Modalities used.....	22
3.9 Distribution of Information Material in Article 5 Countries.....	24
3.10 Collaboration between Implementing Agencies.....	25
4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25

Appendix A : Review Participants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. As foreseen in the 2001 Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme, an independent review of the information exchange activities implemented by UNEP as part of the clearing house function assigned to it has been carried out. The non-tangible nature of information exchange activities makes it difficult to analyse the impact of the project in Article 5 countries. Even field visits would not generate necessarily clear-cut and quantifiable evidence. The approach chosen in view of methodological limitations as well as cost-effectiveness considerations consisted in combining a desk study of available documentation, extended by interviews with various stakeholders, and a survey of user feed back by questionnaires for Ozone Units and other users.

2. The consultant team consisting of Cullbridge Marketing and Communications and Lura Consulting, proceeded in three steps:

- (a) Review of existing documentation and discussions with staff of the MLF Secretariat and UNEP;
- (b) 34 interviews with Ozone officers and other users at the regional network meeting of English-speaking Caribbean countries in Guyana and at the occasion of the 35th Meeting of the Executive Committee in Montreal, in November and December 2001, respectively and
- (c) Questionnaires for National Ozone Units (NOUs) and other users which were completed by 37 NOUs and 42 other users. The questionnaires and their statistical detailed analysis can be consulted at <http://www.cullbridge.com/ozonactionsurvey.htm>.

3. While it was not possible to analyze the details of individual projects, the overall picture emanating from the review of documentation, the personal interviews with selected stakeholders and the survey, showed that UNEP actively communicates with the users of its information services and adapts the programme continuously to their changing requirements. The users, in particular the NOUs confirmed also the positive impact on their countries capacity to phase out ODS. Eight of ten survey respondents either strongly agreed (41%) or mildly agreed (41%) that UNEP's information services have helped to raise awareness about ozone issues and solutions among the general public/consumers in their countries. Three in four either strongly agreed (25%) or mildly agreed (50%) that these services have helped Governments in their countries to make informed policy decisions for complying with the Montreal Protocol, including changes to legislation and licensing systems.

4. Further, UNEP's publications and information materials are reported to be by far the most often used of the various sources of information available with regard to the Montreal Protocol. National government offices and Internet searches rated next, followed by other Implementing Agencies.

5. At the same time, the review identified several areas where UNEP could make improvements:

- (i) Avoiding information overload; in particular for small NOUs;
- (ii) Shifting focus from global to regional and national information needs;
- (iii) Improving timeliness of technical documents and training manuals;
- (iv) Identifying ways of reaching more policy makers and small and medium enterprises (SMEs);
- (v) Dealing with the “corporate memory” lost with high NOU turnover;
- (vi) Addressing language barriers;
- (vii) Finding the right mix of electronic and paper information;
- (viii) Making it easier to find information.
- (ix) Consolidating databases within UNEP.

6. Based on results of the evaluation and in order to respond to evolving user needs and technical opportunities, the following recommendations are made:

- (a) While early benefits were gained by developing and distributing materials relevant to decision-makers globally, a key message from this evaluation is that now UNEP should shift the focus of information services from a global to a regional and national level, as planned with CAP for the whole programme.
- (b) Provide information in languages other than English, develop an introduction for newcomers to the Montreal Protocol and Multilateral Fund decision-making processes and prepare templates for communication materials that are required most commonly for general public awareness material.
- (c) Make information easier to find by continuing the efforts to provide documents in electronic format, and improving the search engine on CD Roms produced.
- (d) Provide SMEs with the information they need, in particular concise cost-benefit information to support investment in ODS-free technology, by drawing also on the expertise and contacts of other implementing agencies.
- (e) Continue to improve the facilities for information exchange between NOUs by organizing information-pools, E-mail circles and/or Internet forums.
- (f) Develop a strategy to improve and accelerate the development of technical documents by reviewing whether the level of consultant fees paid is sufficient, whether payment can be accelerated and how the advice of other Implementing Agencies can be integrated.
- (g) Increase transparency with regard to the cost-effectiveness of UNEP’s information exchange services delivered and the results achieved. Although difficult to quantify, such information, with a reasonable degree of plausibility, should regularly be provided.

- (h) Consolidate databases within UNEP. The thousands of contacts in several databases should be integrated into one contact management system.

7. UNEP collaborated actively throughout the review by commenting on the approach and by providing access to clearing house staff and management as well as documentation and supporting the data collection. The Regional Network Coordinators were helpful by transmitting the questionnaires to ozone officers in their regions and by reminding them to respect the completion dates. UNEP's comments on the draft report were discussed and taken into consideration for the final version.

1. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

1.1 Mandate, objectives and budget of the clearing house

8. An important part of the support provided by the Multilateral Fund to Article 5 countries is the provision of global information exchange services. The mandate for these services is reflected in Articles 9 and 10 of the Montreal Protocol which state:

Article 9

9. *The Parties shall co-operate, consistent with their national laws, regulations and practices and taking into account in particular the needs of developing countries, in promoting, directly or through competent international bodies, research, development and exchange of information on:*

- (a) *best technologies for improving the containment, recovery, recycling, or destruction of controlled substances or otherwise reducing their emissions;*
- (b) *possible alternatives to controlled substances, to products containing such substances, and to products manufactured with them; and*
- (c) *costs and benefits of relevant control strategies.*

10. *The Parties, individually, jointly or through competent international bodies, shall co-operate in promoting public awareness of the environmental effects of the emissions of controlled substances and other substances that deplete the ozone layer.*

Article 10.3.b.iii

11. *The Multilateral Fund shall finance clearinghouse functions to distribute, as provided for in Article 9, information and relevant materials, and hold workshops, training sessions, and other related activities, for the benefit of Parties that are developing countries.*

12. The Second Meeting of the Parties decided (Decision II/8 paragraph 3b) that the Multilateral Fund shall

- (b) *finance clearing house functions to:*
 - (i) *Assist Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5, through country-specific studies and other technical co-operation, to identify their needs for co-operation;*
 - (ii) *Facilitate technical co-operation to meet these identified needs;*

- (iii) *Distribute, as provided for in Article 9 of the Protocol, information and relevant materials, and hold workshops, training sessions and other related activities for the benefit of Parties that are developing countries; and*
- (iv) *Facilitate and monitor other multilateral, regional and bilateral co-operation available to Parties that are developing countries.*

13. UNEP was selected as the implementing agency responsible for providing the clearinghouse function described above. UNEP fulfills this role through the Paris office of its OzonAction Programme, which itself is part of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE). In addition to the clearinghouse, the OzonAction Programme also provides the following non-investment services under the Multilateral Fund: Regional Networks of ODS Officers, training, assistance with Institutional Strengthening and Country Programmes, and the International Recycled Halon Bank Management Information Clearinghouse.

14. Until 1997, the budget for clearinghouse activities was approved as for other projects on a case-by-case basis. The Twenty-first Meeting of the Executive Committee, having considered the 1997 work programme of UNEP together with the comments and recommendations of the Fund Secretariat thereon, as well as the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Project Review, decided (Decision 21/14, paragraph 24):

- (a) *to approve a total amount of US \$1.05 million for recurring information-exchange activities that are ongoing in nature (namely, the collection of sectoral data from world-wide sources; updated OAIC diskette version; dissemination of information materials; direct query-response service; maintenance of contact database of experts and mailing list of OzonAction programme publications; halon bank management clearing-house services; publication of the OzonAction newsletter and special supplements);*
- (b) *to approve a total amount of US \$0.335 million for the remaining, non-recurring information-exchange activities in the UNEP 1997 work programme, including delivery of the OzonAction newsletter and other information through the World Wide Web home page site;*
- (c) *to approve a total amount of US \$1.1 million for networking activities;*
- (d) *the amounts of US \$1.05 million approved for recurring information exchange activities, which are outlined in subparagraph (a) above, and US \$1.1 million for networking activities, which are outlined in sub-paragraph (c) above, would represent caps, and the levels of funding for those activities would not be increased in future years except by a factor of up to 5 per cent to cover inflation. The levels of future funding for non-recurring activities would be considered on the basis of the individual proposals submitted by UNEP;*
- (f) *that UNEP should have the flexibility to apportion, according to its own priorities, the amounts referred to in subparagraphs 24 (a) to 24 (c) above.*

15. At its 32nd Meeting, the Executive Committee decided to approve the UNEP work programme for 2001, as reprioritized to make available US\$191,000 to increase regional awareness programmes sought by Article 5 countries (Decision 32/49).

1.2 Focus and approach of the review

16. As outlined in the Progress Report on the Clearing House Evaluation presented in Section V of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/11, the review focused on recurring and non-recurring information exchange activities implemented by UNEP as defined in Decision 21/14 of the Executive Committee. Other aspects of the OzonAction Programme, such as training as well as networking activities have been covered by earlier evaluations; the clearing house services related to Halon bank management are not dealt with in detail but will be reviewed further in the evaluation of halon projects which is part of this year's monitoring and evaluation work programme.

17. The following key issues were to be addressed in the evaluation:

- (a) Effectiveness and impact of services provided: What are the main activities and outputs of the Clearing-House? Who is using it and for what purpose? What types of information are the users now looking for, and how they would like to receive this information?
- (b) Linkages and Partnerships: Are industries in non-Article 5(1) and Article 5(1) countries cooperating in providing and using information? To what extent do other implementing agencies, including bilateral agencies, coordinate and collaborate with UNEP in planning and using clearing house activities?
- (c) Accountability and continuous improvement: What are the monitoring and reporting mechanisms in place? How can feedback from users be better solicited and used for continuous improvement of the services?
- (d) Resources: What are the financial and the staff resources used? Is the funding level proportionate to the level of activities undertaken?

18. This review was designed to draw on the insights and expertise of those who mainly use UNEP's information services, that means the people responsible for phasing out ODS in Article 5 countries and also representatives from non-Article 5 countries. It focuses on the National Ozone Units (NOUs) in Article 5 countries, but includes feedback from other users as well. (stakeholders within developing countries that also rely on UNEP information such as NGOs, industry, academia, and government services, and also institutions and companies in non-Article 5 countries, and implementing agencies).

19. The review consisted of three main parts:

- (i) review of existing documentation and discussions with staff of the MLF Secretariat and UNEP;
- (ii) 34 interviews with ozone officers and other users at the regional network meeting of English-speaking Caribbean countries in Guyana and at the occasion of the 35th Meeting of the Executive Committee in Montreal, in November and December 2001 respectively, and
- (iii) questionnaires for NOUs and other users which were completed by 37 NOUs and 42 other users.

20. Table 1 below summarizes the total number of UNEP database contacts and lists the number of email and fax contacts to which the questionnaires were distributed by random selection, except for NOUs which were all contacted. In addition to direct email contact, each Regional Network Coordinator (RNC) distributed the survey via the respective regional email forum and reminded the Ozone officers to complete and return them. Users had three options in terms of responding to the evaluation survey: sending the completed questionnaires by email, by fax, and/or completing the survey on line. The questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter introducing the evaluation process.

Table 1: Addresses of users available and sample selected for the survey			
Target Group	Total Number of Addresses Available	Email Contacts Selected	Fax Contacts Selected
RNCs	5	5	
NOUs	130	130	
OzoNews data base	140	140	
Publications request data base	260	32	
OzonAction Newsletter data base	9000	900	506
Query-Response data base	700	190	
Total	10235	1397	506
Total number of surveys distributed	1903		
Total survey responses	79 (of which from NOU: 37)		
Number of Additional Stakeholders providing feedback through interviews only	24		
Total Number of Users contributing to the Survey	103		

21. This report integrates and synthesises the information and views collected and is intended to highlight common themes and issues raised. A detailed account of individual responses to the survey is available on request under separate cover. It is also important to note that in addition to the results of this review, UNEP has an ongoing commitment to collect feedback from users of the OzonAction programme regarding information exchange services. This feedback is most recently presented in a report entitled "Analysis of Feedback from Users" (January 2000 – August 2001). This independent review was designed to complement, and not duplicate these previous information gathering efforts, focusing on key issues, challenges, and advice for the

future that OzonAction Programme users raised through personal interviews and survey responses.

2. UNEP INFORMATION EXCHANGE SERVICES

2.1 Overview

22. UNEP works to assist decision-makers in making informed decisions on policies and investments designed to facilitate compliance with the Montreal Protocol. UNEP's information outreach takes a number of forms, including printed documents (e.g. newsletters, posters, brochures, reports), videos, web-based information, email based network and news services, and personal telephone support. The cornerstone activities of UNEP's information exchange services include:

- (a) regular document distribution (public awareness materials, NOU handbooks, case studies, technical reports, training materials, etc.);
- (b) distribution of the OzonAction Newsletter (3x p.a. now; 4x p.a. before 2001);
- (c) on-going query-response service;
- (d) weekly ozone news email service (OZONEWS); and the Regular Update of Methyl Bromide Alternatives (RUMBA) monthly email news service
- (e) maintenance of the UNEP website;
- (f) OASIS CD-ROM.

23. In addition to these services, UNEP also maintains a library of ozone-related publications, videos, CD-ROMs and public awareness materials (likely the largest collection of ozone-specific materials in the world) and relationships with media to promote ozone-related activities and UNEP products.

24. Funding for UNEP activities comes through two avenues: (i) an approved annual budget of US \$1.05 million for recurring information activities that are ongoing in nature (applied for the first time for UNEP's 1997 work programme, with this amount capped except for up to 5% annual increase to cover inflation), and (ii) proposals submitted by UNEP for funding of non-recurring activities (for example once-off publications). The total funding approved until December 2001 for all activities to be implemented by UNEP for the Multilateral Fund was US\$55,640,637 (not including support costs), representing 4.9% of the total funding approved by the Multilateral Fund until that date.

25. Information exchange projects fall mainly under the "Technical Assistance" category and some under training (only publications are counted here). Until the end of 2001, 50 such projects have been approved; 36 of them are global in outreach, and 14 are providing technical assistance

to Methylbromide activities in various Article 5 countries. The total funding approved for all of these non-recurring activities is US\$ 3,871,800.

26. The 36 global projects show the following profile by type of product or activity:

Awareness raising	5	Newsletter	2
Brochure	1	Outreach	1
Case study	3	Query response	1
CD-ROM	1	Software	1
Data collection	1	Study	2
Database	1	Training manual	2
Dissemination	1	Translation	3
Guidebook	8	Video	1
Halon bank	1	Web site	1
TOTAL			36

27. UNEP defines feedback as comments or opinions about the quality, usefulness or appropriateness of services provided, received from someone who has used that service. Feedback from users is regularly collected through a number of tools, including paper surveys distributed with each printed document distributed, a brief survey by e-mail that is enclosed with all e-mail responses to information queries received by UNEP, and recent one-time surveys to the newly established OZONEWS weekly email news service and to the OzonAction Newsletter. Other sources of feedback are: Business Plan inputs; network meetings, comments from NOUs; questionnaires/surveys, feedback of participants in workshops; comments from implementing and bilateral agencies; reports of MOP, OEWG, ExCom, TEAP/TOC; journals/newsletters, and purchases and/or requests for free copies of publications. UNEP also works closely with an Informal Advisory Group (IAG) to obtain guidance with regard to the development and implementation of products and services within the OzonAction Programme.

2.2 Staff Time

28. In UNEP five full-time and three part-time staff currently are dedicated to the delivery of information exchange services, including two Information Officers, responsible for overall management of information exchange activities. The information exchange group works under the direction of the Coordinator of the OzonAction Programme. The close relationship between training, network support, and information exchange services delivered by UNEP means that staff cooperates closely and that responsibilities overlap between the three areas. This reflects UNEP's priority on ensuring country needs are met through the full package of products and services they offer.

29. UNEP identified three key elements to overall programme delivery: project development, project delivery, and reporting. Estimates of the overall effort dedicated to each element, as well as the various activities implemented as part of each element, are listed below:

- (a) Approximately 15% of UNEP time is spent on project development. This includes (1) identifying the need for a particular product or service, in consultation with the country (ies) concerned (2) assessing the need, (3) justifying the need (including consideration of ExCom eligibility criteria), (4) formulating a project, (5) negotiating the project, and (6) receiving approval for the project.
- (b) Approximately 70% of UNEP time is spent on project delivery, including product development, production, dissemination and marketing, and collection of feedback on the product. Product development activities include identification of technical resources required, development of Terms of Reference for a consultant (if required), negotiating and selection of consultants, tracking of progress and overseeing of work, confirming the technical accuracy of the work, facilitating the expert review of the work, approving final draft, and printing and layout.
- (c) The remaining 15% of staff time is dedicated to project completion reports, financial tracking, and reporting to ExCom.

2.3 Changing Information Needs

30. In the early days of OzonAction programme delivery, UNEP anticipated that country information needs would evolve in accordance with a 7 stage process for attaining full compliance, including: (1) assess country situation, identify needs and build team; (2) build awareness; (3) develop phase-out strategy; (4) establish national policy framework; (5) identify and understand options for best practice; (6) source and select appropriate options; and (7) implement strategy, monitor and evaluate progress. These stages describe the strategical phase-out efforts undertaken by Article 5 in a systematic way; however, while they were originally expected to take place in chronological order, they have in fact not always followed a sequential trend. Table 3 below illustrates a general picture of the current status of country compliance efforts:

Table 2: State of Implementation of Typical Stages of National ODS Phase-Out							
Typical Stages of National ODS Phase-out	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Assess situation Identify needs Build team	Build awareness	Develop phase-out strategy	Establish national policy framework	Identify options for best practice	Choose appropriate options	Implement strategy, monitor and evaluate progress
State of Implementation	Almost complete Updating original assessments	Global political awareness achieved; awareness of different national stakeholders to be further improved	Just about complete	Happening now	Happened early because of early emphasis on investment projects		Ongoing

2.4 Document Distribution

31. All bulk document reproduction and distribution is the responsibility of UNEP's official distribution agency, SMI (Distribution Services) Limited, located in the United Kingdom. SMI's goal is to identify the most cost-effective method for delivering materials in a timely way. There are a number of challenges to global distribution, including long time delays, high costs, and poor reliability of sending information by surface mail, long distances to developing countries, and correspondingly high courier costs. UNEP has an internal commitment to respond to requests for written documents within five days of receiving the request. With many small requests coming in at different times from different places, it is difficult to take advantage of bulk shipping efficiencies.

32. An example of the distribution pattern of documents from UNEP is provided below for the year 2001. The following documents were distributed via mass mailing with the brackets () reflecting the number of copies distributed:

- (a) Poster (124);
- (b) Back to the Future: Working Safely with Hydrocarbons (127 to NOUs);
- (c) Eliminating Dependency on Halons: Case Studies (182);
- (d) Guidebook: Recovery and Recycling (27 CEITs);
- (e) Hotel Guidelines (78);
- (f) UNEP/Heat Pump Centre Special Joint Newsletter (121 NOUs and 5 RNCs);
- (g) Making a Good Catch (185);
- (h) Industry Initiatives CDROM (184);
- (i) Update of Regulations to Control ODS (193);
- (j) Halon Standards and Codes of Practice (188);
- (k) Methyl-Bromide Sourcebook (476);
- (l) HPC Newsletter (169);
- (m) Louder Lessons (91); and
- (n) Healing the Ozone Layer (Children's Painting) (403).

2.5 Database Management

33. UNEP uses at least five separate databases or mailing lists to track and manage various activities and services provided to OzonAction Programme users:

- (a) OzonAction Programme Mailing List Database (MLDB) with the recipients of the OzonAction Newsletter (OAN);
- (b) Tracking requests for printed information (reports, etc.);

- (c) Tracking requests for answers to specific technical and political queries;
- (d) Distribution of the OZONEWS (the weekly email news service); and
- (e) keeping key stakeholders updated regarding “What’s New” on the OzonAction Programme website:

34. The following table highlights the contacts included in each of these data bases with checkmarks highlighting the overlap between them:

Table 3 - Target audiences registered in UNEP data bases					
Target Audiences	Receivers of OAN	Users of Query-Response system	Receivers of printed publications	Receivers of OZONEWS	Receivers of “What’s New” updates
ExCom Members	✓			✓	✓
Fund Secretariat	✓	✓		✓	✓
NOUs	✓	✓	Primarily	✓	
Ozone Secretariat	✓			✓	✓
Regional Network Coord.	✓	✓		✓	✓
Implementing Agencies	✓	✓		✓	✓
OzonAction Team in Paris				✓	✓
Industry	✓	✓			
NGOs	✓	✓			
Academic/Educational	✓	✓			
Bilateral Project Contacts	✓	✓			✓
Article 2 Countries	✓	✓		Some	
Other Individuals	✓	✓		✓	
Total Recipients	Approx. 9,100 as of Dec. 2001	682 queries 1997 - 2001	320 requests received in 2001	Approx. 140 recipients as of Dec. 2001	47

2.6 OzonAction Newsletter

35. Cumulatively, since 1991 the Programme has developed and distributed 40 issues of the OzonAction Newsletter. As of October 2001, the subscriber base for English, French and Spanish totalled 9,094 individuals. Another 2,000 subscribers combined receive the Chinese and Arabic versions of the newsletter. Distribution by region is as follows: Africa 16%, Asia and the Pacific 23%, Eastern Europe 5%, Latin America 14%, North America 14%, Western Asia 5%, and Western Europe 22%.

2.7 Query-Response Service

36. UNEP’s Query-Response service has been electronically tracking questions received since 1997. The following tables summarize the use of the service by country, sector, and query

type. The numbers of queries from Article 5 countries remained more or less stable while those from non-Article 5 countries declined.

Year	Article 5 Countries	Countries with Economies in Transition (CEIT)	Non Article 5 Countries	Not Applicable	Total	Share %
1997	64	3	121	2	190	28%
1998	46	3	67	3	119	17%
1999	38	1	39	20	98	14%
2000	50	0	41	42	133	20%
2001	65	3	49	25	142	21%
Total	263	10	317	92	682	100%
Share %	39%	1%	46%	13%		100%

37. Companies are the most frequent users of the service and technical queries are the most common type of query received. All data relate to the years 1997-2001.

Sector	Number of Queries	% of Total
Company	184	27%
Academic/student	104	15%
Unspecified individual	96	14%
NOU/Focal Point	96	14%
Other Government (not NOU/FP)	46	7%
Research institute	30	4%
Consultant	29	4%
International organization (other than IA)	27	4%
NGO	25	4%
MF Secretariat/Implementing Agency (IA)	21	3%
Industry Association	14	2%
TEAP/TOC	10	1%
Total	682	100%

Query Type	Number of Queries	% of Total
Technical - Industry Sector	265	39%
Policy/Regulations	176	26%
Programme-related	139	20%
Technical/Science/Health/Environmental Effects	70	10%
Web home page	14	2%
OAIC-DV	10	1%
Info about OzonAction Programme	8	1%
Total	682	100%

2.8 OzonAction Web Site

38. The Web site has attracted a consistently growing number of users since its establishment in 1996. The following charts provide data for monthly average use for the full period from October 1999 to May 2001 and for later segments of this period:

Time Period	Visited once	Visited > once
Oct. 1999 to May 2001	2,142	620
May 2000 to May 2001	2,612	729
Nov. 2000 to May 2001	3,482	917

Time Period	User Sessions
Oct. 1999 to May 2001	5,859
May 2000 to May 2001	7,120
Nov. 2000 to May 2001	9,498

39. The latest available breakdown by users in Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries with figures for 1997 and 1998 is shown below. The Web Site is primarily used by developed countries – but that is not to say that it is not well-used and appreciated by developing ones. In fact, the percentage of users from Article 5 countries appears to be growing quickly.

Sector	Article 5	CEITs/EE	Non-Art. 5
1997	2%	11%	87%
1998	4%	30%	66%

40. The Web site provides a cost-effective opportunity for users to obtain UNEP information documents on request. For example, during the month of May 2001 alone 1,490 PDF files were downloaded from the site.

41. In 2001, UNEP launched a Business-to-Business (B2B) web portal to facilitate international exchange of “banked” halons, providing a virtual marketplace where persons can match demand with supply, thus helping companies that use halons for essential or “critical” applications (operators of fire protection systems, fire control services and other organisations). This replaced the earlier on-line halon-banking system.

2.9 Assessing Effectiveness

42. With a number of statistics and numbers regarding UNEP’s activities, as well as a series of comprehensive project and programme reports, it remains a challenge to answer two key questions: (i) what is the effectiveness of UNEP’s information exchange services in reducing emissions of ODS; and (ii) is the amount of funds dedicated to information exchange

proportionate to the volume, quality and impact of the products and services delivered. These questions are important since the Executive Committee is eager to know that the funds are being used economically and in ways that best support phase-out of ODS.

43. Demonstrating the direct influence that information has in supporting country efforts to phase-out ODS continues to be a challenge. Users know that without UNEP information they would not be able to educate themselves or other stakeholders within their countries regarding the Montreal Protocol; however, it is difficult to trace a direct path between information services provided and phase-out activities. In many cases, information comes from various sources and it is not possible to give credit to a particular piece of information. For example, it is difficult to know whether it was a UNEP technical document, verbal advice provided by an NOU over the phone based on an article in the latest newsletter, or information provided by a supplier that had learned something on the UNEP website that results in a company deciding to convert to non-ODS technology.

44. The second question concerns the cost-effectiveness, that means whether the resources used are proportionate to the results achieved. This information is an important part of the evaluation process; however, it reaches beyond the scope of this extended desk study. Although a range of statistics and figures are provided in UNEP progress reports and project completion reports, the justification for the amount of resources dedicated to certain tasks is often not immediately clear and is in any case difficult to establish and to quantify. UNEP could make it's reporting more meaningful and easier for stakeholders to understand by:

- (a) Providing a brief justification for each new project proposal as well as rationale for continued delivery of ongoing services in annual progress reports and work programmes. This is where feedback from users, independent research, and other rationale can be referenced.
- (b) Providing an estimate of the number of person days required (weekly or monthly) to support project implementation.
- (c) Providing an overview of how many UNEP staff are dedicated to delivering information exchange products and services and the amount of time they spend on these tasks.
- (d) Separating, as done now under the CAP, ongoing staff costs from other costs associated with information exchange services, including consultants, reproduction, and distribution costs.
- (e) Benchmarking the staff time and financial resources spent on information exchange tasks against the standards practiced by similar institutions and reporting progress against the benchmark.
- (f) Continuing to work with NOUs to obtain regular feedback on the utility of information exchange products and services. A tentative list of performance indicators has been prepared by the consultants; it is currently being discussed between the Secretariat and UNEP.

3. USER FEEDBACK

3.1 General Comments

45. The overall picture emanating from the review of documentation, the personal interviews with selected stakeholders and the survey, showed that UNEP actively communicates with the users of its information services and adapts the programme continuously to their changing requirements. This contribution is particularly valued in smaller countries where UNEP is often the main source of information related to the Protocol (supplemented in many cases by bilateral partners). Among both large and small NOUs, the combination of proactive and reactive information support provided by UNEP through documents, over the phone, on the web, by email, on the CD Roms, via the OzonAction newsletter, and through videos, is in the replies received generally reported to be effective at “helping NOUs along”, thus increasing the capacity of Article 5 countries to realize the OAS phase-out and to comply with their obligations under the Montreal Protocol.

46. Nine out of ten survey respondents (91%) either strongly agree (46%) or mildly agree (45%) that “UNEP’s information services have been useful and appropriate for (their) organizations.” Almost all (96%) make use of this information and - at least twice a year – they refer back to half or more of the materials they have read. One in four use UNEP materials for generating public awareness and training programs (e.g. 26.9% for posters and 23.7% for training manuals). Over 10% use the materials for each of the following three purposes: generating industry awareness, research studies, and sourcing and selecting commercially available technologies.

47. Annual Clearinghouse Business Plans and notes from Informal Advisory Group meetings reflect an organization that is demand driven. There are many examples of feedback and requests from the Parties that were then translated into action in the annual business plans. By its 2001 Business Plan, the relationship between program plans and user needs is made very clear. In that plan, a table is provided with three columns: Need / Expressed by / Response to need. The survey corroborates UNEP’s reputation as approachable and responsive. Three out of four respondents (74%) think they have sufficient opportunity to provide feedback, and many provided positive experiences as a result. Most of those who thought the opposite were long-term users who completed their surveys in a language other than English.

48. Further, UNEP’s services are by far the most used of the various sources of information available in support of the Montreal Protocol. National government offices and Internet searches rated next, followed by other Implementing Agencies. Only the research and academic community finds other sources to be at least as useful.

49. Evaluation participants provided a wide range of examples demonstrating how they had made use of UNEP’s information materials including: specialized training programs (e.g. of customs officials), co-produced films that aired on public television and videos that were used in schools and at workplaces, the distribution of the OzonAction Newsletter among companies and vocational schools, preparation of media releases, newspaper articles and special newspaper

supplements, and the preparation of PowerPoint presentations for workshops, seminars and information talks directed to various sectors.

3.2 Utility of the information

50. Eight out of ten survey respondents (82%) either strongly agree (41%) or mildly agree (41%) that UNEP's information services have helped to raise awareness about ozone issues and solutions among the general public/consumers in their countries. Three in four (75%) either strongly agree (25%) or mildly agree (50%) that these services have helped Government services in their countries to make informed policy decisions for complying with the Montreal Protocol, including changes to legislation and licensing systems. Long-term users of UNEP's services were even more positive about this impact; however, half of the non-NOU government respondents were indifferent.

3.3 Volume of Information

51. Too much information is leading to information overload. NOUs are regularly faced with large amounts of information on a number of topics – on paper and in electronic formats. Many are interested in reviewing much or all of the material; however, the demands of their job often force them to refer to the information on an “as needed” basis. As a result, the vast majority of NOUs receive more information than they use. This means that many NOUs are unaware of all information and resources available to them. It also means that when NOUs or their stakeholders have a specific question, it can be difficult to find the answer quickly and easily. This is primarily because they have not had time to review all of the documentation available to them, and the purpose or relevance of information is sometimes not immediately clear. It is also difficult when searches of electronic sources are unsuccessful or identify too many “matches”.

52. As one survey respondent put it: *“UNEP should be more selective in the information they send to countries, making countries aware of the resources available, but not over-loading them with information that may not prove really useful for their specific situations. For instance, not all countries need a lot of information on methyl bromide or halons. As the smaller countries have limited capacity to read all the information sent, it would be important to point out to them which information they should really take a serious look at and why, and which they can treat more as general background. This involves a more personalized service, especially for the smaller countries who only have one ozone officer, sometimes on a part-time basis.”*

3.4 Focus of Information

53. According to a number of responses, there needs to be a shift in focus from global to regional/national information. This confirms the move undertaken by UNEP with the CAP to deliver specific, tailored advice directly to countries. There was general recognition from participants that the push to make countries aware of the Montreal Protocol and their respective responsibilities has been generally successful. At this point, information needs are focusing on how to take action and develop policies and legislation to support action. Comments indicate

that there may be limited value in UNEP providing general policy and legislation advice since the circumstances and issues are unique in each country. As identified by some non-Article 5 countries involved in bilateral projects, there is an opportunity for UNEP to add value to their existing services by customizing the information more locally. This means looking at how transferable existing documents are on a global scale, and where necessary, producing information materials that are more specific to regional and country needs (particularly for those options where effectiveness is dependent on local soil, climate, geographic conditions). At the country level, it was suggested that NOUs would benefit from greater customization of communications in regard to what information they are receiving from UNEP, what the information means, how it links to ExCom decisions, and why it is relevant to them. As written by one survey respondent: *“UNEP should be sufficiently knowledgeable about the (local) situation to inform them of the key decisions from Montreal Protocol meetings that will affect them. It may not be enough just to do a general mailing to countries with decisions from the Executive Committee. The country should be contacted, the relevant decision explained in plain language and the effect it can have on the country clarified.”* This task is for NOUs taken up by the regional networks.

54. A focus on NOU information and communications needs would be helpful, along with common template materials. A template outlines the components of a particular communication tool (for example a media release, a communication strategy, a power point presentation, a brochure, or a video), and then provides suggestions regarding components that would need to be customized to match the needs of different users. Different NOUs establish different priorities and approaches to engaging the interest of different sectors within their country, including the general public. It was suggested that there is an important opportunity for UNEP to provide NOUs with direction on which materials are most suitable for outreach to different stakeholders and audiences. In addition, there are many common information needs among NOUs, particularly general information regarding the Montreal Protocol. Rather than “reinventing the wheel” when producing this material, it would be helpful to have as many templates as possible. Examples include template power point presentations providing a general overview of the Montreal Protocol, sample media clips or commercials that could be used on television or radio. Other suggestions coming forward from survey responses included: creating an on-line forum open to the general public; enhancing the glossary for the Montreal Protocol’s related terminology, including abbreviations used in meetings; sending high-level international experts to the Ozone Units on a regular basis to help them improve their work; and launching new information products through forums, talks and meetings *“if possible with some of the authors present, as publishing houses do; these activities could be included at the network meetings, where they would certainly be well received and contribute to enriching the work programs.”*

3.5 Information Content of Products

55. Technical documents and training manuals are considered as useful, but too often out-of-date or not specific enough. Technical documents and training manuals were identified as among the most valuable information provided by UNEP, particularly in their effectiveness at providing unbiased information on technology alternatives. Two out of three survey respondents (66%) refer to the UNEP technical brochure series at least once a month, and find them very

useful (72%.) Almost all of them (92%) find the training manuals to be very useful (68%) or moderately useful (24%). NOUs indicated that this material informs their own understanding of the options, and is frequently passed on from them to enterprises interested in reviewing alternatives.

56. That being said, there were a few NOUs who reported that it is common for them to find out about new technology options from the business sector first.

57. The most frequently raised criticism of the technical documents is that they are too general and “do not go far enough”. Many people commented on the need for more country, sector, company, and equipment-specific information before an enterprise would be able to support a decision to invest in new equipment (e.g. an assessment of how suitable a specific technology is for a specific industry). This is particularly true for SMEs who generally have smaller profit margins, smaller staff, and less time to do their own research on the pros and cons of an equipment purchase, therefore they need material that “makes the case” for them. Some noted that this expertise is provided to enterprises by other implementing agencies and their technical consultants through investment projects, but identified a gap in the availability of this type of detailed information to enterprises *not* involved in investment projects. There are many suppliers who pass on technology options to enterprises; however, they are designed to promote sales of their own equipment.

58. Two large companies which answered were generally satisfied with the information received; one would like to see a regularly updated global summary of CFC/HCFC specific regulations by country (Article 5 and non-Article 5), including any accelerated phase-out dates. Three of four SME’s which responded to the survey found especially helpful the Ozone News, OzoneAction Newsletter and the introductory brochure on ozone depletion. They wanted more information on:

- (a) Government organizations, sectoral organizations and companies in the sector
- (b) Procedures for retrofitting
- (c) Technical consultants with expertise in countries where the conversion has been completed successfully
- (d) Timetable for the dismantling of existing facilities with Halon 1301
- (e) Phase out and cessation timetables for CFC and HCFC decided by the Article 5 countries. This information is vital to European companies involved in implementing refrigeration projects in these countries. One respondent commented: "Information seems to flow only one way, from North to South. Very little makes its way in the other direction."
- (f) Names of organization/s who will provide practical technical training to interested persons in countries like India.

59. Finally, it was also noted that enterprises have a range of information needs, with senior decision-makers often requiring a more general picture of the requirements of the Montreal Protocol and a clear indication of the economic logic of the investment, while manufacturing specialists require detailed knowledge regarding equipment options, specifications, capacity requirements, etc.

60. There is some concern that the length of time it takes UNEP to develop information products (particularly technical documents, which can take up to 3 years) means that much of the information is out-of-date by the time it is released. One out of four survey respondents (26%) thinks that half or more of the material he/she receives from UNEP is out-of-date. Delays were linked to extensive review times. It was suggested that knowledgeable consultants capable of producing high quality material may be difficult to retain due to the relatively low compensation they receive for their efforts and the length of time it takes for them to get paid. When less knowledgeable consultants are used, more responsibility falls on UNEP and the members of Technical Options Committees to invest time in extensive reviews and refinements of the content.

61. Policy Documents are considered as useful, but it is reportedly hard to reach the policy makers. Over half of survey respondents use UNEP's policy guidelines at least once a month, and almost all (97%) rate them as very useful (64%) or moderately useful (33%). However, the materials are mainly used for general information, training, research/studies, generating public awareness, and generating industry awareness. A minority of participants use the materials for developing, implementing or informing about policies or regulations (7%), and for developing and securing political commitment (5%).

62. Reaching policy-makers has been an ongoing challenge for the Programme. In 1995, the Informal Advisory Group (IAG) reported that "industry persons have shown great interest for obtaining information services, while policy-makers have shown weak interest." Again, in 1996 the group said that there was a "lack of awareness at consumer levels (pressure for policy setting is lacking)." The 1997 UNEP Business Plan addressed the issue through information exchange focused on parliamentarians and high-ranking government officials. However, even in 2000 (based on notes from that year's IAG meeting) the participants thought that *"the most important issue is that some of those NOUs are frustrated that they are not able to move forward, within their countries and even at the Executive Committee. What can we do to provide assistance to these NOUs to make sure that these impediments are removed? ... There is a lack of awareness of the higher level government people which makes it difficult to move decisions forward."*

3.6 Understanding of Information

63. Complying with the Montreal Protocol requires to understand the history of decisions made, the terminology used, and the activities implemented. Turnover within NOUs often means that corporate "memory" is lost, with new individuals forced to "learn the ropes" from scratch. This is especially a challenge in smaller countries with one or two individuals working in the NOU. It was suggested that a guide be developed for newcomers to the Montreal Protocol

that explains what has happened, why it has happened, explains how the decision making process works, the division of roles and responsibilities, and the impact of different decisions.

64. While many participants in the evaluation felt that UNEP information is generally straightforward and user-friendly, there were a few who commented that even the general material, including the material on the website, is still too difficult for the average user and the public to understand. A number of opportunities for improvement were identified, including messages specifically targeting consumers preparing to purchase ODS products. A simple mechanism such as a sticker that informs consumers that “This product contains an ozone-depleting substance that will be phased out by 20XX. For more information go to www.xxx.com” was suggested as one way to get the message out.

65. Many NOUs have observed confusion among their stakeholders, and in some cases the media, regarding the difference between ozone depletion and climate change. Both issues are atmosphere-related, and many people are easily confused about the relationship between the two phenomena.

3.7 Format of Information

66. Most information products were rated as clear and appealing. Almost all of the survey respondents (87%) either mildly agree (58%) or strongly agree (29%) that “the design/layout of the materials helps make them user-friendly and attractive.” Almost all (91%) either strongly agree (46%) or mildly agree (45%) that “the style of language (words and phrasing) used in UNEP’s ozone-related materials is clear, appealing, and easy for (them) to understand.” Of the various language groups represented, French-speaking respondents are the least happy with the style of the language.

67. Information is reported to be most useful when it is written in the local language. While UNEP has been making an effort to provide materials in languages other than English, the availability of these materials remains inconsistent. Most respondents agreed that “*UNEP should provide its information materials in a variety of common languages,*” and many commented on the need to improve in this area. In particular, they suggested that all core materials be provided in a range of common languages, and that the translated versions of these materials should be updated each time the English version is. As one respondent put it: “*It is important that there is a basic set of core material available in all UN languages and that funding be made available for countries to translate key materials into their own languages. Greater regionalization of delivery of the information could help with this.*”

68. The need to find the right mix of electronic and paper information was emphasized. This will need continuous reviews and adjustment. Steps during this process include:

- (a) Informing all users that UNEP will gradually phase-out the practice of producing and distributing hard copies of all documents, including the OAN;

- (b) Providing all information via electronic means requires that NOUs confirm by a certain date that the electronic copy is sufficient;
- (c) Following up with NOUs who have not responded to electronic sending of material and determining their need for paper documentation; and
- (d) Continuing to provide paper documentation when specifically requested.

69. The evaluation identified only one country without internet access, and many people who prefer electronic information because it is generally easier to find what they are looking for and enables users to “cut and paste” information for distribution to others. There were some participants who stressed the importance of ensuring electronic information be kept accessible to those using older versions of computer equipment and software. Many people also supported a mix of both paper and electronic documents, since paper documents are generally easier for reading larger volumes of information. Three out of four survey respondents (78%) asked for both electronic and paper copies of each relevant information product.

70. Respondents from countries without reliable or fast internet access found the CD Roms useful, and some non-Article 5 countries also use it regularly since it provides a “one-stop-shop” for information.

71. In terms of making it easier to find information, a number of specific suggestions were put forward, including: putting the catalogue of UNEP publications on the website; having technical reports available electronically so information can be easily found and copied; creating an improved search engine for the CD Roms; putting the OAN online; and making available as much detailed data as possible on what projects have been funded by the Multilateral Fund, what technologies are in use, how much investment has been committed to different technologies, with a description of the full range of technologies. It may be noted that UNEP has already realized some of these suggestions, apparently without being noticed by the respondents. For example, the OzonAction newsletter has been on-line for some years, and probably 80% of technical, policy and awareness documents are on the web site.

3.8 Feedback on Information Modalities Used

72. The OzonAction Web site is considered very useful. Almost all respondents (96%) found the OzonAction web site to be very useful (70%) or moderately useful (26%), particularly for general information, downloading publications, finding other ozone-related web sites and contact addresses for ozone focal points, and for research/studies. However, many find the site somewhat hard to use. Only three out of every five respondents (61%) agreed that “when using the OzonAction Website, I usually find what I am looking for.” Most of those who reported difficulties were long-time users of UNEP’s services who submitted their surveys in a language other than English (especially French). One respondent suggested re-designing the front page of the UNEP home page because “*the current entry page often makes me feel at a loss about where to go next for the information I want.*” Another said “*the procedure for ordering publications for free (for developing countries) on the OzonAction website is not always very clear to use and could be improved.*”

73. The OzonAction Newsletter (OAN) is considered as useful particularly among more recent users of UNEP's services. Many interview and survey participants referred to the value of specific sections within the newsletter. Non-Article 5 countries and the implementing agencies indicated that the section on agency activities was particularly valuable. 83% of survey respondents said they read the newsletter at least monthly, and almost all (97%) found it to be very useful (57%) or moderately useful (40%) – particularly for general information, generating public and industry awareness, and for research/studies. The newsletter content is relevant to audiences well beyond UNEP's circulation list. There are at least eleven countries that (at their own expense) have created similar newsletters / publications that have been assisted or inspired by the OzonAction Newsletter. This 'ripple effect' helps propagate ozone protection and Multilateral Fund messages to a much larger national audience. In terms of improvements, it was suggested that the OAN could be more timely in its arrival (it is often out of date when received) and could be posted on line (which is done already). It was also suggested to eliminate the more commercial and questionable claims of some suppliers. UNEP is undertaking an independent evaluation of the OAN at the time of this evaluation and more detailed feedback will become available there.

74. Not many Article 5 countries are familiar with the recently introduced e-mail service OZONEWS but those that are familiar with it found it valuable. Of those survey respondents who commented on this product, 95% refer to it at least monthly, including 71% who do so at least weekly. Almost all (91%) said it was very useful (57%) or moderately useful (34%).

75. Videos and posters are well used. All of the survey respondents think the videos are either very useful (65%) or moderately useful (35%). More than one in six (17%) reported using the videos for training and for generating public and industry awareness – most being NOUs and other long-time users. However, digitalization of the videos would be appreciated as *“this would make it easy for us to distribute the material and help us to prepare better PowerPoint presentations”*. Almost all respondents (90%) think the posters are either very useful (65%) or moderately useful (35%) – particularly for generating industry and public awareness, and for training sessions.

76. The OASIS CD ROM is often consulted and appreciated particularly by NOUs, non-NOU government staff, research /academic staff, and long-time users in general. Seven out of ten survey respondents (68%) use the CD ROM at least monthly and almost one in four (23%) use it at least weekly. Almost all respondents (91%) find the CD ROM either very useful (61%) or moderately useful (30%). One wrote: *“OASIS has made it possible to prepare almost all of our awareness campaign and obtain other publications, such as reports of the meetings of the different bodies of the Protocol, which we also used to prepare internal reports or to prepare documents for the ratification of amendments and regulations.”*. Another stated: *“This CD-ROM provides for a very compact and easy to use library of information, especially when having to work outside the office and having no easy access to the internet”*.

77. Over half of the survey respondents contact UNEP directly with questions at least once a month; 97% found this service either very useful (87%) or moderately useful (10%). The service was used mostly for assistance with answering general questions, training, and research/studies. A number of NOUs indicated that their contact and relationship with “real people” working in UNEP's Paris office has made an important contribution to their NOU. It provides a sense of

certainty that if they are unable to find an answer to a question, there will be someone who will provide support. Participants in the evaluation reported that they were generally satisfied with response time from UNEP.

78. The on-line halon banking and trading system, which was recently replaced by a Business to Business Web portal, has a relatively small group of frequent users. 46% of the survey respondents use it at least monthly (37%) or weekly (9%.) Respondents find the system less useful than most other UNEP products and services. Of the 46% who use the system at least monthly, only half (50%) consider the system very useful, an additional one in five (19%) find it moderately useful. The remaining 31% say it is not useful or minimally useful.

3.9 Distribution of Information Material in Article 5 Countries

79. Many NOUs reported that they pass on the *content* of the information they receive from UNEP to stakeholders much more frequently than they distribute the materials themselves. The main reasons identified for this included the need to customize the materials to match the local language and culture (includes changing examples to local examples, changing the way information is expressed, etc.), the need to “pick and choose” the information most relevant to local stakeholders so that it is easy to use, and the limited number of copies distributed by UNEP. This is viewed by many NOUs as an essential part of their responsibilities; however, many noted that the cost of producing and reproducing any materials must fit within their limited budgets. Many reported using these limited budgets creatively, editing a number of UNEP videos onto one tape, cutting-and-pasting the most relevant information from the WEB and CD Rom for electronic distribution to stakeholders, creating flyers for companies in specific sectors, etc. Among the materials most commonly passed on directly from UNEP to stakeholders were the “train-the-trainer” materials.

80. Many NOUs indicated that they are continuously working to establish relationships with enterprises in their countries. Sometimes individual technicians visit or phone the NOU office for regular information updates. In other cases NOUs focus on working with trade associations (where they exist), tapping into their knowledge about enterprises working with ODS. Other mechanisms used to outreach to industry include sector and region-specific workshops, dissemination of information through regional offices of environment ministries, study tours of companies with investment projects (within their country and in other countries), newspaper ads and articles, as well as email.

81. Accessing small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) with information regarding the Montreal Protocol is challenging because, with fewer resources, they cannot hire individuals dedicated to environmental issues and often do not have internet access. There are different views regarding the most effective way to get information from UNEP to SMEs. Strong supplier relationships are the lifeline for many small businesses, making them an ideal mechanism for communicating information. There are concerns, however, that suppliers will present a biased picture. In terms of governments approaching industry, there is a concern that some businesses would be reluctant to share information with their government due to a fear that the transparency

would make them more likely to be subject to government scrutiny and potential fines and restrictions. Trade associations may be a useful “intermediary” to communicate this information.

82. Many NOUs reported having established relationships with other government departments and agencies within their countries including environment, foreign affairs, customs, trade, import control, industry, finance, attorney general, health, pest control board, and others. In some countries the relationships are relatively loose, with printed information circulated to each department or agency, while other countries have regular working meetings with committees dedicated solely to addressing ozone issues (e.g. Iran’s National Ozone Committee).

83. Many NOUs reported also that universities, schools, and students are among the stakeholders regularly requesting information on the Montreal Protocol. NOUs generally respond by providing the students with the information they request, and also deliver presentations, lend UNEP videos, host competitions for designing ozone day posters, etc.

3.10 Collaboration between Implementing Agencies

84. There is little overlap between the content of information provided by UNEP and other agencies (UNDP, UNIDO, and the World Bank). UNEP is seen as the lead information provider for all topics related to the Montreal Protocol, except for the project-specific technical expertise that the other agencies provide. The reports from the Technical Options Committees (TOC) published by UNEP come closest to the type of information other agencies provide to beneficiary companies.

85. The other implementing agencies commonly refer companies to UNEP as a first information source (in some cases companies are unaware UNEP material is available) and in some cases handout UNEP reports, brochures, etc. They know that UNEP is the lead information supplier and do not create similar materials. They also use the OzonAction Newsletter (OAN) to get up-dated on the activities of each other between Executive Committee meetings. In some cases, it is through the OAN that agencies learn about certain industrial alternatives under development and use this information to approach companies.

86. A number of opportunities for further collaboration were identified through the evaluation, such as: using other agencies as a distribution mechanism for UNEP materials, collaborating for the development of technical documents, in particular through UNEP collecting the comments of other agencies on drafts, and, as UNEP moves towards more presence in the regions to develop more cooperation with regional and country offices of other agencies.

4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

87. Based on results of the evaluation and in order to respond to evolving user needs and technical opportunities, the following recommendations are made:

- (a) Develop and distribute more information adapted to regional and national needs. While early benefits were gained by developing and distributing materials

relevant to decision-makers globally, a key message from this evaluation is that now UNEP should shift the focus of information services from a global to a regional and national level, as planned with CAP for the whole programme.

- (b) Provide information in languages other than English, develop an introduction for newcomers to the Montreal Protocol and Multilateral Fund decision-making processes and prepare templates for communication materials that are required most commonly for general public awareness material.
- (c) Make information easier to find by continuing the efforts to provide documents in electronic format, and improving the search engine on CD Roms produced.
- (d) Provide SMEs with the information they need, in particular concise cost-benefit information to support investment in ODS-free technology. There is an opportunity to draw on the expertise and contacts of other implementing agencies in the development and distribution of such cost-benefit factsheets, tailored to specific technologies, sectors, and different sizes of enterprises.
- (e) Continue to improve the facilities for information exchange between NOUs. The need for and benefits from this type of peer-to-peer communication were key messages coming forward from the evaluation. UNEP should continue to take a leadership role in organizing information-pools, E-mail circles and/or Internet forums for exchanging information between the NOUs in particular.
- (f) UNEP should review the current approach used for the development of technical documents. This should include a review of the amount of time invested by UNEP and TEAP members in the review and refinement of draft consultant reports, and determine if additional investment in consultant compensation would reduce the amount of time currently invested in the review process. Furthermore, the level of consultant fees paid by UNEP should be compared to other agencies and also the amount of time it takes for payments to be made in order to determine if the availability of consultants and quality of work received can be improved by adjustments in these areas. Finally, other Implementing Agencies have expressed an interest in contributing to the technical documents. It is recommended that UNEP initiate discussions with the IAs to determine the best way to integrate their expertise
- (g) Increase transparency with regard to the cost-effectiveness of UNEP's information exchange services delivered and the results achieved. Although difficult to quantify, such information, with a reasonable degree of plausibility, should regularly be provided. This requires UNEP to relate more clearly staff and financial resources used to the results achieved, to focus in planning and reporting more systematically on outcomes and impacts and to involve NOUs more regularly in obtaining feed-back on the utility of information services provided.
- (h) Consolidate databases within UNEP. The thousands of contacts in several databases should be integrated into one contact management system. Benefits to be realized from this approach would include easier updating of contact information, easier tracking of the range of UNEP services provided and an ability to identify the information needs of different contacts.

Appendix A: Review participants

1. Algeria	*	
2. Antigua & Barbuda	I	
3. Argentina	*	
4. Australia	+I	
5. Bahrain	*+	
6. Barbados	I	
7. Belize	I	
8. Benin	*	
9. Bolivia	*	
10. Bulgaria	*	
11. Burkina Faso	*	
12. Burundi	I	
13. Cambodia	*	
14. Canada	++++I	
15. China	*****++I	
16. Colombia	I	
17. Congo	*	
18. Cook Islands	+	
19. Costa Rica	*+E	
20. Croatia	+	
21. Cuba	*	
22. Denmark	+	
23. Dominican Republic	E	
24. El Salvador	*	
25. Estonia	*	
26. European Commission	++	
27. Fiji	*	
28. Finland	+	
29. France	*+++	
30. Gabon	*	
31. Gambia	*++	
32. German Agency for Technical Cooperation	I	
33. Germany	*+IE	
34. Greenpeace	I	
35. Guinea	*	
36. Guyana	I	
37. Honduras	*	
38. Hong Kong	+	
39. Hungary	*	
40. Iles Comores	*	
41. India	++E	
42. Iran	E	
43. Italy	I	
44. Jamaica	I	
45. Japan	++++	
46. Lebanon	*	
47. Lithuania	+	
48. Macedonia	*+	
49. Mali	*	
50. Malta	*	
51. Mauritius	I	
52. Myanmar	*	
53. Mexico	I	
54. Netherlands	E	
55. Namibia	*	
56. Nigeria	I	
57. Ozone Secretariat	E	
58. Poland	+E	
59. St. Lucia	I	
60. Senegal	*	
61. Spain	*+	
62. Sweden	+E	
63. TEAP Co-Chair	I	
64. Thailand	E	
65. Togo	*	
66. Trinidad & Tobago	I	
67. Tunisia	+	
68. UNDP	I	
69. UNIDO	+I	
70. United States of America	+++	
71. United Kingdom	+I	
72. Uruguay	*	
73. Venezuela	*	
74. World Bank	I	

* Questionnaire(s) completed by NOU

+ Questionnaire(s) completed by other users

I Interview Participants

E Participants in two discussions held at the sidelines of the 35th Meeting of the Executive Committee