



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



Distr.
Restreinte

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/41/84
23 novembre 2003

FRANÇAIS
ORIGINAL: ANGLAIS

COMITÉ EXÉCUTIF
DU FONDS MULTILATÉRAL AUX FINS
D'APPLICATION DU PROTOCOLE DE MONTRÉAL
Quarante et unième réunion
Montréal, 17 - 19 décembre 2003

**ÉCLAIRCISSEMENT DES QUESTIONS ENTOURANT LA FONCTION DE
SURVEILLANCE ET D'ÉVALUATION DU SECRÉTARIAT DU FONDS
MULTILATÉRAL (DÉCISION 39/12 b)).**

1. A la 39e réunion, le Comité exécutif, a décidé, *inter alia*, :
 - b) D'examiner la possibilité de clarifier la question suivante à sa 41^e réunion :
 - L'Administrateur principal chargé de la surveillance et de l'évaluation pourrait-il disposer d'une certaine indépendance au sein du Secrétariat, dans le cadre des règlements applicables au personnel des Nations Unies ?
 - Qui détient la responsabilité finale de l'évaluation des rapports présentés au Comité exécutif et au Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances, notamment en ce qui concerne les recommandations techniques et/ou politiques ?
2. Afin de faciliter les délibérations du Comité, le Secrétariat du Fonds a préparé ce document comportant un extrait des décisions prises par le Comité exécutif sur la surveillance, et l'évaluation ainsi que les documents de référence suivants :
 - Mandats du sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/36, Annexe VII);
 - Description de poste révisée et qualités de l'administrateur de la surveillance et de l'évaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4); et

- Procédures institutionnelles de surveillance et d'évaluation au sein des institutions financières internationales concernées : rapport du consultant (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/2).

EXTRAIT DE DECISIONS RELATIVES A LA SURVEILLANCE ET L'ÉVALUATION

17^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 11 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: LIGNES DIRECTRICES SUR LA SURVEILLANCE ET L'ÉVALUATION DES PROJETS

66. Le Chef du Secrétariat a présenté le projet de proposition de lignes directrices sur la surveillance et l'évaluation des programmes et des projets appuyés par le Fonds multilatéral (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/17/53).

67. Le Comité exécutif a pris note du projet de lignes directrices et a invité les pays à présenter leurs observations d'ici la fin d'août 1995 afin qu'un second projet puisse être préparé à l'intention de la dix-huitième réunion. Le Comité exécutif a aussi pris note du projet de document intitulé (Lignes directrices pour le contrôle et l'évaluation des projets d'investissement pour l'élimination des ODS) (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/17/Inf.4) présenté par la Banque mondiale et il a demandé aux pays intéressés de présenter leurs observations à la Banque d'ici la fin d'août 1995.

18^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 9 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: LIGNES DIRECTRICES SUR LA SUPERVISION ET L'ÉVALUATION

1. Comme suite à l'examen du projet de note sur la supervision et l'évaluation des projets (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/64), le Comité exécutif a décidé ce qui suit:

- (a) prendre les mesures intérimaires ci-après, en attendant l'achèvement de l'élaboration de lignes directrices :

1. Pour assurer le respect des objectifs du Fonds et la prise en compte des « leçons apprises » dans la mise en oeuvre de projets futurs, les agences d'exécution superviseront l'avancement des activités approuvées par le Fonds et les évalueront une fois qu'elles seront terminées. A cet égard, il importe d'assurer un degré adéquat d'indépendance et de crédibilité du système. Il faudra également maintenir l'équilibre entre le niveau de supervision à exercer et les coûts correspondants.

2. Les agences d'exécution rendront compte au Comité exécutif de l'état d'avancement de la mise en oeuvre et de l'évaluation finale dans leurs rapports

périodiques et leurs plans stratégiques, dont la présentation sera mise à jour périodiquement pour tenir compte des indicateurs et des critères d'évaluation qui présentent un intérêt pour le Comité. Dans leur rapport, les agences d'exécution souligneront les progrès réalisés depuis la dernière réunion. Le rapport met aussi en exergue les projets qui n'ont eu aucune activité importante de mise en oeuvre durant des périodes précises, par exemple, 12, 18 et 24 mois après leur approbation. Les agences d'exécution présenteront des observations sur les mesures prises pour résoudre les problèmes qui se sont posés durant la mise en oeuvre et pour éviter qu'ils se reproduisent.

3. Les rapports d'achèvement des projets analyseront et évalueront le succès de leur exécution, en fonction des indicateurs des plans stratégiques et du degré de conformité aux paramètres clés de ces projets. Ces rapports seront soumis au Comité dans les six mois qui suivent les décaissements finaux.

4. Le Secrétariat mettra sur pied un processus d'analyse indépendante pour assurer l'évaluation périodique d'un petit échantillon représentatif de projets terminés de chaque agence, afin d'assurer que des normes d'évaluation cohérentes et objectives sont appliquées.

5. Le Secrétariat regroupera les informations tirées des rapports d'achèvement des projets et rendra compte au Comité du succès du Fonds à réaliser ses propres objectifs et ceux des projets, en se fondant sur les critères et les indicateurs figurant dans les plans stratégiques et les paramètres clés des projets. Le Secrétariat fera également rapport sur la performance de chaque agence en utilisant les mêmes critères et en considérant la nature particulière de son portefeuille respectif.

6. Afin d'assurer que les renseignements de base sont disponibles en quantité suffisante pour permettre une supervision et une évaluation utile des projets, les agences d'exécution continueront à inclure dans les documents de projet les calendriers d'exécution et les quantités d'ODP à éliminer. Elles indiqueront également le matériel qui serait éventuellement détruit, ainsi que tout autre paramètre pertinent dans les propositions de projets soumises au Comité exécutif.

7. Étant donné que la Banque mondiale a établi un projet de lignes directrices techniques pour divers secteurs destinées à faciliter la supervision et l'évaluation, le Secrétariat coordonnera l'adoption de lignes directrices techniques nonnalisées, qui feront l'objet de mises à jour périodiques pour tenir compte de l'expérience acquise dans la supervision et l'évaluation et des développements techniques.

8. Le Secrétariat coopèrera avec les agences d'exécution pour arrêter les critères et les indicateurs relatifs au renforcement des institutions et aux activités de coordination des informations, et pour incorporer les suggestions formulées durant la dix-huitième réunion du Comité exécutif, aux fins de soumission au Comité exécutif à sa vingtième réunion.

- (b) Encourager le Secrétariat et les agences d'exécution à faire appel à l'assistance d'experts de l'extérieur, s'il y a lieu, pour poursuivre l'élaboration des lignes directrices.

(Décision 18/20)

19^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 20 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: CONCEPTION D'UN SYSTEME DE SURVEILLANCE ET D'EVALUATION POUR LE FONDS MULTILATERAL (PROJET DE MANDAT)

72. Le Chef du Secrétariat a présenté le projet de mandat relatif à la conception d'un système de surveillance et d'évaluation pour le Fonds multilatéral (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/63), qui a été préparé en collaboration avec les agences d'exécution pour donner suite à la décision 18/20 du Comité exécutif.

73. Le Comité exécutif a décidé:

- (a) d'entériner le projet de mandat relatif à la conception du système de surveillance et d'évaluation pour le Fonds multilatéral;
- (b) d'autoriser le Secrétariat à procéder, en coopération avec les agences d'exécution, à l'élaboration d'un projet de système de surveillance et d'évaluation aux fins de soumission au Comité exécutif à sa vingtième réunion.

(Décision 19/40)

20^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 10 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: SYSTEME DE SURVEILLANCE ET D'EVALUATION DESTINE AU FONDS MULTILATERAL

54. Le Chef du Secrétariat a présenté le projet de rapport sur un système de surveillance et d'évaluation destiné au Fonds multilatéral (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/58), en rappelant qu'à sa dix-neuvième réunion, le Comité exécutif avait approuvé un cadre de référence pour l'établissement d'un système de surveillance et d'évaluation (Décision 19/40).

55. Le consultant et représentant d'Universalialia a présenté le projet de rapport.

56. Ayant pris note du document soumis, le Comité exécutif a décidé:

- (a) de demander au consultant de poursuivre ses travaux, dont il lui rendra compte à une réunion ultérieure, en concentrant son attention sur les facteurs suivants:

- (i) bien que d'importantes modifications aient été proposées dans le domaine de l'évaluation, le système de surveillance proposé était déjà largement mis en place, comme en témoigne le système de compte rendu actuel;
 - (ii) il importe que les fonctions de surveillance et d'évaluation n'entraînent pas de conflits excessifs et n'aient pas pour effet de gonfler un Secrétariat actuellement minimal et efficace;
 - (iii) les évaluations devront être faites avec la participation de toutes les parties intéressées;
 - (iv) les décisions relatives à la portée des évaluations externes et au nombre d'évaluations à réaliser dans une année devraient peut-être rester la prérogative de la Réunion des Parties;
- (b) d'inviter ses propres membres à soumettre d'autres observations par écrit au Secrétariat du Fonds afin de faciliter la tâche du consultant.

(Decision 20/38)

21^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 9 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: SYSTÈME DE SURVEILLANCE ET D'ÉVALUATION POUR LE FONDS MULTILATÉRAL

49. À la suite de la présentation du projet révisé élaboré par la firme de consultants Universalia sur un système proposé de surveillance et d'évaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/30), ainsi que d'un exposé verbal d'un représentant d'Universalia avec présentation de diapositives sur le système de surveillance et d'évaluation proposé et des réponses de ce représentant à un certain nombre d'observations et de questions des membres du Comité, le Comité exécutif a décidé:

- (a) de remplacer le Sous-comité sur les questions financières par un Sous-comité permanent appelé le Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances;
- (b) d'adopter le mandat du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances, qui figure à l'Annexe VII au présent rapport;
- (c) de charger le Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances:
 - i) d'examiner le cycle des plans d'activités et de la soumission des programmes de travail;

- ii) de revoir le processus de surveillance des projets approuvés;
 - iii) de présenter des recommandations sur ces questions au Comité exécutif à sa vingt-deuxième réunion.
- (d) de réviser, s'il y a lieu, le mandat, après avoir examiné les recommandations du Sous-comité.
 - (e) que le Sous-Comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances se composerait des membres suivants: Antigua-et-Barbuda, Costa Rica et Zimbabwe représentant les Parties visées à l'Article 5 du Protocole, et Australie, Belgique et Royaume-Uni représentant les Parties non visées. L'Australie assurera la présidence.

(Décision 21/35)

22^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

(g) Projet de programme de travail pour la surveillance et l'évaluation

34. Ayant examiné les propositions de programme de travail et de plan de travail pour la surveillance et l'évaluation du Fonds multilatéral sur une période de douze mois entre 1997 et 1998 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/22/SC-MEF/2, Corr. 1 et Add. 1), et ayant pris note des recommandations du sous-comité (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/22/5, paragraphes 33 à 38), le Comité exécutif a décidé:

- (a) d'adopter les objectifs 1, 2, 4 et 5 décrits à l'Annexe III au présent rapport, en notant que la date de démantèlement ou de destruction de l'équipement devrait constituer un des jalons pour la surveillance dans l'objectif n° 5;
- (b) d'adopter les tâches 1 à 4 décrites à l'Annexe III au présent rapport;
- (c) de demander au Secrétariat d'entreprendre les tâches dans l'ordre soumis, sauf les tâches 2 et 3 qui seront interverties;
- (d) de demander au Secrétariat de soumettre la tâche 1 à la prochaine réunion du sous-comité, pour qu'il examine les questions à utiliser dans les évaluations ultérieures, compte tenu des dispositions de la recommandation 1 de la Décision VII/22 de la septième Réunion des Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/12, Annexe V);
- (e) que la tâche 4 devrait se concentrer sur un nombre limité d'activités particulières, à savoir la formation et le renforcement des institutions;

- (f) que les évaluations devraient inclure la question des décaissements ainsi que le rôle des divers intervenants dans le système de surveillance;
- (g) que les évaluations, qui faisaient partie de l'ensemble du processus de surveillance et d'évaluation actuellement en place, devraient porter sur la participation de toutes les parties prenantes dans les efforts visant à réaliser les objectifs du Fonds;
- (h) que le renforcement modeste des effectifs du Secrétariat, approuvé par le Comité exécutif dans sa Décision 21/36, devrait être suffisant pour permettre au Secrétariat d'assurer la surveillance et l'évaluation de façon continue, dans le cadre des activités suivantes: mise sur pied d'un système et d'une base de données de surveillance et d'évaluation; coordination, supervision et exécution d'études et de missions de surveillance et d'évaluation; création au sein du Secrétariat d'un poste de surveillance et d'évaluation dont le titulaire relèverait directement du sous-comité et/ou du Comité exécutif et serait chargé de la coordination de toutes les activités de surveillance et d'évaluation;
- (i) d'approuver un budget pour 12 mois-personnes pour la réalisation de ces tâches.

(Decision 22/19)

23^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

Description de poste pour la surveillance et l'évaluation

15. Le Comité exécutif, ayant pris note des observations et des recommandations du sous-comité (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, paragraphes 13 et 14), a décidé :

- a) d'approuver la description de poste révisé (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, Annexe II)
- b) de charger le Secrétariat de la présenter au bureau de classification des Nations Unies par l'intermédiaire du PNUE afin d'en arrêter le texte.

(Décision 23/3)

Guide d'évaluation

17. Le Comité exécutif, ayant pris note des observations formulées à la deuxième réunion du sous-comité à propos du projet de guide d'évaluation à la deuxième réunion du sous-comité (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, paragraphes 4 à 11), a décidé :

- a) de prendre note du Guide d'évaluation figurant à l'Annexe I au rapport de la deuxième réunion du sous-comité (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4) et de supprimer les expressions, «sur demande» et «dans la mesure du possible et le cas échéant»

qui figurent en regard des deux dernières puces des sections 3 c) et d) de la Partie V.C.3 du guide (voir Annexe II au présent rapport);

- b) de reconnaître que ce guide constitue la première version de ce qui était destiné à être un document dynamique qui serait révisé par l'agent de surveillance et d'évaluation à la lumière de l'expérience de son utilisation que les pays et les agences d'exécution auront acquise;
- c) d'inviter les membres du Comité exécutif à formuler leurs observations sur le guide et de demander aux agences d'exécution de continuer à donner des avis sur la question en fonction de leur propre expérience;
- d) de charger l'agent de surveillance et d'évaluation, lorsqu'il sera désigné, de prendre en compte ces observations et avis lors de la préparation de propositions futures d'améliorations et/ou d'amendement du guide à l'intention du sous-comité et de veiller à ce que les incidences des projets évalués soient examinées compte tenu de leurs effets sur le secteur tout entier au niveau national.

(Décision 23/5)

18. Un représentant a demandé que soit consignée au rapport l'interprétation de sa délégation, selon laquelle l'évaluation du Fonds multilatéral ne représente pas l'évaluation du programme national d'un pays.

24^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

i) État des démarches en vue du recrutement d'un agent de surveillance et d'évaluation

30. Ayant pris note des observations du Sous-comité (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/4, paragraphes 34 et 35), le Comité exécutif a décidé :

- a) de prendre note du rapport de situation;
- b) de charger le Secrétariat de le tenir informé de l'évolution de la situation;
- c) de recourir à un consultant en attendant que l'agent de surveillance et d'évaluation soit affecté à son poste.

(Décision 24/11)

Paragraphs 34 and 35 of the MEF SC report:

34. *Le Secrétariat a présenté un rapport de situation sur l'état des démarches en vue du recrutement d'un agent de surveillance et d'évaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/16) et il a fait le point à ce sujet en informant le Sous-comité que le poste avait été classé par le siège des Nations Unies à New York. Le PNUE est en train de publier la vacance de poste, qui sera affichée pendant environ douze semaines, après quoi, le Secrétariat évaluera les candidats et établira une première sélection à partir de laquelle le titulaire sera choisi. Étant donné qu'il n'en est pas moins impératif d'exécuter dans les meilleurs délais le programme de surveillance et d'évaluation approuvé, le Secrétariat a proposé de retenir, à titre intérimaire, les services d'un consultant en attendant que l'agent soit recruté.*

35. *Le Sous-comité a recommandé que le Comité exécutif :*

- (a) prenne note du rapport de situation;*
- (b) charge le Secrétariat de le tenir au courant de l'évolution de la situation;*
- (c) accepte que les services d'un consultant soient retenus jusqu'à l'arrivée de l'agent de surveillance et d'évaluation.*

25^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 3 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR: ACTIVITÉS DU SECRÉTARIAT

3. Le Chef du Secrétariat a présenté le rapport des activités entreprises par le Secrétariat depuis la vingt-quatrième réunion du Comité exécutif (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/25/2). Mettant à jour les informations du paragraphe 4 sur la nomination d'un administrateur de la surveillance et de l'évaluation, il a indiqué que les dernières clarifications demandées venaient d'être reçues, qu'une liste préférentielle serait préparée et présentée au Bureau des Nations Unies à Nairobi (UNON), suivie d'entrevues et de la présentation d'une recommandation à la Commission des nominations et des promotions à Nairobi.

4.

26^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

POINT 3 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR : ACTIVITÉS DU SECRÉTARIAT

6. Le Chef du Secrétariat a présenté le rapport des activités entreprises par le Secrétariat depuis la vingt-cinquième réunion du Comité exécutif (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/2). Il a indiqué que le processus de recrutement d'un administrateur principal de l'évaluation tirait à sa fin et qu'une offre de nomination avait été présentée au candidat retenu.

(e) État de mise en œuvre du programme de surveillance et d'évaluation

26. Ayant examiné la recommandation du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/4, paragraphe 22), le Comité exécutif a pris note du rapport sur l'état de mise en œuvre du programme de surveillance et d'évaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/13) et il a décidé de charger le Secrétariat du Fonds de préparer un programme de travail pour la surveillance et l'évaluation pour 1999, qu'il lui soumettra à sa première réunion de 1999.

(Décision 26/10)

27^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

(f) Projet de programme de travail sur l'évaluation pour 1999

31. Après avoir examiné les recommandations du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/27/4, paragraphe 27), le Comité exécutif a décidé :

- (a) d'approuver le projet de programme de travail sur l'évaluation pour 1999 ;
- (b) de demander au Secrétariat de soumettre à l'examen du Comité exécutif à sa troisième réunion de 1999 un projet de programme de travail sur l'évaluation pour 2000.

(Décision 27/11)

RAPPORT DE LA 18^E REUNION DU SOUS-COMITE DE LA SURVEILLANCE, DE L'EVALUATION ET DES FINANCES

POINT 3 DE L'ORDRE DU JOUR : PROJET DE PROGRAMME DE TRAVAIL DE SURVEILLANCE ET D'ÉVALUATION POUR L'ANNÉE 2003

19. Le Sous-comité a pris connaissance du projet de Programme de travail de surveillance et d'évaluation pour l'année 2003 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/8), présenté par l'Administrateur principal chargé de la surveillance et de l'évaluation.

20. [Après avoir pris connaissance des principes directeurs, des études d'évaluation et du budget proposé pour l'année 2003, le Sous-comité a recommandé que le Comité exécutif approuve le Programme de travail de surveillance et d'évaluation proposé pour l'année 2003, avec un budget de 198 000 \$US, tel qu'indiqué dans le document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/8.]

21. Plusieurs représentants ayant fait référence à la procédure à suivre pour présenter des rapports d'évaluation au Comité exécutif, notamment dans les cas de désaccord entre le consultant, l'Administrateur principal chargé de l'évaluation et de la surveillance et le Chef du

Secrétariat sur les recommandations, le Sous-comité a poursuivi ses travaux en l'absence des observateurs et du Secrétariat afin de débattre de cette question de procédure.

22. Le Sous-comité a débattu de cette question à huis clos et il a décidé de:
- a. Poursuivre le débat sur cette question de procédure relative à la surveillance et l'évaluation dans un point séparé de l'ordre du jour de sa 19^{ème} réunion;
 - b. Demander au Secrétariat de compiler des informations sur les procédures institutionnelles de surveillance et d'évaluation (unités et personnes) dans d'autres institutions internationales de financement telles que le Fonds pour l'environnement mondial (FEM), le Fonds international de développement agricole (FIDA) et la Banque mondiale, notamment sur les mandats, la hiérarchisation, la préparation et la présentation de documents et de recommandations aux instances dirigeantes ;
 - c. Diffuser ces informations aux membres du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances avant la 19^{ème} réunion.

38^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

b) Projet de Programme de travail de surveillance et d'évaluation pour l'année 2003

4. Après avoir examiné la recommandation du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, para. 20) et sa décision concernant la question de procédure qui sera discutée à sa 19^{ème} réunion (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, par. 22), le Comité exécutif a décidé d'approuver le Programme de travail de surveillance et d'évaluation proposé pour l'année 2003, avec un budget de 198 000 \$, tel qu'indiqué dans le document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/8, et de demander que le travail soit amorcé à l'aide des procédures utilisées pour de telles évaluations au cours des années 1999, 2000 et 2001.

(Décision 38/5)

39^e réunion du Comité Exécutif

Procédures institutionnelles visant la surveillance et l'évaluation des institutions financières internationales pertinentes : Rapport du consultant

46. Après avoir examiné les observations et les recommandations du Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/39/6, para. 40 et 41), le Comité exécutif a décidé :

- a) De prendre note du rapport du consultant, contenu dans le document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/ 2 ;

- b) D'examiner la possibilité de clarifier la question suivante à sa 41^e réunion :
- L'administrateur principal chargé de la surveillance et de l'évaluation pourrait-il disposer d'une certaine indépendance au sein du Secrétariat, dans le cadre des règlements applicables au personnel des Nations Unies ?
 - Qui détient la responsabilité finale de l'évaluation des rapports présentés au Comité exécutif et au Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances, notamment en ce qui concerne les recommandations techniques et/ou politiques ?

(Décision 39/12)

ANNEXE VII

MANDATS DU SOUS-COMITÉ DE LA SURVEILLANCE, DE L'ÉVALUATION ET DES FINANCES

1. À sa vingt-et-unième réunion, le Comité exécutif a décidé de créer un Sous-comité permanent appelé Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances qui remplacera le Sous-comité sur les questions financières qu'il avait créé à sa neuvième réunion.
2. Le Sous-comité sera un organe permanent. Il sera nommé pour une période d'un an, coïncidant avec le mandat du Président et du Vice-Président du Comité exécutif. Comme par le passé, le Président du Sous-comité sera nommé par les membres et la présidence sera confiée aux membres à tour de rôle, d'une réunion des Parties à l'autre.
3. Le Sous-comité se composera de trois membres du Comité exécutif représentant les Parties visées au paragraphe 1 de l'Article 5 du Protocole et de trois membres du Comité représentant les Parties non visées, qui seront désignés par les groupes respectifs. Le Trésorier et le Secrétariat assisteront le Sous-comité dans ses travaux et participeront à ses réunions. Les agences d'exécution pourront être invitées à participer. Le Sous-comité a le pouvoir d'exiger la participation d'une agence d'exécution à l'examen de toute question qui l'intéresserait.
4. Le Sous-comité siégera à huis clos. Les membres du Comité exécutif pourront être admis à titre d'observateurs avec l'accord exprès du Président. Avec l'accord unanime des membres, le Président pourra inviter les observateurs à prendre la parole. Trois représentants d'organisations non gouvernementales (ONG), l'un nommé par les ONG environnementales, le deuxième par les ONG industrielles et le troisième par les ONG de la communauté universitaire, pourront assister aux réunions du Sous-comité à titre d'observateurs, sans droit de participation.
5. La langue de travail des réunions du Sous-comité sera l'anglais.
6. Le Sous-comité se penchera sur les questions concernant la surveillance et l'évaluation des projets approuvés, les rapports d'avancement, les plans d'activités et le processus d'établissement des plans d'activités dans le cadre du Fonds multilatéral. Toutes les responsabilités du Sous-comité sur les questions financières instituées à la neuvième réunion du Comité exécutif sont transférées au Sous-comité de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et des finances.

Annexe II

DESCRIPTION DE POSTE RÉVISÉE ET QUALITÉS DE L'ADMINISTRATEUR DE LA SURVEILLANCE ET DE L'ÉVALUATION

DESCRIPTION DE POSTE

Sous la supervision générale du Chef du Secrétariat, le titulaire assumera les fonctions ci-après:

1. Rédiger le programme de travail et le plan de travail pour la surveillance et l'évaluation, *pour soumission à l'examen et à l'approbation du Sous-comité/Comité exécutif.*
2. Travailler de concert avec les agences d'exécution, les agences bilatérales et autres organismes afin d'étudier les moyens d'assurer l'efficacité de la surveillance et de l'évaluation des projets appuyés par le Fonds *conformément aux exigences du Comité exécutif.*
3. Coordonner les fonctions de surveillance et d'évaluation *requis par le Comité exécutif* avec celles des agences d'exécution et des agences bilatérales, des intermédiaires financiers et des pays bénéficiaires.
4. *Comme suite à toute demande et/ou directive du Comité exécutif, et* en coopération avec les agences d'exécution, préparer et mettre à jour des lignes directrices normalisées sur la surveillance et l'évaluation du contenu des propositions de projets, des rapports périodiques et des rapports d'achèvement sur les activités appuyées par le Fonds, *pour soumission à l'examen et à l'approbation du Sous-comité/Comité exécutif*
5. Vérifier que les normes de surveillance et d'évaluation *approuvées par le Comité exécutif* régissent tous les aspects de l'établissement et de la mise en œuvre des projets approuvés.
6. Mettre sur pied des systèmes et des bases de données de surveillance et d'évaluation *qui répondent à la nécessité de générer les données demandées par le Comité exécutif* en vue de décrire et d'analyser les activités appuyées par le Fonds.
7. Diriger des études spéciales d'évaluation, incluant la préparation de mandat *à soumettre à l'approbation du Comité exécutif*, la sélection d'évaluateurs *divers, conformément à toutes conditions applicables relatives aux appels d'offres*, et superviser l'exécution des évaluations.
8. Regrouper les informations sur l'efficacité du Fonds dans la réalisation de ses objectifs et ceux des projets *conformément aux données demandées par le Comité exécutif.*

9. Rendre compte au Sous-comité de la surveillance de l'évaluation et des finances *et* au Comité exécutif sur les résultats et les leçons tirées des projets approuvés au titre du Fonds multilatéral, à toutes les étapes de la mise en œuvre, en se fondant sur l'expérience des agences bilatérales et autres organismes décrite dans les rapports périodiques concernant les politiques et les lignes directrices du Comité exécutif.
10. Rendre compte au Sous-comité de la surveillance de l'évaluation et des finances *et* au Comité exécutif sur le processus de surveillance et d'évaluation appliqué et suggérer des changements s'il y a lieu.
11. Faire le suivi des décisions et des directives du Comité exécutif dans le domaine de la surveillance et de l'évaluation.
12. *Préparer, et une fois reçue l'approbation du Comité exécutif, diffuser des informations sur les meilleures pratiques et les résultats les plus probants.*
13. Entreprendre des missions, s'il y a lieu, pour s'acquitter des fonctions décrites ci-dessus.

QUALITÉS

1. Expérience, sur une période minimale de 10 ans, de la surveillance, de l'évaluation et de la recherche.
2. Diplôme universitaire de niveau supérieur dans un domaine pertinent des sciences sociales, du génie ou qualités et/ou expérience équivalentes dans le domaine de la surveillance et de l'évaluation.
3. Une expérience de l'élaboration et de la mise en œuvre de programmes serait un atout.
4. Aptitudes prouvées dans les techniques d'évaluation et capacité d'entretenir des relations interpersonnelles.
5. Maîtrise de l'anglais, et de préférence d'autres langues de l'ONU.
6. La connaissance des systèmes de bureautique et des logiciels correspondants est essentielle.
7. Aptitudes à la rédaction de textes analytiques, aux communications et à l'administration.



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/2
7 March 2003



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance
Nineteenth Meeting
Montreal, 31 March -1 April 2003

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN
RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL FINANCING INSTITUTIONS**

REPORT FROM THE CONSULTANT

REPORT ON
EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF SELECTED
INTERNATIONAL FUNDING INSTITUTIONS

PREPARED FOR:
THE SECRETARIAT OF MULTILATERAL FUND
FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

PREPARED BY:
FUAT ANDIC, PH.D.
CONSULTANT

MARCH 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background
2. Methodology

II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RATIONALE OF EVALUATION

III. EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Introductory Remarks
2. The World Bank
3. Global Environmental Facility
4. International Fund for Agricultural Development
5. United Nations Development Programme
6. Asian Development Bank
7. United Nations High Commission for Refugees
8. United Nations Industrial Development Organization
9. The Multilateral Fund

IV. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Some Conceptual Issues
2. The Practice

APPENDIX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. *This Report is prepared upon the decision of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4) that requested from the Secretariat to compile information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation in relevant international funding institutions.*
2. *The Report was prepared by interviewing the persons who are in charge of monitoring and evaluation in the relevant institutions and reviewing the documents that refer to procedural matters and regulations that govern the evaluation and monitoring units in these institutions. Their **modus operandi** was then compared with that of the Multilateral Fund.*
3. *The review of the literature as well as of pertinent documents shows clearly that evaluation is not an end but a means to assist the organizations to carry out their mandate, enabling them to have:*
 - *Greater accountability in the use of resources.*
 - *A clearer basis for decision-making.*
 - *Elements of judgement based on the lessons learned from the past experience in order to better guide future actions and interventions.*
4. *Evaluation is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and the degree of success of ongoing and/or completed projects and programs.*
5. *Evaluations are to be carried out objectively and independently without any interference from any level of management of the organizations, implementers and stakeholders of the projects*
6. *The weight of the evaluations is on the outcomes. In that sense they should indicate:*
 - *The relevance of the projects and programs.*
 - *The efficacy of the projects and programs.*
 - *The efficiency of the projects and programs.*
7. *The evaluation practices, the modus operandi and the internal flow of information of the evaluation units of seven international organizations were compared with those of the Multilateral Fund (MF). These institutions are World Bank (WB), Global Environmental Facility (GEF), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Asian Development Bank (ADB), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). In the comparison four points were always kept in view:*
 - *The role of the evaluation units.*
 - *The modus operandi followed.*
 - *The safeguards integrated in monitoring and evaluation systems to maintain independence and impartiality.*
 - *The responsibilities and attributes of these units.*

8. *The comparison yielded clearly and unambiguously that all evaluation offices of the international organizations examined in this Report are designed to be independent of the projects and/or implementors they are evaluating and transparent. Within the context of independence and transparency, the modus operandi shows some variations. These can be described as follows:*
- *To maintain independence, impartiality and integrity in all evaluation offices **modus operandi and the flow of information** occupy a special place. In appointments, reporting procedures and the role of the head of the organization some nuances and variations are observed.*
 - *With respect to **appointments**, in UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO the head of the organization appoints the director or officer in charge of the evaluation unit. In GEF, IFAD and WB their Board, upon the nomination of their Chief Officers, makes the appointments. In MF there is no evaluation unit as such. Evaluations are in fact a function within its Secretariat and are managed by an officer who is nominated by the chief officer of the Secretariat and appointed by UNEP.*
 - *With respect to the **reporting** procedure, in WB and IFAD the head of the evaluation unit reports directly to the Board. In UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO and GEF reporting is done directly from the head of the evaluation unit to the head of the organization. In MF the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation officer reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee and/or to the Executive Committee.*
 - *In all cases the reports are presented to the Boards as **corporate products**, even though they may be prepared by independent consultants who have no affiliation with the organization, nor may they have participated in the design and implementation of the projects/programs. Only UNDP, GEF and ADB include the names of the independent consultants in the reports. In MF the evaluation reports are submitted to the Executive Committee as corporate products.*
 - *WB and ADB organize independent evaluations, though a staff of the organization heads the evaluation missions. In all others the independent consultant heads the evaluation mission. Some organizations, such as UNDP, may attach a staff to the mission as a resource person whenever appropriate. The practice in MF is that an independent consultant may lead the evaluation mission. If the senior monitoring and evaluation officer of the Fund participates in a mission, he then heads it. Depending upon the nature of the evaluation a staff member of the Secretariat, who is well versed with the subject matter, may also accompany the mission. It is not unusual to have a staff from the implementing agencies to join the mission, as the case warrants.*
 - *Regarding the **role of the heads of the organizations**: In WB, the evaluation office transmits the reports directly to the Board; but in the Board meeting the President, who is the head of the institution, is at liberty to express his agreement/disagreement or reservations. In GEF its head reviews the reports that evaluate the GEF, but does not have the faculty to alter it. He has the duty to transmit them to the Board and, as the head of the institution being evaluated, has the right to express his opinion with respect to conclusions and recommendations. In IFAD the President again is at liberty to express his views,*

as he deems appropriate. In UNDP the Administrator reports to the Board, but reviews the reports beforehand; should a divergence of opinion emerge, every effort is done to harmonize the differences. ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO follow a very similar procedure. In MF the senior monitoring and evaluation officer presents the reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee. As the evaluation is one of the operation of the Secretariat, the evaluation comes forward as a Secretariat document, after having cleared it with the Chief Officer.

9. *One important conclusion that emerges from this comparison is that the evaluation units are indeed essentially independent and occupy a special place within their respective organizations. Their heads are appointed mostly through a different procedure than normal staff appointments. But where the evaluations concern the operation of the activities for which she/he is ultimately responsible, the head of the organization also reserves, even if the reports are submitted directly to the Boards without his interference, the right to express his opinion, his agreement or disagreement with the reports, since he is the one who is entrusted with the duty of overseeing the organizations' functioning and carrying out their mandate as incorporated into their statutes. The final responsibility rests with the Board (or with the Executive Committee in MF), accepting/rejecting and implementing any recommendation contained in these reports. In the final analysis these reports' functions are only advisory.*

SUMMARY TABLE

<i>Organization</i>	<i>TOR is prepared:</i>	<i>Appointments</i>	<i>Report to:</i>	<i>Reports</i>	<i>Role of Head</i>
<i>WB</i>	<i>By the Evaluation Unit; discussed internally</i>	<i>President nominates, Board approves</i>	<i>OED directly to the Board</i>	<i>Corporate Products</i>	<i>During the Board meeting President expresses his opinion</i>
<i>GEF</i>	<i>By the Evaluation Unit; discussed internally</i>	<i>The Council</i>	<i>To CEO of GEF; CEO to the Council</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>CEO reports to the Council</i>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>Nominated by Head, approved by Board</i>	<i>The Board</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>President expresses opinion to the Board</i>
<i>UNDP</i>	<i>Internally; discussed with pertinent bureaus</i>	<i>Staff appointment by Administrator</i>	<i>Administrator</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>Presentation to the Board</i>
<i>ADB</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>Presentation to the Board</i>
<i>UNHCR</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>High Commissioner</i>	<i>Asst. High Commissioner</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Harmonize opinion divergence; submits to ExCom</i>
<i>UNIDO</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>Director General</i>	<i>Dep. Dir. General or Dir. General</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Harmonize opinion divergence; submits to Devt. Board</i>
<i>MF</i>	<i>Internally; discussed with and cleared by CO</i>	<i>CO nominates; UNEP appoints</i>	<i>MEF Sub-Committee and/or ExCom</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Institutional supervision of evaluation process; clearing evaluation reports</i>

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The decision of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 21) reads as follows:

(b) To request the Secretariat to compile information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation (units and persons) in other relevant international financing institutions such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Bank, in particular on terms of reference, lines of reporting, and preparation and presentation of documents and recommendations to the governing bodies.

(c) To circulate this information to members of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance before the 19th Meeting.

This Report is prepared by an independent consultant in response to the above-cited decision of the Sub-Committee in accordance with the terms of reference (see Appendix) prepared by the Secretariat. It is submitted to the Secretariat of MF. The following section presents the methodology. In addition to the three funding institutions specified in the decision, and in compliance with the terms of reference, the practice of four additional institutions is also examined.

2. Methodology

The Report was prepared through four distinct steps. These are briefly as follows:

(i). Interviews were conducted with persons who are in charge of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the following institutions: GEF, IFAD, and World Bank (WB). In compliance with paragraph 3 of the terms of reference UNDP, ADB, UNIDO and UNHCR have also been added. The inclusion of UNDP is especially important since this organization has pioneered in perfecting the evaluation methodology and procedures during the past two decades. ADB is quite active as a regional bank and has developed a very reputable evaluation practice. UNHCR and UNIDO are not essentially funding agencies; rather they execute projects, but their inclusion illustrates the similarity/dissimilarity of the evaluation practices.

(ii). Documents of these institutions referring to procedural matters, chain of command, reporting and presentation of the evaluation documents to the governing bodies were reviewed. This review complemented and supplemented the information obtained from the interviews.

(iii). The M&E procedures of these organizations were compared with the operations of MF in order to enhance the usefulness of the information gathered. The similarities and differences are highlighted in Section IV.

(iv). The first draft of the Report was submitted to the MF Secretariat in order to have feedback with respect to the accuracy of information the Report contained, as well as correcting any factual errors and omissions that may have been committed with respect to MF's evaluation operations.

(v). Upon the receipt of comments from the Secretariat the Report was revised and the final version was submitted.

II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RATIONALE OF EVALUATION

Evaluation is not an end but a means to enable organizations to carry out their mandate. It is an essential management tool to enable it to respond to several demands:

- Greater accountability in the use of resources.
- A clearer basis for decision-making.
- More practical lessons drawn from experience to guide future actions and interventions.

Through the process of M&E the management is able to ascertain whether or not functions are carried out as determined by the organization's mandate. Thereby it can verify whether the projects/programs met the objectives that correspond to its *raison d'être*.

While **monitoring** is a continuous function that primarily provides the project management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project/program with early indications of progress, or the lack thereof, in the achievement of project/program objectives **evaluation** is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and/or completed projects/programs. Hence, monitoring and evaluation are two different but closely related processes. They are mutually supportive and equally important. Monitoring provides quantitative and qualitative data using selective indicators. Evaluation serves as a source of lessons that can be applied in the development of conceptual innovations to the management and furnishes information with respect to the accountability, efficiency and transparency of the organization's activities for the stakeholders.

Since an evaluation of a project/program reflects the way and modality followed by the organization to fulfill its mandate, its very first rule is that **it should be carried out objectively and independently in accordance with the terms of reference without any interference from any level of management of the organization or from the stakeholders**. This is one reason why most evaluation offices are directly attached to its highest executive authority. In more cases than not evaluations are carried out by independent evaluators whose findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented to the representative of the stakeholders. As stated above, evaluation is a tool that helps to enhance the efficiency of the management; but at the same time, and more importantly, it allows the stakeholders to judge the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects/programs carried out by the management as dictated in the organization's mandate. In other words, the stakeholders have the right and responsibility to know what exactly is happening in the execution of the projects/programs, what aspects need corrective action, and whether or not the results obtained are conducive for the organization to carry out its mandate.

This Report will not enter into the technicalities as to how evaluations are carried out. Its weight is on the comparison of the various *modus operandi* in maintaining the impartiality and independence of the evaluation reports. Impartiality and independence are understood as judgments of the evaluators not being unduly influenced by opinions

and views of the staff of the organizations, of the implementers and of stakeholders. The evaluator(s) is guided only by the terms of reference that are prepared within the organization independently from the evaluators. Care is always taken that the evaluators are professionally qualified and their judgment is trustworthy. No person or firm may carry out project/program evaluation if they were involved in the past in designing and/or implementing the project/program in question. The management informs the stakeholders of the results of the evaluation in an impartial manner. This allows them to pass a judgment on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluator(s), on the management of projects/programs, and to make suggestions for corrective measures, if need be, so that the organization can carry out its mandate efficiently and effectively in a transparent manner.

III. EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Introductory Remarks

This section presents the evaluation practices followed by a number of international organizations. The presentation is weighted towards:

- The role of the evaluation units within the respective organizations.
- The modus operandi followed.
- The flow of information.
- The safeguards integrated into the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems so that without undue influence from any quarters evaluations are carried out in accordance with their terms of reference.
- The responsibilities of these units.

2. The World Bank (WB)

The World Bank (WB) has a large evaluation office with 70 professionals. It is called Operations Evaluation Department (OED). This large office is commensurate with the size and array of the operations that WB undertakes.

A Director General heads OED; he is nominated by the Bank's President but appointed by its Board of Executive Directors. The Director General reports directly to the Board. The Board oversees OED's work through its Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE). CODE oversees the operations evaluation system of the Bank and of the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is a standing committee of the Board of Executive Directors and comprises eight members. The functions of CODE are:

- To review the work program and the reports produced by OED and the operations evaluation group of IFC and management responses to them and to identify policy issues for consideration by the Board.
- To satisfy itself that the Bank's operations evaluation and self-evaluation activities are adequate and efficient.
- To examine selected issues concerning operations evaluation and development effectiveness for review and decision making by the Board.

In other words, CODE deliberates on issues that have a bearing on relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Bank's operations, including operation policies and business processes, and monitors the implementation of Bank activities to ensure that the overall purpose of reducing poverty is being served.

The goals of the evaluations that the Bank conducts are to learn from experience to provide an objective basis for assessing the results of the Bank's work and to provide accountability in the achievement of its objectives. The evaluations improve the

undertakings of the Bank by identifying and disseminating the lessons learned from experience and by putting forward recommendations.

WB uses an objectives-based approach to evaluation. This approach has three major advantages:

- It enhances accountability by focusing attention on the extent to which objectives set out by the Bank's Board of Executive Directors have in fact been achieved;
- It promotes efficiency by relating the use of scarce resources to the accomplishment of specific outcomes.
- It allows comparisons by applying a common measurement technique across the wide array of sectors and countries for which the Bank provides financing.

The aim of OED is essentially to evaluate outcomes by considering three factors. These are:

- Relevance, i.e., the intervention's objectives in relation to the needs and institutional priorities of the countries.
- Efficacy, i.e., the extent to which the development objectives have been achieved or are expected to be achieved.
- Efficiency, i.e., the extent to which the objectives have been achieved without using more resources than necessary.

WB has developed an increasingly rigorous system of evaluation over the past 30 years and has always been sensitive to the independence of evaluations. That is to say, evaluations by OED must be independent from line management at all stages of process, including planning of work programs, formulation of terms of reference, staffing of evaluation teams, and clearance of reports.

The modus operandi and the flow of information can be summarized as follows. Certain major evaluations are undertaken in house, whereas project evaluations are carried out independently. A task manager, usually from the OED staff, is responsible to see through that the evaluations conform to OED's established norms, and heads each evaluation. Terms of references are prepared by OED staff and discussed within OED. Whenever required, the task manager selects the independent consultants. Once completed, the evaluation reports are circulated within OED and the staff of the appropriate departments for comments. All comments are not necessarily taken into consideration. The right to determine which comments should be included into the reports and what alterations ought to be done rests with OED. It is the sole judge on this matter. While they remain as internal documents the reports come out with white and yellow covers, depending upon the level of circulation. After OED's judgement the reports are issued with a gray cover; in other words, the reports are now ready to be presented as OED reports to the Board of Directors of the Bank. The Director General of OED presents the gray cover reports as corporate products. The consultants' names do not appear in the gray cover versions.

The flow of information thus is that the gray cover reports go from OED to the Bank's Board. The President is also furnished with a copy, but his comments, corrections and alterations are not sought. However, the President reserves the right to put forward his view to the Board with respect to findings, conclusions and recommendations, and their compatibility with the Bank's overall mandate. The Board may decide to disclose the reports; in which case they become public domain. Alternatively, at the request of OED's Director General, who may suggest not publishing the reports, the Board may decide not to disclose their contents; hence they remain as internal documents.

The Director General of OED presents the evaluation reports to the Board. The President of the Bank also conveys his endorsement and/or his reservations with respect to the conclusions and recommendations of the reports. It is entirely up to the Board to take the appropriate measures and issue instructions with respect to their publication and with respect to the recommendations contained in them. In other words, the final decision rests with the Board.

3. Global Environmental Facility (GEF)

GEF is a mechanism for international cooperation for the purpose of providing new and additional grant and concessional funding to achieve global environmental benefits in the areas of biological diversity, climate change, international waters, ozone layer depletion, and land degradation. UNDP, UNEP, and WB are GEF's implementing agencies. GEF emphasizes partnership with national governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and stakeholders at all levels to protect the global environment.

M&E is a shared responsibility between the GEF and its Implementing Agencies: UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank. The Implementing Agencies have the responsibility for evaluating individual projects; while the M&E unit in the GEF Secretariat is responsible for monitoring and evaluation at the overall level, the focal areas, the programs, as well as cross-cutting issues. It enables the comprehensive assessment of GEF's effectiveness and impacts. M&E adds significantly to GEF's learning and capacity development goals because it facilitates the use of the best existing scientific knowledge to monitor the environmental changes sought by the program in the GEF focal areas and it ensures the development of M&E skills GEF-wide. Hence M&E policies and procedures need to assess how the global dimensions of the focal areas are incorporated into the environmental plans and strategies at the national as well as regional levels. They take into account the features that make GEF a distinctive initiative and institution. M&E also helps the entire GEF enterprise to become progressively more cost effective by building on the lessons of both successes and failures early enough for them to make a difference. GEF views M&E as particularly vital to its effectiveness, because its projects are often innovative and experimental. GEF is also pioneering coordination among many parties, and the development of its successful operational programs requires continuous learning.

A Senior Evaluation Coordinator heads M&E and the office is rather small with only 5 professionals. It relies on independent evaluators quite often. M&E policy has four objectives:

- To monitor and evaluate results and impacts of GEF activities.
- To provide a basis for decision making on amendments and improvements of policies, strategies, program management, procedures and projects.
- To promote accountability for resources used against objectives by participating countries, partner agencies and executing agencies.
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate results and lessons learned.

Hence, the criteria that are applicable to all M&E in GEF are impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability.

The M&E practice of GEF follows the standards established by UN, the multilateral development banks, OECD, etc. The consultants are selected in a way to assure a fair and consistent assessment without being unduly influenced by other interests. The Senior Coordinator is proposed by the CEO of GEF and appointed by the GEF Council. The Senior Coordinator submits the reports to the CEO who, in turn, presents them to the Council. Work plans and annual work programs and budgets of the M&E unit are submitted to the Council for review and approval.

Each year GEF engages in an extensive process to monitor its projects and evaluate their progress. This process yields the Project Performance Reports. GEF's evaluation unit also addresses GEF-wide performance by conducting thematic reviews and by developing program level indicators. Independent evaluators usually carry out the thematic reviews. The M&E practice is a shared responsibility between the GEF Secretariat and its implementing agencies, such as UNDP, UNEP and WB. These agencies have the responsibility for evaluating individual projects. The M&E unit on the other hand is responsible for monitoring and evaluating, at the overall level, the focus areas, the programs, as well as the cross cutting issues.

The M&E unit carries out evaluations with respect to GEF's overall performance, results and impact. An independent evaluation of the overall performance of GEF is conducted every 4 years or as requested by the GEF Council. The main purpose of this quadrennial evaluation is the replenishment of GEF's funds. This independent evaluation assesses results and impacts of GEF programs; the progress made towards its objectives; the extent to which it has effectively implemented Convention guidance, its operational principles and other procedures; and the degree to which recommendations from previous overall performance studies have been followed up. The evaluations are carried out by independent teams selected by the Senior Coordinator of the M&E unit in accordance with the terms of reference criteria approved by the GEF Council and in consultation with GEF's chief executive officer.

The modus operandi and the flow of information can be summarized as follows. The Senior Coordinator of M&E, who is appointed by the GEF Council, presents a work plan

to the Council. The Council instructs the CEO of GEF to start the evaluations as agreed, and the M&E unit prepares the terms of reference, engages consultants whenever needed, and maintains the quality control of the ensuing reports. The unit presents the reports to the CEO, who, in turn, presents them to the Council.¹ Customarily, any divergence of opinion is reconciled within GEF prior to the submission of the reports to the Council. Should any irreconcilable divergence of opinion occur, that of the Senior Coordinator of the M&E unit prevails. However, the CEO of the organization is in complete liberty to express his opinion to the Council. The Council is the recipient of practically all the reports generated within the M&E unit.

This modus operandi clearly indicates that the CEO of GEF is ultimately responsible to the Council. In case of any disagreement between the CEO and M&E unit – which has never occurred so far in the life of GEF – the CEO is at liberty to decide as to which recommendations are to be proposed to the Council. The existing set-up is in fact viewed as not providing the M&E unit a complete independence from the organizational set-up of GEF.

4. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IFAD's Office of Evaluation and Studies is concerned with the evaluation of the Fund's operations and policies. It also seeks to promote learning between IFAD and its partners and to assess the impact of the Fund's activities.

The office has 6 professionals; its head is nominated by the Fund President and appointed by the Executive Board that decides and approves the program and the budget of the office. A sub-committee of the Board does this. The office makes extensive use of independent consultants and prepares their terms of reference. Their findings, conclusions and recommendations are discussed thoroughly with the evaluation officer(s).

Until December 2002 the head of the office reported directly to IFAD's President. Since then the reporting procedure has been changed by the Board so that the head of the office now reports directly to the Board.

The new evaluation process that came into being fairly recently places heavy emphasis on thematic and country program evaluations. Moreover, the office of evaluation makes use of Core Learning Partnerships, which is composed of core partners that steer the evaluation process throughout its cycle. The Partnership is an informal and flexible platform open to deliberations and learning among key stakeholders and it may have one

¹ The Council in its October 14-15, 2002, meeting decided (GEF/C.20/7) to invite the M&E unit of GEF to prepare revised terms of reference. The revision entails that the Coordinator would report directly to the Council rather than to the CEO. The revised terms of reference have been prepared and will be submitted to the Council for approval at its meeting in May 2003. Should they be approved, the M&E unit will become independent and transmit the reports directly to the Council. The CEO will be at liberty to express his opinion about the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

or all the mandates to develop an evaluation action plan; design the stakeholder participation approach; discuss the progress of the evaluation efforts; and discuss findings, conclusions and recommendations. Although the office team is responsible for the integrity of the final outcome of the evaluation analysis, by engaging the Core Learning Partnerships in guiding the learning process it intends to encourage the commitment of the evaluation partners to the final outcome of the evaluation process.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The head of the evaluation office directly reports to the Board. However, the evaluation studies are also discussed with the higher management and the President in order to assure that they do not contain any recommendations that would be contrary to the overall mandate of the Fund. The President does not have the faculty to alter the findings, conclusions and recommendations, since the impartiality of the reports must be upheld.

The reports are submitted to the Board as products of the Office of Evaluation and Studies. They do not carry the names of the independent evaluators (whenever they are used), and are products of the institution. However, the management/President reserves the right to respond to the evaluation in the meeting of the Board, should an irreconcilable divergence of opinion arise between the office and upper management.

5. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The Evaluation Office (EO) of UNDP is not a very large one when compared with its overall activities. It has 10 professionals who are supported with a large number of independent consultants on a need basis. Since its inception EO was in charge of all project and program evaluations. Recently, decentralization took place in such a way that outcome/project evaluations have become the responsibility of the Country Offices. EO now carries out thematic global evaluations, global country evaluations, policy and strategy evaluations, and overall country evaluations. Evaluation programs are usually initiated by EO and approved by the Executive Board. The Board may also instruct the Administrator to have EO to undertake certain evaluations that may not be in the original work program. EO publishes the majority of such evaluations that become public domain after their approval by the Board.

The Administrator appoints the head of EO.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The Administrator presents all the evaluations prepared in EO to the Board. In this function the head of EO always accompanies him. In other words, the head of EO is directly responsible to the Administrator, but the presentations are carried out together with the Administrator. When the evaluations are completed, the reports are circulated within the organization for comments. These are taken into consideration, but care is taken not to tarnish the independence of the reports. Should the Administrator disagree with some of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the reports, he is at full liberty to put forth his views to the Board, but does not have the faculty to alter the reports. The reports are

always corporate products and the independent consultants' names are mentioned in their preface when they finally become available for public circulation.

Among all the institutions that have been discussed so far and will be discussed below UNDP perhaps is the only one where the head of EO is not directly responsible to the governing board of the organization. However, the Administrator is a convenient conduit to transmit EO's reports to the Board and by no means has a veto power. On the other hand, the role of the Administrator before the Board is very clear. He certainly transmits the reports of EO, without altering them on his own accord, but he also has the obligation to put forward his views before the Board, if any conclusions or recommendations appear to him to be conflicting with the mandate of UNDP.

6. Asian Development Bank (ADB)

The evaluation functions in ADB are entrusted to the Operations Evaluation Department (OED). The President of the Bank appoints its Director General. He is directly responsible to the President who approves OED's budget according to the work plan it prepares. OED has 23 professional staff. The Bank views evaluations as an instrument to help decision makers responsible for planning, designing and implementing projects and programs to understand whether resources are well spent and whether the planned outcomes have been achieved through established procedures. Three functions are assigned to OED.

- Distill lessons learned for future operations and disseminate them internally and externally.
- Ensure accountability for use of resources to improve development effectiveness.
- Follow-up on evaluation recommendations to sustain project benefits.

OED evaluates both loan and technical assistance projects individually to produce project performance reports. To understand thematic or systemic issues, groups of projects are also evaluated to assess impact assistance or the performance of particular projects and programs against selected ADB policies. While completion reports are prepared for all projects, only about 40% of completed projects are evaluated. OED undertakes independent evaluation of the completed projects about three years after their completion, including evaluation of early project operations. In the evaluation of the completed projects an OED evaluation specialist leads the work and is assisted by independent consultants who are sector specialists, financial analysts or economists.

The draft evaluation reports prepared by the OED specialists and consultant(s) are reviewed first of all within OED. They are then circulated to other departments in ADB, as well as to the government and executing agencies, for comments. The final reports, which incorporate these comments, are submitted to the President of the Bank for his review. Once approved by the President, the reports are circulated among the Board of Directors and made available to the public.

In brief, *the modus operandi and the flow of information* are as follows. In principle the demand for evaluation comes from the Operations Department of the Bank, i.e.

evaluations are usually initiated at users' request. The evaluation missions are always headed by a staff of OED and follow the terms of reference that are also prepared in OED. The completed reports are discussed internally and revised on the basis of comments received. Whenever deemed appropriate, the reports may go to the Development Effectiveness Committee, which is a sub-committee of the Board and has the mandate of reviewing selected reports and also overseeing the work of OED. Once cleared internally, the reports are presented to the President who, in turn, may make additional suggestions for revision. Once he accepts them, the President presents the reports to the Board. Should a substantial disagreement arise between OED and the President, OED usually further reviews the reports and incorporates into them the views and the comments of the President. Although the reports are presented to the President as corporate products, they mention the names of the evaluation officer who headed the mission and of the consultants.

As can be surmised, the overall procedure of ADB is very similar to that of WB. The outstanding difference is that in the final analysis it is the President of ADB who is responsible for the content of the reports in front of the Board.

7. United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR)

UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU) is in charge of the systematic examination and assessment of the organization's policies, programs, projects and practices. EPAU also promotes research on issues related to the work of the organization and encourages an active exchange of ideas and information between humanitarian practitioners, policy makers and the research community. These activities are undertaken with the purpose of strengthening the organization's effectiveness, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill its mandate on behalf of refugees and other displaced people.

Although an executing agency, UNHCR disburses about 60% of its funds through NGOs; in that sense it is both an implementing and funding agency. EPAU has come to existence in September 1999 with the intention of expanding the quantity and quality of the evaluation activities. It is mandated to contribute towards UNHCR's capacity for organizational learning, performance review and public accountability. EPAU draws upon the description provided in the OECD/DOC evaluation principles that define evaluation as the analysis and assessment, as systematic as possible and as objective as possible, although the organization's policies, programs, practices, partnerships and procedures focus on their planning, design, implementation and impact.

EPAU is a relatively small unit. It has 4 international officers and makes wide use of individual consultants. Its head is appointed by the Assistant High Commissioner and reports to this Commissioner who is located between EPAU and the Executive Committee of UNHCR.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The evaluations can be initiated through a variety of means. Operational units or bureaus or senior management

or Executive Committee members can request that they be undertaken. Once prepared, the reports go through the process of the scrutiny described above and, upon the agreement of the Assistant High Commissioner, are submitted to the Executive Committee. Any divergence of opinion that arises between the evaluation office and upper management is harmonized in house prior to the reports' submission to the Executive Committee. If the divergence of opinion is irreconcilable, the reports remain as internal documents and do not become public domain.

8. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

UNIDO is known as a specialized agency within the UN system. Evaluations provide analytical and objective feedback for it and its stakeholders on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustained impact of UNIDO projects and programs for the purpose of improving the quality of its current and future services.

The Evaluation Office (EO) has developed policies, procedures and methodologies for all evaluation work within UNIDO and elaborated and improved the related instruments. It also develops, manages and monitors the internal (self-evaluation) and external evaluations (independent in-depth) system of technical cooperation programs and projects. Together with the relevant organizational units it also plans and coordinates the involvement of UNIDO in independent in-depth evaluations of technical cooperation programs and projects. It cooperates with UN organizations as well as bilateral cooperation agencies in harmonizing and exchanging information on evaluation policies, procedures and practices.

The Director General of UNIDO appoints the head of EO. The Office has 7 in-house professional staff. It also makes extensive use of independent consultants.

The *modus operandi and flow of information* are as follows. EO prepares a yearly work plan. Evaluations are carried out according to this plan either by staff or by independent consultants or by a combination of the two according to needs. EO prepares the terms of reference. The completed reports are first discussed within EO. They then are reviewed by managing director(s). If the case warrants it, the managing director(s) submits the reports to the Director General. It is at the discretion of the Director General to submit the reports to the Industrial Development Board, unless the Board had requested them specifically. If any divergence of opinion arises with respect to the reports' findings, conclusions and recommendations prior to their submission to the Industrial Development Board, EO as well as the managing directors and the Director General strive to harmonize the divergence. In other words, the reports are corporate products and the Director General in the final analysis is the person who is responsible for their content. There is no established procedure for the case where irreconcilable opinions emerge between the Director General and the managing directors/EO. One would assume that since it is at the Director General's discretion to decide which reports will be presented to the Board, he may refrain to submit them to the Board. However, if submission is mandatory, i.e. if the Board has specifically requested the evaluations, every effort is made to harmonize the views of the Director General with the content of

the reports. No precedent exists in this respect; hence one would assume that the Director General has the liberty to express his opinions and objections, if any, before the Board.

9. The Multilateral Fund (MF)

The Multilateral Fund is the main part of the Financial Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol, and is administered under UN financial rules governing Trust Funds. In contrast to other organizations examined in this Report the Fund has a finite life in the sense that it will cease to exist after it completes its mandate. Hence, the evaluations the Fund conducts acquire additional dimension in guiding it to accomplish its mandate as free from errors as possible.

A Chief Officer manages the MF Secretariat under the overall guidance of the Executive Committee (ExCom). The Committee's decision 22/19(h) reads as follows: "That the modest strengthening of the Secretariat approved by the Executive Committee decision 21/36 should be sufficient **to enable the Secretariat**² to perform monitoring and evaluation on a continuous basis, through the development of a monitoring and evaluation system and data base, the coordination, supervision and carrying out of monitoring and evaluation studies and assignments and the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation post within the Secretariat whose incumbent would report directly to the Sub-Committee and/or the Executive Committee and be responsible for the coordination of all monitoring and evaluation activities." An officer whose title is Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) holds this post and coordinates all such activities. His duties, inter alia, include managing evaluation studies, preparation of terms of references for ExCom approval, selecting evaluators and overseeing the implementation of evaluations. These are specified in the job description of the post.

The evaluations are conducted to provide information on the following:

- Overall Fund performance in reducing ODS according to established targets.
- The effectiveness of investment projects in particular sectors and of non-investment projects.
- To assess the strength and limitations of various types of projects.
- The major causes of observed failures to reach targets.
- Possible actions that might improve the Fund's performance.

Evaluations can be mid-term, i.e., evaluation of a specific project done any time during the life of the project. Or they can be ex-post evaluations, i.e., evaluation of one or more project at some point after project completion.

Within this time frame in mind three major categories of evaluations are done. These are:

- Evaluation of a single investment project.
- Evaluation of sectoral projects or of thematic projects within a sector.
- Evaluation of non-investment projects.

² Emphasis is mine.

In order to obtain independent views, teams of consultants who are not directly linked to the preparation and/or implementation of projects and activities conduct the evaluations. SMEO has the following obligations within the Secretariat:

- To manage the evaluation process.
- To prepare the annual M&E work plan and its budget to be submitted to ExCom.
- To provide evaluation expertise and participate in or head field missions whenever necessary.
- To review the draft evaluation reports prepared by independent consultants to ensure that they meet the requirements of the terms of reference and have adequate technical quality.

The *modus operandi of the evaluation, the chain of command and the flow of information* are as follows. ExCom approves the annual M&E work program and budget and requests the Secretariat to implement it. The SMEO within the Secretariat has the responsibility to manage the implementation of the evaluation program as approved by ExCom. He prepares the terms of reference, the budget and the schedule of the evaluations. In doing so he interacts with the staff of the Secretariat. The Chief Officer also has the obligation to oversee financial and administrative matters, the contracting of consultants, and reviewing the terms of reference. The consultant(s) carries out the field work (for which the Secretariat staff may be attached to the mission as resource person who are well versed in technical matters and the operations of the Fund) and presents his report to the SMEO. In the first instance SMEO interacts with the consultant(s) and reviews the reports. The consultants' names do not appear in the reports. The pertinent Secretariat staff then review them for technical accuracy. The Secretariat submits the document to the Executive Committee after having been cleared by the Chief Officer. The documents are then presented by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to the meeting of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance. The Sub-Committee discusses the reports and makes its recommendations to the Executive Committee. Since the reports are submitted as Secretariat documents, the overall responsibility on accuracy, judgment and implementability of their recommendations become the responsibility of the Secretariat.

IV. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Some Conceptual Tenets

The preceding section described the modus operandi of various evaluation units in a number of UN organizations and international funding agencies. Their mandates are quite similar. They provide information and feedback to the management and to the governing bodies, i.e., the decision makers in the organizations, partner organizations and stakeholders with respect to use of resources, efficiency, effectiveness, and dissemination of information about projects and programs.

All evaluation offices are designed to carry out impartial, transparent and accountable work. That is to say, evaluations and findings, conclusions and recommendations they generate in the reports prepared by them are not subject to undue control or interference from the management of the organizations. They are transparent in the sense that in more cases than not findings and recommendations resulting from the evaluations are placed in the public domain. All organizations, without exception, hold the independent evaluation function as an essential element to their credibility and effectiveness. All organizations uphold the principles, sometimes known as three (Is): integrity, impartiality and independence. It appears that the independence of the evaluation process depends not simply on the independence of the evaluator or of the evaluation unit, but on a range of complementary functions and responsibilities.

- The most important component of *independence* is in the selection of those who will undertake the evaluation mission. Within the scope of the terms of reference the evaluation mission has the obligation and competence to reach the conclusions and recommendations that it deems appropriate, and back up such conclusions and recommendations with facts, figures, and logic. The evaluation team is responsible to make a persuasive case of the conclusions and recommendations put forward.
- The *management and coordination* of an evaluation is the responsibility of the organization's evaluation unit or officer. They are given professional latitude in designing and managing the evaluations. They set the terms of reference – usually in consultation with other bureaus or departments of the organization if warranted – establishing what issues are to be assessed, what questions are to be answered and what type of recommendations are expected to ensue. They also select the evaluators according to their technical specialties, establish the budget and the time allocated to the evaluations. They review the drafts of the evaluation reports and assess their concordance to their terms of reference.
- *Actionable recommendations* of an evaluation are directed to the participating units of the organization as appropriate. Although the evaluation process is managed and guided by an evaluation unit, or officer, or management team, the recommendations are directed to the organization as a whole. Therefore, it is the CEO (Chief, Administrator, President, etc.) or his designee who responds for and

represents the organization and not necessarily the evaluation management unit. In many instances there may be some recommendations directed to different entities – governments, implementing agencies, etc. Each organization responds to the recommendations directed towards its actions and policies as it sees fit.

- An independent evaluation is an *advisory function*. The organization may agree or not with the recommendations, and the decision making authority is not required to act on them in exactly the manner in which they are made. The organization's executive management, or in the case of corporate level its governing board, makes the subsequent decisions, taking into account the evaluators' recommendations together with other elements of institutional experience, policies, budgetary constraints, priorities and the overall mandate of the organization.

All evaluation units of the organizations described in this Report adhere to the conceptual tenets of independence, integrity and impartiality of the evaluation process. However, in practice their modus operandi and the flow of information show certain variations. It is hastened to add that these variations do not alter drastically the stand of independence, but they are more like variations on the same theme. They are explained below and compared with the modus operandi of MF.

2. The Practice

In all the organizations reviewed in this Report, evaluation offices, their modus operandi and the flow of information occupy a special place. This, as mentioned several times, is to maintain their independence, impartiality and integrity. The intention is the same for all; however, in appointments, reporting procedures and the role of the heads of the organizations some nuances and variations exist.

With respect to *appointments*, in UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO the CEO of the organization is responsible of appointing the head of the evaluation unit. In GEF, IFAD and WB their Board, upon the nomination by their CEO, makes the appointments. In MF the executive director of UNEP, upon the nomination by the Chief Officer, appoints the evaluation officer.

In all the organizations an office that is directly attached to the office of the CEO carries out M&E. In MF no such separate evaluation unit exists. The evaluations are the responsibility of one officer and monitoring of another.

With respect to the *reporting* procedure, in WB and IFAD the head of the evaluation unit reports directly to the Board. In UNDP, UNIDO, UNHCR, ADB and GEF the flow of information is directly from the head of the evaluation unit to the CEO of the organization. The Secretariat of MF, not having a separate evaluation unit, the SMEO officer is the one who presents the reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Subcommittee of ExCom.

In all cases the reports presented to the Boards are *corporate products*, even though they may be the work of consultants. In the case of UNDP, GEF and ADB the names of the consultants are listed. The reports of the Secretariat of MF are submitted to the ExCom also as a corporate product without the name(s) of the consultant(s).

WB and ADB organize independent evaluations, though a staff of the organization heads the evaluation missions. In all others an independent consultant heads the evaluation mission. In MF the SMEO heads the evaluation mission if he participates. Otherwise an independent consultant heads the team. A senior staff may be also be attached to the mission as a resource person if warranted.

The *role of the CEO of the organization* in the presentation of the reports to the Boards varies greatly. In WB, since the reports are transmitted from the evaluation office directly to the Board, only in the Board meeting the President is at liberty to express his agreement/disagreement or reservations. The practice in GEF is that its head reviews the reports, but does not have the faculty to alter them. He has the duty to transmit them to the Board and the right to express his opinion with respect to conclusions and recommendations. In IFAD the President again is at liberty to express his views, as he deems appropriate. The Administrator of UNDP, who reports to the Board, reviews the reports beforehand. Should a divergence of opinion emerge, every effort is done to harmonize the differences. ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO follow a very similar procedure. In the MF Secretariat it is the SMEO who presents the report to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Subcommittee of ExCom.

Before this section is closed it is noteworthy to point out an important dissimilarity in the evaluation procedure between the MF Secretariat and other funding organizations examined in this Report. Although the *modus operandi* of MF in essence is similar to that of the other organizations, one dissimilarity stands out. For example, WB, ADB, and UNDP undertake evaluations to examine directly their own projects, policies and programs,³ whereas MF evaluates exclusively the work of the agencies that are contracted by the Secretariat for implementation of its projects. In that sense there is a great deal of similarity in the overall evaluation concept of the MF Secretariat and of GEF.

One single conclusion emerges from this comparison. In whichever organization they exist, the evaluation units occupy a special place. Their heads are appointed mostly through a different procedure than normal staff appointments. The head of the organization reserves, even if the reports are submitted directly to the Boards without his

³ These organizations have dozens of publications that are the results of the evaluations undertaken by them to assess their own programs. See, for example, The World Bank, *The World Bank's Approach to Global Programs: An Independent Evaluation*, Washington, DC, 2002; The World Bank, *OED Review of the Bank's Performance on the Environment*, Washington, DC 2001; Asian Development Bank, *The Impact of Rural Roads on Poverty Reduction*, Manila, 2001; Asian Development Bank, *Sustainability of Policy Reforms through Advisory Technical Assistance*, Manila 2001; Asian Development Bank, *Effectiveness of ADB Assistance in Bangladesh, Kyrgyz Republic and Laos*, Manila 1999; UNDP/EO, *National Execution: Promise and Challenges*, New York, 1995; and UNDP/EO, *Evaluation of Direct Execution*, New York, 2001;

interference, the right to express his opinion, his agreement/disagreement with the reports, since he is entrusted with the duty of overseeing the organization's functioning and carrying out its mandate as incorporated into its statutes. The final responsibility rests with the Board accepting/rejecting and implementing any of the recommendations contained in these reports. It cannot be overemphasized that in the final analysis these reports' functions are only advisory.

APPENDIX I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Compilation of information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation from the following financial institutions:
 - Global Environmental facility (GEF)
 - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
 - World Bank Group (WB)
 - Other international institutions as may be relevant

2. The information should focus on:
 - Terms of reference of the evaluation units/functions as appropriate;
 - Management structure and modus operandi of the evaluation units/functions of these institutions including lines of reporting, responsibility of preparation and presentation of documents and recommendations to the governing bodies.

3. In order to enhance the usefulness of the information indicated above the consultant will compare the procedures followed by the institutions named above with those of the Multilateral Fund.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The consultant wishes to acknowledge gratefully the assistance extended to him by Jarle Harstad (GEF), Patrick Grasso (WB), Luigiani Lavizzari and Ashwani Muttoo (IFAD), Khloid Malik and Nurul Alam (UNDP), Caroline Heider (ADB), Hans Heep (UNIDO) and Dominik Bartsch (UNHCR). They all gave their valuable time and discussed freely the pertinent aspects of evaluation and monitoring in their respective organizations.

Dr. Omar El-Arini of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat discussed personally with the consultant the terms of reference of the study.

Heartfelt thanks to all of them.