

Decisions relevant to Monitoring and Evaluation at 95th Executive Committee Meeting (extracts from Final Report of the Meeting [UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94*](#)

DECISION	AGENDA ITEM	RELATED DOCUMENTS
Decision 95/8	Evaluation 6(b) Final report on the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10
Decision 95/9	Evaluation 6(c) Desk study for the evaluation of the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/11
Decision 95/10	Evaluation 6(d) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/12
Decision 95/11	Evaluation 6(e) Annual report on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2024 and the updated work programme for 2025	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/13/Rev.1*
Decision 95/24	Programme implementation 7(c) 2024 consolidated project completion report (part II)	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/22
Decision 95/91	Item 12 Mapping of reporting requirements and the streamlining of reporting on progress across the spectrum of reports (decision 93/1(b))	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/91

AGENDA ITEM 6: EVALUATION

(b) Final report on the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund

44. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10.

45. Several members said that the report of the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund would provide a sound basis for the next stages of the process, including the development of a road map to strengthen the evaluation function and the articulation of a Multilateral Fund evaluation policy. The structure, organization, frankness and clear conclusions of the report were praised. There was recognition of the need to strengthen the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, as pointed out by the 2019 report of the Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network.

46. Certain recommendations received particular attention. First, the restructuring of the position currently termed the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer was widely discussed. There was agreement that monitoring should be removed from that person's responsibilities, reframing the position as Senior Evaluation Officer in charge of the evaluation unit. That would assist in assuring the independence of the evaluation function, helping to ensure its credibility and impartiality. Second, development of an evaluation policy would strengthen evaluation as a tool for analysing performance and would enable continuous learning and improvement. Third, the role of the implementing agencies under the new structure would need clarification. Enhanced cooperation with the implementing agencies would assist in facilitating evaluation without overburdening the Multilateral Fund. Fourth, a tracking system was needed to monitor implementation of the recommendations; focus should be maintained on what actions added greatest value to the work of the Multilateral Fund and were reflective of its core mandate.

47. Regarding the project completion report (PCR) element, one member expressed support for retention of that element as part of the evaluation function, while making it more user-friendly. Another member said that placing the PCR element in the project cycle would allow the proposed Senior Evaluation Officer to focus on evaluation activities, liberating additional time and resources for that function.

48. One member, while stating that evaluation was one of the key functions under the framework of the Multilateral Fund and acknowledging the value of periodic review as part of the process of improvement, said that a cautious approach should be adopted to making structural changes at a time when many Article 5 countries were preparing and implementing their KIPs, including addressing new elements such as energy efficiency and waste disposal. In that regard, additional elements, such as the use of the evaluation guidelines

as a tool for raising awareness and encouraging engagement of diverse stakeholders and diversification of the focus of evaluation to include assessment of social and economic impacts, might place an unnecessary additional burden on countries as well as bilateral and implementing agencies.

49. Several suggestions were made regarding matters that should be included in reporting on evaluation to the Executive Committee at its 96th meeting. Those included challenges faced and lessons learned by countries in project implementation; staff requirements for the evaluation function; budgetary implications of the proposed changes; the modalities related to the engagement of key stakeholders in the work process of evaluation, including through country visits; development of an evaluation policy commensurate with the organizational scale of the Multilateral Fund; and ensuring that the evaluation policy remained a tool to support the work of the Multilateral Fund in assisting Article 5 countries to meet their obligations under the Montreal Protocol.

50. In response to a query about the focus, in the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer's recommendation, on the first recommendation of the report, namely preparation of an evaluation policy, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer said that the first recommendation was directly under her remit, whereas the proposed actions on the other six recommendations of the report were dependent on guidance from the Executive Committee. Responding to queries about inclusion, under the recommendation to reappraise the Multilateral Fund evaluation framework, of more general issues, such as gender, human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer commented that those considerations were related to the norms and standards for evaluation developed by the United Nations Evaluation Group for application throughout the United Nations system. The external assessment had found a perception of distance from end beneficiaries, and it was important to raise awareness of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, including through site visits and greater country representation. The degree of visibility of those elements in the evaluation framework of the Multilateral Fund was a matter for discussion by the Executive Committee.

51. The Executive Committee agreed to continue discussion of the matter in an informal group.

52. Subsequently, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To take note of the final report on the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10;
- (b) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare a potential management response to the assessment referred to in subparagraph (a) above, including an evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund, for consideration at the 96th meeting, taking into consideration the discussion and suggestions made by members of the Executive Committee at the 95th meeting and the elements for a draft outline of such a policy contained in annex III to the present report, and the recommendations listed in paragraphs 22 to 31 of that final report referred to in subparagraph (a) above; and
- (c) To invite Executive Committee members to provide submissions to the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer on their views on the assessment referred to in subparagraph (a) above by 28 February 2025 to inform the potential management response referred to in subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision 95/8)

(c) Desk study for the evaluation of the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme

53. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/11.

54. Several members noted the importance of the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), which, since its inauguration, had been pivotal in assisting Article 5 countries to meet their obligations under the Montreal Protocol. The role of the CAP had become more significant during the HFC phase-down, particularly considering the associated new elements.

55. Regarding the desk study, several members expressed support for its findings, although one member stated that the terms of reference of the study had possibly been too ambitious. While the report was well structured and organized, the function of such a study was to review the available documentation in order to develop preliminary findings that could inform the more comprehensive evaluation of the CAP that was envisaged as the next step. The desk study could not assess more elaborate dimensions, such as the impact and effectiveness of the CAP, which should be covered in the second phase of the evaluation.

56. One member said that the present document suggested that the evaluation could develop the performance indicators of the CAP. Nevertheless, while the evaluation could provide insights and ideas for the revision of the performance indicators, that revision should be addressed separately from the evaluation. The member also said that there was a need for clarification of the methodology to be followed in preparing the second phase of the evaluation, focusing on the assessment of the CAP as a global programme, which would not necessarily require field missions.

57. Another member noted the important role of the CAP in supporting Article 5 countries in meeting their obligations under the Protocol and suggested that the second phase of the evaluation could focus on the following activities of the CAP: reorientation of the work of the regional networks with a focus on in-depth understanding of key policies and their discussion at Montreal Protocol meetings; the highlighting of supply chain challenges in project implementation; the exchange of experience related to enforcement measures, including with regard to illegal trade and how related changes had been addressed by countries; assistance to countries in preparing their data submissions; the development and sharing of detailed case studies covering successful implementation of sectoral ODS phase-out that could serve as guidance for countries in implementation of HCFC phase-out projects; development of standardized project implementation guidance for conversion that should assist national ozone units (NOUs) in ensuring effective project implementation; organization of meetings of the regional networks to enable in-depth timely discussion of the decisions of the Executive Committee and their implications for countries; and development of a global outreach programme for LVC countries to raise awareness of technologies with low global-warming potential (GWP).

58. It was also noted that, while the CAP continued to function under UNEP, its role should be independent from UNEP as an implementing agency under the framework of the Multilateral Fund, especially as it related to the unique clearing-house function of UNEP. The focus of the CAP function should be to help Article 5 countries strengthen mechanisms and frameworks in their own countries, not only to meet compliance obligations during the HFC phase-down, but also to sustain that HFC phase-down.

59. Another member suggested items that could be covered by the terms of reference of the evaluation, including support to Article 5 countries in implementing projects related to energy efficiency, the provision of more analysis of barriers and challenges affecting implementation and the consideration of the concerns reported by Article 5 countries to the Thirty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on those issues. That could be achieved through a focus on more systemic issues and interviews with NOUs to help the Executive Committee to understand and lessen those constraints.

60. The Executive Committee agreed that interested parties would continue discussion of the matter in an informal group.

61. Subsequently, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the desk study for the evaluation of the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/11;

- (b) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to present updated terms of reference for an in-depth comprehensive evaluation of the CAP at the 97th meeting, taking into account:
 - (i) The reports to be submitted by the OzonAction programme and the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to the 96th and 97th meetings, respectively, pursuant to decision 92/5(e) and 92/5(f), and the related discussions and decisions, where applicable;
 - (ii) The suggestions made by members of the Executive Committee at the 95th meeting during the discussion of the document mentioned in subparagraph (a) above; and
 - (iii) That the evaluation could provide insights for further revision of the CAP performance indicators.

(Decision 95/9)

(d) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects

62. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/12.

63. In the ensuing discussion, several members offered proposals of matters that could be included in the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects and in the second-phase evaluation that would undertake a more in-depth analysis of the main challenges arising during the implementation of projects. The evaluation should be framed by considering the life-cycle management of refrigerants. Issues deemed to be of importance included the availability of infrastructure for testing; modalities for handling contamination; the technical problems associated with recycling, reuse and repair; the storage of reclaimed refrigerants; the impact of changes in the price of refrigerants; and the respective roles and obligations of stakeholders. Wider contextual issues included the policy framework and related incentives; technologies and market conditions; the regulatory framework present in countries; what business models had proved successful; the geographical and other barriers that had hindered implementation; the starting points of the countries at the time of commencing project implementation; and the factors that had been found to encourage long-term sustainability.

64. With regard to field visits for the evaluation, care should be taken to ensure geographical balance and the representation of LVC countries. Another issue that merited consideration was evaluation of the success of projects compared to their starting points, which could differ widely by country or regional context, taking into account the existing situation in terms of laws, policies, market and businesses involved in recovery, the recovery, recycling and reclamation networks in place and the presence of reclamation centres.

65. One member said that, as in the case of the evaluation of the UNEP CAP, care needed to be taken to ensure that the proposed tasks and actions were commensurate with the purposes of the desk study and full evaluation. The role of the desk study was to gather basic information on recovery, recycling and reclamation projects that could then inform the more comprehensive second-phase evaluation, including field visits. It was important to recall that the purpose of reclamation projects was to help countries comply with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol, and a key part of the evaluation should therefore be an assessment of how effective projects had been in reusing recovered refrigerants and reducing the use of new refrigerants through recycling and recovery. He also queried whether the planned funding of US \$50,000 would be sufficient to undertake the two phases of the evaluation. There was a need to provide an estimate and a forecast for each evaluation activity that would be presented at the 97th meeting for the biennial work programme for 2026–2027.

66. One member questioned whether the proposed evaluation was needed at the present time, taking into consideration the number of previous evaluations, what added value they had achieved and the number of present projects under the Kigali Amendment that contained a recovery, recycling and reclamation component that could be assessed. Another member said that while, previous evaluations had considered aspects of recovery, recycling and reclamation, the proposed evaluation would be the first stand-alone evaluation of all three elements since the 31st meeting. The inclusion in many KIPs of elements of recovery, recycling and reclamation indicated the value that could be added by an assessment of activities related to those components.

67. Responding to the question of the adequacy of the proposed budget of US \$50,000, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer said that it would become clearer whether additional funding would be needed upon conclusion of the desk study and the development of terms of reference for the second phase of the evaluation. She also recalled that the present thematic evaluation had been included in the monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2024 and 2025 approved at the 93rd meeting, after a consultative process.

68. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of recovery, recycling and reclamation projects contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/12; and
- (b) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, when conducting the evaluation of recovery, recycling and reclamation projects, to take into consideration the comments on the matter made by Executive Committee members at the 95th meeting.

(Decision 95/10)

(e) Annual report on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2024 and the updated work programme for 2025

69. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/13.

70. Members had a number of comments on the revised budget for 2025 as presented in table 2 of the document. One asked how the need for the US \$17,250 rephased for potential travel for consultancy services had been determined and suggested that, for the sake of clarity, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer allocate the funds to one of the four evaluation activities rather than simply budgeting an amount to be allocated as needed. He also suggested that the US \$25,000 budget for the evaluation of the UNEP CAP would be more appropriate in the budget for the 2026–2027 biennium, as the terms of reference for that evaluation would be considered by the Committee only at its 97th meeting, with work likely to begin only in 2026. For the remaining components of the budget, he acknowledged that the amounts budgeted would likely be needed in 2025. Nevertheless, recalling that in previous years an estimate of the full cost of each evaluation had been provided along with the amount needed in a given year, thus introducing a certain discipline into the budgetary aspect of the work plan, he requested that, in the 2026–2027 budget to be presented at the 97th meeting, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer include her best estimate of the full cost of each evaluation activity across multiple years.

71. Another member requested that broader development benefits be assessed during evaluations, such as, in the context of the evaluation of HPMPs, their contribution to policy development as well as training, capacity-building and certification schemes in refrigeration servicing. She explained that the broader assessment would be important for donor countries, whose development budgets were increasingly subject to scrutiny in terms of their impact.

72. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation generally concurred with the comments but requested the Committee's guidance on the needed adjustments to the budget. It was agreed that she would consult with the interested members in the margins of the meeting.

73. Following the informal consultations, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer reported that the document had been revised and re-issued as document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/13/Rev.1. The budget for 2025 had been revised to reflect a full refund of the 2024 unspent funding as well as the deduction of the planned allocation for the second phase of the CAP evaluation, which would now take place in 2026.

74. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the annual report on the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2024, including information reported pursuant to decision 92/6(d) on the evaluation of enabling activities for HFC phase-down, and the updated work programme for 2025, contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/13/Rev.1;
- (b) To note that the consolidated project completion report would be presented on an annual basis, starting from the first meeting in 2025;
- (c) To note the return of the provisional remaining balance of US \$35,849 from the 2024 approved budget to the Multilateral Fund; and
- (d) To approve the revised monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2025 contained in annex IV to the present report, noting that the revised budget for 2025 amounted to US \$150,000.

(Decision 95/11)

AGENDA ITEM 7: PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

(c) 2024 consolidated project completion report

119. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/22.

120. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the 2024 consolidated project completion report (PCR) (part II) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/22;
- (b) To request:
 - (i) Bilateral and implementing agencies to submit to the 96th meeting of the Executive Committee, outstanding project completion reports (PCRs) for multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects or to provide reasons for failing to do so;
 - (ii) Lead and cooperating implementing agencies to continue coordinating their work closely in finalizing their respective portions of PCRs to facilitate the timely submission of the reports by the lead implementing agency;
 - (iii) Bilateral and implementing agencies, when filling in the data for PCR submissions, to ensure the inclusion of relevant and useful information, including gender information, and to report on lessons learned and reasons for delays in project implementation for their use in future improvements in project design and implementation; and

- (c) To invite all those involved in the preparation and implementation of MYAs and individual projects, in particular the Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies, to take into consideration the lessons learned from PCRs, where applicable.

(Decision 95/24)

AGENDA ITEM 12: MAPPING OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND THE STREAMLINING OF REPORTING ON PROGRESS ACROSS THE SPECTRUM OF REPORTS (DECISION 93/1(b))

417. The representative of the Secretariat introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/91.

418. Members expressed general support for the document, highlighting the need for targeted action to streamline the reporting burden, while acknowledging the importance of reporting as a monitoring tool. One member noted that implementing agencies had said that reporting work had been made more complicated by the practice of breaking down multi-year agreement tranches into several components for the purposes of the project inventory and annual progress reporting. Clarification was requested as to whether paragraph (d) of the proposed recommendation, on the format for progress and financial reporting, would address that issue. The representative of the Secretariat confirmed that that would be the case.

419. The same member questioned the description, in paragraph (c) of the proposed recommendation, of the document on tranche submission delays as a business planning tool; in his view, that document had been developed primarily to inform the Secretariat of delays and allow it take action where necessary and to inform the Government of the country concerned that the Executive Committee had noted the delay and to request that it be addressed. The member also requested clarification as to why, in the same paragraph, the UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94 96 document on tranche submission delays was to be submitted at the Committee's second meeting of the year only. The representative of the Secretariat clarified that the text proposed that tranche submission delays be reported to the Executive Committee as part of another Committee meeting document submitted to the first meeting of the year, and with letters sent to inform the Governments in question of the delay and to request them to submit the outstanding tranches at the following meeting. The reason for the delay would not be referred to in the letter because the relevant agency was not being requested to report on the matter.

420. With a view to reducing the reporting requirement, the same member asked whether the document could instead be considered at the Committee's first meeting of the year, which was often less busy than its second meeting. The representative of the Secretariat confirmed that it would be possible to do so, noting that the issue of tranche submission delays could be presented as part of the update on the implementation of the triennial business plans, and that the issues of previous tranche implementation causing submission delays would usually already be captured in the consolidated progress report, which was also considered at the year's second meeting.

421. It was proposed that the phrase "as a business planning tool" would be removed from paragraph (c) of the proposed recommendation and that the recommendation call for the document to be submitted at the Executive Committee's first meeting of the year.

422. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the mapping of reporting requirements and the streamlining of reporting on progress across spectrum of reports contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/91;
- (b) To note the efforts of the Secretariat in streamlining reporting on project progress referred to in paragraphs 12 to 14 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/91;

- (c) That the document on tranche submission delays would be submitted at the first Executive Committee meeting of the year;
- (d) To request the Secretariat, in consultation with implementing agencies, to review the format for progress and financial reporting including its narrative, with a view to streamlining reporting while allowing the collection of the data required for the preparation of the Multilateral Fund performance report, and to present the revised format for consideration of the Executive Committee at its 96th meeting; and
- (e) To request the Secretariat and the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to explore the possibility of integration of reporting through project completion reports (PCRs) and detailed final project reports, taking into account the approved universal PCR format, and to report back at the 97th meeting of the Executive Committee.

(Decision 95/91)