

Decisions relevant to Monitoring and Evaluation at 96th Executive Committee Meeting (extracts from Final Report of the Meeting [UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/66](#))

DECISION	AGENDA ITEM	RELATED DOCUMENTS
Decision 96/4	Evaluation 6 (a) Potential management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, including an evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund (decision 95/8(b))	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6
Decision 96/5	Evaluation 6 (b) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the contribution of HCFC phase-out management plans to the development of policies, regulations and national strategies to ensure compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the sustainability of achievements	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/7/Rev.1
Decision 96/6	Evaluation 6 (c) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of training, capacity-building and certification schemes in the refrigeration servicing sector under HCFC phase-out management plans	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/8/Rev.1
Decision 96/18	Programme implementation 7 (c) 2025 consolidated project completion report	UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/13

AGENDA ITEM 6: EVALUATION

(a) Potential management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, including an evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund (decision 95/8(b))

36. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document [UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6](#).

37. The potential management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund and the draft evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund were broadly welcomed by the Executive Committee. The proposed responses to the various recommendations of the external assessment were viewed positively by members and took due account of the suggestions put forward by members, although some further adjustments might be required. Several members highlighted the important role played by the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund in assessing the effectiveness of programmes and projects. The separation of the evaluation role from monitoring in the mandate of the incoming Senior Evaluation Officer and the clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the Senior Evaluation Officer in the draft evaluation policy, would add value to the exercise of the evaluation function. One member said that, in developing an evaluation policy, the principles of independence, effectiveness, credibility and transparency should be adhered to and that evaluation should be undertaken within the scope of the Multilateral Fund, taking full account of the compliance needs and specific circumstances of Article 5 countries.

38. Responding to a query about the role of the evaluation function of the implementing agencies within the Multilateral Fund evaluation policy, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer said that she had contacted the evaluation offices of the implementing agencies during the preparation of the policy and that they were open to the concept of working more closely with the evaluation unit of the Multilateral Fund in future. Currently, evaluations, undertaken by implementing agencies, of projects funded by the Multilateral Fund were not generally shared with the Multilateral Fund.

39. There was some discussion of the next actions to be carried out, taking into account the imminent retirement of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the subsequent appointment of a new officer. Care should be taken to ensure a smooth transition, with minimal disruption to the process of following up on the implementation of the management response and the evaluation policy. Several members expressed an interest in viewing the

proposed new terms of reference of the Senior Evaluation Officer. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer said that they would be made available.

40. The Executive Committee agreed to establish a contact group to continue discussion of the potential management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, including the evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund.

41. Subsequently, the convener of the contact group informed the Executive Committee that the group had agreed on both the management response and the evaluation policy set out in a conference room paper.

42. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the potential management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund, including an evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund, contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6;
- (b) To approve:
 - (i) The management response to the external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund contained in annex III to the present report;
 - (ii) The evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol contained in annex IV to the present report;
- (c) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer:
 - (i) To prepare a concept note to describe possible scenarios for establishing a follow-up system to track and report on the implementation of approved recommendations of evaluation reports, including the potential use of online digital tools;
 - (ii) To implement the actions for which the Executive Committee had expressed support in paragraphs 5 to 11 of the management response, referred to in subparagraph (b)(i) above;
 - (iii) To report to the Executive Committee, in the annual report on the implementation of the evaluation work programme, on progress in the implementation of the actions referred to in subparagraphs (c)(i) and (c)(ii), above;
- (d) To request the Secretariat to finalize the terms of reference of the Senior Evaluation Officer in line with the evaluation policy referred to in subparagraph (b)(ii) above; and
- (e) To encourage the Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies to participate in evaluations, when requested, and to make use of the findings and lessons learned from evaluation reports in their project work.

(Decision 96/4)

(b) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the contribution of HCFC phase-out management plans to the development of policies, regulations and national strategies to ensure compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the sustainability of achievements

43. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/7.

44. The Executive Committee welcomed the terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the contribution of HPMPs to the development of policies, regulations and national strategies. While there was broad agreement with the content, several members said that the proposed evaluation questions were too complex and detailed for a desk study that was to be undertaken with a relatively modest budget of US \$25,000 and that had such a wide scope, entailing a review of HPMP projects for 145 countries approved between 2010 and 2024. As a consequence of their complexity, the questions might not be adequately answered by a desk study, making it difficult to assess the quality of the work that had been undertaken. A possible way forward was to streamline the current list to a reduced number of more strategic key questions and to develop proposed terms of reference, with additional questions, for a future, more detailed evaluation, should the Executive Committee decide to undertake a second-phase evaluation.

45. There was some discussion on how to proceed with the next stage of the development of the terms of reference in the context of the retirement of the present Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the appointment of an incoming officer. Moving forward with the development of the terms of reference at the present meeting would ensure that progress was made on the matter and would provide the new officer with a basis for future work. On the other hand, that person might prefer greater ownership of the whole evaluation process.

46. The Executive Committee agreed to request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to revise the terms of reference, with a particular focus on the scope of the evaluation questions, on the basis of the suggestions put forward during discussion of the matter and informal consultations with interested parties, with a view to defining more specific work to be carried out under the aegis of the incoming Senior Evaluation Officer. The revised terms of reference would be posted online for further review and comments by members.

47. Subsequently, the Executive Committee decided to approve the terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of the contribution of HCFC phase-out management plans to the development of policies, regulations and national strategies to ensure compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the sustainability of achievements, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/7/Rev.1.

(Decision 96/5)

(c) Terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of training, capacity-building and certification schemes in the refrigeration servicing sector under HCFC phase-out management plans

48. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/8.

49. Consistent with the approach taken under agenda item 6(b), the Executive Committee agreed to request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to revise the terms of reference, with a particular focus on the scope of the evaluation questions, on the basis of the suggestions put forward during discussion of the matter and informal consultations with interested parties, with a view to defining more specific work to be carried out under the aegis of the incoming officer. The revised terms of reference would be posted online for further review and comments by members.

50. Subsequently, the Executive Committee decided to approve the terms of reference for the desk study for the evaluation of training, capacity-building and certification schemes in the refrigeration servicing sector under HCFC phase-out management plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/8/Rev.1.

(Decision 96/6)

(d) Progress update on the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects

51. The Executive Committee had before it document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/9, which provided a progress update on the delivery of the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects. The desk study would be prepared by a consultant, the hiring of whom had not yet been completed.

52. The Executive Committee took note of the progress update on the desk study for the evaluation of the recovery, recycling and reclamation projects, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/9.

(e) Progress update by UNEP OzonAction on the implementation of the road map contained in the final report on the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers (decision 92/5(e))

53. The representative from UNEP OzonAction introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/10.

54. One member expressed uncertainty about how women's empowerment and participation could be carried out in relation to the Montreal Protocol, given that many of the related activities, such as the installation and maintenance of room air-conditioning equipment, were performed by men. Further work was needed to understand how the concept could be applied to the Montreal Protocol.

55. Another member noted the profound changes that had taken place in the activities of the regional networks of ozone officers over the years and expressed his gratitude to UNEP for its leadership and organizational role in that regard. He said that, while many countries in Europe and Central Asia were undergoing an economic transition, some of them were non-Article 5 countries and were thus required to finance their own participation in network meetings and in Meetings of the Parties. Since projects under HPMPs in most of those countries had ended, and they had not yet begun implementation of the Kigali Amendment, they did not receive funding from the GEF. As a result, the participation of those non-Article 5 countries in regional and global meetings was very low because of a lack of funding. That was problematic, as the issue of illicit trafficking of controlled substances through those countries, for example, was not being discussed at regional network meetings, owing to the absence of the country representatives.

56. One member noted his appreciation for the resources devoted by UNEP OzonAction to the planning and operation of regional network meetings, in particular in Latin America and the Caribbean and in Asia and the Pacific. He agreed with broadening the number of stakeholders that participated in those meetings and highlighted the importance of ensuring that industry representatives shared industry perspectives that were of genuine interest to the national ozone officers, rather than using the meetings as a platform for promoting purely commercial interests. He also highlighted the benefits of the participation of representatives of the Fund Secretariat and the Ozone Secretariat in network meetings. As a result of their attendance, there had been a genuine increase in the understanding of their work among national ozone officers. Lastly, he noted that the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer would report further on the implementation of the evaluation recommendations at the 97th meeting.

57. Another member thanked the representative of UNEP for the helpful update and expressed his support for the earlier preparation of the network meetings. He emphasized that the fundamental purpose of the financing of such activities by the Multilateral Fund was to enable parties' compliance with the obligations under the Protocol. It was important to recall that any other goals or objectives that might be supported by that work, such as the Sustainable Development Goals, were co-benefits.

58. The Executive Committee took note, with appreciation, of the progress update by UNEP OzonAction in the implementation of the road map contained in the final report on the evaluation of regional networks of national ozone officers (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/6), contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/10.

AGENDA ITEM 7: PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

(c) 2025 consolidated project completion report

90. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/13.

91. One member highlighted the importance of the timely submission of project completion reports, given that it affected the transfer of the title of ownership from the implementing agency to the end users, the latter being subject to certain controls whereby they needed to prove that they were the owners of the equipment.

92. The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note the 2025 consolidated project completion report (PCR) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/13;
- (b) To request:
 - (i) Bilateral and implementing agencies to submit at the 97th meeting, for consideration by the Executive Committee at the 98th meeting, outstanding PCRs for multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects or to provide reasons for failing to do so;
 - (ii) Lead and cooperating implementing agencies to continue coordinating 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 96/18)

Note to the reader: Annex III presents the management response and annex IV presents the MLF evaluation policy as contained in the 96th final report of the meeting in document [UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/66](#).

Annex III

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT OF THE EVALUATION FUNCTION OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND

1. The Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund commends the final report on the assessment of the Multilateral Fund's evaluation function and expresses appreciation for the constructive engagement and comprehensive analysis provided by an independent consultant. We acknowledge the author's efforts to understand the Multilateral Fund's unique business model and her professionalism throughout the assessment process.
2. The Executive Committee acknowledges the opportunity presented by this assessment to further strengthen the evaluation function. The coordination and guidance from the evaluation team in facilitating the assessment process are also deeply appreciated. We extend our thanks to the Chief Officer of the Secretariat for supporting the consultant and the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) in facilitating access to relevant information and engaging Secretariat staff in the assessment.
3. The Executive Committee welcomes the thorough analysis presented in the final report as well as the comprehensive data on monitoring and evaluation outputs and budgets since 2009, consolidated in the first part of the report.¹ This serves as a solid foundation for the Committee's decision-making regarding a future evaluation policy and its role in supporting the Multilateral Fund's mission to assist Article 5 countries in meeting their Montreal Protocol obligations.

Response to the assessment recommendations

4. Overall, the final assessment report offers a positive assessment of the Multilateral Fund's evaluation function over its 30-year history while identifying areas for improvement. Seven key recommendations are outlined for updating the evaluation function. After examining the seven recommendations of the assessment, the Executive Committee considers the following:
5. Regarding recommendation 1: The Executive Committee agrees that an evaluation policy would provide an operational framework for improved implementation of the work of the evaluation unit. Regarding the separation between the monitoring and evaluation functions, making the SMEO responsible solely for evaluation, the Executive Committee considers that this could be approved as long as it does not represent an additional burden for the Secretariat. The practical implications concern the management of project completion reports (PCRs). Consequently, the Executive Committee approves the evaluation policy presented in annex IV of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/66 and the reframing of the role of the SMEO to Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO), while requesting the SMEO in consultation with the Secretariat to finalise the modalities for the transfer of the monitoring component of the PCR-related work to the Secretariat.
6. Regarding recommendation 2: The Executive Committee agrees that the preparation of guidelines and tools for awareness raising on the evaluation function, after adoption of the evaluation policy, may be useful. These evaluation products would be posted on the evaluation page of the Multilateral Fund website, and the SMEO would inform the Executive Committee in the annual report on the evaluation function. Briefings for the implementing and bilateral agencies may also be organized at the inter-agency coordination meetings (IACMs), and as relevant.

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/7

7. Regarding recommendation 3: The Executive Committee agrees with the establishment of a systematic follow-up system to track the status of implementation of the approved evaluation recommendations. The SMEO should prepare a proposal to be considered at the 98th meeting for a system to follow up on recommendations, which could include the consideration of digital tools for an online follow-up system and possible integration with the knowledge management system of the Multilateral Fund. The Executive Committee agrees with the usefulness of preparing guidance for consultants on delivering evaluation reports, and considers that this is an internal management of the evaluation work which can be developed by the SMEO without requiring additional guidance.

8. Regarding recommendation 4: The Executive Committee agrees with the usefulness of engaging stakeholders in the process of evaluation, in particular with regard to ensuring that field experiences are better reflected in evaluation products. Regarding the five sub-components of recommendation 4, the Executive Committee is of the following view:

- (a) On revisiting the purpose of desk studies and consider the introduction of inception papers: The Executive Committee agrees that this is a relevant practice that could be introduced in the preparation of evaluations, when a desk study appears not to be sufficient for a comprehensive evaluation;
- (b) On undertaking fewer, deeper and more strategic evaluations: The Executive Committee agrees with this recommendation that some strategic evaluations be considered in future programmes of work;
- (c) On streamlining interactions with the Committee: The Executive Committee is satisfied with the current practice of interaction with the SMEO and wishes to maintain its regular oversight role for continued reporting of progress on the implementation of the evaluation work programme;
- (d) On introducing briefing sessions with evaluation consultants: The briefing sessions with evaluation consultants could be organized ad hoc, when relevant for the results of an evaluation, with due attention to avoid adding a burden to the Secretariat's work. The Executive Committee considers that this practice should be used discretionally only when it would bring clear added value to the final evaluation; and
- (e) On requesting evaluation as a standing item at key Multilateral Fund meetings (i.e., IACMs and regional network meetings): The Executive Committee observes that IACM agendas already include an evaluation item, and that it is included in some of the regional network meeting agendas. The Executive Committee agrees with the usefulness of including an evaluation item in the agendas of these meetings, as relevant.

9. Regarding recommendation 5: Reappraise the evaluation framework used at the Multilateral Fund. The Executive Committee agrees with undertaking more innovative approaches in evaluation. However, the inclusion of softer dimensions should remain within the realm of the mandate of the Fund. The SMEO will consider developing a framework for evaluating non-investment activities that clearly define expected outputs, outcomes and ultimate results of these evaluations for consideration at the 98th meeting.

10. Regarding recommendation 6: Introduce enhanced quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation reports. The Executive Committee agrees with the need for the SMEO to ensure the quality of evaluation reports. Involving the Secretariat's programme managers should not be done at the expense of the workload of the project review team. The Executive Committee agrees that the measures should be implemented to ensure high quality evaluation work, but without an extra burden for the Secretariat and with no additional costs for the evaluation budget.

11. Regarding recommendation 7: Supplementing evaluation expertise in the short term. The Executive Committee observes that this recommendation identified a need to support the review on PCRs which has now been completed with the adoption of the universal PCR format at the 94th meeting. Therefore, there is no longer a need for temporary support. The Executive Committee is open to considering the possibility of a Junior Professional Officer in the future, should the SEO present a reasonable plan for this request with a clear explanation of the role and purpose of such temporary support.

12. The Executive Committee appreciates the findings of the assessment and reaffirms its commitment to supporting the strengthening of the evaluation function. It further requests the SMEO to implement the elements contained in the recommendations, as per the response in paragraphs 5 to 11 above. The Executive Committee will continue to exercise its oversight function in examining progress made, as a result of the assessment, in enhancing the utility and relevance of the evaluation function.²

² See terms of reference for an external assessment of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/8.

Annex IV

EVALUATION POLICY FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

Rationale for an evaluation policy at the Multilateral Fund

1. The Executive Committee has given the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) the mandate to prepare an evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund, after having considered the external assessment on the evaluation function at its 95th meeting. In a broader context, the Secretary-General has overseen an extensive UN reform effort. In his report A/72/492 on “Shifting the management paradigm in the United Nations: ensuring a better future for all,” he indicated his intention to strengthen the evaluation capacity within the UN Secretariat to better inform programme planning and reporting on programme performance. He stressed that the results of evaluations would be used by programme managers to better plan and adjust their activities. Evaluation in general is integral to learning and supports results-based management and increased transparency.

2. In this context, in order to strengthen accountability mechanisms, new instructions, procedures and guidelines were issued for the implementation of Article 7 of the regulations and rules governing programme planning, programme aspects of the budget, the monitoring of implementation and the methods of evaluation in the United Nations.¹

3. The present evaluation policy is inspired by the existing rules and regulations within the United Nations, to support enhanced accountability and to encourage a stronger culture of evaluation to benefit the work of the Multilateral Fund, its evaluation unit and the implementing agencies. The scope of the policy has been narrowed to ensure that the evaluation policy focuses on the core mandate of the Fund as defined in Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol.

Definition of evaluation

4. The Multilateral Fund subscribes to the definition of evaluation derived from the Norms and Standards for Evaluation of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)² and the Administrative Instruction of the United Nations Secretariat.³

5. An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyzes the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of the organization and its stakeholders.

6. Evaluation is part of, but distinct from, a larger organizational oversight architecture for assessing programme performance which may also include monitoring, audit and inspection. Audit and inspection functions are under the purview of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the United Nations, which can conduct audits and inspections of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat if required. The monitoring function

¹ ST/SGB/2018/3

² United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). Norms and Standards for Evaluation, New York, UNEG.

³ ST/AI/2021/3. 6 August 2021 and related [Guidelines - Administrative Instruction on Evaluation in the United Nations Secretariat](#).

at the Multilateral Fund is under the purview of its Secretariat and Chief Officer, delivered by the project review team, the administrative team and the Treasurer.⁴

Purposes of the Multilateral Fund evaluation function

7. Within the Multilateral Fund, the responsibility for evaluation lies with the evaluation unit headed by a Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO). The evaluation function was established in 1997; however, the present evaluation policy is the first of this kind adopted by the Executive Committee and will guide the work of the SEO in managing the evaluation unit and delivering the approved evaluation work programme.

8. The primary objective of the evaluation function in the Multilateral Fund is to assess the effectiveness of programmes and projects, learn from the evaluations and apply the lessons learned to improve the design, implementation and to lay the groundwork for ensuring sustainability of future projects. Content-based evaluations facilitate informed decision-making and learning among stakeholders involved in project design, approval and implementation.

9. Evaluation at the Multilateral Fund serves three main purposes:

- (a) Accountability: Evaluation is a key component of oversight and contributes to accountability by generating independent analysis of results, progress, and effective implementation of planned activities. It provides credible information that supports the Executive Committee in its role of overseeing the Multilateral Fund. Transparent reporting of evaluation findings contributes to the Committee's confidence in the Fund's ability to deliver on the responsibilities entrusted to it;
- (b) Evidence-based decision-making: Evaluation supports better decision-making at all levels of the Multilateral Fund. It should inform planning, programming, budgeting, implementation and reporting, and contribute to evidence-based policymaking and organizational effectiveness. Evaluation and feedback on the implementation of evaluation recommendations are relevant contributions to effective results-based management; and
- (c) Learning: A strong culture of evaluation is a prerequisite for a learning organization. Evaluation will help the organization and its implementing partners to learn from experience in programme planning and project implementation and better understand why – and to what extent – intended and unintended results were achieved, as well as to analyze the implications of the results. The compilation, analysis and dissemination of lessons learned can be the driver for innovation and continuous improvement.

10. The present evaluation policy adapts the established evaluation guidelines for the United Nations as defined in ST/AI/2021/3 to the specific mandate of the Multilateral Fund to create a fit-for-purpose framework to evaluate programmes and projects supported by the Fund through the lens of achieving compliance with the Montreal Protocol. It defines the roles and responsibilities regarding the exercise of the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund.

Responsibilities and roles

11. The responsibilities and roles to guarantee an effective, accountable, credible, useful and independent evaluation function are shared by the key stakeholders, as defined below:

⁴ The SMEO was responsible for only one component of the monitoring function (related to project completion reports). During the discussions at the 95th meeting, as reflected in paragraph 46 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94, there was agreement that the monitoring should be removed from the SMEO's responsibilities.

Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund

- (a) Is the custodian of the evaluation policy;
- (b) Approves the evaluation policy and its periodic updates;
- (c) Approves the biennial work programme and budget for evaluation and the annual reports and updates on the evaluation work programme. The Executive Committee can propose specific evaluations at any time based on the priorities of the Fund;
- (d) Approves the terms of reference (TORs), and subsequent revisions, for the responsibilities of the SEO, as head of the evaluation unit;
- (e) Considers the evaluation reports and related recommendations presented by the SEO;
- (f) Responds to the recommendations in evaluation reports by taking a decision on each evaluation, taking into account the recommendations of the SEO, and if it deems necessary, through a management response; and
- (g) Takes decisions on further follow-up on the evaluation recommendations after considering the periodic report on the status of implementation of evaluation's recommendations, to be presented by the SEO to the Executive Committee at the first meeting of the year.

Senior Evaluation Officer, Head of the Evaluation Unit

- (a) Leads the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund as the head of the evaluation unit;
- (b) Manages all aspects required to implement the evaluation work programme as approved by the Executive Committee, including recruitment and supervision of evaluation staff and non-staff (e.g. consultants, interns);
- (c) Prepares and presents a draft biennial evaluation work programme and related budget to the Executive Committee for approval, and is accountable for it;
- (d) Presents evaluation reports to the Executive Committee including general and actionable recommendations which, when applicable, might include specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) indicators to facilitate follow-up on their implementation; general recommendations may also be issued aiming at addressing more strategic aspects relevant to the work of the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies;
- (e) Ensures that all evaluation reports are of high quality and conform to UNEG norms and standards for evaluation, where applicable within the mandate of the Fund;
- (f) Ensures that Multilateral Fund evaluations comply with the approved evaluation policy of the Multilateral Fund, as well as align to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation as per ST/SGB/2018/3 and with the ST/AI/2021/3 on evaluation in the United Nations Secretariat;
- (g) Develops and maintains a follow-up system to monitor the status of implementation of recommendations and periodically reports on progress in the uptake and implementation of evaluation recommendations to the Executive Committee. The follow-up reporting on specific evaluation recommendations should be discontinued after four years of their acceptance, unless otherwise decided by the Committee;

- (h) Spearheads collaboration and coordination with the evaluation offices of the Multilateral Fund's implementing agencies to explore options for joint evaluations on issues related to Multilateral Fund project implementation, or ad hoc consultations on evaluation-related issues of mutual interest;
- (i) Represents the Multilateral Fund evaluation function at the UNEG and other relevant United Nations forums, such as the evaluation communities of practice in the United Nations Secretariat; remains up-to-date on trends and innovations in evaluation and informs about these trends and innovations, including about how they can be best used in the interest of improving performance in achieving the goals of the Montreal Protocol;
- (j) Takes responsibility to promote the visibility and dissemination of evaluation products through online corporate tools, including a periodic evaluation newsletter, to facilitate the uptake of evaluation-work findings and lessons learned;
- (k) Reports to the Executive Committee on measures that ensure that the Multilateral Fund evaluation function is aligned with the evolving requirements of evaluation functions in the United Nations and in UNEP;
- (l) Develops guidelines and standard operating procedures to create a culture of evaluation and facilitate the use of evaluation products among the stakeholders; and
- (m) Upon request of the Executive Committee, prepares potential management responses to evaluations.

Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat

- (a) Safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function, ensuring its independence from operational management;
- (b) Upon completion of a recruitment process, recommends the appointment of the SEO to the Executive Director of UNEP;
- (c) Contributes with the views of the Secretariat on the preparation of the biennial evaluation work programme that is presented to the Executive Committee by the SEO for approval;
- (d) Holds the role of administrative supervision of the SEO and facilitates the approval of administrative matters related to the implementation of the evaluation work programme;
- (e) May prepare a Secretariat's management response on evaluation reports if requested by the Executive Committee;
- (f) Ensures the use of evaluation reports and lessons learned in the Secretariat's project review work; and
- (g) Allocates some of the Secretariat's time to provide the necessary technical advice for enhanced quality assurance of the Multilateral Fund-specific expertise on technical aspects covered by the evaluations.

Implementing and bilateral agencies (including their evaluation offices)

- (a) The implementing agencies of the Multilateral Fund, i.e., UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, the World Bank, and the bilateral agencies are instrumental to facilitate data collection for the evaluations (the agencies hereafter);

- (b) The agencies should respond to requests for information emanating from the evaluation unit to facilitate the information needed by consultants to prepare evaluation reports;
- (c) The evaluation offices of the agencies could be consulted by the Multilateral Fund evaluation unit in order to promote synergies, on both directions, in evaluating the programmes and projects aiming at compliance with the Montreal Protocol;
- (d) The Multilateral Fund evaluation unit and the agencies' evaluation offices may maintain a regular information exchanges on projects of common interest pertaining to the scope of the Montreal Protocol goals;
- (e) The agencies should take the necessary actions in responding to recommendations addressed to them, when the Executive Committee would so decide after the consideration of evaluation reports. They should monitor the implementation of the recommendations on what relates to their work and report through the SEO to the Executive Committee on progress on implementation; and
- (f) The agencies may contribute at any time to the preparation of the draft evaluation work programme through sharing their views on the most salient issues of interest regarding project implementation, based on their experience in programme and project implementation.

Other stakeholders, including at the national level

12. The national ozone units (NOUs), project management units and other national stakeholders in implementation are encouraged to participate in the evaluations when invited by the SEO to do so.

Evaluation framework - principles, norms and standards of relevance to the Multilateral Fund

13. Evaluations in the Multilateral Fund will follow the United Nations Regulations and Rules on evaluation and related guidelines, as referred to in paragraphs 2 and 10 above. The purpose of the evaluations will respond to the mandate of the Fund and be guided by principles and practices at the core of international good evaluation practices for high-quality evaluation as set out in the UNEG Norms and Standards (2016), the UNEG ethical guidelines (2020) and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation (2008), and the evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund. Only the norms relevant to the Multilateral Fund will be applicable, not to expand beyond the Fund's mandate, and in full respect with the corpus of decisions of the Executive Committee.

14. The SEO, as head of the Multilateral Fund evaluation unit, will endeavour to conform to these norms, standards, codes and guidance in the design, management and conduct of evaluations, and throughout the structures and operations of the evaluation function. In so doing, however, only the norms that conform to the core mandate of the Multilateral Fund would be used, without expanding further to any area not agreed by the Executive Committee. Norm 8 would be applied only in reference to gender as there is an approved gender mainstreaming policy for the Multilateral Fund.

Table 1: UNEG Norms for Evaluation

General norms for evaluation
Norm 1: Internationally agreed principles, goals and targets
Norm 2: Utility
Norm 3: Credibility
Norm 4: Independence
Norm 5: Impartiality
Norm 6: Ethics
Norm 7: Transparency

Norm 8: Human rights and gender equality
Norm 9: National evaluation capacities
Norm 10: Professionalism
Institutional norms for evaluation at the United Nations System
Norm 11: Enabling environment
Norm 12: Evaluation policy
Norm 13: Responsibility for the evaluation function

Source: UNEG (2016)

15. Among the evaluation norms and standards, observing the norms of independence, utility, credibility and transparency in delivering the evaluation work will contribute to enhanced relevance and quality of the work delivered by the evaluation function to leverage a positive impact on the work of the Multilateral Fund.

Independence

16. The independence of the evaluation function is overseen by the Executive Committee. Independence of evaluation is necessary for credibility; it influences the ways in which an evaluation is used and allows evaluators to be impartial and free from undue pressure throughout the evaluation process.

17. The SEO must have the ability to evaluate without undue influence by any party, and to conduct evaluative work impartially, without the risk of negative effects on career development and must be able to freely express the results of the evaluative work.

18. Independence also demands that the Multilateral Fund's evaluation unit be independent from the organization's management functions, except for mandatory administrative procedures applicable to all Secretariat staff members, including the SEO and the staff of the evaluation unit.

19. The independent evaluation unit carries the responsibility of setting the evaluation work programme in response to the mandate given by the Executive Committee through its decisions and its approval of the evaluation work programme and related budget. The evaluation function needs to be provided with adequate resources through a commensurate budget aligned to the agreed evaluation workload. It also needs administrative support to conduct its work, to independently evaluate the effectiveness and performance of the Multilateral Fund's portfolio of programmes and projects.

20. The SEO has the responsibility to submit evaluation reports to the Executive Committee, in consultation with the Chief Officer. In the event of divergent views on the evaluation reports or products, the Chief Officer, as the head of the Secretariat, can issue dissenting opinions setting forth the discrepancies, for the consideration of the Executive Committee.

Utility

21. Evaluations should be commissioned and conducted with the clear intention to use the resulting analysis, findings, lessons learned and recommendations to inform the Executive Committee's decisions. Useful evaluations make relevant and timely contributions to informed decision-making, organizational learning processes and accountability for results. Evaluations can contribute to knowledge generation and empowering stakeholders, with the stakeholders using the lessons learned to improve the effectiveness of design and implementation of Multilateral Fund programmes and projects.

Credibility

22. Evaluations must be credible. Key elements of credibility include transparent evaluation processes, impartiality, inclusive approaches involving relevant stakeholders and robust quality assurance systems. Evaluation results and recommendations are derived from the use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence. Credibility requires that

evaluations are ethically conducted and managed by evaluators that exhibit professional and cultural competencies, ensuring the quality of processes and outputs.

Transparency

23. Transparency is an essential element of evaluation that establishes trust and builds confidence, enhances stakeholder ownership and increases public accountability. Evaluation products should be publicly accessible online and should be circulated as an integral component of Multilateral Fund's communication and knowledge management platforms. The SEO will ensure that transparency does not trespass the boundaries of confidentiality where applicable. For those specific cases, restricted access would be granted only to Executive Committee members and the Chief Officer so as to preserve the full confidentiality of the sensitive information.

Evaluation modalities and outputs

24. Programme and project evaluation can be performed through different approaches, for which the scope and coverage would vary, depending on the request made by the Executive Committee. Modalities for evaluation are shown in table 2 below. The Executive Committee will decide the modality for the evaluations that it will approve as part of the evaluation work programme.

Table 2: Modalities of evaluations

Evaluation modality	Description
Strategic and thematic evaluations	Strategic evaluations will provide balanced coverage of policies, strategies and core planning instruments.
Programme and portfolio evaluations	Programme and portfolio evaluations will be undertaken in situations where the level of aggregation offers learning and accountability opportunities in a more efficient manner than through individual project-level assessments.
Project evaluations	The evaluation unit will purposefully select a sample of projects reaching operational completion for independent evaluation.
Sectoral and cross-sectoral evaluations – including regional/inter-regional and national approaches	Evaluation of specific sectors to be covered under this modality; cross-sectoral evaluations would shed light on potential synergies (or externalities) of actions in one sector over others; they can be performed at the national, regional and/or inter-regional level of analysis.
Impact evaluations / Studies	Impact evaluations /studies will be selectively undertaken as time and resources allow, including cross-sectoral evaluations positioning the achievements of the Montreal Protocol and related to the sustainable development goals (SDGs) within its mandate, such as gender and climate, and other UN system cross-cutting sustainable development issues where needed.
Evaluation modality	Description
Joint evaluations (semi-independent evaluations)	Joint evaluations will be undertaken for shared evaluands – no coverage norms apply. They can be planned, when relevant, in collaboration with the evaluation offices of the Multilateral Fund's implementing and bilateral agencies, when requested by the Executive Committee for selected evaluations
Process evaluations	Evaluations of processes and workflows involving different actors – Secretariat, implementing and bilateral agencies, NOUs and other Multilateral Fund partners as applicable, to identify potential gains in effectiveness and efficiency.
Biennial evaluation synthesis	This will be undertaken every two years at the end of a programme of work implementation period.

Softer and more strategic evaluations

25. Apart from the above types of evaluations, the function could on occasions, when so requested by the Executive Committee, assess the broader impacts of Multilateral Fund projects and activities, such as gender, social and economic impacts (i.e., in particular in relation to the Kigali Amendment). When relevant and appropriate, these impacts may be considered as part of the traditional sectoral and project evaluations, rather than as separate evaluation exercises. Evaluations of institutional strengthening, training programmes,

and technical assistance should be undertaken periodically, to assess the effective and efficient functioning of this key component of the support to Article 5 countries.

Evaluation outputs

26. Multilateral Fund evaluations have been delivered as desk studies, eventually to be followed by a second phase, after consideration of the findings and recommendations of the desk study. Desk studies are self-contained reports relying mainly on documentation produced by the Multilateral Fund and implementing agencies. They do not typically involve country visits but can use surveys and interviews as required.

27. In aligning with the development of the professionalization of the evaluation function, the Multilateral Fund will introduce the use of inception reports as part of the possible evaluation outputs. The use of an inception paper strengthens the analytical linkages between the first phase of an evaluation – the desk study – and the proposed additional evaluation work for the second phase, when this would be considered as a requirement for final verification of evidence and validation of findings and recommendations after the consideration of the desk study and its annexed inception paper.

28. The evaluation unit may produce a variety of outputs, depending on the purpose and stage of the evaluations, responding to the requests of the Executive Committee when approving the evaluation work programme and the TOR for each mandated evaluation. Typically, the outputs of the evaluation work may consist of the following products:

- TORs;
- Inception papers;
- Desk studies;
- Evaluation reports;
- Guidelines and templates;
- Working papers on evaluation issues;
- Briefings on lessons learned;
- Highlights on evaluation findings; and
- Reports on follow-up of recommendations

29. The list of outputs can evolve in time together with the needs of the evaluation function and can be revisited in future updates of the evaluation policy to be undertaken at the request of the Executive Committee.

Resources for evaluation

30. The Executive Committee approves the resources for evaluation when adopting the biennial evaluation work programme, including the related budget, and may introduce amendments to it at any meeting, in particular after the presentation of progress updates in the annual report presented by the SEO.

31. The evaluations are prepared with the support of external consultants recruited in agreement with the regulations and rules and administrative issuances of the United Nations Secretariat on the matter. The Secretariat of the Multilateral Fund provides the administrative support for the recruitment processes. Occasionally, at the request of the Executive Committee, the consultants might be involved in presenting the results of an evaluation.

32. The SEO is accountable for the evaluation work and its outputs. The consultants work under the supervision of the SEO and are reporting at interim milestones during the evaluation process. The SEO is assisted by a general services staff who provides support on both research and administrative tasks of the evaluation unit.

Dissemination, outreach and public disclosure

33. Evaluation reports should be disseminated to all evaluation stakeholders and made publicly available in the evaluation page of the Multilateral Fund website. The SEO should prepare short information documents for the dissemination of key findings, lessons learned and recommendations and share them through the website. Due attention should be paid to preserving the confidentiality of sensitive information which may be used during the preparation of the evaluation outputs, in line with evaluation standards on the matter.

34. The evaluation unit may also prepare internal working papers and guidelines to contribute to the strengthening of the relevance of evaluations and their use by the relevant stakeholders, as well as stories for the website to disseminate the results from the evaluation work.