

Evaluation policy for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

May 2025

Note: The present document contains the Evaluation Policy for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, which was approved at the 96th meeting of the Executive Committee, as per decision 96/4, and is contained in annex IV of the final report of the meeting ([document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/66](#)).

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.

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](#).

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 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:

- **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;
- **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
- **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.

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.

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:

Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund

- Is the custodian of the evaluation policy;
- Approves the evaluation policy and its periodic updates;
- 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;
- Approves the terms of reference (TORs), and subsequent revisions, for the responsibilities of the SEO, as head of the evaluation unit;
- Considers the evaluation reports and related recommendations presented by the SEO;
- 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
- 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

- Leads the evaluation function of the Multilateral Fund as the head of the evaluation unit;
- 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);
- Prepares and presents a draft biennial evaluation work programme and related budget to the Executive Committee for approval, and is accountable for it;
- 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;

- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- Develops guidelines and standard operating procedures to create a culture of evaluation and facilitate the use of evaluation products among the stakeholders; and
- Upon request of the Executive Committee, prepares potential management responses to evaluations.

Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat

- Safeguards the integrity of the evaluation function, ensuring its independence from operational management;
- Upon completion of a recruitment process, recommends the appointment of the SEO to the Executive Director of UNEP;
- 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;

- 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;
- May prepare a Secretariat's management response on evaluation reports if requested by the Executive Committee;
- Ensures the use of evaluation reports and lessons learned in the Secretariat's project review work; and
- 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)

- 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);
- The agencies should respond to requests for information emanating from the evaluation unit to facilitate the information needed by consultants to prepare evaluation reports;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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
- 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 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.
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.