

联合国
环境规划署Distr.
GENERALUNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6
4 May 2025CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第九十六次会议
2025 年 5 月 26 日至 30 日，蒙特利尔
临时议程¹项目 6(a)

对多边基金评价职能的外部评估的潜在管理层回应，包括多边基金的一 项评价政策（第 95/8 号决定(b) 段）

导言

1. 执行委员会其第九十五次会议上注意到由高级评价员兼独立顾问 Chandi Kadirgamar 女士编写的多边基金评价职能外部评估报告。²
2. 执行委员会对报告表示赞赏，承认报告为根据 2019 年多边组织业绩评估网络 (MOPAN) 评估提出的建议加强评价职能奠定了坚实基础。³
3. 执行委员会第 95/8(b) 号决定请高级监测和评价干事考虑到执行委员会成员在第九十五次会议上进行的讨论和提出的建议、会议最后报告附件三所载这项政策纲要草案的内容以及最后报告第 22 至 31 段所列建议，编写管理层对评估的潜在回应，包括多边基金的评价政策，供第九十六次会议审议；第 95/8(c) 号决定邀请执行委员会成员在 2025 年 2 月 28 日之前向高级监测和评价干事提交他们对评估的意见，以便为管理层的潜在回应提供信息。⁴
4. 根据要求，高级监测和评价干事编写了管理层对评估的潜在回应（见下文附件），包括附件一中的评价政策草案，供执行委员会审议。附件二载有执行委员会七个成员机构根据第 95/8(c) 号决定提交的意见汇编；附件三载有高级监测和评价干事对评估结果及其建议的主动意见，仅供参考；附件四载有评估提出的七项建议，以供参考。

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/1

² UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10

³ MOPAN 《多边基金的评估》，2019 年。

⁴ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94

5. 高级监测和评价干事在编写供执行委员会审议的管理层回应草案时考虑了上述所有内容，草案附于下文。

潜在管理层回应

6. 多边基金执行委员会赞扬关于多边基金评价职能的最终评估报告，并对独立顾问 Chandi Kadirgamar 女士的建设性投入和全面分析表示赞赏。我们感谢作者为理解多边基金独特的业务模式付出的努力，以及她在整个评估过程中展现的专业精神。

7. 执行委员会承认本次评估为进一步加强评价职能提供了机会。也非常感谢评价小组为促进评估过程提供协调和指导。我们感谢秘书处主任向顾问兼高级监测和评价干事提供支持，为获取相关信息提供便利，并让秘书处工作人员参与评估。

8. 执行委员会欢迎最后报告中提出的详尽分析，以及报告第一部分⁵综合的关于 2009 年以来监测和评价产出和预算的全面数据。这为委员会奠定了坚实的基础，以便就今后的评价政策及其在支持多边基金不负使命协助第 5 条国家履行《蒙特利尔议定书》义务方面发挥的作用做出决策。

对评估建议的回应

9. 总体而言，最终评估报告对多边基金 30 年来的评价职能给予了积极评价，同时指出了有待改进的领域。报告概述了更新评价职能的七项主要建议。在审查了评估报告中的七项建议后，⁶执行委员会审议了以下内容：

10. **关于建议 1:** 执行委员会同意，评价政策将为改进评价部门工作的实施提供一个业务框架。关于将监测和评价职能分开，由高级监测和评价干事专门负责评价工作的问题，执行委员会认为，只要不增加秘书处的负担，就可以批准这样做。所涉实际问题是关于项目完成报告的管理。因此，谨建议执行委员会通过附件一提出的评价政策草案，并将高级监测和评价干事的作用重新界定为高级评价干事，同时请高级监测和评价干事和秘书处为第九十七次会议编写一份说明，说明将监测职能移交秘书处的影响，并提出执行时间表。

11. **关于建议 2:** 执行委员会同意，在通过评价政策后，编制提高对评价职能认识的准则和工具可能是有益的。这些评价产品将张贴在多边基金网站的评价页面上，高级监测和评价干事将在关于评价职能的年度报告中向执行委员会通报情况。还可在机构间协调会议和区域网络会议上为执行机构和双边机构举办简报会。

12. **关于建议 3:** 执行委员会同意建立一个系统的后续系统，以跟踪已核准的评价建议的执行情况。高级监测和评价干事应编写一份关于建立一个建议后续行动系统的提案，供第九十七次会议审议，其中可包括考虑用数字工具构建在线后续行动系统。执行委员会同意为顾问编写提交评价报告的指南是有用的，并认为这涉及评价工作的内部管理，可由高级监测和评价干事制定，不需要额外的指南。

⁵ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10 和 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/94/7

⁶ 为方便参考，请参阅附件四，其中包含评估建议全文。

13. **关于建议 4:** 执行委员会同意让利益攸关方参与评价过程是有益的，特别是在确保评价产品更好地反映实地经验方面。关于建议 4 的五个分项，执行委员会的意见如下：

- (a) 关于重新审视案头研究的目的和考虑采用起始文件的问题：执行委员会同意，在案头研究似乎不足以进行全面评估的情况下，可以在评价的准备工作中采用这种相关做法；
- (b) 关于开展更少、更深入和更具战略性的评价：执行委员会同意这项建议，支持将更少但更加相关的战略性评价纳入工作方案；
- (c) 关于简化与委员会的互动：执行委员会对目前与高级监测和评价干事互动的做法感到满意，并希望保持其定期监督作用，继续报告评价工作方案的执行进展情况；
- (d) 关于举行与评价顾问的情况介绍会：在涉及到评价结果的情况下，可以临时组织与评价顾问的情况介绍会，但要适当注意避免增加秘书处的工作负担。执行委员会认为，只有在这种做法会给最终评价带来明显的附加值时，才可酌情采用；
- (e) 关于要求将评价作为多边基金主要会议（即机构间协调会议和区域网络会议）的常设项目：执行委员会注意到，机构间协调会议的议程中已经包括了一个评价项目，而且一些区域网络会议的议程也包括了这一项目。执行委员会同意在这些会议的议程中列入评价项目是有益的。

14. **关于建议 5:** 重新评估多边基金使用的评价框架。执行委员会同意在评价中采用更具创新性的方法。然而，纳入一些更柔和层面仍应属于基金的任务范围，如气候和性别问题。

15. **关于建议 6:** 为评价报告引入更强的质量保证机制。执行委员会同意有必要确保评价报告的质量。秘书处管理人员的参与不应影响项目审查小组的工作量。执行委员会同意应采取措施确保高质量的评价工作，但不应增加秘书处的负担，也不应给评价预算带来额外费用。

16. **关于建议 7:** 在短期内补充评价专门知识。执行委员会注意到，该建议确定了支持项目完成报告审查的需要，随着第九十四次会议通过通用项目完成报告格式，该审查已经完成。因此，不再需要临时支持。如果高级监测和评价干事能够就此请求提出合理计划，并明确解释这种临时支持的作用和目的，执行委员会愿意考虑今后设立一个初级专业人员额的可能性。

17. 执行委员会对评估结果表示赞赏，并重申其支持加强评价职能的承诺。执行委员会还请高级监测和评价干事按照上文第 10 至 16 段的回应落实建议中的内容。执行委员会将

继续行使其监督职能，审查根据评估结果在加强评价职能的实用性和相关性方面取得的进展。⁷

建议

18. 执行委员会不妨：

(a) 注意到 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6 号文件所载对多边基金评价职能的外部评估的潜在管理层回应，包括多边基金的一项评价政策；

(b) 考虑：

（一）核准(a)分段所述文件中所载的管理层对评价职能的潜在回应；

（二）核准(a)分段所述文件附件一中所载的多边基金评价政策；

（三）请高级监测和评价干事：

a. 编写一份概念说明，描述建立一个后续系统的可能情形，以跟踪和报告已核准的评价报告建议的执行情况，包括使用在线数字工具的可能性；

b. 执行 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/96/6 号文件第 10 至 16 段所载执行委员会对管理层回应中表示支持的行动；

c. 在每年的第一次会议上以及在关于评价工作方案执行情况的年度报告中，向执行委员会报告上文(b)(一)和(b)(二)分段所述行动的执行进展情况；以及

（四）鼓励秘书处、执行机构和双边机构应邀参与评价，并在其项目工作中利用评价报告的结论和经验教训。

⁷ 见 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/8 号文件所载多边基金评价职能外部评估的职权范围。

附件一

《蒙特利尔议定书》多边基金评价政策草案

多边基金评价政策的依据

1. 执行委员会在其第九十五次会议上审议了关于评价职能的外部评估后，授权高级监测和评价干事为多边基金编写一份评价政策草案。而在更广泛的背景下，秘书长监督了广泛的联合国改革工作。秘书长在关于“转变联合国的管理模式：确保人人都有更美好的未来”的报告(A/72/492)中表示，他打算加强联合国秘书处内部的评价能力，以便更好地为方案规划和方案执行情况报告提供信息。他强调，方案管理人员将利用评价结果更好地规划和调整他们的活动。总的来说，评价是学习的组成部分，有助于实现成果管理制和提高透明度。

2. 在此背景下，为加强问责机制，发布了新的指示、程序和指导方针，以落实联合国方案规划、预算内方案部分、执行情况监督和评价方法条例和细则第 7 条。¹

3. 本评价政策草案²受到联合国内部现有规则和条例启发，支持加强问责制，并鼓励更强有力的评价文化，使多边基金、其评价股和执行机构的工作受益。该政策的范围已经缩小，以确保评价政策侧重于《蒙特利尔议定书》第 10 条规定的基金核心任务。

评价的定义

4. 多边基金赞同联合国评价小组的《评价规范和标准》³以及《联合国秘书处行政指示》中的评价定义。⁴

5. 评价是对一项活动、项目、方案、战略、政策、专题、主题、行业、业务领域或机构业绩进行的尽可能系统和公正的评估。它利用适当的标准，如相关性、有效性、效率、影响和可持续性等，通过审查结果链、流程、背景因素和因果关系，分析预期和意外结果的实现程度。评价应提供可信、有用和以证据为基础的信息，使评价结果、建议和经验教训能够及时纳入有关组织及其利益攸关方的决策过程。

6. 评价是评估方案执行情况的更大组织监督架构的一部分，但又有别于该架构，后者可能还包括监测、审计和检查。审计和检查职能属于联合国内部监督事务厅的职权范围，如有需要，该厅可对多边基金秘书处进行审计和检查。多边基金的监测职能由其秘书处和主任负责，由项目审查小组、行政小组和财务主任履行。⁵

¹ ST/SGB/2018/3

² 以下简称“评价政策”。

³ 联合国评价小组（2016 年）。《评价规范和标准》，纽约，联合国评价小组。

⁴ ST/AI/2021/3。2021 年 8 月 6 日及相关[准则--《联合国秘书处评价行政指示》](#)。

⁵ 高级监测和评价干事只负责监测职能的一个部分（与项目完成报告有关）。在第九十五次会议讨论期间，如 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94 号文件第 46 段所示，各方一致认为应将监测工作从高级监测和评价干事的职责中去除。

多边基金评价职能的目的

7. 在多边基金内部，评价工作由高级评价干事领导的评价股负责。评价职能于 1997 年设立；然而，本评价政策是执行委员会通过的第一项此类政策，将指导高级评价干事管理评价股和执行核定评价工作方案的工作。

8. 多边基金评价职能的主要目标是评估方案和项目的有效性，从评价中吸取经验教训，并将经验教训用于改进未来项目的设计和执行。以内容为基础的评价有助于参与项目设计、批准和实施的利益攸关方在知情的情况下做出决策和学习。

9. 多边基金的评价有三个主要目的：

- (a) **问责制：**评价是监督的关键组成部分，通过对计划活动的成果、进展和有效实施进行独立分析，促进问责制。它提供可信的信息，支持执行委员会发挥监督多边基金的作用。透明地报告评价结果有助于委员会相信多边基金有能力履行赋予它的职责。
- (b) **询证决策：**评价有助于多边基金在各个层面做出更好的决策。评价应为规划、方案编制、预算编制、执行和报告提供信息，并为循证决策和组织成效做出贡献。评价和对评价建议执行情况反馈是对有效的成果管理制的相关贡献；以及
- (c) **学习：**浓厚的评估文化是学习型组织的先决条件。评价有助于本组织及其执行伙伴从方案规划和项目实施中吸取经验教训，更好地了解为什么--以及在多大程度上--取得了预期的和非预期的结果，并分析结果的影响。对经验教训的汇编、分析和传播可以推动创新和不断改进。

10. 本评价政策调整了 ST/AI/2021/3 号文件中规定的联合国既定评价指导方针，以适应多边基金的具体任务，从而建立一个合适的框架，通过实现遵守《蒙特利尔议定书》的目标来评价多边基金支助的方案和项目。它界定了多边基金在行使评价职能方面的作用和责任。

职责和作用

11. 如下文所述，主要利益攸关方共同承担责任和作用，以确保有效、负责、可信、有用和独立的评价职能：

多边基金执行委员会

- (a) 是评价政策的保管人；
- (b) 核准评价政策及其定期更新；
- (c) 核准评价的两年期工作方案和预算以及评价工作方案的年度报告和更新。执行委员会可根据基金的优先事项随时提出具体的评价建议；

- (d) 批准高级评价干事作为评价股负责人的职责范围及其随后的修订；
- (e) 审议高级评价干事提交的评价报告和相关建议；
- (f) 对评估报告中的建议做出回应，就每项评价做出决定，同时考虑到高级评价干事的建议，并在其认为必要时做出管理层回应；
- (g) 在审议高级评价干事向执行委员会每年第一次会议提交的关于评价建议执行情况定期报告后，就进一步落实评价建议做出决定。

高级评价干事兼评价股股长⁶

- (a) 作为评价股股长，领导多边基金的评价职能；
- (b) 管理执行委员会核准的执行评价工作方案所需的所有方面，包括评价工作人员和非工作人员（如顾问、实习生）的征聘和监督；
- (c) 编制两年期评价工作方案草案和相关预算，提交执行委员会批准，并对其负责；
- (d) 向执行委员会提交评价报告，包括一般性和可操作的建议，在适用时可包括具体、可衡量、可实现、相关和有时限的（SMART）指标，以促进落实这些建议；也可提出一般性建议，旨在解决与多边基金及其执行机构的工作有关的更具战略性的问题；
- (e) 确保所有评价报告都是高质量的，并符合联合国评价小组的评价规范和标准（如果在基金任务范围内适用）；
- (f) 确保多边基金的评价符合多边基金的核定评价政策，并与 ST/SGB/2018/3 规定的《方案规划、预算内方案部分、执行情况监测和评价方法条例和细则》和关于联合国秘书处评价的 ST/AI/2021/3 保持一致；
- (g) 开发和维护一个后续系统，以监测建议的执行情况，并定期向执行委员会报告在采纳和执行评价建议方面取得的进展。对具体评价建议的后续报告应在建议被接受四年后停止，除非委员会另有决定；
- (h) 率先与多边基金执行机构的评价办公室开展合作与协调，探讨对多边基金项目执行相关问题进行联合评价的备选方案，或就共同关心的评价相关问题进行特别磋商；
- (i) 在联合国评价小组和其他相关的联合国论坛（如联合国秘书处的评价实践社区）上代表多边基金的评价职能；随时了解评价方面的趋势和创新，并通报这些趋势和创新，包括如何最好地利用这些趋势和创新来提高实现《蒙特利

⁶ 如果本评价政策获得批准，可能会对高级评价干事的职务说明进行更新，以更新高级评价干事的现有职权范围（第 58/5(c)号决定通过）。

尔议定书》目标的绩效；

- (j) 负责通过在线企业工具，包括定期评价通讯，提高评价产品的知名度及促进其传播，以促进吸收评价工作结果和吸取经验教训；
- (k) 向执行委员会报告为确保多边基金评价职能符合联合国和环境规划署评价职能不断变化的要求而采取的措施；
- (l) 制定准则和标准业务程序，以创建评价文化，并促进利益攸关方使用评价产品；以及
- (m) 根据执行委员会的要求，准备管理层可能对评价做出的回应。

多边基金秘书处主任

- (a) 保障评价职能的完整性，确保其独立于业务管理；
- (b) 在招聘程序完成后，向环境规划署执行主任推荐高级评价干事的任命；
- (c) 与秘书处一起为编制两年期评价工作方案献计献策，该方案由高级评价干事提交执行委员会核准；
- (d) 发挥对高级评价干事的行政监督作用，并促进批准与执行评价工作方案有关的行政事项；
- (e) 视执行委员会的要求，编写秘书处管理层对评价报告的回应；
- (f) 确保在秘书处的项目审查工作中使用评价报告和经验教训；以及
- (g) 拿出秘书处的部分时间提供必要的技术咨询，使多边基金在就评价所涉技术方面提供的专门知识更具质量保证。

执行机构和双边机构（包括其评价办公室）

- (a) 多边基金的执行机构，即开发计划署、环境规划署、工发组织、世界银行和双边机构在促进评价数据收集方面发挥着重要作用[以下简称机构]；
- (b) 各机构应响应评价股的提供信息要求，以便利顾问获得编写评价报告所需的信息；
- (c) 多边基金评价股可以咨询各机构的评价办公室，以便在评价旨在遵守《蒙特利尔议定书》的方案和项目时促进双向协同增效；
- (d) 多边基金评价股和各机构的评价办公室可就《蒙特利尔议定书》目标范围有关的共同感兴趣的项目定期交流信息；
- (e) 在执行委员会审议评价报告后做出决定时，各机构应采取必要行动，对向其

提出的建议做出回应。它们应监测与其工作有关的建议的执行情况，并通过高级评价干事向执行委员会报告执行进展情况；以及

- (f) 各机构可随时根据其在方案和项目执行方面的经验，就项目执行方面最突出的相关问题发表意见，从而为编制评价工作方案草案做出贡献。

其他利益攸关方，包括国家一级的利益攸关

12. 鼓励其他利益攸关方，包括国家臭氧机构、项目管理机构和其他参与执行工作的国家利益攸关方应高级评价干事的邀请参与评价。

评价框架--与多边基金有关的原则、规范 and 标准

13. 多边基金的评价将遵循上文第 2 段和第 10 段提及的联合国评价《条例和细则》及相关准则。评价的目的将与基金的任务相一致，并以联合国评价小组《规范和标准》（2016 年）、联合国评价小组《道德准则》（2020 年）、联合国评价小组《评价行为守则》（2008 年）和多边基金评价政策中规定的高质量评价的国际良好评价做法的核心原则和做法为指导。只适用与多边基金相关的规范，不得超出基金的任务范围，并充分尊重执行委员会的各项决定。

14. 高级评价干事作为多边基金评价股的负责人，将努力在评价的设计、管理和开展以及评价职能的整个结构和运作中遵守这些规范、标准、守则和指南。但是，在这样做的时候，将只使用符合多边基金核心任务的规范，而不进一步扩展到执行委员会未同意的任何领域。规范 8 仅适用于性别问题，因为多边基金有一项经核准的性别主流化政策。

表 1: 联合国评价小组的评价准则

一般评价准则
准则 1: 国际商定的原则、目标和指标
准则 2: 实用性
准则 3: 可信性
准则 4: 独立性
准则 5: 公正性
准则 6: 道德
准则 7: 透明度
准则 8: 人权与性别平等
准则 9: 国家评价能力
准则 10: 专业精神
联合国系统评价的机构准则
准则 11: 有利的环境
准则 12: 评价政策
准则 13: 评价职能的责任

来源: 联合国评价小组 (2016 年)

15. 在评价规范和标准中，在开展评价工作时遵守独立性、实用性、可信性和透明度等规范将有助于提高评价职能所开展工作的相关性和质量，从而对多边基金的工作产生积极影响。

独立性

16. 执行委员会负责监督评价职能的独立性。评价的独立性是可信度的必要条件；它影响评价的使用方式，并使评价人员在整个评价过程中保持公正，免受不必要的压力。

17. 高级评价干事必须有能力在不受任何一方不当影响的情况下进行评价，公正地开展评价工作，避免对职业发展造成负面影响，并且必须能够自由表达评价工作的结果。

18. 独立性还要求多边基金的评价股独立于该组织的管理职能，但适用于秘书处所有工作人员（包括高级评价干事和评价股工作人员）的强制性行政程序除外。

19. 独立评价股负责根据执行委员会通过其决定和批准评价工作方案及相关预算所赋予的任务制定评价工作方案。需要根据商定的评价工作量，通过相应的预算为评价职能提供充足的资源。评价职能必须得到行政支持才能开展工作、独立评价多边基金方案和项目组合的成效和业绩。

20. 高级评价干事有责任与主任协商，向执行委员会提交评价报告。如果对评价报告或产品有不同意见，主任作为秘书处的负责人，可以发表不同意见，陈述差异，供执行委员会审议。

实用性

21. 在委托和开展评价时，应列明打算利用由此产生的分析、结果、经验教训和建议，为执行委员会的决策提供信息。有用的评价能为知情决策、组织学习进程和成果问责做出相关和及时的贡献。评价可以促进知识的生成，增强利益攸关方的能力，利益攸关方可以利用汲取的经验教训提高多边基金方案和项目设计和执行的有效性。

可信性

22. 评价必须是可信的。可信性的关键因素包括透明的评价过程、公正性、有相关利益攸关方参与的包容性方法和强有力的质量保证系统。评价结果和建议是通过使用现有的最客观、可靠和有效的数据，以及对证据进行准确的定量和定性分析得出的。可信性要求评

价工作由具有专业和文化能力的评价人员以合乎道德的方式进行和管理，确保评价过程和评价结果的质量。

透明度

23. 透明度是评价的一个基本要素，它可以建立信任和信心，增强利益攸关方的主人翁意识，加强公众问责。评价产品应可在网上公开获取，并应作为多边基金交流和知识管理平台的一个组成部分进行分发。高级评价干事将确保透明度不会超出适用的保密范围。在这些特定情况下，只允许执行委员会成员和主任有限制地访问，以保持敏感信息的完全机密性。

评价方式和产出

24. 方案和项目评价可以通过不同的方法进行，其范围和覆盖面各不相同，取决于执行委员会提出的要求。评价方式见下表 2。执行委员会将决定其作为评价工作方案一部分核准的评价方式。

表2: 评价方式

评价方式	说明
战略和专题评价	战略评价将均衡地涵盖政策、战略和核心规划手段。
方案和组合评价	进行方案和组合评价的情况如下：即与单个项目评估相比，综合评估能更有效地提供学习和问责的机会。
项目评价	评价股将有目的地选择一些即将完成业务的项目样本进行独立评价。
部门和跨部门评价--包括区域/区域间和国家方法	将在这种方式下对具体部门进行评价；跨部门评价将揭示一个部门的行动与其他部门的行动可能产生的协同作用（或外部效应）；这些评价可以在国家、区域和/或区域间分析层面进行。
影响评价/ 研究	在时间和资源允许的情况下，将有选择地开展影响评价/研究，包括对《蒙特利尔议定书》取得的成就进行跨部门评价，以及与其任务范围内的可持续发展目标有关的评价，如性别和气候，必要时还包括其他联合国系统横向可持续发展问题。
联合评价 (半独立评价)	联合评估将针对共同的评价对象进行--不适用覆盖范围规范。在相关情况下，可根据执行委员会对选定评价的要求，与多边基金执行机构和双边机构的评价办公室合作规划联合评价。
过程评价	对涉及不同行为者--秘书处、执行机构和双边机构、国家臭氧机构和其他适用的多边基金伙伴--的程序和工作流程进行评价，以确定效力和效率方面的潜在收益。
两年期评价综述	这将在工作方案执行期结束时每两年进行一次。

更柔和、更具战略性的评价

25. 除上述类型的评价外，该职能有时可应执行委员会的要求，评估多边基金项目和活动的更广泛影响，如性别、社会和经济影响（即，特别是与《基加利修正案》有关的气候相关问题）。在相关和适当的情况下，可将这些影响作为传统的行业和项目评价的一部分，

而不是作为单独的评价活动来考虑。应定期对体制强化、培训计划和技术援助进行评价，以评估支持第 5 条国家的这一关键部分的有效和高效运作情况。

评价产出

26. 多边基金的评价是以案头研究的形式进行的，最终在审议了案头研究的结果和建议之后进入第二阶段。案头研究是自成一体的报告，主要依靠多边基金和执行机构编制的文件。案头研究通常不涉及国家访问，但可以根据需要使用调查和访谈。

27. 为了与评价职能专业化的发展保持一致，多边基金将采用起始报告作为可能的评价产出的一部分。在对案头研究及其所附的初始文件进行审议之后，初始文件将被视为对证据进行最终核实以及对结论和建议进行验证的一项要求，而初始文件的使用将加强评价的第一阶段（案头研究）与第二阶段拟议的额外评价工作之间的分析联系。

28. 评价股可根据评价的目的和阶段，按照执行委员会在批准评价工作方案和每项授权评价的职权范围时提出的要求，提供各种产出。通常情况下，评价工作的成果可能包括以下产品：

- 职权范围；
- 初始文件；
- 案头研究；
- 评价报告；
- 指南和模板；
- 关于评价问题的工作文件；
- 经验教训简报；
- 评价结果要点；以及
- 关于建议后续行动的报告。

29. 产出清单可随着评价职能的需要而不断变化，并可在今后应执行委员会的要求更新评价政策时重新审视。

评价资源

30. 执行委员会在通过两年期评价工作方案时批准评价资源，包括相关预算，并可在任何会议上，特别是在高级评价干事提交的年度报告介绍最新进展情况之后，对其进行修正。

31. 评价工作是在根据联合国秘书处有关该事项的条例和细则以及行政通知聘用的外部顾问的支持下进行的。多边基金秘书处为招聘过程提供行政支持。顾问偶尔可应执行委员会的要求参与介绍评价结果。

32. 高级评价干事对评价工作及其结果负责。顾问在高级评价干事的监督下工作，并在评价过程中的中期阶段提交报告。高级评价干事由一名一般事务人员协助，后者为评价股的研究和行政工作提供支持。

宣传、推广和公开披露

33. 评价报告应分发给所有评价利益攸关方，并在多边基金网站的评价页面上公布。高级评价干事应编写简短的信息文件，以传播主要的评价结果、经验教训和建议，并通过网站进行分享。应适当注意对敏感信息的保密，这些信息可能会在编制评价产出时使用，应符合有关这一事项的评价标准。

34. 评价部门还可以编写内部工作文件和指导原则，以促进加强评价的实用性和相关利益攸关方对评价的利用，并为网站编写报道，传播评价工作的成果。

Annex II

COMPILATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE SMEO FROM SEVEN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS' CONSTITUENCIES AS PER DECISION 95/8(c)(*)

Note: Annex II presents the literal text of the submissions provided by seven Executive Members' constituencies as per decision 95/8(c). It is to be noted that the comments on the evaluation policy are made on the draft outline which was included in the final assessment report in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10. The contents of the submissions have been considered by the SMEO in preparing the draft evaluation policy (annex I of the present document) and the draft potential management response. The text of the submissions has been anonymized.

SUBMISSION 1

In general

It is important to make a clear distinction between recommendations for 1) improvement of the evaluation and monitoring function that will need a reorganization of tasks within the MLF-Secretariat, 2) the establishment of a clear evaluation function and 3) elements that are connected to the interaction of the evaluation function and reports with the Executive Committee.

Clear distinction between responsibilities of Chief Officer and Evaluation Officer

The evaluation function of the MLF should be designed in such a way that someone or a unit can analyze and evaluate projects and programs and put forward recommendations to the Executive Committee without actual approval of the SMEO, MLF-staff or the ones involved in the projects and programs.

Changing the name to Senior Evaluation Officer and deleting the 'Monitoring' would make the function clearer. Information to fill in the evaluation reports should however be collected through the people and organizations involved in projects and programs and their views should be heard, but not necessarily be approved by the evaluation officer. In the preparation of the reports, the Evaluation Officer can also organize meetings with evaluation consultants, MLF-Secretariat and implementing agencies involved in the projects. In the end there should be an independent evaluation report, approved by the Senior Evaluation Officer.

In case there are differences of opinion between the Chief Officer and the Evaluation Officer in presenting an evaluation report to the Executive Committee, the Chief Officer can provide a minority report (as has been done before) to the Executive Committee. It is then up to the Executive Committee to look at these reports and if necessary, provide a management response. It would be logical to establish a protocol on how evaluations are conducted and what are the roles, responsibilities and procedures to be followed in the MLF-Secretariat and especially to secure the independent position of the Evaluation Officer and the Chief Officer.

Separate monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are now mixed in one function. Monitoring projects and programs shouldn't be part of the evaluation function, but be a task performed by others in the MLF-Secretariat. The monitoring doesn't need to be part of evaluation, as it is more keeping track of projects and programs and can be part of the regular work of the ones in charge of projects/programs.

* This compilation of submissions has been anonymized with no attribution to specific members.

How the monitoring could be organized in the work of the MLF-Secretariat is something that can be worked out by the Secretariat itself. As long as the Executive Committee gets the requested information, and the monitoring is performed in the same accurate way as before.

Make more use of evaluation functions/information of the implementing agencies

In order to make the Evaluation function in the MLF as efficient and effective as possible it would be good to see if more use can be made of the evaluation infrastructure within the implementing agencies and see how that information can be drawn into the MLF. It would be good to explore if this is a workable way and how it can be done.

Develop an Evaluation Policy

The further development of the evaluation function should also be complemented with an evaluation policy on how the evaluations will be conducted, how the processes are designed, what the role of desk studies is, who will be involved and if possible, how to make use of or cooperate with the evaluation infrastructure in the implementing agencies. This also could be combined with the protocol on the roles, responsibilities and procedures to be followed in the MLF-Secretariat and especially to secure the independent position of the Evaluation Officer.

The role of the Executive Committee and spreading knowledge

In order to improve the evaluations, the recommendation to establish fewer and more strategic evaluations would be a logical one to follow up. These evaluations could then be included in the biennial work program. And fewer and more strategic evaluations could also be more discussed in dept in the Executive Committee and combined with an appropriate management response of the Executive Committee. As these evaluations then become more integrated in the whole process of project- and program management in the MLF it also would be good to have them more widely spread to the organizations and people that were part of the evaluation, to the evaluation offices from the implementing agencies and to the public in general to learn via the website.

SUBMISSION 2

Recommendation 1: Finalise a Multilateral Fund evaluation policy using a participatory process

Support this recommendation

Comments

The draft outline of an evaluation policy contained in Annex II of the *Final Report on the External Assessment of the Evaluation Function of the Multilateral Fund* provides a good basis for an evaluation policy for the MLF. The Executive Committee member supports the structure and the key elements of this draft outline. The member also confirms that it agrees with the recommendation to reframe the role of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) into that of a Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO), and hence to clarify that all monitoring functions, including the review of project completion reports (PCRs), will from thereon be the responsibility of Secretariat staff.

However, there are a few points where the Member differs from what is proposed under the draft evaluation outline and a few additional issues we would like to raise, as per the following.

- It has not been the usual practice under the Multilateral Fund that a management response be prepared for each evaluation. In the Member's view, the decision taken by the Executive Committee

in response to the recommendations of the SMEO (or SEO) would in most cases continue to be sufficient to address the results and recommendations of the evaluation, though occasionally, the Executive Committee could decide that a formal management response be prepared (as per the present self-assessment of the evaluation function). In such cases, the Executive Committee could decide to request the Chief Officer to prepare a draft management response for its consideration (however, this does not need to be specified in the evaluation policy). We therefore suggest that point (e) under “The Executive Committee” in the draft outline be modified as follows (text in bold is added):

- It **responds endorses and approves to the** recommendations in evaluation reports ~~as well as associated by~~ **taking a decision on each evaluation, taking into account the recommendations of the Senior Evaluation Officer, and if it deems necessary, through a management response.**

Consequently, we suggest to delete the point under “The Chief Officer”: *Ensures that a management response is prepared for each evaluation report.* In the context of the Multilateral Fund, the role of ensuring whether a management response is prepared or not should rest with the Executive Committee.

- Under the section “Responsibility for Evaluation”, or in a separate section, the roles and responsibilities of the bilateral and implementing agencies (IAs) should also be outlined, for instance, in terms of their roles in providing project-related information to the SMEO and evaluation consultants and when appropriate, accompanying them on field evaluation visits. Reference could also be made to the internal evaluation functions and practices of the implementing agencies as these pertain to their MLF project portfolios. On a related point, the bilateral and implementing agencies sometimes conduct evaluations of MLF projects in response to their own internal evaluation requirements. Whether and how the results of such evaluations could be shared with the SMEO and Executive Committee should be discussed with the agencies and ideally addressed in the policy.
- In the section on “Types of Evaluation”, taking into account Recommendation 5, which the Executive Committee member partly agrees with, it would be useful to indicate in the policy that in addition to the types of evaluations mentioned (sectoral, investment, non-investment), evaluations could on occasion be conducted to assess the broader impacts of MLF projects and activities, such as gender, social, economic and SDG impacts. When relevant and appropriate, these impacts may be considered as part of the traditional sectoral and project evaluations, rather than as separate evaluation exercises.
- Also, in the section on “Types of Evaluation”, the concept of Inception Reports, discussed under Recommendation 4, should be incorporated. It may also be considered that inception reports could be an outcome of the desk studies in cases when the latter are followed by field evaluations. It would also be useful to clarify that unlike field evaluations, desk studies and inception reports would not normally involve site visits, as the language in Recommendation 4 could be misinterpreted.
- Further, in the section on “Types of Evaluation”, the Member is open-minded to include the concepts of “semi-independent evaluation” and “joint evaluation with implementing agencies’ evaluation units”, on the understanding that these evaluation modalities would be considered occasionally and when there is a particular reason to do so. It may be useful for the Executive Committee to further discuss with the SMEO, Secretariat and IAs how these types of evaluations could bring added value, the level of additional resources involved, and how they should be reflected in the evaluation policy.
- While the concept of “inspection” is briefly defined in the draft outline, it is not clear what role, if any, inspections would play within the MLF’s evaluation framework. We suggest that the SMEO

provide more information and context with respect to this concept and that it be discussed at the 96th Executive Committee meeting.

Recommendation 2: Use evaluation guidelines as a tool for raising awareness

Partially support this recommendation

Comments

The Executive Committee member agrees that once an evaluation policy is developed, its key elements should inform the development of specific guidelines that outline how evaluations are carried out, roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders (SMEO), Secretariat, bilateral and implementing agencies, consultants, NOUs), the principles, approaches and practices to be used in evaluations, etc. However, the Member sees such guidelines as a technical document that would be shared with these stakeholders for the purpose of enabling their work in relation to evaluations, not a document to raise awareness about evaluations generally. Therefore, the Member does not see the need to share or discuss such guidelines at regional network meetings. As the issue of outreach to regional network meetings is also partly addressed under Recommendation 4, the Member's views with respect to the role of such meetings, and on awareness-raising beyond immediate evaluation stakeholders, are outlined in our response to that particular recommendation. The Member agrees that the guidelines should be made available on-line in the evaluation section of the MLF website. In addition to being shared with key evaluation stakeholders. The Member thinks the guidelines should be shared with the Executive Committee for information only.

Recommendation 3: Upgrade and standardize the formats of evaluation reports and introduce a system of follow-up to track evaluation recommendations

Support this recommendation

Comments

The Executive Committee member supports the proposal that the SMEO prepare “a simple annotated guide for evaluation consultants which standardizes the format and provides illustrative examples of how key sections such as the Executive Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations, should be presented”. The Member expects that such guidance could be incorporated into the aforementioned evaluation guidelines rather than be subject of a separate document. That said, the Member is open-minded on this issue. With respect to a follow-up system to track whether and how evaluation recommendations are being addressed, again the Member supports this in principle. However, to the extent possible, the system should be simple and avoid excessive reporting requirements unless there is a compelling case for an extensive follow-up. Furthermore, we expect that in most cases, the tracking of recommendations emanating from a particular evaluation will not be perpetual, so there will be a need to specify for how long the recommendations will be tracked, which would likely need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. It would be useful if the SMEO could share preliminary ideas for a tracking system at Executive Committee 96. Finally, while the Member agrees that, to the extent possible, recommendations should be “specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART)”, this should not preclude the possibility of occasionally having more general recommendations, the implementation of which may not be easily or directly measurable, such as requesting or encouraging the agencies or NOUs to consider certain issues when developing or implementing projects.

Recommendation 4: Engaging stakeholders in the work progress of evaluation***(a) Revisit the purpose of desk studies and consider introducing inception reports***

The Executive Committee member supports this recommendation

Comments

The Executive Committee member is open to the idea of inception reports as described in the recommendation. However, we still consider desk studies as a valid first phase or as a limited report in their own right for particular types of evaluations. As indicated under recommendation 1, an inception report could be the outcome of a desk study. All type of reports should be outlined in the evaluation policy along with their differing methodologies and approaches. We suggest having the type of report proposed in the inception stage or terms of reference for each evaluation for Executive Committee approval.

(b) Undertake fewer, deeper more strategic evaluations

The Executive Committee member broadly supports this recommendation

Comments

The Executive Committee member is open to the concept of having some deeper more strategic evaluation activities but would not like them to replace the more content-based evaluations undertaken at present.

- It is important to recognise the primary objective of the evaluation function is to assess and improve the implementation of projects, and evaluations should continue to focus on this objective.
- We are open to the concept of some evaluations involving more than one external consultant where the Executive Committee sees the value in a more comprehensive / resource intensive approach.

We agree with the concept of MLF staff contributing ideas for issues which might benefit from an evaluation, however that is organised. We also agree with exploring the possibility of joint evaluations with IAs where this may improve the evaluation outcomes and inviting IA staff to join an evaluation team where this could provide value. In relation to the proposal for having MLF Secretariat staff as part of evaluation teams, we are concerned about the potential burden this will place on already very busy staff. We would be open to MLF staff contributing support for short period of time and for specific activities, but not on an ongoing basis and not during the project review period.

(c) Streamline interaction with Executive Committee

The Member does not support this recommendation

Comments

We would not like to see evaluations proceed without Executive Committee oversight. We would also not like to see significant work carried out in advance of Executive Committee agreement to undertake specified evaluations. However, we consider the process could be streamlined somewhat as we do not see the third step (a report on evaluation progress) as being essential. In the case of the Executive Committee agreeing to a desk study in advance of consideration of whether to proceed to a final evaluation report, this needs to be incorporated into the timeline.

(d) *Introduce briefing sessions with evaluation consultants*

The Executive Committee member supports this recommendation

Comments

Please note we do not consider “face-to-face” sessions as being “in-person” sessions. In many cases, virtual sessions will be the most cost-effective means to conduct briefing sessions. We also consider the involvement of MLF staff is discretionary and dependent on their time and interest in the particular evaluation.

Request evaluation as standing agenda item at key Multilateral Fund meetings with stakeholders (e.g. IACM and Regional Networks Meetings)

The Executive Committee member partially supports this recommendation

Comments

We agree on a session on evaluation being included in the Inter-agency Coordination Meeting (IACM) agenda for its first meeting of the year. It is not clear whether it requires a half day to be scheduled for this perhaps a maximum of 1.5 or 2 hours would be sufficient. We are not convinced that evaluation should be a standing agenda item at regional network meetings. We do see value in some evaluation results being shared at network meetings where they are relevant to the operation of NOUs or implementation of specific types of projects, but this would be on a case-by-case basis. We suggest consultations with UNEP to determine which evaluation outcomes should be shared in network meetings.

Recommendation 5: Reappraise the evaluation framework used at Multilateral Fund

The Executive Committee member is supportive of this recommendation. As indicated in our response to Recommendation 1, the Member is open to consider the SMEO conducting “softer” evaluations that focus on the possible broader impacts of projects. However, we would want to assess the value of any proposed “softer” activities on a case-by-case basis and in light of other evaluation activities planned and priorities of the Executive Committee. While not mentioned under this recommendation, The Executive Committee member suggests that there is a need to develop more innovative evaluation approaches with respect to non-investment activities supported by the MLF (including training, policy assistance and institutional strengthening), as we feel that such evaluations have lacked a certain rigor in the past. The SMEO could consider developing a framework to evaluate such activities that clearly defines the expected outputs, outcomes and ultimate results of these activities.

Recommendation 6: Introduce enhanced quality assurance (QA) mechanisms for evaluation reports

The Executive Committee member is generally supportive of this recommendation; however, we see the QA role as one for the SMEO to undertake. The SMEO was recruited as an expert in evaluation, and we do not see the point of having an expert SMEO and then farming out all the evaluation and QA work to consultants. We do see value in relevant MLF staff providing comments on evaluation outcomes, provided this does not occur during project review periods and where they consider they have relevant expertise to share.

Recommendation 7: Supplementing evaluation expertise in the short to medium term

The Member does not support the proposal to supplement evaluation expertise with a junior evaluation officer, whether in the short to medium term by recruitment, as we consider that the current PCR reform,

preparation of the evaluation policy and other tasks can be undertaken by the SMEO within existing resources. Once the responsibility for monitoring the PCRs has shifted to Secretariat staff, the SMEO should have additional time to focus on evaluation work. That said, if a strong case is made by the SMEO that additional consultant expertise is required to address other specific issues from time-to-time, the Member would be open to consider this on a case-by-case basis.

SUBMISSION 3

Recommendation 1: Finalise a Multilateral Fund evaluation policy using a participatory process

Agreed - Additional comments on the role of the head of the evaluation unit to be updated in the evaluation policy can be useful for the text of the PMR. Do the evaluation policy respond to the needs and findings? I.e. clarifying the purpose, role and use of evaluation, and how it differs from monitoring.

Recommendation 2: Use evaluation guidelines as a tool for raising awareness

Agree but perhaps the SMEO could further elaborate on how this is foreseen to be performed and the messages.

Recommendation 3: Upgrade and standardize the formats of evaluation reports and introduce a system of follow-up to track evaluation recommendations

Agreed

Recommendation 4: Engaging key stakeholders in the work process of evaluation (a to e)

Agree in the need of having active stakeholders to ensure accuracy in the conclusion of the evaluation, though not fully following the overarching rationale for this recommendation.

- (a) Agree with remarks to be taken into consideration: Acknowledge that the outcome of this recommendation could have positive effects by strengthening this type of evaluation, however, there will be a need to prioritize carefully the use of this type of evaluation, since it implies larger financial and human resources.
- (b) Agree.
- (c) Partially agree, we agree to streamline to a certain extent. Perhaps the SMEO could present an alternative way in the PMR. We believe there is a risk to miss useful insights from the Executive Committee when the ToR are not anymore up to consideration to the Executive Committee. Experience has shown that the Executive Committee has contributed with useful comments overtime ensuring quality and pertinence of the ToR, and this has been decisive to leading to successful evaluations.
- (d) Agree on both type of briefings presented in the recommendation, but with the following remarks on briefing sessions with consultants, SMEO and Secretariat staff to discuss draft reports before finalization: positive to organizing such sessions especially in the case where the Executive Committee will not consider draft reports anymore (reference to recommendation 4c). However, we are wondering whether it could be an idea to explore possible synergies with the recommendation no. 6. It would have been useful if the SMEO could address this in the PMR.

- (e) Agree to include a standard item in the agenda with IACM, also a Regional Networks Meetings, however, we are uncertain about the proposed length of time, half day session seems rather long. Perhaps the SMEO could provide some clarification on this point in the PMR.

Recommendation 5: Reappraise the evaluation framework used at Multilateral Fund

Agree that the framework must be possible to adjust according to the needs, it should therefore be considered thoroughly what would be appropriate ambitions considering the size of the MLF, its limited financial resources, as well as the workload of the MLF institutions. Perhaps the SMEO could elaborate a bit more in the potential management response on options for gradually extending the evaluation framework and develop innovative approaches overtime.

Recommendation 6: Introduce enhanced quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation reports

Agree that it is important to assure enhances quality. A question is though that isn't it the role of SEO to ensure the quality of the evaluation reports. i.e. it's the consultants who perform the evaluation and then deliver to SEO for assurance? What timeframe is anticipated for this? The development of the ToR is mainly a one-off action. Also here, it should be considered thoroughly what would be appropriate ambition level considering the size of the MLF, its limited financial resources, as well as the workload of the MLF institutions. As mentioned previously, there might be possible synergies to explore with recommendation number 4. It would have been useful if the SMEO could address this in the PMR. It is also not clear for us whether this recommendation entail new staff recruitment (in reference to "consider recruiting a resource person") considering that the SMEO already has an assistant. It will be useful to have some clarification on this matter in the PMR.

Recommendation 7: Supplementing evaluation expertise in the short to medium term

Might agree, but it would have been useful to have more clarification in the potential management response about the suggestions in this recommendation, what are the needs more specifically and what it will imply in terms of financial resources.

SUBMISSION 4

Recommendation 1: Finalise a Multilateral Fund evaluation policy using a participatory process

Happy with the proposal for a clear and separate identity for evaluation and monitoring, feel this is needed. Support the creation of a new post.

Recommendation 2: Use evaluation guidelines as a tool for raising awareness

This outreach will be very helpful especially in the context of bilateral projects, look forward to the next IACM in March. People have to see value in the results of evaluations. Summarizing of lessons learned is important. Maybe find an example of one specific evaluation result that clearly shows how to improve a certain work process.

Recommendation 3: Upgrade and standardize the formats of evaluation reports and introduce a system of follow-up to track evaluation recommendations

Support a tracking system for evaluation recommendations and more easily readable as its often time consuming to locate – it would be helpful to have this coordinated in one place for ease of access. Agreed. Develop digital or KI-solution to track recommendations on specific topics or per region?

Recommendation 4: Engaging key stakeholders in the work process of evaluation (a to e)

The Executive Committee member is positive to learn about planning stakeholder outreach as part of this process. If more visits to countries are valuable then we can support this, although we should be mindful of the costs involved.

- (a) Support revisiting the purpose of the desk studies, they often feel too comprehensive and feel MLF could benefit from a more streamlined/analytical process.
- (b) Undertake fewer but more strategic evaluations – Chief Officer lead MLF staff in a brainstorming session to explore what issues require evaluation attention. Is this something that will routinely go via Executive Committee too? It could be useful for Parties to input into the areas in which we'd benefit more information on/lessons learned.
- (e) I wonder if regular sessions at IACM would be necessary, apart from a kick-off for the new strategy and rather do this at regional network meetings, where NOUs and IAs are present.

Recommendation 5: Reappraise the evaluation framework used at Multilateral Fund

Agree that more innovative evaluation approaches should be developed for softer activities - feel that MLF could benefit from stronger linkages with other SDGs (i.e. 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13) – the compliance-oriented approach sometimes limits our ability to assess other outcomes and impacts. Monitoring and evaluation are less developed for institutional strengthening or capacity building, compared to investment projects – I hope this process will try to address that? Clearer set of performance measures needed for non-investment activities and verifying and ensuring the sustainability of results needs more attention from MLF.

Agreed. With all the current changes and difficulties in governments globally it becomes more important to have figures on impact, not only the substances, e.g., which can be very abstract for people not familiar with the sector. Important to promote MP results also outside of the refrigeration world.

Recommendation 6: Introduce enhanced quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation reports

Agreed.

Recommendation 7: Supplementing evaluation expertise in the short to medium term

The Member's constituency supports a [temporary] junior position.

SUBMISSION 5

I do agree with the seven recommendations of the assessment.

SUBMISSION 6

Je viens au nom de toute l'équipe vous témoigner une fois encore notre gratitude pour le partage des Recommandations et du projet de politique d'évaluation. Cependant, après analyse des différents documents, nous partageons les différentes recommandations. De ce fait, nous n'avons pas de commentaires et d'amendements à faire. Toutefois nous restons ouverts pour la suite de la collaboration.

SUBMISSION 7

I. COMMENTS ON ELEMENTS FOR A DRAFT OUTLINE OF AN EVALUATION POLICY FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

1. Among the Evaluation Principles, Norms and Standards of Relevance to Multilateral Fund in Part III, credibility is of paramount importance for the evaluation. Considering the various situations in Article 5 countries and the limited number of Article 5 countries participating in the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, the evaluation reports should ensure broad stakeholder participation and incorporate the views of stakeholders, in particular Article 5 countries and the international implementing agencies, in order to ensure the objectivity and authenticity of the evaluation reports.

2. Also in Part III, on the principle of transparency, it states that evaluation products should be publicly accessible. In view of the fact that the evaluation reports cover projects and activities carried out by countries and may involve relevant trade secrets or sensitive data and information, it is suggested that the principle of transparency explicitly states that the evaluation reports should avoid involving relevant trade secrets or sensitive data and information.

3. The Types of Evaluations in Part IV include two existing types of evaluations (independent evaluations, desk studies) and two new types of evaluations proposed to be added (semi-independent evaluation and joint evaluation with implementing agencies' evaluation units). It is suggested that SMEO, in its report to the 96th Executive Committee, provide additional analysis of the characteristics of the above four types of evaluations and the circumstances in which they are applicable, and the necessity for adding semi-independent evaluation and joint evaluation with implementing agencies' evaluation units, for further consideration by the Executive Committee.

II. COMMENTS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A ROADMAP TO STRENGTHEN THE MLF EVALUATION FUNCTION

Recommendation 5 proposes more innovative evaluation approaches and would support assessment of gender, human rights and SDGs as newer priorities for the Multilateral Fund and central to the Norms and Standards of the UNEG. It is suggested that the evaluation should be carried out within the policies of the Multilateral Fund, and that the scope of the evaluation should not be expanded arbitrarily. It's suggested that the texts "This would support assessment of gender, human rights and the SDGs which are newer priorities for the Multilateral Fund and central to the Norms and Standards of the UNEG" should be deleted.

Annex III

VIEWS OF THE SENIOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OFFICER ON THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSESSMENT AND DRAFT TENTATIVE PLAN OF FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

1. The independent assessment of the evaluation function constitutes a landmark report which can ignite a transformative approach to achieve enhanced utility and relevance for the MLF evaluation function, which was sought in the terms of reference (TOR) for the assessment.¹ In my capacity as the head of the evaluation unit, I will provide the SMEO's views on the recommendations of the assessment,² keeping in mind the discussions held at the 95th meeting, as reflected in paragraphs 44 to 51 of the final report of the 95th meeting,³ and the submissions provided by the Executive Committee members' constituencies, as per decision 98/5(c).
2. The below SMEO views on recommendations are followed by a summary table for a draft tentative plan of action, which could provide some indication on timeline for the implementation of some actions, should the Committee be interested and request them as part of its consideration and adoption of the Potential Management Response. The draft tentative plan of action is a pro-active initiative which is meant to facilitate the discussions for the next steps towards a more relevant and useful evaluation function. It is presented for information purposes.
3. **Recommendation 1:** It refers to the *definition of an evaluation policy* for the Multilateral Fund, the separation of the monitoring and evaluation functions, and the reframing of the role of the SMEO as a Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO). With its endorsement, the Executive Committee would also provide the framework for the updated role of the evaluation function, including the adoption of an evaluation policy and updated TOR for the head of the evaluation unit, transferring the monitoring function of project-related work fully to the Secretariat, from a date to be decided by the Executive Committee. During the discussions at the 95th meeting, there was agreement that monitoring should be removed from the person's [SMEO's] responsibilities, reframing the position to Senior Evaluation Officer.
4. The formalization of an evaluation policy for the Fund is a necessary step to provide an operational framework for the development of the evaluation function, defining the institutional set-up for it and the roles of the different stakeholders in contributing to evaluation processes and outputs. In response to this recommendation and as requested in decision 95/8, a draft evaluation policy is proposed in annex I of the present document, for adoption at the 96th meeting. After the approval of an evaluation policy, the Executive Committee may revise the job description for the head of the evaluation unit, to be reframed as Senior Evaluation Officer, to update the responsibilities of the position in line with the recommendations of the assessment and the updated evaluation policy. The Committee could request to the SMEO and the Secretariat to prepare and present a proposed revision of the job description for the SEO at the 97th meeting, for its consideration.
5. Regarding the transfer of responsibilities for project completion reports (PCRs), in my view the process should be completed by the 98th meeting, after the full integration of the universal PCR format in the knowledge management system (KMS). The evaluation unit and the Secretariat could coordinate the transfer for a smooth transition. From there, the Secretariat could take responsibility for the collection and management of PCRs, owning the entire monitoring function to cover the full life cycle of Multilateral Fund projects.

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/92/8

² For ease of reference, a literal extract of the seven recommendations of the assessment is in annex IV.

³ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94 paragraphs 44 to 52.

6. **Recommendation 2:** This recommendation refers to the *development and use of evaluation guidelines* for awareness raising among stakeholders. These would be developed after the adoption of the new evaluation policy by the Executive Committee. In my view, the preparation of guidelines will help inform the different stakeholders about their expected role in contributing to the evaluations and will provide outreach tools for disseminating the results of the evaluation reports. As such, this component of recommendation 2 could be accepted, and the evaluation unit could undertake to prepare the guidelines and present them to the Executive Committee for information.

7. The evaluation products, tools and guidelines should be posted under the evaluation page of the Multilateral Fund website.⁴ The SMEO could be requested to report on progress made in the development of specific guidelines, in a dedicated section of the annual report on evaluation activities providing updates on the reform of the evaluation function.

8. Another element of the recommendation refers to the use of meetings of regional networks and the inter-agency coordination meetings (IACMs) to disseminate information about evaluation. As this has already been done on ad hoc basis depending on the needs of the function and the availability of new information to be shared, in my view this part of the recommendation does not require further action other than continuing with current practices. The regular IACM agenda already includes an evaluation item, and in average the SMEO attends two regional network meetings per year, either online or in person.

9. **Recommendation 3:** This recommendation refers to the preparation of standards for evaluation reports and the *establishment of a systematic follow-up system* to track the status of implementation of the approved evaluation recommendations. The SMEO would organize a procedure to collect the data on a regular basis to consolidate a report. Such a mechanism would help to better measure the impact and utility of the evaluation function's work. The proposed follow-up system would enhance the utility of the evaluation reports by increasing stakeholders' accountability with regard to reporting on the implementation of the approved recommendations.

10. The establishment of a follow-up system is also in line with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms, which also refer to the need for periodic reporting to governing bodies or heads of organizations on the implementation of recommendations. Therefore, in my view this recommendation could be accepted.

11. **Recommendation 4:** This recommendation addresses different modalities for *engaging with stakeholders*, including forms of interaction with the governing body, the purpose and development of the evaluation work, and the involvement of different stakeholders. It is presented through five sub-recommendations that are not clearly interrelated, making it difficult to consider accepting recommendation 4 all at once. In my view, if the Executive Committee is interested in discussing the above-mentioned five sub-recommendations further, a more detailed analysis of this recommendation could be prepared for the 97th meeting to be included in the annual report, or for the first meeting in 2026.⁵

12. It is advisable that further consultation be undertaken to identify modalities of engagement with stakeholders that would increase the uptake of evaluation results. The approach of fewer but more strategic evaluations is welcome and merits further analysis on how to select the topics for such strategic evaluations. Involving the Executive Committee and the agencies in preparing the evaluation work programme, while

⁴ Replacing the current tab of monitoring and evaluation.

⁵ The Executive Committee may prefer to consider it at the first meeting of the year where there is a lesser workload than at the 2nd meeting, therefore at the 98th meeting.

incorporating consultations with the Secretariat, would pave the way for the work programme to become more strategic and relevant.

13. Regarding the proposed streamlining of interaction with the Executive Committee, in my view the existing *status quo* of consultation works well. No change in the existing reporting mechanisms would be required for the governing body to exercise its oversight role on the evaluation function. Concerning the possibility of having consultants involved in briefing sessions, in my view this would be useful only in cases where the evaluation is commissioned by but independent from the evaluation unit, as was the case for the assessment of the evaluation function. Otherwise, unless it is needed for technical reasons requiring in-depth expertise beyond the SMEO's ability to report, it may not bring added value to the briefing session, while implying additional costs to fund the consultant's participation.

14. Regarding the evaluation as a standing item in the meetings of the Multilateral Fund, it is already the case for the meetings of the Executive Committee. Recalling that the document "Evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their business plans" is prepared and presented by the Secretariat, I would suggest that this report be presented under the agenda item eight⁶ which includes agencies' presentations of their business plans or annual reports. In such a way, the evaluation item six of the Executive Committee meeting would contain exclusively outputs prepared by the evaluation unit, while those items related to agencies, such as the performance document, would fall under item eight.

15. **Recommendation 5:** While the overall reference to the UNEG norms and standards is the broadly accepted professional set-up for the work of evaluation offices within the United Nations, I would like to explicitly mention that these would always be applied within the realm of the approved mandate of the Multilateral Fund and its evaluation function, in alignment with policies approved by the Executive Committee. For example, gender can be addressed as part of norm 8,⁷ noting that there is an approved gender mainstreaming policy for the Multilateral Fund.

16. Thus, in my view, this recommendation can be partially accepted, with the caveat of preserving the boundaries of the Multilateral Fund mandate. This will avoid that the observance of UNEG norms and standards might broaden the scope of evaluations beyond the core Multilateral Fund mandate. The nuance has already been included in the proposed draft evaluation policy in annex I.

17. **Recommendation 6:** This recommendation proposes the *introduction of quality-assurance mechanisms* through internal peer reviews in the Secretariat or with the help of a reference group that could help review the technical aspects of evaluation reports. The SMEO has the required skills and knowledge to exercise quality assurance in relation to undertaking evaluations and applying the professional standards for evaluation. The additional quality-assurance mechanisms are intended to address review mechanisms for specific content related to the technical dimension of the projects under evaluation, which can require expert knowledge not covered by the generic competencies of an evaluator.

18. In my view, based on my experience at the Multilateral Fund, staff from the implementing agencies and the Secretariat should engage through technical review when requested, contributing with their expertise to assess the technical accuracy of evaluation products at an advanced stage of finalizing the draft evaluation report.

19. **Recommendation 7:** This recommendation refers to the *possibility of adding an additional resource with the recruitment of a Junior Professional Officer (JPO)* to assist the evaluation unit in

⁶ Document "Evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their business plans" could be considered in the future meetings under regular agenda item 8, "business planning".

⁷ Human rights and gender equality, norm 8, United Nations Evaluation Group – Norms and Standards 2016.

completing the PCR review. This recommendation was crafted at a time when the work on the PCR reform was just being initiated. Since then, most of the work has been completed. The remaining efforts would not require an additional staff member for the evaluation unit.

20. However, the Executive Committee may wish to consider whether a temporary additional resource, such as the use of the JPO programme,⁸ could be envisaged. A junior professional could provide support both to the Secretariat and the evaluation unit, facilitating the flow of information between the two without adding to the project review team's workload. A junior professional position would alleviate the burden of work for the SMEO who is currently assisted by one general service staff only for all the duties related to the position.

21. Based on the above SMEO's review of recommendations, a draft tentative plan of proposed follow-up actions is shared below in table 1. It could inspire the Executive Committee in the coming years, should it wish to request any of these actions to be implemented. This is presented for information purpose to share the results the SMEO's own reflection about the scope and transformative potential for the evaluation function, based on the thoughtful assessment prepared by the consultant. It provides a tentative timeline for different actions, which could be developed if so requested.

Table 1: Draft tentative plan of follow-up actions proposed by the Senior Monitoring Evaluation Officer

# Rec	Scope of the recommendation	Proposed follow-up action plan by the SMEO
1.	Establish an evaluation policy without the monitoring function	Recommendation 1: Suggest to be agreed The Executive Committee accepts <i>recommendation 1</i> and: (a) Approves the evaluation policy, included as annex I to the present document presented by the SMEO When: At the 96th meeting (b) Requests the SMEO and the Secretariat: (c) (i) to coordinate the transition of the monitoring function and the streamlining of reporting, including on PCRs; (ii) to prepare a draft revised job description aligned to the updated role and responsibilities of the Head of the Evaluation Unit to be renamed Senior Evaluation Officer (SEO); When: To be completed at the latest by the 98th meeting
2.	Prepare evaluation guidelines and standard operating procedures for the preparation of evaluations and disseminate on a regular basis at meetings	Recommendation 2: Suggest to be partially agreed No need to include formally an evaluation item in the agenda of regular IACMs and regional network meetings. It would be useful to develop evaluation guidelines, templates and standard operating procedures to be disseminated for use by consultants, agencies and other relevant stakeholders, to be posted under the evaluation section of the Multilateral Fund website. When: After formal adoption of the evaluation policy, the evaluation unit should prepare guidelines, templates and other evaluation support documents for dissemination and awareness-raising, from the 97th meeting onwards, as a continuous process, to be presented to the successive meetings of the Executive Committee to report on progress.
3.	Introduce a follow-up system for recommendations and prepare guidance for	Recommendation 3: Suggest to be agreed The Executive Committee accepts <i>recommendation 3</i> and: Requests the SMEO: (a) <i>To prepare and present a concept note on Multilateral Fund evaluation processes and tools, including the use of digital tools, proposing a</i>

⁸ For more information on the JPO programme, see [UNITED NATIONS | Junior Professional Officer Programme](#).

# Rec	Scope of the recommendation	Proposed follow-up action plan by the SMEO
	consultants on formats for evaluations, findings and recommendations	procedure and system to follow-up on the uptake and status of implementation of recommendations from the evaluation reports. When: To be presented at the 98th meeting (b) To present a consolidated report on follow-up to recommendations on a regular basis to the Executive Committee (e.g., every two years) When: Once the follow-up system, as requested in (a), is in place, from the 99th meeting onwards.
4.	Ensure engagement of key stakeholders in the work process of evaluations	Recommendation 4: Suggest to be partially agreed There are five sub-recommendations, some of which are generally accepted while others have not reached consensus. There seems to be interest in undertaking fewer but more strategic evaluations, while not replacing the more content-based evaluations undertaken at present. Exploring the possibility of joint evaluations and/or semi-independent evaluations could also be considered but requires further analysis to be presented to the Executive Committee. There is interest in introducing the practice of preparing inception papers. The Executive Committee could request the SMEO to prepare a more detailed analysis of the issues covered under recommendation four, excepting the interaction modality with the Executive Committee, which is to continue unchanged. When: To be included in the same <i>concept note on Multilateral Fund processes and tools</i> requested for recommendation three, to be presented at the 98th meeting.
5.	Create an evaluation framework for the MLF and use UNEG standards	Recommendation 5: Suggest to be partially agreed The professionalization of the evaluation function is agreed, using UNEG norms and standards. Nuances are introduced to indicate that not all UNEG norms and standards would be applied, only those that are in line with the policies approved by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee requests the SMEO to ensure that the evaluation work uses UNEG norms and standards in conformity with the core mandate of the Multilateral Fund, aligned to its approved policies, without expanding beyond them (as reflected in the draft evaluation policy). When: To be applied on a continuous basis, after formal adoption of the evaluation policy, from the 97th meeting onwards, in preparing evaluations.
6.	Introduce enhanced quality-assurance mechanisms, to ensure the credibility and utility of the final evaluation reports	Recommendation 6: Suggest to be partially agreed The Executive Committee understands the usefulness of internal peer review mechanisms to ensure technical accuracy in evaluation reports. There is value in Secretariat staff providing comments on advanced evaluation outcomes, provided this does not occur during project review periods. Quality assurance checks should not add to the workload of the Secretariat and/or the agencies at the peak time of project review prior to the meetings of the Executive Committee. It requests: The SMEO to implement quality-assurance mechanisms while avoiding any unnecessary burden on agencies and Secretariat staff; and The Secretariat and the agencies' staff to contribute, when applicable, to review the technical contents of evaluation reports regarding specific Multilateral Fund-related specialised expertise of the reports. When: From the 97th meeting onwards, as a continuous process.
7.	Obtain additional temporary expertise to support PCR reform, such as a Junior	Recommendation 7: Suggest to be partially agreed Most of the PCR review work has been completed. It does not require additional support. Some members could support the request for a JPO, if the workload of the evaluation function were to justify it in the future. The Executive Committee requests the SMEO to assess the needs of the evaluation unit to deliver its evaluation work programme, and to provide justification for any request for additional human resources, such as for a JPO.

# Rec	Scope of the recommendation	Proposed follow-up action plan by the SMEO
	Professional Officer	When: At the 98 th meeting as part of an evaluation concept note.

22. The above table 1 may inspire further requests to be made to the SMEO, the results of which could be presented either as part of the annual reports or in ad hoc evaluation concept notes, to elaborate further on specific areas of interest proposed in the recommendations of the assessment, for more detailed analysis of their potential implications.

Annex IV

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A TIME-BOUND ROADMAP TO STRENGTHEN THE
MULTILATERAL FUND EVALUATION FUNCTION
TEXT EXTRACTED FROM DOCUMENT UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/10**

Recommendations of the external assessment of the evaluation function
Recommendation 1: Finalise a Multilateral Fund evaluation policy using a participatory process The annexed evaluation policy draft outline proposes a clear and separate identity for evaluation and monitoring, with the responsibilities of the post of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer reframed as a <i>Senior Evaluation Officer, as the head of the evaluation unit</i>. In consultation with the Chief Officer, the SMEO should arrange for a consultative process to review the proposed evaluation policy outline with the intention of presenting a final draft that has been well vetted to the Executive Committee for consideration. The process should involve Multilateral Fund Secretariat staff and other stakeholders including the Independent Evaluation Office of UNEP given that the Fund is co-located with UNEP. The objective is to benefit from a cross-section of voices familiar with (a) Multilateral Fund programming and (b) expertise in United Nations system evaluation. This should be a brief, well organized brainstorming activity that leads to a polished final draft of the evaluation policy. In addition, the advanced draft should be shared with the heads of evaluation offices in the United Nations implementing agencies to solicit their views as well. These agencies have been approached as part of this assessment and have shown an interest to support Multilateral Fund evaluation.
Recommendation 2: Use evaluation guidelines as a tool for raising awareness. Once the evaluation policy has been endorsed, the SMEO should translate key elements of the policy into summary guidance targeting key stakeholders who will have roles to play in operationalizing this policy. Briefings should be organized at Inter-Agency Coordination Meeting (IACM) meetings and at Regional Network Meetings where the SMEO and the Chief Officer present the headlines of the new policy and encourage questions to be raised and address concerns. While these sessions would be preferable in person, they could be done on-line. The objective of these brief familiarization sessions would be to demystify what evaluation means in the context of the Fund and to emphasise that it is not an additional burden but an opportunity to communicate issues of importance that will be reflected in the evaluation reports that go to the Executive Committee. Once these briefings are completed, succinct guidelines should be circulated and made available on-line in the evaluation section of the Multilateral Fund website.
Recommendation 3: Upgrade and standardize the formats of evaluation reports and introduce a system of follow-up to track evaluation recommendations. Thus far evaluation reports have been available only as 'parliamentary' documentation presented to the Executive Committee. In addition, it is recommended that to demonstrate transparency, evaluation reports should be easily readable and publicly accessible as part of the evaluation section of the Multilateral Fund website. With this objective in mind, it is recommended that the SMEO should compile a simple annotated guide for evaluation consultants which standardizes the format and provides illustrative examples of how key sections such as the Executive Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations, should be presented. Recommendations should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound (SMART) and this guide should develop criteria for what constitutes a lesson learned, by providing specific examples of what does and does not constitute a 'lesson learned'.

Recommendation 4: Engaging key stakeholders in the work process of evaluation

Some stakeholders see the 'independence' of the evaluation mandate as a factor that inhibits candid exchange on draft reports and confine themselves to commenting on the factual accuracy of findings and not on the feasibility of suggestions for conclusions and the 'way forward'. Furthermore, to ensure that ground-level realities inform the findings of evaluations, stakeholders have requested more visits to the countries. Considering these views, the following suggestions are made for consideration to make evaluation more animated, active and immediate and less a function that operates in a silo within the Multilateral Fund Secretariat.

The SMEO should consult with the Chief Officer to consider their viability and a possible timeline for sub-recommendations (a) through (e):

- (a) ***Revisit the purpose of desk studies and consider introducing inception reports:*** While desk studies were originally conceived of as preparatory activities for country visits by evaluation teams, they often became self-contained studies which reviewed internal Multilateral Fund documentation and extracted conclusions and lessons learned. While desk studies should not be abandoned as a modality, criteria should be developed as to which projects lend themselves to this more limited appraisal. Inception reports should be introduced for evaluations that contain evaluation questions, data collection instruments, and involve evaluation team travel to regions and countries as the norm rather than the exception.
- (b) ***Undertake fewer, deeper more strategic evaluations:*** To ensure that evaluation topics meet the strategic needs of the Multilateral Fund, it is recommended that the Chief Officer lead senior Multilateral Fund staff in a brainstorming session once every 18 months to explore what issues require evaluation attention for the biennial work programme. It is also recommended that given the limited capacity of the evaluation unit; it should undertake fewer, deeper evaluations that should typically involve more than one external consultant. Furthermore, the possibility of joint evaluations with evaluation offices of the implementing agencies, should be explored. It is also strongly recommended to revive the practice of having Multilateral Fund Secretariat Staff members as part of the evaluation teams as resource persons. Implementing agency staff could also be encouraged to join teams in a similar capacity as was done in earlier Multilateral Fund evaluations.
- (c) ***Streamline interaction with Executive Committee:*** At present, evaluation planning involves four interactions with the Executive Committee: (i) work programme submission; (ii) terms of reference submission; (iii) a report on evaluation progress; followed by (iv) submission of the final report. It is recommended that this process be streamlined to two steps with (i) submission of a biennial work programme that provides sufficient information for Executive Committee approval of the content and number of evaluations, and (ii) the submission of the final evaluation report.
- (d) ***Introduce briefing sessions with evaluation consultants:*** As part of the finalization of draft reports, the SMEO should organize brief, informal face-to-face sessions with the evaluation consultants, the SMEO and with Multilateral Fund Secretariat staff to discuss draft reports. It would be optimal if the evaluation calendar is timed to ensure draft reports are available during the start of the calendar year, when programme staff are not as busy preparing as they usually are for the second meeting of the year of the Executive Committee. In addition, once the evaluation reports are finalized, the consultants should prepare PowerPoint presentations that they will present in brief on-line meetings, chaired by the SMEO, for interested implementing agency staff and Executive Committee members prior to the Executive Committee meetings.
- (e) ***Request evaluation as standing agenda item at key Multilateral Fund meetings with stakeholders (e.g. IACM and Regional Networks Meetings):*** To ensure visibility of evaluation as a corporate priority, it is recommended that a half-day session on evaluation is included in the IACM agenda, at the first meeting of the year. These sessions should be interactive and

solicit ideas on issues that would merit independent assessment, share key highlights of evaluation results and methods used for data collection ('most-significant-change', 'outcome mapping' for example) and include National Ozone Units (NOUs) as resources for feedback on topics such as evaluation plans, topical concerns and data collection strategies and suggestions. The objective is to make evaluation more recognized, familiar and participatory. It builds on Recommendation 4(a) above.

Recommendation 5: Reappraise the evaluation framework used at Multilateral Fund
More innovative evaluation approaches should also be developed to assess the 'softer' activities in programming involving industry and private sector entities, manufacturers associations, etc.

Since the start, evaluation topics have focused on assessments of the Multilateral Fund programming by type/sector such as Chlorofluorocarbon (CFCs), Hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFCs) and more recently Hydrofluorocarbon (HFCs) phase-out, ODS disposal and destruction, refrigeration projects, methyl bromide, halon banking to name a few. Interviewees suggested there may be other options for framing evaluations such as a focus on countries that had large programmes as a unit of analysis, as they often involve several implementing agencies. More innovative evaluation approaches should also be developed to assess the 'softer' activities in programming involving industry and private sector entities, manufacturers associations etc. This would support assessment of gender, human rights and the SDGs which are newer priorities for the Multilateral Fund and central to the Norms and Standards of the UNEP. The SMEO could invite a review group composed of a few of the former Multilateral Fund evaluation consultants who are technical experts as well as experienced in evaluation, to consider the options for reframing the evaluation practice. Including consultants who have evaluated similar programmes for other agencies (e.g. GEF), and representatives from implementing agencies could add value. This exercise could also be used to update and diversify the evaluation roster of consultants qualified to undertake Multilateral Fund evaluations.

Recommendation 6: Introduce enhanced quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation reports
To ensure that evaluation reports are technically sound, credible and easily readable it is recommended that the SMEO consider recruiting a resource person(s) or set up a reference group as required to support framing of the Terms of Reference and quality assuring the final draft reports. It is also suggested that a member of the Programme Management team could act as internal peer reviewer and sounding board to provide quality assurance support as a report is being finalized.

In larger offices, evaluation reports are customarily peer reviewed by other evaluation officers who have not been involved in the evaluation. External consultants to provide both technical and assessments of the clarity of report presentation have also been used, particularly when controversial evaluations are to be submitted to executive boards. Given that the Multilateral Fund evaluation unit is small, such expert and peer review support will help assure both the technical and evaluation quality of its reports without entailing costs for additional staff.

Recommendation 7: Supplementing evaluation expertise in the short to medium term – It is suggested that temporary measures should be explored for the next three years, such as recruiting a Junior Professional Officer or short-term professional/ consultant expertise with experience in evaluation, to support current PCR reform.

Considering the ongoing PCR reform, the related work on lessons learned, and the preparation of the evaluation policy suggested in this assessment, the evaluation unit may require a boost in support for the SMEO, to address the additional work beyond the delivery of evaluations.