



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/13
7 March 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-third Meeting
Montreal, 4-8 April 2011

**DRAFT MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME
FOR THE YEARS 2011 AND 2012**

1. This work programme is based on the document entitled “Terms of reference and workload for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (decisions 56/8(e) and 57/12)” adopted by the Executive Committee at its 58th Meeting. Besides the terms of reference for the post, the document suggests some monitoring and evaluation work for the following years. In addition, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) who joined the Multilateral Fund Secretariat in October 2010, undertook further discussions with various stakeholders that led to the elaboration of the present work programme.

2. It is worthy to note however, that additional issues of interest may arise, that will need to be effectively addressed in the future. A certain degree of flexibility, therefore, might be allowed in the application of the present work programme, as well as in the allocation of its budget in order to accommodate any issues that arise.

I. Evaluation studies and monitoring work to start in 2011

(a) Completion report format for multi-year agreements

3. Under decision 62/6, the Executive Committee requested the SMEO to “address the issue of development of a completion report format for completed multi-year projects as a matter of priority and to inform the 65th meeting of the Executive Committee on progress”. Currently there is no project completion report format for multi-year agreements (MYAs), although a large number of projects have already ended. The SMEO will develop an appropriate report in a user friendly electronic format, and link it to the existing MYA electronic database. The format will include both narrative information and numeric data, will be user friendly and will synthesize information related to the completion of MYAs. It will help stakeholders and implementing agencies to reflect on previous work experience and gain new perspectives for a successful HCFC phase-out.

(b) Strategy for dissemination and communication of lessons learned

4. Two activities are included:

- (a) The elaboration of a lessons learned database. This will be a user friendly online tool that will allow stakeholders to access valuable knowledge about various issues in project implementation and will help disseminate information to specified target audiences. Sharing and communicating lessons learned from previous implementation experiences will also help stakeholders to take the right decision to succeed in the programme. Furthermore, it will ensure that the same mistakes will not be repeated at the cost of project effectiveness and will help minimize delays in implementation. In addition the body of knowledge in the database can be used for risk identification and management.
- (b) A periodic electronic newsletter that will display in a concise manner information from the latest evaluations, progress, completion and verifications reports. It will highlight issues of concern for stakeholders involved in project implementation.

5. In addition, both the newsletter and database will improve communication among various stakeholders. At a later date these could be paired with further activities, such as webinars, lessons learned meetings, chats, etc.

(c) Evaluation of multi-year agreements

6. The evaluation will focus on a sample of completed and/or close to completion MYA projects to be selected on a regional and low-volume-consuming (LVC)/non-LVC basis, with a view to drawing lessons learned and recommendations that may be applicable for the preparation and approval of HCFC

phase-out management plans. It will analyze *inter alia*: project effectiveness in achieving objectives; the influence of a multi-year, tranche-based funding modality on project functioning; institutional, financial, and procedural issues related to project performance; causes of delays and how can they be avoided in the future; issues of coordination among various parties; monitoring, reporting and quality of data; communication and awareness-raising issues.

7. A desk study will analyze existing documents and formulate further evaluation questions. Several field trips will collect additional data in various countries. A final report will synthesize the main findings and recommendations.

(d) The consolidated project completion report for 2011

8. The report will provide the Executive Committee with an overview of the results and lessons learned included in the project completion reports (PCRs) issued during the period under review.

II. Evaluation studies and monitoring work to start in 2012

(a) Evaluation of chiller projects with co-funding modalities

9. The chillers desk study carried out in 2009 and submitted to the 58th Meeting of the Executive Committee pointed out the need for a final evaluation of completed chiller projects at some future date to provide an overview of what has been achieved. The study addresses issues related to earlier phases of project implementation. Among these, there were the attempts of the Multilateral Fund to set-up co-funding programmes with other institutions; delays that occurred in the project implementation; working relations between implementing agencies and public and private sector; incentives and motivations.

10. Furthermore, a progress report presented at the 62nd Meeting of the Executive Committee on chiller demonstration projects stresses difficulties in synchronization of project cycles, procedures and schedules among various funding and implementing partners.

11. An evaluation in 2012 of chiller projects using co-funding modalities may therefore be timely because it will compare various experiences with regard to co-funding modalities that could be used for future projects; will help formulate lessons learned; will help HCFC-22 chiller phase-out; and will avoid the complexity of implementation and obstacles encountered in the case of CFC centrifugal chillers.

12. The evaluation will analyze:

- (a) The functioning of the co-funding mechanism, by stressing what features of this approach are positive and replicable in future projects, and under which conditions;
- (b) How this mechanism has impacted the cooperation among institutions, co-funding as well as implementation partners;
- (c) Whether projects helped create a specific infrastructure that could be used for future similar projects;
- (d) Agencies' efforts in improving energy efficiency when replacing chillers to reduce the demand for CFCs;
- (e) Issues of promotion, motivation and incentives;

- (f) The role of global and regional projects in helping countries dealing with chiller projects at the local level;
- (g) Causes of delays and ways to avoid them in the future;
- (h) Institutional, legal and regulatory, capacity and technical barriers that limited and impeded project functioning.

13. Furthermore, while some projects acquired additional features and a larger scope it would be worthwhile to know how these additions impacted on the initial objectives as well as what is their added value in achieving results.

14. An overview of existing documents will complete the existing desk study. Several field trips will collect primary data in various representative countries. A final report will synthesize the main findings.

(b) Evaluation of licensing and regulatory systems

15. The evaluation will examine how regulations, licenses and quotas concerning ODS production and consumption originate and are applied. It will compare the situation in several countries and will analyze successes and drawbacks in implementing and/or renewing regulatory systems; it will also look at awareness rising strategies, acceptance and application of regulation among various stakeholders. Furthermore it will formulate lessons learned for future projects. A desk study and case studies will analyze data that will be synthesized in a final report.

(c) The first consolidated project completion report for MYAs for 2011

16. The first consolidated project completion report for MYAs for 2011 will provide the Executive Committee with an overview of the results and lessons learned reported through the newly issued completion report format .

(d) The consolidated project completion report for 2012

17. The report will provide the Executive Committee with an overview of the results and lessons learned included in the PCRs issued during the period under review.

Table 1

2011-2012 SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION DOCUMENTS TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

2 nd Meeting 2011 (64 th)	3 rd Meeting 2011 (65 th)	1 st Meeting 2012 (66 th)	2 nd Meeting 2012 (67 th)	3 rd Meeting 2012 (68 th)
Lessons learned database format	Follow-up on completion report format for MYAs	First consolidated completion report for MYAs for 2011	Final evaluation report for MYA projects	2012 consolidated project completion report
Newsletter format	Desk study on the evaluation of MYA projects	Evaluation of chiller projects: completed desk study	Desk study on the evaluation of licensing and regulatory systems	Final report on the evaluation of chiller projects
	2011 consolidated project completion report			

III. Implementation modalities and methodological approach

18. The previous practice of preparing desk studies will be continued. Desk studies help identify the purpose, objectives and intended outcomes of the evaluation; formulate work hypotheses as well as evaluation questions. They also provide a thorough review of existing project literature and synthesize information from databases available in the Multilateral Fund Secretariat. Other data collection methods could feed information into the desk study, such as telephone interviews, e-mail surveys using open-ended or structured questionnaires, intranet chat discussions. Desk studies also prepare the data collection instruments to be used during field visits and identify the sample of projects to be visited. Each field visit issues a report. A thorough analysis of findings leads to the drafting of a final report.

19. This evaluation approach is also participatory for it involves all stakeholders who receive the draft report for comments. Eventually, the Executive Committee is invited to discuss the report and consider its conclusions and recommendations.

20. In line with decision 46/7(c) evaluation reports submitted to the Executive Committee are for general distribution. They are posted on the public web site of the Secretariat (www.multilateralfund.org) at the time of dispatch, jointly with the decision taken by the Executive Committee. The desk study and project case studies are placed on the intranet of the Secretariat.

21. Likewise during past evaluations experienced individual consultants will proceed with data collection and analysis. The use of consultants proved to be less costly than hiring consulting companies. The hiring process will take into account technical, geographical and gender related criteria.

IV. Budget

22. The budget includes the fees and travel costs for consultants as well as for the SMEO who will attend various regional meetings. In addition, it includes US \$60,000 already used for the creation of the MYA tables. Concerning this sum, decision 59/52(a) of the Executive Committee states that "... should be deducted from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer's work programme...".

23. Table 2 presents the budget for the 2011 work programme for the approval of the Executive Committee. A budget for the 2012 work programme will be submitted for approval during the 65th Meeting of the Executive Committee.

Table 2

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE 2011 MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME

2011	
Description	Amount (US \$)
Lessons learned database – electronic format	7,000
Completion report format for MYAs	12,000
Desk study on evaluation of MYA projects	18,750
Staff travel (SMEO's travel to network and thematic meetings, MOP meetings)	50,000
Miscellaneous (equipment, communication)	6,000
MYA monitoring tables	60,000
Total 2011	153,750

V. Action expected from the Executive Committee

24. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Approving the proposed 2011 work programme at a budget of US \$153,750, as shown in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/13;
- (b) Noting:
 - (i) The draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2012; and
 - (ii) That the budget for the 2012 draft monitoring and evaluation work programme will be submitted for approval at the 65th Meeting of the Executive Committee.
