



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/11
18 October 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-fifth Meeting
Bali, Indonesia, 13-17 November 2011

**DRAFT MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME
FOR THE YEAR 2012**

1. This work programme is based on the draft submitted at the 63rd meeting entitled “Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the years 2011 and 2012” and noted by the Executive Committee. It addresses the work to be undertaken in 2012 only, with some modifications to reflect additional issues of interest, and suggestions made during the previous meetings. In addition, it includes the 2012 budget.

2. It is worthy to note however, that additional issues of interest may arise that may need to be effectively addressed over the next year. 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 such issues.

I. Evaluation studies and monitoring work to start in 2012

(a) Final evaluation of multi-year agreement (MYA) projects

3. Based on the recommendations of the desk study on the evaluation of the MYAs, ten case studies covering a broad geographic spectrum will collect information about issues related to project implementation in various countries. A final report will synthesize the findings of the case studies and use some of the information gathered in the desk study. Recommendations will focus on lessons learned for the implementation of HCFC projects.

(b) Evaluation of methyl bromide projects

4. The findings in the 2005 evaluation of the methyl bromide projects focused mainly on sustainability-related issues. The evaluation stressed that the planned phase-out was generally achieved in completed projects and was likely to be achieved in ongoing projects albeit in many cases with some delays, due to various factors which show the complex character of this sector. It also pointed out issues that may delay or impede the implementation of projects and the achievement of compliance targets.

5. Several years later many of the methyl bromide projects have been completed or approach completion. Recurrently, however, problems with such projects are mentioned during the Montreal Protocol meetings and even in the media. These issues are related mainly to the difficulties in achieving objectives as well as to the sustainability of project results. One of the issues, for example is the sustainability of methyl bromide alternatives in terms of cost, efficacy, availability, technical capacity and regulatory constraints; another issue pointed to the risk of abandoning the alternative-based methods in some sectors in agriculture.

6. Following the path traced by the 2005 evaluation the desk study and final report will address issues related to the actual sustainability of methyl bromide projects. It will examine, *inter alia*, issues related to:

- (a) The use of alternatives and the probability of reverting back to the use of methyl bromide;
- (b) The economic feasibility of alternative projects;
- (c) Cost-related issues and barriers in use of new technology;
- (d) How methyl bromide uses are controlled;
- (e) Issues related to methyl bromide in quarantine and pre-shipment;
- (f) The impact of training and the sustainability of training results;

- (g) The involvement of key stakeholders;
- (h) The need for further technical assistance.

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

7. The desk study on the evaluation of chiller projects carried out in 2009 and submitted to the 58th meeting of the Executive Committee (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/9) pointed to 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, including 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.

8. Furthermore, a progress report presented at the 62nd meeting of the Executive Committee (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/62/9) on chiller demonstration projects stresses difficulties in synchronization of project cycles, procedures and schedules among various funding and implementing partners.

9. 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; and will avoid the complexity of implementation and obstacles encountered in the case of CFC centrifugal chillers. The desk study will be presented to the first meeting in 2012. Because of additional commitments, the final report is expected to be presented to the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2013.

10. The evaluation will analyze the following issues:

- (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 deal 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.

11. Also, 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 their added value would be achieving results.

12. 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.

(d) Evaluation of metered-dose inhalers (MDI) projects

13. The need for an evaluation of MDI projects was stressed during the 63rd meeting of the Executive Committee (decision 63/11). The evaluation will examine issues related to project effectiveness in meeting objectives, as well as institutional, financial and procedural issues related to the production and consumption of MDIs.

14. More specifically, the evaluation will focus on:

- (a) Institutional, legal and regulatory, capacity and technical issues that facilitated or limited project functioning;
- (b) Causes of delays and ways to avoid them in the future;
- (c) Adequacy of funding;
- (d) The type and impact of technical assistance provided;
- (e) Issues concerning the launch of chlorofluorocarbon-free alternatives and withdrawal of associated chlorofluorocarbon products;
- (f) Role of national and multi-national companies in achieving phase-out;
- (g) Issues related to the introduction of new technology and conversion of MDI manufacturing facilities;
- (h) Impact of training and awareness-raising among various stakeholders, including the medical sector; impact of thematic and regional workshops; and
- (i) Challenges in implementing educational programmes for health care professionals, government health authorities and patients about the transition to chlorofluorocarbon-free treatments.

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

15. Pending the finalization of the MYA project completion report format, 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.

(f) The consolidated project completion report for 2012

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

(g) Report on MYA tables database

17. Decision 63/61(e) requests the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to inform the Executive Committee at the last meeting of each year on the status of update of the information contained in the database tables.

Table 1

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

1st meeting 2012 (66th)	2nd meeting 2012 (67th)	3rd meeting 2012 (68th)
Evaluation of chiller projects: completed desk study	Desk study on the evaluation of MDI projects	2012 consolidated project completion report
Evaluation of methyl bromide project: completed desk study	Final evaluation report for MYA projects	Final report on the evaluation of methyl bromide projects
	Consolidated project completion report for MYAs (tentative)	Report on MYA tables database
		Work programme 2013

II. 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 as 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.

III. Budget

22. Table 2 presents the budget for the 2012 monitoring and evaluation work programme for the approval of the Executive Committee. The budget includes the fees and travel costs for consultants as well as for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer who will participate in some case studies and attend regional meetings.

Table 2

**PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE 2012 MONITORING AND EVALUATION
WORK PROGRAMME**

2012	
Description	Amount (US \$)
Desk study on the evaluation of chillers projects (1 consultant * 30 working days at US \$500/day)	15,000
Evaluation of methyl bromide projects:	
• Desk study (1 consultant * 30 working days at US \$500/day)	15,000
• 10 case studies	120,000
• Final report (10 working days *US \$500)	5,000
Evaluation of MYAs:	
• 10 case studies	120,000
• Final report (10 working days*US \$500)	5,000
Desk study for evaluation of MDIs (1 consultant * 30 working days at US \$500/day)	15,000
Staff travel	50,000
Miscellaneous (equipment, communication, etc.)	6,000
Total 2012	351,000

IV. Action expected from the Executive Committee

23. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Approving the proposed 2012 work programme at a budget of US \$351,000, as shown in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/11.
