



United Nations  
Environment  
Programme



Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/7  
5 June 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Fifty-eighth Meeting  
Montreal, 6-10 July 2009

**TERMS OF REFERENCE AND WORKLOAD  
FOR THE SENIOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OFFICER  
(decisions 56/8(e) and 57/12)**

## **I. Background**

1. At the 56<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee considered the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2009 and decided “to request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare and submit a document to the 57<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee outlining existing terms of reference for the position and briefly summarizing how evaluation functions in other similar fund secretariats and financial institutions were organized and implemented” (decision 56/8(d)).

2. At the 57<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee, after considering the report presented by the independent consultant, decided to “request the Secretariat to prepare and submit to the 58<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, for approval, the terms of reference and workload for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, taking into consideration that the Members of the Executive Committee reaffirmed that the position of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should retain independence and was best situated in the Secretariat. The Secretariat should propose additional responsibilities to the workload and the terms of reference, including work on climate benefits, risk of non-compliance, auditing and increased emphasis on monitoring functions, and taking into account that the work should be relevant and helpful for HCFC phase-out”. Moreover, the decision also indicated that “the terms of reference should include a provision for such a position to be fixed-term in line with the standard practice of other international funding institutions” (decision 57/12(b)).

## **II. Monitoring and Evaluation in the Multilateral Fund Secretariat**

### **(a) Establishment of the post of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer**

3. Efforts to develop a monitoring and evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund started in 1995 by the Fund Secretariat with the submission to the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Executive Committee of two proposals on Guidelines on Monitoring and Evaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/17/53 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/64). Later on, at its 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting the Executive Committee reconstituted the former Sub-Committee on Financial Matters, with the added mandate to oversee the monitoring and evaluation programme, by establishing the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee (decision 21/35(a)). The Committee also approved and decided to move ahead with the implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system and that “there should be a modest strengthening of the Secretariat in order to provide a measure of monitoring and evaluation capacity”, to assist in the implementation of future evaluations (decision 21/36(a)).

4. Subsequently, the 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee decided “that the modest strengthening of the Secretariat approved by the Executive Committee in decision 21/36 should be sufficient to enable the Secretariat to perform monitoring and evaluation on a continuous basis, through the development of a monitoring and evaluation system and database, the coordination, supervision and carrying out of monitoring and evaluation studies and assignments and the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation post within the Secretariat whose incumbent would report directly to the Sub-Committee and/or the Executive Committee and be responsible for the coordination of all monitoring and evaluation activities” (decision 22/19(h)).

5. The operational model that the Executive Committee decided to implement for monitoring and evaluation in the Multilateral Fund would build upon the then existing progress reporting system to the extent possible and upgrade it to enable it to serve more strategic needs for programme oversight management.

6. At the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting the Executive Committee approved the job description of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the Fund Secretariat to monitor and evaluate on a continuous basis the projects that were being implemented. The position was created in 1998 as part of the Fund Secretariat

and filled in 1999 following the United Nations classification as “Senior Evaluation Officer”<sup>1</sup>, at P5 level. The salary of the monitoring and evaluation officer is part of the Fund Secretariat budget, which also provides the support of a secretary and a half-time database assistant.

## **(b) Assessment of the existing monitoring and evaluation functions**

### **Monitoring**

7. The monitoring function can be defined as “supervisory activities carried out by project management at different levels over the entire implementation process of the project to ensure the attainment of its objectives” (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/64). It can be further explained as “a continuous function that primarily provides the management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project/programme with early indications of progress, or the lack thereof, in the achievement of project/programme objectives” (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/13).

8. Therefore, the main tasks of monitoring are the routine tracking of the progress of specific project activities and output production against established schedules and indicators of progress, to identify operational problems and to recommend revisions or corrective actions for specific activities. It is a management tool for operational purposes. Monitoring, contrary to evaluation, does not presuppose independence of the monitoring agent and is embedded in the management structure of the institution.

9. Monitoring in the Multilateral Fund Secretariat takes place at various stages in the project or programme’s life, from inception to completion. Various monitoring tools and mechanisms have been developed and put in place by the Secretariat to facilitate data collection and progress reporting. The Fund Secretariat monitors the funded activities of bilateral and implementing agencies through their annual progress reports, annual implementation reports in the case of multi-year agreements and project completion reports. These reports may raise issues that can then be added to the actual evaluations, such as implementation delays, budget overviews, non-achievement of ODS phase-out.

10. For monitoring purposes the Secretariat has prepared and implemented a number of formats and database tables for data collection and reporting at different operational levels. These tables and formats include, among others, progress report database format, balance report formats, country programme format, compliance tables, inventory database tables, project completion report (PCR) formats and multi-year agreement (MYA) formats. These two last monitoring tools were developed by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in cooperation with the Secretariat. For the implementation of these monitoring tools a set of operational guidelines has also been put in place.

11. Due to its nature as a management tool for operational purposes, monitoring responsibilities in the Multilateral Fund Secretariat are distributed among different officers, both programme and administrative, who use monitoring as a management tool to perform their own assigned duties:

- (a) Monitoring of expenditures and balances is done by the Senior Administrative and Fund Management Officer;
- (b) Monitoring of implementing agency performance is done by a Senior Programme Management Officer;
- (c) Monitoring of project delays is done by a Senior Programme Management Officer;
- (d) Monitoring of country level compliance is done by a Senior Programme Management Officer;

---

<sup>1</sup> The United Nations classification does not include the word “monitoring”.

- (e) Monitoring of annual progress reports from the implementing agencies is done by a Senior Programme Management Officer;
- (f) Monitoring of annual implementation reports for MYAs is done by all Senior Programme Management Officers;
- (g) Monitoring of project completion is done by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer;
- (h) Monitoring of multi-year projects with special reporting requirements is done by Senior Programme Management Officers;
- (i) Evaluations of ongoing multi-year and completed projects through field visits is done by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, sometimes with the attendance of the relevant Senior Programme Management Officer and sometimes a Senior Programme Management Officer may independently visit ongoing projects.

12. In all matters related to monitoring, particularly implementation of monitoring tools and guidelines, there is an ongoing interaction between programme officers that perform monitoring and the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. However, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer has not coordinated the monitoring efforts of ongoing projects, with the exception of establishing the first version of on-line MYA tables in cooperation with the Secretariat.

13. For the above reasons the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer has not coordinated or carried out monitoring activities that constitute direct inputs for the work of programme officers, nor is such an approach recommended. In fact, programme officers use data monitoring and reporting as a dynamic management tool for regular review purposes.

## Evaluation

14. The evaluation function can be conceptualised as a systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing (mid-term) or completed (terminal) activity, project or programme. The aim of evaluation is to determine, at a given point in time, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome, impact and sustainability of a project, programme or policy and to draw any lessons that can help guide future policy directions and practice. Evaluation is an important source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance. It also contributes to building knowledge and to organizational learning; is an important agent of change and plays a critical and credible role in supporting accountability.<sup>2</sup>

15. There is a clear distinction between the evaluations that are performed by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the preliminary evaluations that are carried out by the programme officers. Preliminary evaluations performed by programme officers serve the operational purposes of the Secretariat during project review, assessing if a project or activity fulfils the criteria and guidelines and, therefore, is eligible for funding. In operational matters where timing is an issue, programme officers are in a better position to react and take action more rapidly than the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. The evaluations carried out by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer serve a more strategic purpose by informing the Executive Committee on specific matters, such as effectiveness, efficiency or sustainability of activities, where an *independent* view point is needed. *Independency* is therefore the key element that characterises and differentiates the position of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the Multilateral Fund.

---

<sup>2</sup> Definition based on extracts from the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) *Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*.

16. As per the current Job Description, the duties of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer include, among others, management of evaluation studies; preparation of terms of references for individual consultants, selection of evaluators; overseeing the implementation of evaluations following monitoring and evaluation guidelines; preparation and submission of annual work plans, reporting and making recommendations to the Executive Committee on the evaluation exercise.

17. As in other international financial institutions, the main field of activity of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer has been in evaluation, rather than in monitoring. By analysing the work programmes for monitoring and evaluation approved by the Executive Committee covering the period 2000 to 2009, one can determine that the activity of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer has been focused mainly in the development of evaluation studies, which include desk studies and case studies with field visits. Nevertheless, certain monitoring functions have been carried out through the project completion reports, the multi-year overview tables and the preparation of monitoring tools and guidelines.

18. Since 2000, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer carried out 26 sector and sub-sector evaluations, 165 case studies by country and 23 case studies by region. He also received and processed 2,593 project completion reports.

19. The focus of these evaluations and desk studies has been on generating conclusions and lessons learned for use in project approvals and on assessing the impact of activities by collecting field based information, including on the difficulties many countries face to complete projects without delays and risk of non-compliance. As a result of these evaluations a wealth of lessons learned are now available.

20. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer selects the evaluation topics. He also prepares the terms of reference and desk studies for each evaluation and presents them for discussion and approval by the Executive Committee in the monitoring and evaluation annual work programme.

### **The audit function**

21. Internal audit is an independent and objective assurance designed to add value and improve an organization's operations. It contributes to the functioning of an organization and helps accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach improving its effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.<sup>3</sup>

22. This function has so far never been part of the duties of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. Considering the special circumstances of the Multilateral Fund, any internal auditing functions that may be added to the duties of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should not involve financial auditing, as internal audits are carried out by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in UNEP and external audits are done by the Board of Auditors as mandated by the United Nations Secretary General.

23. The Multilateral Fund as a financial mechanism has been designed in a way that all projects funded to achieve compliance in Article 5 countries, are outsourced to four implementing agencies and to bilateral agencies. UNEP is also the Treasurer of the Fund and as such transfers funds to the implementing agencies, which in turn submit audited financial statements. The special agreements between the Multilateral Fund and the implementing agencies specifically indicate that the agencies will only be subject to internal and external auditing procedures according to their own financial rules and regulations.

---

<sup>3</sup> Definition taken from the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* published by the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA).

24. Considering the above mentioned agreements, the audit function of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer may be focused, upon request from the Executive Committee, on coordinating and implementing selected verification audits of MYAs. These are currently carried out by the implementing agencies. However, considering the independent nature of the position of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, transferring this task under his/her responsibility would avoid any possibility of a conflict of interest that the implementing agencies may have in performing such audits, and so would add transparency to the verification auditing process. This activity will have to be implemented with the full collaboration of the implementing agencies, which have to agree to facilitate access to findings and observations to MYA audits for verification by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

### **III. Work of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer**

#### **(a) Assessment of the workload of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer**

25. The accelerated phase-out of hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) together with decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties that established environmental concerns regarding the use of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) due to their high global warming potential (GWP), and the specific requirement to take that into account in the work of the Multilateral Fund, are new variables that need to be considered. Furthermore, new relations with other international environmental treaties, for instance the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the emerging cooperation with other financial institutions, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), may further contribute to changing the way business is being carried out by the Multilateral Fund.

26. The international financial institutions are now operating in a global framework that has started to use innovative financial mechanisms to mitigate environmental impacts; for example, revolving funds, co-funding, private/public partnerships and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Although this framework is still at its early stages, it is gaining momentum and is likely to play an increasing role for the Multilateral Fund, and therefore creating a need to rapidly collect lessons learned and assess the impact of activities funded by the Multilateral Fund.

27. The conditions prevailing today have already increased the requirements of efficiency for the Fund to demonstrate increased environmental benefits for each dollar spent, particularly in view of the lower ODP of HCFCs. Innovation in funding mechanisms for projects has already been under trial on a limited scale in chiller projects. If this becomes more significant or predominant in the near future, the need may arise to examine how evaluations should be carried out in a co-funding situation. Issues such as joint evaluations and interagency sharing of monitoring and evaluation results will need to be examined and discussed. Moreover, evaluations should also be able to assess whether the co-funding institutions fulfil the requirements and expectations of the Executive Committee.

28. Given this situation, it is likely that evaluations will not only be meaningful, but necessary to provide a critical review of past and ongoing activities with a forward-looking approach. This would broaden and widen the field for evaluations, giving the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer an amended and enhanced role. In fact, in view of the coming challenges the role of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should continue to be of great importance over the next 5-10 years to help the Multilateral Fund work more efficiently and effectively, by providing feedback for Multilateral Fund strategic planning, priority setting and budget allocation; and helping the Multilateral Fund to learn and evolve in a period of change, ensuring effective institutional and organizational responsiveness to the new challenges that the HCFC phase-out management may present.

29. The timeline is an important element that should be borne in mind when analysing the immediate and future work of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. It should be noted that given the time needed for necessary internal procedures for hiring a professional for the post of Senior Monitoring and

Evaluation Officer, the new officer will only be in a position to effectively assume duties sometime in the second half of 2010.

30. Due to the multi-meeting character of evaluations and desk studies, it is most likely that the activities that the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will initiate once he/she takes office will not be in time to influence the first stage of HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) projects. Nevertheless, considering that after implementing the first stage of an HPMP the Fund will still have to address 90 per cent of the problem, such evaluations will be essential at that stage.

31. During the period ahead a great percentage of the work of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will continue to be dedicated to the planning and implementation of different evaluation activities, while monitoring will be focused on the verification of phase-out agreements.

### **Immediate and short-term needs**

32. In the short term the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation officer could be requested to focus his/her attention on addressing some of the following immediate monitoring and evaluation needs:

- (a) Evaluation study on all funded projects to fully document climate impacts, how this relates to Climate Change and how the lessons learned can be applied to future HPMP activities;
- (b) Evaluation study on the process of project preparation for funding, with special focus on the quality assurance;
- (c) Development of a completion report format for completed MYA projects. Currently there is no project completion format for MYAs and projects are now approaching the stage of completion. This is an urgent activity that should be done before the first Executive Committee Meeting in 2010;
- (d) Evaluation of selected completed MYA projects, with a view to drawing lessons learned and recommendations that may be applicable for the preparation and approval of HPMPs;
- (e) Carry out selected verification audits for phase-out agreements. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should pay special attention to the quality of the information provided and the accuracy of the data reported. He/she will also ensure that the approved guidelines are being followed and, if necessary, advise on changes to the guidelines or improvements in the verification techniques;
- (f) Assessment of the country programme reports with special focus on the quality of data being collected and its applicability to future activities. Considering the wealth of data that is included in the reports, systematic evaluations can be done for each set of data, assessing its quality and its utilization as input for monitoring purposes, such as risk compliance analysis;
- (g) Second conversion evaluation study for foam projects and further chiller case studies, focusing on lessons learned for application in HPMPs;
- (h) Prepare and submit for Executive Committee approval, a strategy on how to communicate and disseminate results, lessons learned and recommendations among the different stakeholders.

33. Considering the time constraint indicated in paragraph 29, it is suggested that the above mentioned activities can be developed during the period 2010-2011. Some activities could become ongoing activities to be carried out periodically, such as MYA verifications.

### **Future and long-term needs**

34. In the longer term the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer may, upon request of the Executive Committee, engage in some of the following activities:

- (a) Management and coordination of the evaluation of the financial mechanism established under Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol;
- (b) Evaluation of implementing agencies;
- (c) Evaluation of the efficiency of processes of the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies in matters such as:
  - (i) Data collection, streamlining, prioritizing and quality control;
  - (ii) Utilization of the data collected;
  - (iii) Tools and methodology;
  - (iv) Quality and completeness of data collected;
- (d) Risk of non-compliance reports and evaluation of data reporting to further develop and improve monitoring;
- (e) Evaluation and performance assessment need stemming from close association with climate change, regarding the relation between consumption and emissions and climate performance of projects post completion;
- (f) Evaluations in the context of multi-funding and co-funding efforts by the Multilateral Fund.

### **IV. Revised job description of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer**

35. The tenure of office of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the Multilateral Fund has been so far a renewable fixed-term appointment of two years, with no time limit. The tenure of the position for a fixed-term of five years has some merit, but may not be feasible in the light of UNEP's internal policy of limiting initial appointment contracts to two years. The indefinite renewable nature of the two-year contract provides a solution to this limitation and would enable the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to implement medium and long term work programmes without any interruption.

36. The current Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer's work plan is prepared and approved on an annual basis. It could become meaningful to have longer term work plans or programmes (i.e. over a three to five year timeframe) with a strategic approach. Such an approach would provide strategic guidance to monitoring and evaluation in the Multilateral Fund, without losing sight of the basic objectives. In the short term, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer could propose a strategic planning workshop with the aim of developing a multi-year work plan for monitoring and evaluation in the Multilateral Fund.

37. At the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting the Executive Committee approved the job description of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer with special consideration to the monitoring and evaluation needs of the Multilateral Fund and to the fact that the position of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer should have the independence to produce credible and valid evaluations within the Multilateral Fund.

38. The Executive Committee might consider in the near future the preparation of a specific charter of the independent monitoring and evaluation needs under the Multilateral Fund that could contain some of the elements put forward in this paper. This would provide the incumbent of the position of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer with a framework to successfully carry out and complete his/her mission.

39. A revised job description for the position of Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer is presented under Annex I of this document with minimal modification in volume and complexity of its content since most of the functions were taken into account in the original version, including the management of the evaluation of the Multilateral Fund mechanism. It is proposed that this particular task be conducted for each triennium as a standing activity in time for the next discussions on replenishment of the Fund.

## V. Recommendations

40. The Executive Committee may wish to:

- (a) Note the document “Terms of reference and workload for the senior monitoring and evaluation officer (decisions 56/8(e) and 57/12)” presented under UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/7;
- (b) Agree on the assessment of the workload of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer as presented in this document;
- (c) Adopt the revised job description for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer as presented in Annex I.

- - - -



## Annex I

### REVISED JOB DESCRIPTION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SENIOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OFFICER

#### MISSION

The mission of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer is to contribute to organizational learning through provision of systematic and independent assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome, impact and sustainability of projects, programmes and activities funded by the Multilateral Fund.

#### JOB DESCRIPTION

Under the guidance of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will be responsible for:

1. Drafting annual and medium term work programmes and work plans for monitoring and evaluation for Executive Committee review and approval;
2. Coordinating monitoring and evaluation functions required by the Executive Committee with those of implementing and bilateral agencies, financial intermediaries and recipient countries and explore ways of ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation of projects supported by the Multilateral Fund;
3. Following any Executive Committee request and/or guidance, and in cooperation with implementing agencies, prepare and update standard monitoring and evaluation guidelines for the content of project proposals, progress reports and completion reports for Fund-supported activities for Executive Committee approval;
4. Evaluating the efficiency of processes of the Multilateral Fund and its implementing agencies, verifying that Executive Committee approved monitoring and evaluation standards are being applied to all facets of the development and implementation of approved projects;
5. Developing monitoring, evaluation and information systems and databases consistent with the need to collect and generate data requested by the Executive Committee with which to describe and analyse activities supported by the Fund;
6. Managing evaluation studies, including the preparation of terms of references, selecting diverse evaluators consistent with any applicable bidding requirements and overseeing the implementation of evaluations;
7. Managing and coordinating, as directed by the Executive Committee, the evaluation of the financial mechanism established under Article 10 of the Montreal Protocol;
8. Reporting to the Executive Committee on the performance of and lessons learned from projects approved under the Multilateral Fund at all stages of implementation based on experience from bilateral and other agencies through periodic reports in relation to Executive Committee policies and guidelines;
9. Preparing, and after Executive Committee approval, disseminating information on best practices, lessons learned, recommendations and successful results to the different stakeholders;
10. Undertaking any task, within his/her field of activity, that the Executive Committee may entrust to him/her.

## **QUALIFICATIONS**

1. At least 10 years of experience in the areas of monitoring, evaluation and result-based management or similar field, involving work at an international level in multilateral or bilateral organizations.
2. Advanced university degree in a relevant field of the social or natural sciences, engineering or another field that is related to the environment, development and/or experience in monitoring and evaluation.
3. Experience with respect to both programme planning and programme implementation is necessary.
4. Demonstrated abilities in assessment techniques and analytical skills.
5. Fluency in English and preferably other United Nations languages.
6. Knowledge of office automation systems and related software is essential.
7. Good writing, interpersonal communications, presentation and administrative skills.

- - - -

**Annex II****EVALUATION HISTORY IN THE MULTILATERAL FUND**

1) Total approved funds for the monitoring and evaluation work programme	US \$2,815,000
2) Total funds approved for projects (%)	0.12%
3) Total number of final evaluation synthesis reports (aerosol, CAP programme, cases of non-compliance, CFC production, clearing house, compressor, CTC sector, customs training, foam, halon, halon (LVC), incentive programme for retrofits, institutional strengthening (30 <sup>th</sup> and 56 <sup>th</sup> Meetings), MAC, methyl bromide, national phase-out plans in non-LVCs, refrigeration, regional network, RMPs in LVCs, RMPs in non-LVCs, solvent (China), training and R&R, TPMP, chillers)	26
4) Total number of cases studies by country	165
5) Total number of cases studies by region	23
6) Total number of PCRs received (investment (1,775) and non-investment (818))	2,593

**FINAL EVALUATION REPORTS BY THE EXECUTIVE  
BUDGET EVOLUTION COMMITTEE MEETING**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Allocations (US \$)</b>
2000	361,000
2001	318,000
2002	328,000
2003	198,000
2004	256,000
2005	246,000
2006	346,000
2007	361,000
2008	326,000
2009	75,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,815,000</b>

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Meeting</b>
Institutional Strengthening	30th
Refrigeration	30th
Training and R&R	31st
Foam	33rd
Regional Network	33rd
Compressor	34th
Solvent	35th
Clearing House	36th
Aerosol	38th
MAC	38th
Halon	40th
RMPs in LVCs	41st
CFC Production	42nd
Solvent (China)	42nd
Halon (LVC)	44th
Customs Training	45th
Methyl Bromide	46th
RMPs in Non-LVCs	48th
Cases of Non-compliance	50th
CTC Sector	51st
Incentive Programme for Retrofit	52nd
Cap Programme	52nd
NPP in Non-LVCs	54th
Institutional Strengthening	56th
TPMP and Chillers	58th

- - -



### Annex III

## RELATED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DECISIONS ON THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PROGRAMME

### 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting

#### Guidelines on monitoring and evaluation

Having considered the draft paper on project monitoring and evaluation (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/18/64), the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) as an interim step pending the further development of the guidelines:
- "1. To ensure that the Fund's objectives are being carried out and to consider 'lessons learned' in future operations, implementing agencies shall monitor the progress of activities approved by the Fund and evaluate those activities upon their completion. In doing this, it is important to maintain an adequate level of independence and credibility of the system. And it is necessary to strike a balance between the level of oversight that has to be exercised and the cost of doing so.
  - "2. Implementing agencies will report to the Executive Committee on implementation progress and final evaluation in their progress reports and business plans, whose format will be updated from time to time to reflect indicators and evaluation criteria of interest to the Committee. On implementation of progress, the implementing agencies will highlight successes since the last meeting. The report will also highlight projects for which no significant implementation action has taken place within specified periods of say, 12, 18 and 24 months since project approval. Implementing agencies should comment on measures taken to correct problems which have arisen during implementation and measures to prevent their repetition.
  - "3. Project completion reports will discuss and evaluate project implementation success based on business plan indicators and conformance with key project parameters. Reports will be submitted to the Committee within six months of final project disbursements.
  - "4. The Secretariat will establish an independent review process which will periodically evaluate a small representative sample of completed projects from each agency to ensure that consistent and objective evaluation standards are being applied.
  - "5. The Secretariat will aggregate information from project completion reports and report to the Committee on the success of the Fund in meeting Fund and project objectives, based on criteria and indicators indicated in the business plan and key project parameters. In addition, the Secretariat will report on the performance of each agency using the same criteria while considering the special nature of an agency's portfolio.
  - "6. To ensure that sufficient baseline information is available to allow for meaningful monitoring and evaluation of projects, implementing agencies will continue to include project implementation schedules and ODP to be phased out in their project documents. They shall also specify which equipment, if any, will be destroyed and other relevant parameters in project proposals submitted to the Executive Committee.
  - "7. Noting that the World Bank has prepared draft technical guidelines for various sectors to facilitate monitoring and evaluation, the Secretariat will coordinate the adoption of standard technical guidelines which will be updated periodically to reflect experience in Monitoring and Evaluation and technical developments.

- "8. The Secretariat shall work with the implementing agencies to finalize the criteria and indicators for institutional strengthening and clearing house activities and to incorporate suggestions received during the Eighteenth Meeting of the Executive Committee, for submission to the Executive Committee at its Twentieth Meeting."
- (b) that the Secretariat and the implementing agencies should be encouraged to seek expert outside assistance, as necessary, in the further development of the guidelines.

**(Decision 18/20)**

### **19<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

The Chief Officer introduced the draft terms of reference for the design of a monitoring and evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/63), which has been prepared in collaboration with the implementing agencies in pursuance of Executive Committee decision 18/20.

The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To endorse the draft terms of reference for the design of a monitoring and evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund;
- (b) To authorize the Secretariat, in cooperation with the implementing agencies, to proceed with the preparation of a draft monitoring and evaluation system for submission to the Executive Committee at its Twentieth Meeting.

**(Decision 19/40)**

### **20<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

The Chief Officer introduced the draft report on a monitoring and evaluation system for the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/20/58), recalling that the Executive Committee at its Nineteenth Meeting had approved terms of reference for a monitoring and evaluation system (decision 19/40).

A representative of Universalia, the consultant for the report, presented the draft report.

The Executive Committee, having taken note of the presentation, decided:

- (a) To request the consultant to do further work, for submission to a subsequent Meeting, concentrating on the following considerations:
- (i) While significant changes were proposed in the evaluation area, the proposed system of monitoring was largely in place already, embodied in the present system of reporting;
- (ii) It was important that the monitoring and evaluation function should not engender excessive costs, nor inflate a presently lean and efficient Secretariat;
- (iii) Evaluations had to involve all stakeholders;
- (iv) Decisions on the scope of external evaluations, and on the number performed in a year, might have to remain in the hands of the Meeting of the Parties;

- (b) To invite members of the Executive Committee to submit additional comments in writing to the Fund Secretariat in order to facilitate the work of the consultant.

**(Decision 20/38)**

**21<sup>st</sup> Meeting**

Having considered a revised draft of a proposed monitoring and evaluation system prepared by the consulting firm Universalia (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/30) and an oral and slide presentation by a representative of Universalia on the proposed monitoring and evaluation system, as well as the replies of the representative to a number of comments and queries by members of the Committee, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To replace the Sub-Committee on Financial Matters with a standing sub-committee to be called the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee;
- (b) To adopt the terms of reference contained in Annex VII to the present report for the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee;
- (c) To request the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee:
- (i) To review the cycle for business planning and the submission of work programmes;
  - (ii) To review monitoring of approved projects; and
  - (iii) To make recommendations on these matters to the Executive Committee at its Twenty-second Meeting;
- (d) To revise the terms of reference, as necessary, following its review of the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee.
- (e) That the membership of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee would consist of Antigua and Barbuda, Costa Rica and Zimbabwe, from Parties operating under Article 5 of the Protocol, and Australia, Belgium and the United Kingdom, from Parties not so operating. Australia would act as Chairman.

**(Decision 21/35)**

In adopting the decision, the Committee agreed that, as far as language services were concerned, the same practices would be followed as in the Sub-Committee on Project Review. The Committee recognized that, when the Sub-Committees were meeting simultaneously, this arrangement would involve additional cost for interpretation but requested the Secretariat to ensure that such costs were kept to a minimum by consulting with members of the Sub-Committees beforehand to ascertain the languages in which interpretation services were required.

The Executive Committee further decided:

- (a) That there should be a modest strengthening of the Secretariat in order to provide a measure of monitoring and evaluation capacity;
- (b) That once the work programme has been defined and developed by the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee, necessary evaluations will be carried out,

bearing in mind the requirements of Action 1 under decision VII/22 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.7/12, annex V);

- (c) That it would need to review the progress on implementation of the monitoring and evaluation programme after one year;
- (d) To request the Secretariat to work with the implementing agencies and propose for consideration by the Executive Committee or the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee deletions from and/or additions to the current monitoring parameters so as to make them more strategic. In this regard, the Secretariat and the implementing agencies should consider suggestions by members of the Executive Committee;
- (e) To request the Secretariat to work with the implementing agencies to explore ways in which standardized monitoring and evaluation components could be included in project proposals and to propose standardized guidelines for the content of project completion reports by implementing agencies; and
- (f) To request the Secretariat to report back to the Twenty-second Meeting of the Executive Committee on actions taken pursuant to these decisions.

**(Decision 21/36)**

**22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the proposed work programme and work plan on monitoring and evaluation of the Multilateral Fund for a twelve-month period between 1997-1998 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/22/SC-MEF/2 and Corr.1 and Add.1) and having noted the recommendations of the Sub-Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/22/5, paras. 33-38), the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To adopt deliverables 1, 2, 4 and 5 as contained in Annex III to the present report, noting that one of the milestones for monitoring in deliverable 5 should be the date of dismantling or destruction of equipment;
- (b) To adopt outputs 1-4 as contained in Annex III to the present report;
- (c) To request the Secretariat to take the outputs up in sequence, reversing the order of outputs 2 and 3;
- (d) To request the Secretariat to submit output 1 to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee for review of the evaluation questions to be used for the subsequent evaluations, bearing in mind the requirements of Action 1 under decision VII/22 of the Seventh Meeting of the Parties (UNEP/OzL.Pro.7/12, annex V);
- (e) That output 4 should focus on a limited number of specific activities, namely training activities, and institutional strengthening;
- (f) That evaluations should include the question of disbursements and also the role of the various actors in the monitoring system;
- (g) That the evaluations, which were part of the whole monitoring and evaluation process now in place, should review the involvement of all stakeholders in working towards the Fund's objectives;

- (h) That the modest strengthening of the Secretariat approved by the Executive Committee in Decision 21/36 should be sufficient to enable the Secretariat to perform monitoring and evaluation on a continuous basis, through the development of a monitoring and evaluation system and database, the coordination, supervision and carrying out of monitoring and evaluation studies and assignments, and the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation post within the Secretariat whose incumbent would report directly to the Sub-Committee and/or the Executive Committee and be responsible for the coordination of all monitoring and evaluation activities;
- (i) To approve a budget for 12 person-months for these tasks.

**(Decision 22/19)**

With regard to the proposed budgets contained in appendices 1-4 to the work plan on monitoring and evaluation, the Executive Committee took note of the concerns expressed at the Sub-Committee by the Implementing Agencies, with the exception of the World Bank, that they would be unable to cover the costs of external consultants for evaluation under their 13 per cent support costs and the strong disagreement of the Sub-Committee, which considered that the cost of agency participation in the evaluation exercise should be covered by their support costs. The Executive Committee also noted that the phased evaluation recommended would probably take longer than the one-year period envisaged.

Having noted the recommendation of the Sub-Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/22/5, para. 39), the Executive Committee decided that the proposed budgets should be adjusted to reflect the changes to the Secretariat personnel.

## **23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**

### **Job description for the monitoring and evaluation post**

The Executive Committee, having taken note of the Sub-Committee's comments and recommendations (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, paragraphs 13 and 14), decided:

- (a) To approve the revised job description (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, Annex II);
- (b) To request the Secretariat to initiate its submission to the United Nations classification office through UNEP for finalization.

**(Decision 23/3)**

### **Evaluation guide**

The Executive Committee, having noted the comments on the draft Evaluation Guide made at the second meeting of the Sub-Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, paragraphs 4-11) decided:

- (a) To take note of the Evaluation Guide in Annex I to the Sub-Committee's Report of its second meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4) and to delete the qualifications 'if requested' and 'if and when feasible' in the last two bullets of sections c) and d) in part V.C.3 of the Guide (see Annex II to the present report);
- (b) To recognize that the Guide was the first version of what was intended to be a dynamic document that would be revised by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer in the light of experience with its use by countries and implementing agencies;

- (c) To invite members of the Executive Committee to provide their comments on the Guide, and implementing agencies to continue to offer their advice on the subject in the light of their experience; and
- (d) To request the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, when appointed, to take such comments and advice into account in preparing future proposals for improvements and/or amendments to the Guide for the consideration of the Sub-Committee and to ensure that the impacts of evaluated projects were considered in the light of their impact on the sector as a whole at the national level.

**(Decision 23/5)**

### **26<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/4, para. 22), the Executive Committee took note of the report on the status of implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/13) and decided to request the Fund Secretariat to prepare a monitoring and evaluation work programme for 1999 for submission to the Executive Committee at its first meeting in 1999.

**(Decision 26/10)**

### **27<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 1999

The Executive Committee, having considered the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/27/4, para. 27), decided:

- (a) To approve the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 1999;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to submit a draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2000 for consideration at the third meeting of the Executive Committee in 1999.

**(Decision 27/11)**

### **29<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

The Executive Committee, having considered the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/29/4, paras 16 and 17) decided:

- (a) To approve the proposed work programme;
- (b) To approve the budget for its implementation in the amount of US \$361,000;
- (c) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare, for submission to the Thirtieth Meeting of the Executive Committee, a paper on the possibility of incorporating a desk study on recovery and recycling projects into the work programme for monitoring and evaluation for the year 2000.

**(Decision 29/5)**

### **32<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**

Taking note of the draft 2001 monitoring and evaluation work programme (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/20) and having considered the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/3, para. 48), the Executive Committee decided to approve the proposed 2001 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a revised budget of US \$318,000, after the removal of the “Extended desk study on recovery and recycling projects” due to insufficient data on the status quo of recovery and recycling projects.

**(Decision 32/22)**

### **35<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/4, para. 31), the Executive Committee approved the proposed 2002 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$328,000, as indicated in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/13.

**(Decision 35/11)**

### **38<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, paragraph 20), and its decision concerning the procedural issue to be discussed at its 19th Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, paragraph 22), the Executive Committee decided to approve the proposed 2003 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$198,000, as indicated in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/8, and request that work be initiated using the same procedures that had been utilized for such evaluations during 1999, 2000 and 2001.

**(Decision 38/5)**

### **39<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

#### **Institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation in relevant international financing institutions: Report from the Consultant**

Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/39/6, paragraphs 40 and 41), the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To take note of the Consultant’s report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/2;
- (b) To consider clarifying the following issues at its 41st Meeting:
  - Could the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer exercise a certain independence within the Secretariat in the context of United Nations staff rules?
  - Who had final responsibility for the evaluation reports presented to the Executive Committee and to the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance, particularly with respect to technical and/or policy recommendations?

**(Decision 39/12)**

### **41<sup>st</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/41/6, paragraphs 17 to 19), the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To approve the proposed 2004 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$256,000, as indicated in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/41/9; and
- (b) To take into account the comments made by the members of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance, particularly with regard to the extent to which sectoral and national phase-out plans assisted countries to meet their obligations under the Montreal Protocol.

**(Decision 41/7)**

### **44<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the results of the 2004 work programme, the evaluation studies for the year 2005, the implementation modalities and methodological approach, and the proposed budget for the year 2005, the Executive Committee decided to approve the proposed 2005 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$246,000, as shown in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/13.

**(Decision 44/10)**

### **46<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the addition of US \$80,000 to the budget to enable the preparation of country case studies for the evaluation of national and sectoral phase-out plans in the second half of 2005, and the reclassification of evaluation reports submitted to the Executive Committee, including those submitted in previous years, for general distribution, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To add US \$80,000 to the budget for the 2005 monitoring and evaluation work programme for the preparation of country case studies for the evaluation of national and sectoral phase-out plans in the second half of 2005, combined with the evaluation of refrigerant management plans in non-low-volume-consuming countries;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to clearly indicate on all pre-sessional documents that they were without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take; and
- (c) To reclassify evaluation reports submitted to the Executive Committee, including those submitted in past years, as documents for general distribution.

**(Decision 46/7)**

### **47<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Having considered the results of the 2005 work programme, the evaluation studies proposed for the year 2006, the implementation modalities and methodological approach, and the proposed budget for the year 2006, the Executive Committee decided to approve the proposed 2006 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$346,000, as shown in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/47/11.

**(Decision 47/9)**

## 50<sup>th</sup> Meeting

The Executive Committee decided to approve the 2007 work programme for monitoring and evaluation at a budget of US \$361,000, as shown in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/50/11, with the following amendments requesting the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer:

- (a) To send the final country studies on cases of non-compliance to the Parties concerned; and
- (b) To initiate, instead of further country studies on cases of non-compliance estimated at US \$100,000, work on standardization of annual work programmes, progress and verification reports on multi-year agreements.

**(Decision 50/9)**

## 53<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

Following the discussion the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To approve the 2008 monitoring and evaluation work programme and schedule for submission of documents on monitoring and evaluation to the Executive Committee as set out in Table 1 below; and
- (b) To approve the budget for the 2008 monitoring and evaluation work programme at the amount of US \$326,000 as set out in Table 2 below (note: tables 2 not included).

**(Decision 53/7)**

## 56<sup>th</sup> Meeting

The Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To approve a reduced budget of US \$75,000 for the implementation of the 2009 monitoring and evaluation work programme, in view of the departure of the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer at the end of 2008. The Secretariat, with the assistance of an interim Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and consultants, should finalize activities under way, specifically the preparation of the extended desk study on the evaluation of chiller projects, the final report on the evaluation of terminal phase-out management plans, the consolidated project completion report for the year 2009, the multi-year agreement tables, the web-based country profiles, and the multi-year agreement reporting format;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to adhere to the draft timetable as proposed in the 2009 monitoring and evaluation work programme, as modified by the work identified in paragraph (a) above and the time required to recruit the interim Monitoring and Evaluation Officer provided for in the 2009 budget, and in any case to complete the work in 2009 and report back on its completion to the Executive Committee by the 59<sup>th</sup> Meeting;
- (c) To request the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair (Article 5) and the Vice-Chair (non-Article 5), as well as the outgoing Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, to engage the services of an interim Monitoring and Evaluation Officer consistent with existing terms of reference for that position, to the extent feasible;

- (d) To request the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to prepare and submit a document to the 57<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee outlining existing terms of reference for the position and briefly summarizing how evaluation functions in other similar fund secretariats and financial institutions were organized and implemented; and
- (e) Commencing at the 57<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, to make an effort to reach a decision no later than the 58<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, to discuss priorities and arrangements that might be necessary over the next five years for the monitoring and evaluation programme, and bearing in mind the 2010 compliance period, the size and complexity of the future work, including associated budgetary and institutional arrangements for carrying out such work, including the possibility of cost effective and independent delivery options external to the Fund Secretariat.

**(Decision 56/8)**

### **57<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

#### **Monitoring and evaluation: Report on the existing terms of reference and how the evaluation functions in similar institutions are organized and implemented (decision 56/8(d))**

The interim SMEO introduced document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/13 containing the consultant's report comparing the existing terms of reference for the position of SMEO and the operation of the evaluation function at the Multilateral Fund against positions at the evaluation offices of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Bank Group (WBG), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and UNDP. He explained that the consultant had gathered the information for the report by interviewing the officers in charge of evaluation and monitoring at those multilateral institutions, and by reviewing all relevant documentation. It had been found that the monitoring and evaluation function and procedure at the Multilateral Fund were quite similar to those at the other institutions as they all adhered to the same standards set by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), and were governed by the same principles of integrity, impartiality and independence. Finally, he indicated that the consultant had been invited to the Meeting to present the report's substance, findings and conclusions.

The consultant pointed out that his report raised a number of points for further reflection, one being the fact that the financing and human resources budget for the monitoring and evaluation position had not changed in ten years. Regardless of workload changes, there might be a need to adjust the budget to reflect inflation. The SMEO should be a high-ranking official, given the significant responsibilities involved, and should therefore be no lower than P5 level. The consultant also noted that the SMEO reported directly to the Executive Committee, and said that it might be worth considering the creation of a Monitoring and Evaluation Office headed by a high-ranking officer.

Following the consultant's presentation, the Members thanked the interim SMEO and the consultant for the report. The monitoring and evaluation function was seen as fundamental to ensuring high standards and success within the Multilateral Fund by providing lessons learned and making it possible to adjust and improve operations on an ongoing basis. Though the monitoring and evaluation function was seen as having been very efficient, there was a need to re-evaluate the 10 years of past activities to see whether any adjustments should be made to the terms of reference for the future incumbent. The importance of giving the monitoring and evaluation function a degree of independence was underlined and the idea that the position should be held by a high-ranking official was supported.

Several suggestions were made with regard to potential future activities for the post, particularly in the light of future challenges such as climate change and the risk of non-compliance. It was pointed out that renewed emphasis on monitoring might prove very beneficial. An auditing function was also proposed,

with the SMEO examining the efficiency of institutional arrangements and measuring them against the standard at other international institutions. The SMEO's functions might also include analysis of the impact of evaluation activities on the overall work of the Fund. It was also suggested that the terms of reference be reviewed with regard to specific activities useful to HCFC phase-out, including climate-related impacts. Concerning the term of the SMEO's mandate, it was proposed to review the current situation, namely a two-year term renewable indefinitely, which had been highlighted by the consultant as being different from that in other international organizations. In relation to the need to adjust the budget, a comment was made to the effect that the Fund had always proven very creative in its allocation of resources to the monitoring and evaluation function.

Following the discussion, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note:
  - (i) With appreciation, the Consultant's report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/13;
  - (ii) The express agreement of the Members of the Executive Committee to continue with the function of monitoring and evaluation at the current budget level and that the post should remain staffed by a highly qualified professional; and
- (b) To request the Secretariat to prepare and submit to the 58<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee, for approval, the terms of reference and workload for the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO), taking into consideration that the Members of the Executive Committee reaffirmed that the position of SMEO should retain independence and was best situated in the Secretariat. The Secretariat should propose additional responsibilities to the workload and the terms of reference, including work on climate benefits, risk of non-compliance, auditing and increased emphasis on monitoring functions, and taking into account that the work should be relevant and helpful for HCFC phase-out. In addition, the terms of reference should include a provision for such a position to be fixed-term in line with the standard practice of other international funding institutions.

**(Decision 57/12)**

- - -