



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/41/84
23 November 2003



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Forty-first Meeting
Montreal, 17 - 19 December 2003

**CLARIFICATION OF ISSUES RELATED TO THE MONITORING AND
EVALUATION FUNCTION OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND SECRETARIAT
(DECISION 39/12(b))**

1. The Executive Committee at its 39th Meeting decided, *inter alia*,:
 - “(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?”
2. To facilitate the deliberations of the Committee, the Fund Secretariat has prepared this paper containing an extract of decisions taken by the Executive Committee on Monitoring and Evaluation as well as the following background documents:
 - Terms of Reference of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/21/36, Annex VII);
 - Revised job description and qualifications for Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/23/4, Annex II); and
 - Institutional Procedures of Monitoring and Evaluation in relevant International Financing Institutions: Report from the Consultant (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/2).

EXTRACT OF DECISIONS CONCERNING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

17th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 11: GUIDELINES ON PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION

66. The Chief Officer introduced the proposed draft guidelines on the monitoring and evaluation of the programmes and projects supported by the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/17/53).

67. The Executive Committee took note of the draft guidelines and requested countries to submit comments to the Secretariat by the end of August 1995 to enable a second draft to be prepared for the Eighteenth Meeting. The Executive Committee also took note of the draft "Monitoring and evaluation guidelines for ODS phase-out investment projects" (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/17/Inf.4) submitted by the World Bank and requested interested countries to submit comments to the Bank by the end of August 1995.

18th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 9: GUIDELINES ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. 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)

19th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 20: DESIGN OF A MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND (DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE)

72. 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 been prepared in collaboration with the implementing agencies in pursuance of Executive Committee decision 18/20.

73. 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)

20th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 10: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND

54. 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).

55. A representative of Universalialia, the consultant for the report, presented the draft report.

56. 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)

21st Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 9: MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR THE MULTILATERAL FUND

49. 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)

22nd Meeting of the Executive Committee

(g) Draft work programme and work plan for monitoring and evaluation

34. 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)

23rd Meeting of the Executive Committee

Job description for the monitoring and evaluation post

15. 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

17. 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)

18. One representative asked that his delegation's understanding that the Multilateral Fund's evaluation was not the evaluation of the national programme of a country should be recorded in the report.

24th Meeting of the Executive Committee

(i) Status of recruitment of Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

30. The Executive Committee, having noted the Sub-Committee's observations (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/4, paragraphs 34 and 35), decided:

- (a) To take note of the status report;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to keep it informed of developments; and
- (c) That a consultant should be employed until the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer could take up the post.

(Decision 24/11)

Paragraphs 34 and 35 of the MEF SC report:

34. The Secretariat presented a status report on recruitment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/24/16), updating it by advising that the post had been classified by United Nations Headquarters in New York. UNEP was processing the vacancy announcement, which would be open for a period of some twelve weeks, following which the Secretariat would evaluate the candidates and draw up a short list on the basis of which a final decision would be taken. As it was nonetheless imperative that implementation of the approved work programme of monitoring and evaluation should begin as soon as possible, the Secretariat proposed that a consultant should be retained in the interim period pending the recruitment of the officer.

35. *The Sub-Committee recommended that the Executive Committee:*

- (a) note the status report ;*
- (b) request the Secretariat to keep it informed of developments; and*
- (c) agree that a consultant should be employed until the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer could take up the post.*

25th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 3: SECRETARIAT ACTIVITIES

3. The Chief Officer introduced the report on the various activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the Twenty-fourth Meeting of the Executive Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/25/2). Updating the information given in paragraph 4, on the appointment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, he said that the last clarifications had recently been received; a shortlist would be drawn up and submitted to the United Nations Office

at Nairobi (UNON); interviews would follow; and a recommendation would be made to the Appointments and Promotions Board in Nairobi.

26th Meeting of the Executive Committee

AGENDA ITEM 3: SECRETARIAT ACTIVITIES

6. The Chief Officer introduced the report on the various activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the Twenty-fifth Meeting of the Executive Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/2). He reported that the process of recruitment of a Senior Evaluation Officer was reaching its final stages, and an offer of appointment was being made to the selected candidate.

(e) Status of implementation of the monitoring and evaluation work programme

26. 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)

27th Meeting of the Executive Committee

(f) Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 1999

31. 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)

**REPORT OF THE 18TH MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE
ON MONITORING, EVALUATION AND FINANCE**

**AGENDA ITEM 3: DRAFT MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK
PROGRAMME FOR THE YEAR 2003**

19. The Sub-Committee considered the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2003 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/8), which was presented by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.

20. [Having considered the guiding principles, the evaluation studies and the proposed budget for the year 2003, the Sub-Committee recommended that the Executive Committee 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.]

21. After several representatives had referred to the question of the procedure to be followed for the submission of evaluation reports to the Executive Committee, particularly in cases where there might be disagreement among the consultant, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Chief Officer regarding recommendations, the Sub-Committee continued its meeting in the absence of observers and the Secretariat in order to discuss the procedural issue.

22. The Sub-Committee debated the issue in a closed session and decided:

- (a) To continue discussing the procedural issue of monitoring and evaluation at its 19th Meeting as a separate agenda item;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to compile information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation (units and persons) in other relevant international financing institutions such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Bank, in particular on terms of reference, lines of reporting, and preparation and presentation of documents and recommendations to the governing bodies;
- (c) To circulate this information to members of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance before the 19th Meeting.

38th Meeting of the Executive Committee

(b) Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2003

4. 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)

39th Meeting of the Executive Committee

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

46. 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)

ANNEX VII**TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE MONITORING, EVALUATION,
AND FINANCE SUB-COMMITTEE**

1. The Executive Committee at its Twenty-first Meeting decided to create a standing sub-committee entitled the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee which will replace the Sub-Committee on Financial Matters established at the Ninth Meeting of the Executive Committee.
2. The Sub-Committee will be a standing committee. It will be appointed for a period of one year coinciding with the term of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee. In accordance with past practice, the Chair of the Sub-Committee will be determined by the membership and alternate among members from one Meeting of the Parties to the next.
3. The Sub-Committee shall consist of three Executive Committee members from Parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Protocol and three members from Parties not so operating, as determined by the respective groups. The Treasurer and the Secretariat will assist the Sub-Committee in its work and participate in Sub-Committee meetings. Implementing agencies may be invited to participate. The Sub-Committee is empowered to require the attendance of any implementing agency on any matter causing concern to the Sub-Committee.
4. The Sub-Committee will be a closed Committee. Executive Committee members may be admitted as observers with the express agreement of the Chairman. With the concurrence of all members of the Sub-Committee, the Chairman could invite the observers to speak. Three representatives from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) - one nominated by environmental NGOs, one by industry NGOs and one by NGOs from the academic community - may observe the meeting of the Sub-Committee but may not participate.
5. The working language of the meeting of the Sub-Committee will be English.
6. The Sub-Committee will address issues concerning monitoring and evaluation of approved projects, progress reports, business plans, and the business planning process under the Multilateral Fund. All of the responsibilities of the Sub-Committee on Financial Matters established at the Ninth Meeting of the Executive Committee are transferred to the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee.

Annex II

REVISED JOB DESCRIPTION AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OFFICER

JOB DESCRIPTION

Under the general supervision of the Chief Officer, the incumbent will be responsible to:

1. Draft the work programme and work plan for monitoring and evaluation *for Sub-Committee/Executive Committee review and approval.*
2. Work with the implementing agencies, bilateral and other agencies to explore ways of ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation of projects supported by the Fund *consistent with Executive Committee requirements.*
3. Coordinate monitoring and evaluation functions *required by the Executive Committee* with those of implementing and bilateral agencies, financial intermediaries and recipient countries
4. *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 Sub-Committee review and Executive Committee approval.*
5. Verify that *Executive Committee approved* monitoring and evaluation standards are being applied to all facets of the development and implementation of approved projects.
6. Develop monitoring and evaluation systems and databases *consistent with the need to generate data requested by the Executive Committee* with which to describe and analyze activities supported by the Fund.
7. Manage special evaluation studies, including the preparation of terms of references *for Executive Committee approval*, selecting *diverse* evaluators *consistent with any applicable bidding requirements*, and overseeing the implementation of evaluations.
8. Aggregate information on the performance of the Fund in meeting Fund and project objectives *consistent with information requested by the Executive Committee.*
9. Report to the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee *and 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.

10. Report to the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee *and the* Executive Committee on the process of monitoring and evaluation being used and suggest changes as necessary.
11. Follow-up on the decisions and directives of the Executive Committee within the field of monitoring and evaluation.
12. *Prepare, and after Executive Committee approval, disseminate* information on best practices and successful results.
13. Undertake missions, as required to carry out the above functions.

QUALIFICATIONS

1. At least 10 years of experience, in the areas of monitoring, evaluation, and research.
2. Advanced university degree in a relevant field of the social sciences, engineering, or equivalent qualifications and/or experience in monitoring and evaluation.
3. Experience with respect to both programming and programme implementation would be an advantage.
4. Demonstrated abilities in assessment techniques and good skills in interpersonal communication.
5. Fluency in English and preferably other UN languages.
6. Knowledge of office automation systems and related software are essential.
7. Good analytic writing, communications, and administrative skills.



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/SCMEF/19/2
7 March 2003



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance
Nineteenth Meeting
Montreal, 31 March -1 April 2003

**INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN
RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL FINANCING INSTITUTIONS**

REPORT FROM THE CONSULTANT

REPORT ON
EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF SELECTED
INTERNATIONAL FUNDING INSTITUTIONS

PREPARED FOR:
THE SECRETARIAT OF MULTILATERAL FUND
FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

PREPARED BY:
FUAT ANDIC, PH.D.
CONSULTANT

MARCH 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background
2. Methodology

II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RATIONALE OF EVALUATION

III. EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Introductory Remarks
2. The World Bank
3. Global Environmental Facility
4. International Fund for Agricultural Development
5. United Nations Development Programme
6. Asian Development Bank
7. United Nations High Commission for Refugees
8. United Nations Industrial Development Organization
9. The Multilateral Fund

IV. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Some Conceptual Issues
2. The Practice

APPENDIX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. *This Report is prepared upon the decision of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4) that requested from the Secretariat to compile information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation in relevant international funding institutions.*
2. *The Report was prepared by interviewing the persons who are in charge of monitoring and evaluation in the relevant institutions and reviewing the documents that refer to procedural matters and regulations that govern the evaluation and monitoring units in these institutions. Their **modus operandi** was then compared with that of the Multilateral Fund.*
3. *The review of the literature as well as of pertinent documents shows clearly that evaluation is not an end but a means to assist the organizations to carry out their mandate, enabling them to have:*
 - *Greater accountability in the use of resources.*
 - *A clearer basis for decision-making.*
 - *Elements of judgement based on the lessons learned from the past experience in order to better guide future actions and interventions.*
4. *Evaluation is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and the degree of success of ongoing and/or completed projects and programs.*
5. *Evaluations are to be carried out objectively and independently without any interference from any level of management of the organizations, implementers and stakeholders of the projects*
6. *The weight of the evaluations is on the outcomes. In that sense they should indicate:*
 - *The relevance of the projects and programs.*
 - *The efficacy of the projects and programs.*
 - *The efficiency of the projects and programs.*
7. *The evaluation practices, the modus operandi and the internal flow of information of the evaluation units of seven international organizations were compared with those of the Multilateral Fund (MF). These institutions are World Bank (WB), Global Environmental Facility (GEF), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Asian Development Bank (ADB), United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). In the comparison four points were always kept in view:*
 - *The role of the evaluation units.*
 - *The modus operandi followed.*
 - *The safeguards integrated in monitoring and evaluation systems to maintain independence and impartiality.*
 - *The responsibilities and attributes of these units.*

8. *The comparison yielded clearly and unambiguously that all evaluation offices of the international organizations examined in this Report are designed to be independent of the projects and/or implementors they are evaluating and transparent. Within the context of independence and transparency, the modus operandi shows some variations. These can be described as follows:*
- *To maintain independence, impartiality and integrity in all evaluation offices **modus operandi and the flow of information** occupy a special place. In appointments, reporting procedures and the role of the head of the organization some nuances and variations are observed.*
 - *With respect to **appointments**, in UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO the head of the organization appoints the director or officer in charge of the evaluation unit. In GEF, IFAD and WB their Board, upon the nomination of their Chief Officers, makes the appointments. In MF there is no evaluation unit as such. Evaluations are in fact a function within its Secretariat and are managed by an officer who is nominated by the chief officer of the Secretariat and appointed by UNEP.*
 - *With respect to the **reporting** procedure, in WB and IFAD the head of the evaluation unit reports directly to the Board. In UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO and GEF reporting is done directly from the head of the evaluation unit to the head of the organization. In MF the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation officer reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee and/or to the Executive Committee.*
 - *In all cases the reports are presented to the Boards as **corporate products**, even though they may be prepared by independent consultants who have no affiliation with the organization, nor may they have participated in the design and implementation of the projects/programs. Only UNDP, GEF and ADB include the names of the independent consultants in the reports. In MF the evaluation reports are submitted to the Executive Committee as corporate products.*
 - *WB and ADB organize independent evaluations, though a staff of the organization heads the evaluation missions. In all others the independent consultant heads the evaluation mission. Some organizations, such as UNDP, may attach a staff to the mission as a resource person whenever appropriate. The practice in MF is that an independent consultant may lead the evaluation mission. If the senior monitoring and evaluation officer of the Fund participates in a mission, he then heads it. Depending upon the nature of the evaluation a staff member of the Secretariat, who is well versed with the subject matter, may also accompany the mission. It is not unusual to have a staff from the implementing agencies to join the mission, as the case warrants.*
 - *Regarding the **role of the heads of the organizations**: In WB, the evaluation office transmits the reports directly to the Board; but in the Board meeting the President, who is the head of the institution, is at liberty to express his agreement/disagreement or reservations. In GEF its head reviews the reports that evaluate the GEF, but does not have the faculty to alter it. He has the duty to transmit them to the Board and, as the head of the institution being evaluated, has the right to express his opinion with respect to conclusions and recommendations. In IFAD the President again is at liberty to express his views,*

as he deems appropriate. In UNDP the Administrator reports to the Board, but reviews the reports beforehand; should a divergence of opinion emerge, every effort is done to harmonize the differences. ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO follow a very similar procedure. In MF the senior monitoring and evaluation officer presents the reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee. As the evaluation is one of the operation of the Secretariat, the evaluation comes forward as a Secretariat document, after having cleared it with the Chief Officer.

9. *One important conclusion that emerges from this comparison is that the evaluation units are indeed essentially independent and occupy a special place within their respective organizations. Their heads are appointed mostly through a different procedure than normal staff appointments. But where the evaluations concern the operation of the activities for which she/he is ultimately responsible, the head of the organization also reserves, even if the reports are submitted directly to the Boards without his interference, the right to express his opinion, his agreement or disagreement with the reports, since he is the one who is entrusted with the duty of overseeing the organizations' functioning and carrying out their mandate as incorporated into their statutes. The final responsibility rests with the Board (or with the Executive Committee in MF), accepting/rejecting and implementing any recommendation contained in these reports. In the final analysis these reports' functions are only advisory.*

SUMMARY TABLE

<i>Organization</i>	<i>TOR is prepared:</i>	<i>Appointments</i>	<i>Report to:</i>	<i>Reports</i>	<i>Role of Head</i>
<i>WB</i>	<i>By the Evaluation Unit; discussed internally</i>	<i>President nominates, Board approves</i>	<i>OED directly to the Board</i>	<i>Corporate Products</i>	<i>During the Board meeting President expresses his opinion</i>
<i>GEF</i>	<i>By the Evaluation Unit; discussed internally</i>	<i>The Council</i>	<i>To CEO of GEF; CEO to the Council</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>CEO reports to the Council</i>
<i>IFAD</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>Nominated by Head, approved by Board</i>	<i>The Board</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>President expresses opinion to the Board</i>
<i>UNDP</i>	<i>Internally; discussed with pertinent bureaus</i>	<i>Staff appointment by Administrator</i>	<i>Administrator</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>Presentation to the Board</i>
<i>ADB</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>President</i>	<i>Corporate products; consultant names listed</i>	<i>Presentation to the Board</i>
<i>UNHCR</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>High Commissioner</i>	<i>Asst. High Commissioner</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Harmonize opinion divergence; submits to ExCom</i>
<i>UNIDO</i>	<i>Internally</i>	<i>Director General</i>	<i>Dep. Dir. General or Dir. General</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Harmonize opinion divergence; submits to Devt. Board</i>
<i>MF</i>	<i>Internally; discussed with and cleared by CO</i>	<i>CO nominates; UNEP appoints</i>	<i>MEF Sub-Committee and/or ExCom</i>	<i>Corporate products</i>	<i>Institutional supervision of evaluation process; clearing evaluation reports</i>

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The decision of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance of the Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Multilateral Fund (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/4, sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 21) reads as follows:

(b) To request the Secretariat to compile information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation (units and persons) in other relevant international financing institutions such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Bank, in particular on terms of reference, lines of reporting, and preparation and presentation of documents and recommendations to the governing bodies.

(c) To circulate this information to members of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance before the 19th Meeting.

This Report is prepared by an independent consultant in response to the above-cited decision of the Sub-Committee in accordance with the terms of reference (see Appendix) prepared by the Secretariat. It is submitted to the Secretariat of MF. The following section presents the methodology. In addition to the three funding institutions specified in the decision, and in compliance with the terms of reference, the practice of four additional institutions is also examined.

2. Methodology

The Report was prepared through four distinct steps. These are briefly as follows:

(i). Interviews were conducted with persons who are in charge of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the following institutions: GEF, IFAD, and World Bank (WB). In compliance with paragraph 3 of the terms of reference UNDP, ADB, UNIDO and UNHCR have also been added. The inclusion of UNDP is especially important since this organization has pioneered in perfecting the evaluation methodology and procedures during the past two decades. ADB is quite active as a regional bank and has developed a very reputable evaluation practice. UNHCR and UNIDO are not essentially funding agencies; rather they execute projects, but their inclusion illustrates the similarity/dissimilarity of the evaluation practices.

(ii). Documents of these institutions referring to procedural matters, chain of command, reporting and presentation of the evaluation documents to the governing bodies were reviewed. This review complemented and supplemented the information obtained from the interviews.

(iii). The M&E procedures of these organizations were compared with the operations of MF in order to enhance the usefulness of the information gathered. The similarities and differences are highlighted in Section IV.

(iv). The first draft of the Report was submitted to the MF Secretariat in order to have feedback with respect to the accuracy of information the Report contained, as well as correcting any factual errors and omissions that may have been committed with respect to MF's evaluation operations.

(v). Upon the receipt of comments from the Secretariat the Report was revised and the final version was submitted.

II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RATIONALE OF EVALUATION

Evaluation is not an end but a means to enable organizations to carry out their mandate. It is an essential management tool to enable it to respond to several demands:

- Greater accountability in the use of resources.
- A clearer basis for decision-making.
- More practical lessons drawn from experience to guide future actions and interventions.

Through the process of M&E the management is able to ascertain whether or not functions are carried out as determined by the organization's mandate. Thereby it can verify whether the projects/programs met the objectives that correspond to its *raison d'être*.

While **monitoring** is a continuous function that primarily provides the project management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project/program with early indications of progress, or the lack thereof, in the achievement of project/program objectives **evaluation** is a time-bound exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and/or completed projects/programs. Hence, monitoring and evaluation are two different but closely related processes. They are mutually supportive and equally important. Monitoring provides quantitative and qualitative data using selective indicators. Evaluation serves as a source of lessons that can be applied in the development of conceptual innovations to the management and furnishes information with respect to the accountability, efficiency and transparency of the organization's activities for the stakeholders.

Since an evaluation of a project/program reflects the way and modality followed by the organization to fulfill its mandate, its very first rule is that **it should be carried out objectively and independently in accordance with the terms of reference without any interference from any level of management of the organization or from the stakeholders**. This is one reason why most evaluation offices are directly attached to its highest executive authority. In more cases than not evaluations are carried out by independent evaluators whose findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented to the representative of the stakeholders. As stated above, evaluation is a tool that helps to enhance the efficiency of the management; but at the same time, and more importantly, it allows the stakeholders to judge the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects/programs carried out by the management as dictated in the organization's mandate. In other words, the stakeholders have the right and responsibility to know what exactly is happening in the execution of the projects/programs, what aspects need corrective action, and whether or not the results obtained are conducive for the organization to carry out its mandate.

This Report will not enter into the technicalities as to how evaluations are carried out. Its weight is on the comparison of the various *modus operandi* in maintaining the impartiality and independence of the evaluation reports. Impartiality and independence are understood as judgments of the evaluators not being unduly influenced by opinions

and views of the staff of the organizations, of the implementers and of stakeholders. The evaluator(s) is guided only by the terms of reference that are prepared within the organization independently from the evaluators. Care is always taken that the evaluators are professionally qualified and their judgment is trustworthy. No person or firm may carry out project/program evaluation if they were involved in the past in designing and/or implementing the project/program in question. The management informs the stakeholders of the results of the evaluation in an impartial manner. This allows them to pass a judgment on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluator(s), on the management of projects/programs, and to make suggestions for corrective measures, if need be, so that the organization can carry out its mandate efficiently and effectively in a transparent manner.

III. EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SELECTED INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Introductory Remarks

This section presents the evaluation practices followed by a number of international organizations. The presentation is weighted towards:

- The role of the evaluation units within the respective organizations.
- The modus operandi followed.
- The flow of information.
- The safeguards integrated into the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems so that without undue influence from any quarters evaluations are carried out in accordance with their terms of reference.
- The responsibilities of these units.

2. The World Bank (WB)

The World Bank (WB) has a large evaluation office with 70 professionals. It is called Operations Evaluation Department (OED). This large office is commensurate with the size and array of the operations that WB undertakes.

A Director General heads OED; he is nominated by the Bank's President but appointed by its Board of Executive Directors. The Director General reports directly to the Board. The Board oversees OED's work through its Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE). CODE oversees the operations evaluation system of the Bank and of the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It is a standing committee of the Board of Executive Directors and comprises eight members. The functions of CODE are:

- To review the work program and the reports produced by OED and the operations evaluation group of IFC and management responses to them and to identify policy issues for consideration by the Board.
- To satisfy itself that the Bank's operations evaluation and self-evaluation activities are adequate and efficient.
- To examine selected issues concerning operations evaluation and development effectiveness for review and decision making by the Board.

In other words, CODE deliberates on issues that have a bearing on relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Bank's operations, including operation policies and business processes, and monitors the implementation of Bank activities to ensure that the overall purpose of reducing poverty is being served.

The goals of the evaluations that the Bank conducts are to learn from experience to provide an objective basis for assessing the results of the Bank's work and to provide accountability in the achievement of its objectives. The evaluations improve the

undertakings of the Bank by identifying and disseminating the lessons learned from experience and by putting forward recommendations.

WB uses an objectives-based approach to evaluation. This approach has three major advantages:

- It enhances accountability by focusing attention on the extent to which objectives set out by the Bank's Board of Executive Directors have in fact been achieved;
- It promotes efficiency by relating the use of scarce resources to the accomplishment of specific outcomes.
- It allows comparisons by applying a common measurement technique across the wide array of sectors and countries for which the Bank provides financing.

The aim of OED is essentially to evaluate outcomes by considering three factors. These are:

- Relevance, i.e., the intervention's objectives in relation to the needs and institutional priorities of the countries.
- Efficacy, i.e., the extent to which the development objectives have been achieved or are expected to be achieved.
- Efficiency, i.e., the extent to which the objectives have been achieved without using more resources than necessary.

WB has developed an increasingly rigorous system of evaluation over the past 30 years and has always been sensitive to the independence of evaluations. That is to say, evaluations by OED must be independent from line management at all stages of process, including planning of work programs, formulation of terms of reference, staffing of evaluation teams, and clearance of reports.

The modus operandi and the flow of information can be summarized as follows. Certain major evaluations are undertaken in house, whereas project evaluations are carried out independently. A task manager, usually from the OED staff, is responsible to see through that the evaluations conform to OED's established norms, and heads each evaluation. Terms of references are prepared by OED staff and discussed within OED. Whenever required, the task manager selects the independent consultants. Once completed, the evaluation reports are circulated within OED and the staff of the appropriate departments for comments. All comments are not necessarily taken into consideration. The right to determine which comments should be included into the reports and what alterations ought to be done rests with OED. It is the sole judge on this matter. While they remain as internal documents the reports come out with white and yellow covers, depending upon the level of circulation. After OED's judgement the reports are issued with a gray cover; in other words, the reports are now ready to be presented as OED reports to the Board of Directors of the Bank. The Director General of OED presents the gray cover reports as corporate products. The consultants' names do not appear in the gray cover versions.

The flow of information thus is that the gray cover reports go from OED to the Bank's Board. The President is also furnished with a copy, but his comments, corrections and alterations are not sought. However, the President reserves the right to put forward his view to the Board with respect to findings, conclusions and recommendations, and their compatibility with the Bank's overall mandate. The Board may decide to disclose the reports; in which case they become public domain. Alternatively, at the request of OED's Director General, who may suggest not publishing the reports, the Board may decide not to disclose their contents; hence they remain as internal documents.

The Director General of OED presents the evaluation reports to the Board. The President of the Bank also conveys his endorsement and/or his reservations with respect to the conclusions and recommendations of the reports. It is entirely up to the Board to take the appropriate measures and issue instructions with respect to their publication and with respect to the recommendations contained in them. In other words, the final decision rests with the Board.

3. Global Environmental Facility (GEF)

GEF is a mechanism for international cooperation for the purpose of providing new and additional grant and concessional funding to achieve global environmental benefits in the areas of biological diversity, climate change, international waters, ozone layer depletion, and land degradation. UNDP, UNEP, and WB are GEF's implementing agencies. GEF emphasizes partnership with national governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and stakeholders at all levels to protect the global environment.

M&E is a shared responsibility between the GEF and its Implementing Agencies: UNDP, UNEP, and the World Bank. The Implementing Agencies have the responsibility for evaluating individual projects; while the M&E unit in the GEF Secretariat is responsible for monitoring and evaluation at the overall level, the focal areas, the programs, as well as cross-cutting issues. It enables the comprehensive assessment of GEF's effectiveness and impacts. M&E adds significantly to GEF's learning and capacity development goals because it facilitates the use of the best existing scientific knowledge to monitor the environmental changes sought by the program in the GEF focal areas and it ensures the development of M&E skills GEF-wide. Hence M&E policies and procedures need to assess how the global dimensions of the focal areas are incorporated into the environmental plans and strategies at the national as well as regional levels. They take into account the features that make GEF a distinctive initiative and institution. M&E also helps the entire GEF enterprise to become progressively more cost effective by building on the lessons of both successes and failures early enough for them to make a difference. GEF views M&E as particularly vital to its effectiveness, because its projects are often innovative and experimental. GEF is also pioneering coordination among many parties, and the development of its successful operational programs requires continuous learning.

A Senior Evaluation Coordinator heads M&E and the office is rather small with only 5 professionals. It relies on independent evaluators quite often. M&E policy has four objectives:

- To monitor and evaluate results and impacts of GEF activities.
- To provide a basis for decision making on amendments and improvements of policies, strategies, program management, procedures and projects.
- To promote accountability for resources used against objectives by participating countries, partner agencies and executing agencies.
- To document, provide feedback on and disseminate results and lessons learned.

Hence, the criteria that are applicable to all M&E in GEF are impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability.

The M&E practice of GEF follows the standards established by UN, the multilateral development banks, OECD, etc. The consultants are selected in a way to assure a fair and consistent assessment without being unduly influenced by other interests. The Senior Coordinator is proposed by the CEO of GEF and appointed by the GEF Council. The Senior Coordinator submits the reports to the CEO who, in turn, presents them to the Council. Work plans and annual work programs and budgets of the M&E unit are submitted to the Council for review and approval.

Each year GEF engages in an extensive process to monitor its projects and evaluate their progress. This process yields the Project Performance Reports. GEF's evaluation unit also addresses GEF-wide performance by conducting thematic reviews and by developing program level indicators. Independent evaluators usually carry out the thematic reviews. The M&E practice is a shared responsibility between the GEF Secretariat and its implementing agencies, such as UNDP, UNEP and WB. These agencies have the responsibility for evaluating individual projects. The M&E unit on the other hand is responsible for monitoring and evaluating, at the overall level, the focus areas, the programs, as well as the cross cutting issues.

The M&E unit carries out evaluations with respect to GEF's overall performance, results and impact. An independent evaluation of the overall performance of GEF is conducted every 4 years or as requested by the GEF Council. The main purpose of this quadrennial evaluation is the replenishment of GEF's funds. This independent evaluation assesses results and impacts of GEF programs; the progress made towards its objectives; the extent to which it has effectively implemented Convention guidance, its operational principles and other procedures; and the degree to which recommendations from previous overall performance studies have been followed up. The evaluations are carried out by independent teams selected by the Senior Coordinator of the M&E unit in accordance with the terms of reference criteria approved by the GEF Council and in consultation with GEF's chief executive officer.

The modus operandi and the flow of information can be summarized as follows. The Senior Coordinator of M&E, who is appointed by the GEF Council, presents a work plan

to the Council. The Council instructs the CEO of GEF to start the evaluations as agreed, and the M&E unit prepares the terms of reference, engages consultants whenever needed, and maintains the quality control of the ensuing reports. The unit presents the reports to the CEO, who, in turn, presents them to the Council.¹ Customarily, any divergence of opinion is reconciled within GEF prior to the submission of the reports to the Council. Should any irreconcilable divergence of opinion occur, that of the Senior Coordinator of the M&E unit prevails. However, the CEO of the organization is in complete liberty to express his opinion to the Council. The Council is the recipient of practically all the reports generated within the M&E unit.

This modus operandi clearly indicates that the CEO of GEF is ultimately responsible to the Council. In case of any disagreement between the CEO and M&E unit – which has never occurred so far in the life of GEF – the CEO is at liberty to decide as to which recommendations are to be proposed to the Council. The existing set-up is in fact viewed as not providing the M&E unit a complete independence from the organizational set-up of GEF.

4. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IFAD's Office of Evaluation and Studies is concerned with the evaluation of the Fund's operations and policies. It also seeks to promote learning between IFAD and its partners and to assess the impact of the Fund's activities.

The office has 6 professionals; its head is nominated by the Fund President and appointed by the Executive Board that decides and approves the program and the budget of the office. A sub-committee of the Board does this. The office makes extensive use of independent consultants and prepares their terms of reference. Their findings, conclusions and recommendations are discussed thoroughly with the evaluation officer(s).

Until December 2002 the head of the office reported directly to IFAD's President. Since then the reporting procedure has been changed by the Board so that the head of the office now reports directly to the Board.

The new evaluation process that came into being fairly recently places heavy emphasis on thematic and country program evaluations. Moreover, the office of evaluation makes use of Core Learning Partnerships, which is composed of core partners that steer the evaluation process throughout its cycle. The Partnership is an informal and flexible platform open to deliberations and learning among key stakeholders and it may have one

¹ The Council in its October 14-15, 2002, meeting decided (GEF/C.20/7) to invite the M&E unit of GEF to prepare revised terms of reference. The revision entails that the Coordinator would report directly to the Council rather than to the CEO. The revised terms of reference have been prepared and will be submitted to the Council for approval at its meeting in May 2003. Should they be approved, the M&E unit will become independent and transmit the reports directly to the Council. The CEO will be at liberty to express his opinion about the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

or all the mandates to develop an evaluation action plan; design the stakeholder participation approach; discuss the progress of the evaluation efforts; and discuss findings, conclusions and recommendations. Although the office team is responsible for the integrity of the final outcome of the evaluation analysis, by engaging the Core Learning Partnerships in guiding the learning process it intends to encourage the commitment of the evaluation partners to the final outcome of the evaluation process.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The head of the evaluation office directly reports to the Board. However, the evaluation studies are also discussed with the higher management and the President in order to assure that they do not contain any recommendations that would be contrary to the overall mandate of the Fund. The President does not have the faculty to alter the findings, conclusions and recommendations, since the impartiality of the reports must be upheld.

The reports are submitted to the Board as products of the Office of Evaluation and Studies. They do not carry the names of the independent evaluators (whenever they are used), and are products of the institution. However, the management/President reserves the right to respond to the evaluation in the meeting of the Board, should an irreconcilable divergence of opinion arise between the office and upper management.

5. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The Evaluation Office (EO) of UNDP is not a very large one when compared with its overall activities. It has 10 professionals who are supported with a large number of independent consultants on a need basis. Since its inception EO was in charge of all project and program evaluations. Recently, decentralization took place in such a way that outcome/project evaluations have become the responsibility of the Country Offices. EO now carries out thematic global evaluations, global country evaluations, policy and strategy evaluations, and overall country evaluations. Evaluation programs are usually initiated by EO and approved by the Executive Board. The Board may also instruct the Administrator to have EO to undertake certain evaluations that may not be in the original work program. EO publishes the majority of such evaluations that become public domain after their approval by the Board.

The Administrator appoints the head of EO.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The Administrator presents all the evaluations prepared in EO to the Board. In this function the head of EO always accompanies him. In other words, the head of EO is directly responsible to the Administrator, but the presentations are carried out together with the Administrator. When the evaluations are completed, the reports are circulated within the organization for comments. These are taken into consideration, but care is taken not to tarnish the independence of the reports. Should the Administrator disagree with some of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the reports, he is at full liberty to put forth his views to the Board, but does not have the faculty to alter the reports. The reports are

always corporate products and the independent consultants' names are mentioned in their preface when they finally become available for public circulation.

Among all the institutions that have been discussed so far and will be discussed below UNDP perhaps is the only one where the head of EO is not directly responsible to the governing board of the organization. However, the Administrator is a convenient conduit to transmit EO's reports to the Board and by no means has a veto power. On the other hand, the role of the Administrator before the Board is very clear. He certainly transmits the reports of EO, without altering them on his own accord, but he also has the obligation to put forward his views before the Board, if any conclusions or recommendations appear to him to be conflicting with the mandate of UNDP.

6. Asian Development Bank (ADB)

The evaluation functions in ADB are entrusted to the Operations Evaluation Department (OED). The President of the Bank appoints its Director General. He is directly responsible to the President who approves OED's budget according to the work plan it prepares. OED has 23 professional staff. The Bank views evaluations as an instrument to help decision makers responsible for planning, designing and implementing projects and programs to understand whether resources are well spent and whether the planned outcomes have been achieved through established procedures. Three functions are assigned to OED.

- Distill lessons learned for future operations and disseminate them internally and externally.
- Ensure accountability for use of resources to improve development effectiveness.
- Follow-up on evaluation recommendations to sustain project benefits.

OED evaluates both loan and technical assistance projects individually to produce project performance reports. To understand thematic or systemic issues, groups of projects are also evaluated to assess impact assistance or the performance of particular projects and programs against selected ADB policies. While completion reports are prepared for all projects, only about 40% of completed projects are evaluated. OED undertakes independent evaluation of the completed projects about three years after their completion, including evaluation of early project operations. In the evaluation of the completed projects an OED evaluation specialist leads the work and is assisted by independent consultants who are sector specialists, financial analysts or economists.

The draft evaluation reports prepared by the OED specialists and consultant(s) are reviewed first of all within OED. They are then circulated to other departments in ADB, as well as to the government and executing agencies, for comments. The final reports, which incorporate these comments, are submitted to the President of the Bank for his review. Once approved by the President, the reports are circulated among the Board of Directors and made available to the public.

In brief, *the modus operandi and the flow of information* are as follows. In principle the demand for evaluation comes from the Operations Department of the Bank, i.e.

evaluations are usually initiated at users' request. The evaluation missions are always headed by a staff of OED and follow the terms of reference that are also prepared in OED. The completed reports are discussed internally and revised on the basis of comments received. Whenever deemed appropriate, the reports may go to the Development Effectiveness Committee, which is a sub-committee of the Board and has the mandate of reviewing selected reports and also overseeing the work of OED. Once cleared internally, the reports are presented to the President who, in turn, may make additional suggestions for revision. Once he accepts them, the President presents the reports to the Board. Should a substantial disagreement arise between OED and the President, OED usually further reviews the reports and incorporates into them the views and the comments of the President. Although the reports are presented to the President as corporate products, they mention the names of the evaluation officer who headed the mission and of the consultants.

As can be surmised, the overall procedure of ADB is very similar to that of WB. The outstanding difference is that in the final analysis it is the President of ADB who is responsible for the content of the reports in front of the Board.

7. United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR)

UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU) is in charge of the systematic examination and assessment of the organization's policies, programs, projects and practices. EPAU also promotes research on issues related to the work of the organization and encourages an active exchange of ideas and information between humanitarian practitioners, policy makers and the research community. These activities are undertaken with the purpose of strengthening the organization's effectiveness, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill its mandate on behalf of refugees and other displaced people.

Although an executing agency, UNHCR disburses about 60% of its funds through NGOs; in that sense it is both an implementing and funding agency. EPAU has come to existence in September 1999 with the intention of expanding the quantity and quality of the evaluation activities. It is mandated to contribute towards UNHCR's capacity for organizational learning, performance review and public accountability. EPAU draws upon the description provided in the OECD/DOC evaluation principles that define evaluation as the analysis and assessment, as systematic as possible and as objective as possible, although the organization's policies, programs, practices, partnerships and procedures focus on their planning, design, implementation and impact.

EPAU is a relatively small unit. It has 4 international officers and makes wide use of individual consultants. Its head is appointed by the Assistant High Commissioner and reports to this Commissioner who is located between EPAU and the Executive Committee of UNHCR.

The modus operandi and the flow of information are as follows. The evaluations can be initiated through a variety of means. Operational units or bureaus or senior management

or Executive Committee members can request that they be undertaken. Once prepared, the reports go through the process of the scrutiny described above and, upon the agreement of the Assistant High Commissioner, are submitted to the Executive Committee. Any divergence of opinion that arises between the evaluation office and upper management is harmonized in house prior to the reports' submission to the Executive Committee. If the divergence of opinion is irreconcilable, the reports remain as internal documents and do not become public domain.

8. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

UNIDO is known as a specialized agency within the UN system. Evaluations provide analytical and objective feedback for it and its stakeholders on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustained impact of UNIDO projects and programs for the purpose of improving the quality of its current and future services.

The Evaluation Office (EO) has developed policies, procedures and methodologies for all evaluation work within UNIDO and elaborated and improved the related instruments. It also develops, manages and monitors the internal (self-evaluation) and external evaluations (independent in-depth) system of technical cooperation programs and projects. Together with the relevant organizational units it also plans and coordinates the involvement of UNIDO in independent in-depth evaluations of technical cooperation programs and projects. It cooperates with UN organizations as well as bilateral cooperation agencies in harmonizing and exchanging information on evaluation policies, procedures and practices.

The Director General of UNIDO appoints the head of EO. The Office has 7 in-house professional staff. It also makes extensive use of independent consultants.

The *modus operandi and flow of information* are as follows. EO prepares a yearly work plan. Evaluations are carried out according to this plan either by staff or by independent consultants or by a combination of the two according to needs. EO prepares the terms of reference. The completed reports are first discussed within EO. They then are reviewed by managing director(s). If the case warrants it, the managing director(s) submits the reports to the Director General. It is at the discretion of the Director General to submit the reports to the Industrial Development Board, unless the Board had requested them specifically. If any divergence of opinion arises with respect to the reports' findings, conclusions and recommendations prior to their submission to the Industrial Development Board, EO as well as the managing directors and the Director General strive to harmonize the divergence. In other words, the reports are corporate products and the Director General in the final analysis is the person who is responsible for their content. There is no established procedure for the case where irreconcilable opinions emerge between the Director General and the managing directors/EO. One would assume that since it is at the Director General's discretion to decide which reports will be presented to the Board, he may refrain to submit them to the Board. However, if submission is mandatory, i.e. if the Board has specifically requested the evaluations, every effort is made to harmonize the views of the Director General with the content of

the reports. No precedent exists in this respect; hence one would assume that the Director General has the liberty to express his opinions and objections, if any, before the Board.

9. The Multilateral Fund (MF)

The Multilateral Fund is the main part of the Financial Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol, and is administered under UN financial rules governing Trust Funds. In contrast to other organizations examined in this Report the Fund has a finite life in the sense that it will cease to exist after it completes its mandate. Hence, the evaluations the Fund conducts acquire additional dimension in guiding it to accomplish its mandate as free from errors as possible.

A Chief Officer manages the MF Secretariat under the overall guidance of the Executive Committee (ExCom). The Committee's decision 22/19(h) reads as follows: "That the modest strengthening of the Secretariat approved by the Executive Committee decision 21/36 should be sufficient **to enable the Secretariat**² to perform monitoring and evaluation on a continuous basis, through the development of a monitoring and evaluation system and data base, 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." An officer whose title is Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) holds this post and coordinates all such activities. His duties, inter alia, include managing evaluation studies, preparation of terms of references for ExCom approval, selecting evaluators and overseeing the implementation of evaluations. These are specified in the job description of the post.

The evaluations are conducted to provide information on the following:

- Overall Fund performance in reducing ODS according to established targets.
- The effectiveness of investment projects in particular sectors and of non-investment projects.
- To assess the strength and limitations of various types of projects.
- The major causes of observed failures to reach targets.
- Possible actions that might improve the Fund's performance.

Evaluations can be mid-term, i.e., evaluation of a specific project done any time during the life of the project. Or they can be ex-post evaluations, i.e., evaluation of one or more project at some point after project completion.

Within this time frame in mind three major categories of evaluations are done. These are:

- Evaluation of a single investment project.
- Evaluation of sectoral projects or of thematic projects within a sector.
- Evaluation of non-investment projects.

² Emphasis is mine.

In order to obtain independent views, teams of consultants who are not directly linked to the preparation and/or implementation of projects and activities conduct the evaluations. SMEO has the following obligations within the Secretariat:

- To manage the evaluation process.
- To prepare the annual M&E work plan and its budget to be submitted to ExCom.
- To provide evaluation expertise and participate in or head field missions whenever necessary.
- To review the draft evaluation reports prepared by independent consultants to ensure that they meet the requirements of the terms of reference and have adequate technical quality.

The *modus operandi of the evaluation, the chain of command and the flow of information* are as follows. ExCom approves the annual M&E work program and budget and requests the Secretariat to implement it. The SMEO within the Secretariat has the responsibility to manage the implementation of the evaluation program as approved by ExCom. He prepares the terms of reference, the budget and the schedule of the evaluations. In doing so he interacts with the staff of the Secretariat. The Chief Officer also has the obligation to oversee financial and administrative matters, the contracting of consultants, and reviewing the terms of reference. The consultant(s) carries out the field work (for which the Secretariat staff may be attached to the mission as resource person who are well versed in technical matters and the operations of the Fund) and presents his report to the SMEO. In the first instance SMEO interacts with the consultant(s) and reviews the reports. The consultants' names do not appear in the reports. The pertinent Secretariat staff then review them for technical accuracy. The Secretariat submits the document to the Executive Committee after having been cleared by the Chief Officer. The documents are then presented by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to the meeting of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance. The Sub-Committee discusses the reports and makes its recommendations to the Executive Committee. Since the reports are submitted as Secretariat documents, the overall responsibility on accuracy, judgment and implementability of their recommendations become the responsibility of the Secretariat.

IV. OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Some Conceptual Tenets

The preceding section described the modus operandi of various evaluation units in a number of UN organizations and international funding agencies. Their mandates are quite similar. They provide information and feedback to the management and to the governing bodies, i.e., the decision makers in the organizations, partner organizations and stakeholders with respect to use of resources, efficiency, effectiveness, and dissemination of information about projects and programs.

All evaluation offices are designed to carry out impartial, transparent and accountable work. That is to say, evaluations and findings, conclusions and recommendations they generate in the reports prepared by them are not subject to undue control or interference from the management of the organizations. They are transparent in the sense that in more cases than not findings and recommendations resulting from the evaluations are placed in the public domain. All organizations, without exception, hold the independent evaluation function as an essential element to their credibility and effectiveness. All organizations uphold the principles, sometimes known as three (Is): integrity, impartiality and independence. It appears that the independence of the evaluation process depends not simply on the independence of the evaluator or of the evaluation unit, but on a range of complementary functions and responsibilities.

- The most important component of *independence* is in the selection of those who will undertake the evaluation mission. Within the scope of the terms of reference the evaluation mission has the obligation and competence to reach the conclusions and recommendations that it deems appropriate, and back up such conclusions and recommendations with facts, figures, and logic. The evaluation team is responsible to make a persuasive case of the conclusions and recommendations put forward.
- The *management and coordination* of an evaluation is the responsibility of the organization's evaluation unit or officer. They are given professional latitude in designing and managing the evaluations. They set the terms of reference – usually in consultation with other bureaus or departments of the organization if warranted – establishing what issues are to be assessed, what questions are to be answered and what type of recommendations are expected to ensue. They also select the evaluators according to their technical specialties, establish the budget and the time allocated to the evaluations. They review the drafts of the evaluation reports and assess their concordance to their terms of reference.
- *Actionable recommendations* of an evaluation are directed to the participating units of the organization as appropriate. Although the evaluation process is managed and guided by an evaluation unit, or officer, or management team, the recommendations are directed to the organization as a whole. Therefore, it is the CEO (Chief, Administrator, President, etc.) or his designee who responds for and

represents the organization and not necessarily the evaluation management unit. In many instances there may be some recommendations directed to different entities – governments, implementing agencies, etc. Each organization responds to the recommendations directed towards its actions and policies as it sees fit.

- An independent evaluation is an *advisory function*. The organization may agree or not with the recommendations, and the decision making authority is not required to act on them in exactly the manner in which they are made. The organization’s executive management, or in the case of corporate level its governing board, makes the subsequent decisions, taking into account the evaluators’ recommendations together with other elements of institutional experience, policies, budgetary constraints, priorities and the overall mandate of the organization.

All evaluation units of the organizations described in this Report adhere to the conceptual tenets of independence, integrity and impartiality of the evaluation process. However, in practice their modus operandi and the flow of information show certain variations. It is hastened to add that these variations do not alter drastically the stand of independence, but they are more like variations on the same theme. They are explained below and compared with the modus operandi of MF.

2. The Practice

In all the organizations reviewed in this Report, evaluation offices, their modus operandi and the flow of information occupy a special place. This, as mentioned several times, is to maintain their independence, impartiality and integrity. The intention is the same for all; however, in appointments, reporting procedures and the role of the heads of the organizations some nuances and variations exist.

With respect to *appointments*, in UNDP, ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO the CEO of the organization is responsible of appointing the head of the evaluation unit. In GEF, IFAD and WB their Board, upon the nomination by their CEO, makes the appointments. In MF the executive director of UNEP, upon the nomination by the Chief Officer, appoints the evaluation officer.

In all the organizations an office that is directly attached to the office of the CEO carries out M&E. In MF no such separate evaluation unit exists. The evaluations are the responsibility of one officer and monitoring of another.

With respect to the *reporting* procedure, in WB and IFAD the head of the evaluation unit reports directly to the Board. In UNDP, UNIDO, UNHCR, ADB and GEF the flow of information is directly from the head of the evaluation unit to the CEO of the organization. The Secretariat of MF, not having a separate evaluation unit, the SMEO officer is the one who presents the reports to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Subcommittee of ExCom.

In all cases the reports presented to the Boards are *corporate products*, even though they may be the work of consultants. In the case of UNDP, GEF and ADB the names of the consultants are listed. The reports of the Secretariat of MF are submitted to the ExCom also as a corporate product without the name(s) of the consultant(s).

WB and ADB organize independent evaluations, though a staff of the organization heads the evaluation missions. In all others an independent consultant heads the evaluation mission. In MF the SMEO heads the evaluation mission if he participates. Otherwise an independent consultant heads the team. A senior staff may be also be attached to the mission as a resource person if warranted.

The *role of the CEO of the organization* in the presentation of the reports to the Boards varies greatly. In WB, since the reports are transmitted from the evaluation office directly to the Board, only in the Board meeting the President is at liberty to express his agreement/disagreement or reservations. The practice in GEF is that its head reviews the reports, but does not have the faculty to alter them. He has the duty to transmit them to the Board and the right to express his opinion with respect to conclusions and recommendations. In IFAD the President again is at liberty to express his views, as he deems appropriate. The Administrator of UNDP, who reports to the Board, reviews the reports beforehand. Should a divergence of opinion emerge, every effort is done to harmonize the differences. ADB, UNHCR and UNIDO follow a very similar procedure. In the MF Secretariat it is the SMEO who presents the report to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Subcommittee of ExCom.

Before this section is closed it is noteworthy to point out an important dissimilarity in the evaluation procedure between the MF Secretariat and other funding organizations examined in this Report. Although the modus operandi of MF in essence is similar to that of the other organizations, one dissimilarity stands out. For example, WB, ADB, and UNDP undertake evaluations to examine directly their own projects, policies and programs,³ whereas MF evaluates exclusively the work of the agencies that are contracted by the Secretariat for implementation of its projects. In that sense there is a great deal of similarity in the overall evaluation concept of the MF Secretariat and of GEF.

One single conclusion emerges from this comparison. In whichever organization they exist, the evaluation units occupy a special place. Their heads are appointed mostly through a different procedure than normal staff appointments. The head of the organization reserves, even if the reports are submitted directly to the Boards without his

³ These organizations have dozens of publications that are the results of the evaluations undertaken by them to assess their own programs. See, for example, The World Bank, *The World Bank's Approach to Global Programs: An Independent Evaluation*, Washington, DC, 2002; The World Bank, *OED Review of the Bank's Performance on the Environment*, Washington, DC 2001; Asian Development Bank, *The Impact of Rural Roads on Poverty Reduction*, Manila, 2001; Asian Development Bank, *Sustainability of Policy Reforms through Advisory Technical Assistance*, Manila 2001; Asian Development Bank, *Effectiveness of ADB Assistance in Bangladesh, Kyrgyz Republic and Laos*, Manila 1999; UNDP/EO, *National Execution: Promise and Challenges*, New York, 1995; and UNDP/EO, *Evaluation of Direct Execution*, New York, 2001;

interference, the right to express his opinion, his agreement/disagreement with the reports, since he is entrusted with the duty of overseeing the organization's functioning and carrying out its mandate as incorporated into its statutes. The final responsibility rests with the Board accepting/rejecting and implementing any of the recommendations contained in these reports. It cannot be overemphasized that in the final analysis these reports' functions are only advisory.

APPENDIX I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Compilation of information on the institutional procedures of monitoring and evaluation from the following financial institutions:
 - Global Environmental facility (GEF)
 - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
 - World Bank Group (WB)
 - Other international institutions as may be relevant

2. The information should focus on:
 - Terms of reference of the evaluation units/functions as appropriate;
 - Management structure and modus operandi of the evaluation units/functions of these institutions including lines of reporting, responsibility of preparation and presentation of documents and recommendations to the governing bodies.

3. In order to enhance the usefulness of the information indicated above the consultant will compare the procedures followed by the institutions named above with those of the Multilateral Fund.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The consultant wishes to acknowledge gratefully the assistance extended to him by Jarle Harstad (GEF), Patrick Grasso (WB), Luigiani Lavizzari and Ashwani Muttoo (IFAD), Khloid Malik and Nurul Alam (UNDP), Caroline Heider (ADB), Hans Heep (UNIDO) and Dominik Bartsch (UNHCR). They all gave their valuable time and discussed freely the pertinent aspects of evaluation and monitoring in their respective organizations.

Dr. Omar El-Arini of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat discussed personally with the consultant the terms of reference of the study.

Heartfelt thanks to all of them.