

Leadership team meeting - UNECE People-first Impact Assessment Tool

14 April 2020 - Videoconference

Attendance:

Amanda Loeffen, Anand Chiplunkar, Doris Chevalier, James Stewart, Jean-Patrick Marquet, Joan Enric Ricart, Jordi Salvador, Melissa Peneycad, Pedro Neves, Tetiana Bessarab, Waleska Lemus.

Secretariat: Geoffrey Hamilton, Claudio Meza, Tony Bonnici, Antonin Menegaux.

Minutes:

- Geoffrey Hamilton and James Stewart welcomed the participants.
- Tetiana Bessarab and Doris Chevalier will need more time to review the benchmarks of their respective subgroups.
- James Stewart suggested that two persons could be assign the task to review the benchmarks of one people-first outcome at a time.
- Jean-Patrick Marquet referred to the issue of lack of consistencies between the benchmarks of each subgroup.
- On the issue of N/A answers, Anand Chiplunkar proposed to normalize the score to adjust the scoring in case of N/A answers.
- Melissa Peneycad explained that the Envision methodology simply adjusts the total points when an answer is N/A. Joan Ricart also supported this solution.
- Jean-Patrick Marquet suggested, together with Anand, that some benchmarks might be mandatory or be identified as “fatal flaw criteria”. Both Amanda Loeffen and Waleska Lemus agreed with this approach.
- Jean-Patrick Marquet, with regard to the scoring of the evaluation criteria, stressed the need to decide between having a binary scoring (Yes/No) versus a scale of answers (Strong Yes, Yes, No, Strong No).
- James Stewart and Melissa Peneycad suggested that this might depend on each benchmark; some may require a scale and other binary answers. Joan Ricart also agreed this approach.
- All participants agreed to allocate 100 points in total instead of 30 - and only assign 1 and 0 points per evaluation criteria and no negative points.
- Referring to the end users of the Tool, being member States, their PPP Units and in particular those thriving to use PPPs and Innovative Financing Mechanisms, Pedro Neves reminded the importance of having a simple methodology and benchmarks, easy to understand and use.
- Doris Chevalier, drawing from her experience working with the French PPP Unit, stressed the need to have an easy to understand methodology, although not too simple, but more importantly to provide support and guidance to PPP Units.
- Anand Chiplunkar suggested as resilience cuts across economic, environmental and social aspects, other subgroups could also deal with resilience. He also explained that his subgroup has included some mandatory questions (the only answer is yes). About the references to the case studies, he reminded that the UNECE compendium of case studies is a living document that can be revisited to test the evaluation methodology. Finally, he suggested that, in order to have a simple document, an idea could be to separate the document containing just the benchmarks with the evaluation criteria of all subgroups and develop a

guide or explanatory note on the use and intent of the benchmarks and evaluation criteria. Such explanation will facilitate the user to understand the intent of the benchmarks and coverage or provision needed in the project for each evaluation criteria.

- Amanda Loeffen noticed that there is an overlap between environment issues and community engagement, although not the same. A cross reference could be included.
- Melissa Peneycad stressed the importance of having a robust methodology and that it might be difficult to compromise on the robustness of the benchmarks for the sake of simplicity.
- Amanda Loeffen suggested to have an executive summary with a list of the benchmarks without the evaluation criteria.
- James Stewart suggested that a small group be established to reflect and find solutions on how to present in a simple way the methodology.
- Amanda Loeffen also suggested to have a more qualitative approach to the benchmarks of her subgroup as an additional way to establish more information about some of the case studies, as it is difficult to see which cases are actually using a good stakeholder engagement process (this is not to replace the benchmarks as they stand but could bring additional background material as good practices)..
- **The following follow-up actions were agreed:**
 - The secretariat will develop, together with Melissa Peneycad, guidelines to the subgroups for next steps (i.e. total points to be assigned, units of measure, how to handle criteria that are deemed not applicable (remove or normalize points) etc.).
 - Each subgroup will then refine their benchmarks using the guidance from the secretariat.
 - Tetiana Bessarab will provide the revised benchmarks of the subgroup Replicability by 17 April 2020, and Doris Chevalier will provide the revised benchmarks of the subgroup Access and Equity by 24 April 2020.
 - Amanda Loeffen and Anand Chiplunkar will discuss further the links between the benchmarks of their subgroups.
 - The secretariat will put Amanda Loeffen in contact with some companies which have done stakeholder engagement.
 - A follow-up call will be organized by the secretariat at a later date.