

Leadership team meeting - UNECE People-first Impact Assessment Tool

25 June 2020 – Videoconference (3.30 to 4.40pm, Geneva time)

Attendance:

Amanda Loeffen, Anand Chiplunkar, Doris Chevalier, James Stewart, Jean-Patrick Marquet, Joan Enric Ricart, Jordi Salvador, Pedro Neves, Pierre Sarrat, Tetiana Bessarab.

Apologies: Melissa Peneycad.

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

Minutes:

Agenda item 1 - Information by the secretariat

- **James Stewart** welcomed the participants.
- **Geoffrey Hamilton** informed the group that Melissa Peneycad and Pedro Neves have kindly agreed to be seconded to the secretariat over the summer to provide support in the finalisation of the evaluation methodology. He further suggested that, to help advancing the work on the tool, the group may decide to set up a sub-group to ensure consistency of the tool.

Agenda item 2 - Scoring

- a) How should the 3 cross-cutting indicators (location, statement of intent and verification of data) be included in the methodology?
 - **Anand Chiplunkar** suggested that regarding the location, it might not be applicable to the Environmental and Sustainability subgroup.
 - **Joan Enric Ricart** stressed that regarding the verification of data, this could be applicable to certification scheme and not to the self-evaluation tool.
 - **Amanda Loeffen** suggested that we should keep the self-evaluation tool simple and not over complicate it with the 3 cross-cutting indicators. Although these could be added to the certification scheme.
 - **Pedro Neves** agreed with Amanda's comment.
 - **Jean-Patrick Marquet** stressed that, in the certification scheme, the evaluators will adjust their evaluation depending on these indicators. For example, the location of a project and the veracity of the data will always influence their evaluation. Therefore, the Project Team should not try to control these cross-cutting indicators and it might not be necessary to include them in the self-assessment tool..
- b) How has the methodology dealt with different stages in project development (design, construction and operations)?
 - **Geoffrey Hamilton** proposed that each sub-group re-visits its respective template to ensure that the evaluation criteria are valid for each of the 3 phases.
 - **James Stewart** suggested that this could be done at a later stage to avoid overcomplicating the self-assessment tool, unless this is easily integrated into the Excel file.
- c) If considered desirable, how can qualitative comments on projects, as well as a score, be provided in the self-assessment tool?
 - **Tony Bonnici** informed the group of the willingness of the secretariat to develop guidance for applicants to use the self-assessment tool. Besides a score, the self-assessment tool will

also generate a number of qualitative comments and observations on the strengths and weaknesses of projects vis-à-vis the People-first outcomes and the SDGs.

- **Group members** agreed to have qualitative comments in the score.
- d) Do you need to pass all the benchmarks to get a score?
 - **Anand Chiplunkar** made a number of suggestions on the need to develop a common approach to scoring. He suggested that subgroups should decide what should be the minimum score for their outcome and proposed to consider 50 - 70% as a threshold for each outcome. He argued that subgroups may also decide to set a minimum score for some benchmarks. Furthermore, subgroups should also decide which of their evaluation criteria be mandatory.

Agenda item 3 - Testing

Testing in the short-term (2 months)

- **Geoffrey Hamilton** informed that the testing of the evaluation methodology will be coordinated by the secretariat with the technical support of **Melissa Peneycad** and **Pedro Neves**, while others are also welcomed to contribute. The purpose of the testing will be to
 - a) Eliminate anomalies in the methodology;
 - b) Determine that the scoring provide a balance between projects that meet the designated People-first status and those that fail;
 - c) Make the benchmarks and evaluation criterial operational; and
 - d) Ensure sustainability of the tool;
- **Pedro Neves** stressed that the testing phase is of great importance. Between 20 and 30 case studies will be used to test the evaluation methodology. Inputs from the proponents of these case studies will be sought and used to adjust the methodology.
- **Joan Enric Ricart** offered to provide support during the testing phase.
- **Amanda Loeffen** and **Anand Chiplunkar** have also volunteered to work with **Pedro Neves** on the case studies
- **James Stewart** referred to **Geoffrey Hamilton's** proposal to set up a sub-group or volunteers to: 1. Ensure consistency of the tool across the five outcomes; and 2. Reinforce the resilience aspects in the tool in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- **Amanda Loeffen** volunteered to provide suggestions on how the resilience aspects could be reinforced in the tool
- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** volunteered to review the tool in its entirety (benchmarks, evaluation criteria and scoring) across all outcomes and provide suggestions.

Testing in the medium-term (2 to 6 months)

- **Tony Bonnici** explained that after the first phase of the testing, a second phase will be undertaken after the summer.

Follow-up actions agreed:

For agenda item 2 - Scoring:

- **3 cross-cutting indicators** – the secretariat has taken on board the comments and will make a proposal on how they could be included in the methodology for consideration at the next virtual meeting.

- **3 stages in project development (design, construction and operations)** – based on the input by the group, the secretariat will explore ways and means to incorporate the 3 stages into the Excel while keeping the tool simple and user friendly.
- **Qualitative comments on projects** – the secretariat will incorporate this feature into the self-assessment tool and will share with the leadership group.
- **A common approach to scoring** – the secretariat will send the slides presented by Anand and will make suggestions on the scoring at the next virtual meeting.

For agenda item 3 - Testing:

- The secretariat will involve **Joan Enric Ricart, Amanda Loeffen and Anand Chiplunkar** in the testing of case studies
- **Amanda Loeffen** will provide suggestions on how the resilience aspects could be reinforced in the tool by 15 July
- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** will review the tool in its entirety (benchmarks, evaluation criteria and scoring) across all outcomes and provide suggestions by 15 July

Next meeting:

- The next virtual meeting will take place on 15 July at 3.30pm Geneva time.