

Leadership team meeting - UNECE People-first Impact Assessment Tool

10 July 2020 – Videoconference (4.30 to 5.30pm, Geneva time)

Attendance:

Amanda Loeffen, Anand Chiplunkar, Doris Chevalier, Jean-Patrick Marquet, Joan Enric Ricart, Melissa Peneycad, Pedro Neves, Tetiana Bessarab.

Apologies: James Stewart, Jordi Salvador, Pierre Sarrat.

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

Minutes:

- **Geoffrey Hamilton** welcomed the participants and mentioned the webinars on the evaluation methodology being given by the secretariat. Representatives from PPP Units have been attending so far and expressed great interest in the Tool. He invited the participants to discuss the comments received from the leadership group for this meeting.

1. Benchmarks:

- **Amanda Loeffen** informed the group that she provided comments to the secretariat on how to incorporate resilience into the benchmarks. She also stressed that benchmarks are different and not always consistent, but she stressed that the different People-first outcomes are different and thus benchmarks will always be of different nature.
- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** agreed with Amanda's comment but stressed that the description on the importance of the benchmarks (in the template) should be consistent and harmonised between the subgroups. Specifically, some subgroups should expand their description and other should summarise their description.
- **Anand Chiplunkar** referred to the descriptions of his subgroup's benchmarks and stressed that for quantitative benchmarks there was a need to provide detailed description and also include the related best practices.
- **Amanda Loeffen** stressed that providing guidance is needed for the users. A decision is needed whether this guidance should be included in the template or in a separate document or user guide. Simplicity is important it is imperative to make sure users understand the questions.
- **Tetiana Bessarab** expressed her agreement with Amanda's suggestion, i.e. the need to provide detailed explanation on the benchmarks.

2. Project stages in template:

- **Geoffrey Hamilton** proposed to revert to the initial project stages
- **The group** agreed with the proposal.

3. Scoring:

- **Amanda Loeffen** mentioned that the proposal of her subgroup is to have only two categories, i.e. Clear Yes, Mixed, Clear No.

- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** stressed that it is important to have the same harmonised points scale. He suggested to apply a linear scale.
- **Amanda Loeffen** agreed with the linear scale proposal.
- **Anand Chiplunkar** mentioned that a harmonised scale is not necessary and that this would not affect the Tool.

4. Self-assessment:

- **Anand Chiplunkar** stressed that the score is important to inform users on their projects and promote and help them improving their projects.
- **Joan Enric Ricart** stressed that the scoring is not the objective of the assessment but to help users improve their project, with other mechanisms such as guidelines and explanations
- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** stressed that in the self-assessment scheme, there will not be an evaluator to provide feedback, so the indicative score is the only feedback users will get.
- **Tony Bonnici** mentioned that some qualitative feedback will be automatically provided by the self-assessment tool
- **Amanda Loeffen** expressed her interest with Tony's proposal.
- **Doris Chevalier** proposed that there should be a way for users to provide more explanation on their answers.
- **Pedro Neves** stressed the importance of scoring as well as additional comments and feedback.

5. Certification:

- **Joan Enric Ricart** stressed the assessment should be only done ex-post as this is when data is available. Also, conflict of interest may exist for ex-ante assessments.
- **Doris Chevalier** stressed the importance of providing certificate for a certain time, for example for 1 year, as PPP change over the contract duration.
- **Jean Patrick Marquet** stressed the importance of providing a score or certificate, even a provisional certificate, at design stages is important to help Project developer raise funding.
- **Joan Enric Ricart** clarified that the assessment could be done at any stages but the certificate should only be given for projects in operations (ex-post).
- **The group** expressed his satisfaction with the proposal of providing "provisional certificate" to address this issue.
- **Amanda Loeffen** stressed that the word "certification" might be risky to use. Another terminology could be use, such as "recognition", that will provide a degree of confidence.
- **Jean Patrick Marquet** agreed with Amanda's proposal and mentioned that rating agencies only provide points/rating and not certificates.

6. Other matters:

- **Pedro Neves** proposed that corruption should not be the first benchmarks in the Economic Effectiveness outcome and that the UNECE ZTC Standard should not be the only focus of the question.
- **Jean-Patrick Marquet** agreed with the proposal to change the order of the benchmarks accordingly.
- **Tony Bonnici** stressed that corruption is relevant to economic effectiveness and that it is a priority issue that should be at the top of the other questions/benchmarks. The guide should provide more details on the concept of corruption in the project.

- **Doris Chevalier** agreed with Tony's comments and that the ZTC should be complied with in projects.

Follow-up

- The secretariat will incorporate all the comments received from the leadership group and those received during the public review in the evaluation methodology and continue working on the certification scheme, self-assessment tool and guidance document.
- The next meeting will be organised by the secretariat after the summer.