

# Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR): Preliminary Findings of the First Independent Evaluation

Development Portfolio Management Group

October 2014



## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BBL	Brown Bag Lunches
CCD	Climate Change Department (China and Turkey)
CCF	Climate Change Fund (Mexico)
CCL	Climate Change Law (Mexico)
CIF	Climate Investment Funds
CMU	Contributing Management Units
CMU	Country Management Unit
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
COP	Conference of Parties for the UNFCCC
CP	Contributing Participant
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DPMG	Development Portfolio Management Group
EC	European Commission
ER	Emission Reduction
ETS	Emissions Trading Scheme(s)
EU	European Union
EU ETS	European Union Emissions Trading Scheme
EUD	Electricity Producers Association (Turkey)
EWG	Evaluation Working Group
FIRM	Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation(UNEP)
FY	Fiscal Year
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GP	Global Practice (World Bank)
ICP	Implementing Country Participant
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KS&M	Knowledge Sharing and Management
LCDS	Low Carbon Development Strategies
LECB	Low Emissions Capacity Building (UNDP)
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MENR	Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (Turkey)
MOC	Ministry of Construction (Vietnam)
MoEU	Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (Turkey)
MOIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade (Vietnam)
MONRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Vietnam)
MPI	Ministry of Planning and Investment (Vietnam)
MRP	Market Readiness Proposal
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action(s)
NDRC	National Development and Reform Commission (China)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization

OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PA	Partnership Assembly
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PC	Partnership Committee
PECC	Special Program for Climate Change (Mexico)
PMR	Partnership for Market Readiness
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SOEs	State-Owned Enterprises (China)
TNA	Technology Needs Assessment
TTL	Task Team Leader (World Bank)
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USC	University of Southern California
VCM	Voluntary Carbon Market

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
I. Introduction and Organization of this Report .....	1
II. Partnership Relevance.....	3
III. Partnership Effectiveness to Date .....	17
IV. Partnership Efficiency.....	26
V. Partnership Governance and Management.....	33
VI. Conclusion .....	38
Annex 1: Proposed Contents of Draft Final Report.....	39
Annex 2: Tables Containing Additional Survey Results to Date.....	40

## Boxes and Tables

Box 1	UNDP's Low Emissions Capacity Building (LECB) Programme and UNEP's Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation (FIRM) Project .....	12
Box 2	PMR Technical Workshops, Training and Other Events between September 2013 and October 2014 .....	14
Box 3	PMR's Proposed Upstream Analytical Policy Support .....	21
Box 4	FY14 PMR Budget: Use of Funds (in US\$ thousands) .....	27
Box 5	Expenditure Categories in PMR Administrative Budget.....	28
Box 6	Roles and Responsibilities of the PMR's Partnership Assembly and Secretariat.....	34
Table 1	Relevance of PMR Objectives in Relation to International Needs, Priorities and Strategies according to Different Stakeholder Groups .....	7
Table 2	Relevance of PMR Design according to Different Stakeholder Groups .....	15

## Executive Summary

1. This report presents the preliminary findings of the first independent evaluation of the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR). The initial evaluation is still a work in progress as a comprehensive round of structured interviews with key stakeholders remains to be completed. However, the evaluation team has carried out an extensive review of PMR documents, including those associated with the Partnership's knowledge sharing and management (KS&M) activities, undertaken three country case studies, and, in the process interacted with present or former PA representatives of one Contributing Participant (CP) and four Implementing Country Participants (ICPs), as well as with present and former members of the PMR Secretariat, World Bank Task Team Leaders (TTLs) and team members for PMR projects in different ICPs. In addition, survey questionnaires regarding PMR performance to date have been sent to individuals involved to date in PMR activities in six different key stakeholder groups: (i) CPs; (ii) ICPs; (iii) Partnership Assembly (PA) Observers; (iv) Technical Experts; (v) TTL and team members; and (vi) participants in PMR Technical Workshops.

2. Three limitations to what follows should be mentioned before turning to the initial findings of the evaluation. First, it is important to reiterate the preliminary nature of the results presented below as this evaluation is still ongoing. Secondly, it is still too early to assess the outcomes and medium and longer-term impacts of the PMR's activities since the vast majority of the Market Readiness Proposals (MRPs) have not begun implementation, and some have not even been finalized. Third, the survey response rates by the various key stakeholder groups mentioned above to date have generally been low. Even though representatives of a majority of the CPs, ICPs, and World Bank country teams working on the PMR did respond to the surveys and/or were personally interviewed by the evaluation team, the overall numbers in each category are still too low to be able to consider the survey responses to be fully representative of the stakeholder categories in question. This notwithstanding, the survey results are generally consistent with those from the interviews carried out with PMR participants to date.

3. This report focuses on three key topics or evaluation "clusters" -- relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency -- focusing primarily on the PMR's inputs and outputs to date, as it is still too soon to assess its outcomes, impacts and their sustainability. As the PMR is a global program, its resource mobilization and use (under the heading of "efficiency") and its governance and management up to the present time will also be assessed. Because the PMR is still in early stages of implementation, the first evaluation is "formative" rather than "summative," but helps to set the stage for future program assessments. The findings presented, accordingly, represent essential, but not definitive, inputs for the draft final evaluation report, which will be completed in the months following PA 10 in Santiago for presentation to the Evaluation Working Group (EWG) by the end of 2014 and to the full PA in early 2015. As a preliminary report, it does not put forward any conclusions, lessons, or recommendations at this stage.

### *Relevance*

4. PMR "relevance" is defined as the extent to which its objectives and activities are suited to the priorities and policies of its participants and, since it is a global program, meet identified needs of the international community more generally. PMR relevance is assessed from the following perspectives: supply-side, demand-side, horizontal, vertical, and relevance of program design. Thus, in order to assess relevance – and the case is the same for effectiveness – it is necessary to start with a clear understanding of program objectives and how they may have evolved over time. Taking the PMR's evolving "core" objectives, as stated in various Partnership reports issued since its inception in early 2011 into account, Chapter II attempts to shed light on each of these aspects of the PMR based on the data collected through the evaluation process thus far.

5. As concerns “supply-side” relevance, there does appear to have been a general international consensus that a collaborative partnership of key industrialized and developing countries parallel to the official negotiating forum, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), would be useful to help the latter set of countries more effectively address the increasingly urgent need for all countries to mitigate the rising greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that contribute directly to global climate change. From a “demand-side” perspective, in turn, PMR ICPs surveyed indicated that this was the case, and, for the most part, affirm the Partnership’s relevance to their own needs and priorities in this regard. To assess “horizontal relevance,” a comparison with other UN agency programs that provide capacity building support in relation to climate change mitigation to developing countries suggests that the PMR has much greater financial resources at its disposal and is both different in scope and more inclusive in terms of the developing nations involved, also including most of the world’s largest GHG emitters. It is likewise far more participatory in terms of its governance arrangements and procedures and is able to benefit from the World Bank’s convening power and its significant experience with other global programs in relation to climate change and carbon finance, as well as more generally.

6. “Vertical relevance” is assessed by examining the relevance of the PMR’s activities at different levels – international, national, and subnational (i.e., state/provincial and local) of governance, as well as the extent to which its activities on the ground are appropriately tailored both to involve these different levels within national public administration structures and to engage the private productive sector and civil society. A detailed initial review of selected Market Readiness Proposals (MRPs) -- those of China, Mexico, and Turkey -- suggests that this is indeed largely the case. The “relevance of program design,” finally, entails an examination of whether – and the extent to which – the inputs and outputs of the PMR seem likely *a priori* to be able to achieve its desired outcomes and impacts, and, thus, to achieve its objectives based on certain key assumptions. The initial findings of this evaluation suggest that the PMR’s relevance from this perspective is also generally positive, but that its ultimate effectiveness will depend on a number of other key factors that are not directly under the control of the PMR. These elements include most importantly political will at the level of individual participating countries and a positive evolution of the global policy environment with regard to climate change mitigation, for which the continuing UNFCCC process will be critical and which the PMR’s CPs and ICPs, especially the largest emitting ones, will have a critical role in determining.

### *Effectiveness*

7. Chapter III examines various aspects of Partnership effectiveness to date. “Effectiveness” is understood as the extent to which a program (or project) has achieved its desired outcomes and impacts and/or declared objectives – or seems likely to and/or is on track to do so at any point in time before it is completed. Thus, a program’s (or project’s) effectiveness can only truly be assessed once it has been fully implemented. However, it is possible to gauge whether a program’s – in this case the PMR’s – inputs are being used effectively to generate or are likely to result in its desired outputs, outcomes, and, to a lesser extent, as the future uncertainty is proportionally greater, impacts.

8. Findings from the country visits and surveys undertaken by the DPMG/USC independent evaluation team suggest mixed results to date in terms of PMR’s effectiveness, which are also related to the Partnership’s efficiency in terms of converting its inputs into outputs and outcomes. This is not surprising considering that only three grant agreements for approved MRPs have been signed with the World Bank and these are at very early stages of implementation. On the other hand, survey findings suggest that many planned inputs have been “delivered” satisfactorily in the views of the various stakeholder groups, especially the ICPs. In general, ICP representatives surveyed and interviewed seem to have a somewhat more positive view of Partnership effectiveness to date than do the other stakeholder groups, although again it should be kept in mind that the survey results may not be fully representative.

## *Efficiency*

**9.** Program “efficiency” refers to the extent to which program inputs have been used to produce outputs in a timely and cost-effective way, and, in the case of the PMR, how well the Partnership has used its available resources more generally. Chapter IV examines resource mobilization and use by the PMR to date, including the PMR Secretariat’s operational budget, the preparation and implementation grants to ICPs, and the signing of grant agreements to transfer resources for execution of the associated MRPs. The perceived efficiency by the different stakeholder groups with which the PMR Secretariat is delivering its inputs/services has also been surveyed.

**10.** The PMR has been successful in terms of its resource mobilization to date, exceeding its initial fund raising target of US\$100 million. It has also incorporated a larger number of ICPs than originally anticipated and added a new category of participant, the “Technical Partners.” However, the Partnership is now entering into “untested waters” during the current fiscal year (July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015), as a much larger operational budget, including a US\$ 5 million “envelope” to fund a new “work stream,” upstream policy analysis, was endorsed by the PA in May 2014, more than doubling its administrative resource allocation in relation to previous years. It is too early to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of this significant addition to the Partnership’s activities, but it is likely to place an additional burden on the Secretariat’s staff and work program, as will the need to help oversee implementation of an increasing number of MRPs once the associated grant agreements have been signed and resources from them begin to be utilized by the respective ICPs.

## *Governance and Management*

**11.** Finally, prior to a brief conclusion, Chapter V summarizes the governance and management arrangements for the Partnership as agreed by its founding participants, including the roles and responsibilities of both the Partnership Assembly (PA) and the PMR Secretariat. It also presents the views of the different stakeholder groups surveyed regarding PA and Secretariat transparency and accountability in resource allocation, expert consultant selection, and other key decisions to date. In the process, it also considers the nature and quality of communication between the Secretariat and other parts of the World Bank, especially the various sectoral (or Global Practices) and country management units, which collectively constitute the predominant “delivery partner” for the PMR grant-supported activities at the individual implementing country level.

**12.** Initial findings suggest that these arrangements seem to be generally working well, although there is room for improvement. Some of those surveyed, for example, indicate that both transparency and accountability could be stronger, and there appears to be a need for the Secretariat to improve its communication with some of the participating World Bank GPs/sectoral and Country Management Units (CMUs), where knowledge of the Partnership’s role, activities, and importance is still insufficient. The Partnership’s knowledge sharing and management (KS&M) activities could also be strengthened in order to provide more effective support both to PMR members and a larger potential external audience interested in carbon pricing instruments and related core technical market readiness requirements. This suggests that the work load of the PMR Secretariat is likely to increase as it moves more deeply into the PMR’s implementation phase.

## I. Introduction and Organization of this Report

13. This report presents the preliminary findings of the first independent evaluation of the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR) undertaken by the Development Portfolio Management Group of the University of Southern California (DPMG/USC)<sup>1</sup>. The initial evaluation is a work in progress as a comprehensive round of structured interviews with key stakeholders remains to be completed. However, the evaluation team has carried out an extensive review of PMR documents, including those associated with the Partnership's knowledge sharing and management (KS&M) activities, undertaken three country case studies, and, in the process, interacted with present or former PA representatives of one Contributing Participant (CP) country (Germany) and four Implementing Country Participants (ICPs) (China, Mexico, Turkey and Vietnam) in June and August 2014, as well as with present and former members of the PMR Secretariat and numerous World Bank Task Team Leaders (TTL) and persons working on PMR projects in various ICPs (in May and June 2014). One evaluation team member attended PA9 meeting in Cologne, Germany in late May 2014 to make an initial presentation on the proposed evaluation approach and methodology and to numerous PMR participants.

14. There have also been several productive teleconferences and written communications regarding the work in progress with members of the Partnership Assembly's (PA's) Evaluation Working Group (EWG)<sup>2</sup> since the inception of this assignment, together with orientation and follow-up meetings with members of the PMR Secretariat at the World Bank. Based on the constructive guidance received from the EWG and the Secretariat, DPMG/USC has elaborated a draft of the proposed evaluation framework for the PMR, which is being distributed, in parallel to the present report, for purposes of discussion and feedback at the upcoming PA meeting in Santiago, Chile, November 3-5, 2014.<sup>3</sup>

15. In addition, survey questionnaires regarding PMR performance to date were sent electronically in late September 2014 to more than four hundred individuals who have been involved in PMR activities in one capacity or another since 2011 and who fall into one or more of six stakeholder groups: (i) CPs; (ii) ICPs; (iii) Partnership Assembly (PA) Observers; (iv) Technical Experts who have participated in PMR activities; (v) TTLs; and (vi) participants in various PMR Technical Workshops. As the response rates were generally low as when the survey was closed on October 10, 2014, the evaluation team and the Secretariat have agreed that, prior to attempting to finalize the draft first independent evaluation report these sources of information and feedback on the Partnership's activities would be complemented by additional structured face-to-face and telephone interviews to be undertaken prior, during and immediately following 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the PA (PA10). Attendance at this meeting and the associated side events by a DPMG/USC evaluation team member will provide the team with a further opportunity to observe important PMR activities as well as to meet and obtain evaluation feedback from other PMR participants. In addition, finalization of the first independent evaluation is necessarily dependent on PA endorsement of the PMR evaluation framework as the contents of the latter will influence those of the former. The proposed organization of the first independent evaluation report is presented in Annex 1.

16. It is important to mention three limitations to what follows before turning to the initial findings of the first evaluation. The first is simply to reiterate the *preliminary* nature of the findings presented below.

---

<sup>1</sup> DPMG/USC was awarded the contract to develop the Evaluation Framework for and to carry out this first assessment of the PMR in May 2014.

<sup>2</sup> EWG members are from Australia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States and this group was established by the Partnership Assembly in order to provide guidance to and oversee development of the Evaluation Framework for and the first independent evaluation of the PMR.

<sup>3</sup> See Development Management Portfolio Group, University of Southern California (DPMG/USC), *Evaluation Framework for the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR)*, draft for presentation to the Partnership Assembly of the PMR, October 2014.

Second, it is *still too early to assess the outcomes and medium and longer-term impacts of the PMR's activities* since the vast majority of the ICPs' Market Readiness Proposals (MRPs) have not begun implementation. With this in mind, based on the Terms of Reference for this assignment,<sup>4</sup> and in consultation with the EWG and the PMR Secretariat, it was agreed (including by the full PA) that the first evaluation would be “*formative*”, focusing on inputs, processes, and some early outputs, and not “*summative*”, which would also seek to assess PMR outcomes, impacts and sustainability. It would, thus, concentrate on the first three of the five standard evaluation criteria for development assistance activities established by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) – relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency.<sup>5</sup> As the PMR is a global program, however, its resource mobilization and use (under the heading of “efficiency” and its governance and management up to the present time will also be assessed, as these elements, together with the five aforementioned OECD/DAC criteria, are parts of other evaluations for such programs.<sup>6</sup>

**17.** Third, *because of the low response rates, the survey results should be considered indicative rather than fully representative of the views of the various key PMR stakeholder groups*. The survey response rates by the various key stakeholder groups were low; the highest response rate came from workshop participants (23.8 percent), followed by World Bank task team members (21.6 percent), Technical Experts (15.7 percent), CPs (14.6 percent), ICPs (7.3 percent),<sup>7</sup> and PA Observers (3.3 percent). However, representatives of eight of the thirteen CPs, or 61.5 percent of the total, and nine of the seventeen ICPs, or 53.9 percent of the total, have either been interviewed by DPMG/USC or responded to the survey. Finally, (non-PMR Secretariat) World Bank staff who responded to the survey and/or have been personally interviewed by the DPMG/USC evaluation team to date concerning PMR performance have worked or are working with the PMR in two-thirds of the eighteen ICPs

**18.** This report, which draws on the various sources of information examined and/or gathered thus far by the DPMG/USC evaluation team, will focus on three evaluation “clusters” -- relevance, effectiveness, efficiency -- as well as PMR governance and management to date. The findings presented, accordingly, represent essential, but not definitive, inputs for the draft final evaluation report, which will be completed in the months following P10 for presentation to the EWG by the end of 2014 and to the full PA in early 2015. As a preliminary report, it will not put forward any conclusions, lessons, or recommendations. However, these will be a central feature of the draft final evaluation report, which will also reflect the feedback received from the EWG and the full PA on the contents of the present document received during and after the upcoming Santiago meeting. The proposed outline of the final draft evaluation report is presented in Annex 1 to the present document. Finally, it should be noted that the survey ratings presented below, indicative though they may be, should be considered essentially on a “binary” basis as representing either satisfactory (i.e., “highly” and “substantially” relevant, effective, efficient) or unsatisfactory (“modestly” or “negligibly” relevant, effective, efficient) performance, respectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Partnership for Market Readiness, *Terms of Reference for the First Independent Evaluation of the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR)*, Washington D.C., February 3, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> For more on these criteria, see OECD/DAC, *DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance* (1991) and later defined in the *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management* (2000) and DPMG/USC, *Evaluation Framework for the Partnership for Market Readiness*, op. cit. The two remaining criteria which cannot yet be assessed at this time in the case of the PMR are impact and sustainability.

<sup>6</sup> See Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*, World Bank and OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Washington, DC, 2007.

<sup>7</sup> The PMR's first Technical Partner (see the section on Governance and Management below), Kazakhstan, was also included in the ICP stakeholder group for purposes of the survey exercise.

## II. Partnership Relevance

19. According to OECD/DAC, “relevance” refers to the extent to which a development activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor, in evaluating the relevance of a program, such as the PMR as whole, or project, such as the individual country-specific activities supported by the PMR, such as an MRP. In order to assess program or project relevance, it is useful to consider the following generic questions: (i) to what extent are the objectives of the program still valid; (ii) are the activities and outputs of the program consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives; and (iii) are the activities and outputs of the program consistent with the intended impacts and effects<sup>8</sup> The first of these questions refers to the relevance of program objectives and the latter two to the relevance of program design and can be evaluated either together or separately. In the case of global programs<sup>9</sup> such as the PMR, relevance can also be assessed from “supply-side,” “demand-side,” “horizontal” and “vertical” perspectives, as well as in terms of the relevance of its design. These perspectives are defined in a sourcebook for the evaluation of regional and global programs as follows:

- Supply-side relevance – the existence of an international consensus that global collective action is required.
- Demand-side relevance – consistency with the needs, priorities and strategies of beneficiary countries and groups.
- Horizontal relevance – the absence of alternative sources of supply of the same goods and services provided by the program.
- Vertical relevance – consistency with the subsidiary principle, namely, the most appropriate level (global, regional, national, or local) at which particular activities should be carried out in terms of filling gaps, efficient delivery, and responsiveness to the needs of beneficiaries.
- Relevance of the design – the extent to which the strategies and priority activities of the program are appropriate for achieving its objectives.<sup>10</sup>

20. Based on the information and evidence gathered by the DPMG/USC evaluation team to date, each of these dimensions of program relevance is considered below. However, as stated at the outset of this report, it should be kept in mind that these findings and observations are preliminary and, thus, subject to further elaboration and/or modification as additional data are collected from new interviews and other sources. Furthermore, before considering the various dimensions of relevance *per se*, which refer both to program objectives and design and are also of direct importance for assessing PMR effectiveness, it is

---

<sup>8</sup> OECD/DAC, *op. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> “Global programs,” which are increasingly important for the delivery of international development assistance, can be defined as programmatic multilateral or international partnerships in which: (i) at least some of the partners contribute and pool resources (financial, technical, staff and reputational) toward achieving agreed-upon objectives over time; (ii) the activities of the program are global, regional, or multi-country in scope; and (iii) the partners establish a new organization with a governance structure and management unit to deliver these activities. See Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*, World Bank and OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Washington, DC, 2007, Overview, pg. xvi. The PMR clearly meets all of these criteria.

<sup>10</sup> IEG, *The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility*, Global Program Review, Volume 6, Issue 3, Washington D.C., August 27, 2012, pg. 13. This source (in its Glossary) also offers an alternative definition of “relevance” more generally: the extent to which the objectives and design of a global program are consistent with (a) the current global challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups.

essential to recall the PMR's objectives as endorsed during PA1 in Barcelona in May 2011 and as they appear to have evolved since that time. The differences are more than semantic.

### Evolution of PMR Objectives

21. According both to the PMR *Design Document* and the annexed *PMR Governance Framework* issued in May 2011, the PMR's general "aims" were "to provide a platform for technical discussions and the exchange of information on market instruments for [greenhouse gas] mitigation, and to help interested countries build capacity for scaling up their mitigation efforts through market instrument, and to pilot instruments appropriate to their domestic context." To do this, the PMR would seek to achieve the following objectives:

- (a) to provide grant financing to countries for building market readiness components;<sup>11</sup>
- (b) to pilot, test and sequence new concepts for market instruments, both for domestic and new international mechanisms, and to identify potential synergies between national market based instruments at an early stage;
- (c) to create a platform to enable policy makers of government agencies, practitioners, and public and private entities to share experiences and information regarding elements of market readiness, to learn from one another, promote south-south cooperation, and explore and innovate together on new instruments and approaches;
- (d) to create and disseminate a body of knowledge on market instruments that could be tapped for country-specific requirements; and,
- (e) to share lessons learned, including with the UNFCCC [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change].<sup>12</sup>

22. The Partnership's objectives, however, have been expressed in different ways in subsequent PMR documents.<sup>13</sup> The most recent version is contained in the *Annual Report April 2013-2014*, released in May of this year, which describes the Partnership's general purpose in the following terms: "through grant funding and technical assistance, the PMR helps countries to explore and address the technical capacity gaps to assessing, designing, and adopting innovative and cost-effective approaches to greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation." It adds that "particular focus is on mitigation approaches that lead to a price on carbon – such as domestic ETS [Emissions Trading Schemes] and carbon taxes" and that "importantly, the PMR supports countries to move forward with national action plans that lower carbon emissions, while also

---

<sup>11</sup> An indicative list of "market readiness components" were contained in a Box in the original *Design Document* for the Partnership, which was divided into three categories: technical components, institutional components, and policy components (see Box 2, pg. 11), but there was no specific mention of instruments such as Emissions Trading Schemes, offsetting mechanisms or carbon taxes. The document stressed, however, that this list was "not comprehensive" and "for illustrative purposes only."

<sup>12</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Design Document*, Washington D.C., paras. 17-18, pg. 9 and *PMR Governance Framework*, paras. 1.1-1.2, pg. 21 of the *Design Document*.

<sup>13</sup> The *Annual Report FY 2013*, which was issued in April or May 2013, for example, describes (pg. 2) the general purpose of the Partnership as "through grant funding and technical assistance the PMR helps build capacity to support the design and implementation of market-based approaches for GHG mitigation, including domestic emissions trading systems (ETS), carbon taxes, and new crediting mechanisms. In addition, the partnership brings together developed and developing countries for technical discussions and collective innovation to foster low-carbon development."

stimulating growth and competitiveness.”<sup>14</sup> Following these statements, the PMR’s “core objectives” are identified as follows:

- **Provide grant funding** for building market readiness components that support the implementation of market-based approaches to carbon mitigation;
- **Pilot innovative carbon pricing instruments** e.g., domestic ETS, scaled-up crediting mechanisms or carbon taxes;
- **Provide a platform for technical discussions**, country-to-country exchanges, and collective innovation on cost-effective approaches to GHG mitigation. Share insights and lessons learned with the international community, including the UNFCCC; and,
- **Support efforts to establish common standards and approaches** for the use of carbon pricing and other innovative instruments to scale up domestic GHG mitigation.<sup>15</sup>

**23.** Even though the basic purpose of the PMR has remained largely the same since its inception, the way its “core objectives” have been expressed has evolved. There is no explicit mention, for example, of either “carbon pricing instruments” or “efforts to support common standards and approaches” for their use in the initial statement of PMR objectives endorsed by the PA in May 2011. The original objective “to create and disseminate a body of knowledge on market instruments that could be tapped for country-specific requirements” as such has been dropped, even though knowledge management activities continue to be an important part of the PMR’s activities, meriting a specific chapter in both the FY 2013 (i.e., July 2012-June 2013) and April 2013-2014 *Annual Reports*. In addition, initial objectives (c) and (e) have been merged into a single one and broadened to include the sharing of both “insights” and “lessons learned” with the “international community” as a whole and not just highlighting the UNFCCC.

**24.** This evolution of the PMR’s “core objectives” is a direct reflection of how the international dialogue with respect to the use of market instruments, including carbon pricing, for climate change mitigation has evolved over the past several years, as well as a shift in emphasis among PMR activities. It also reflects the PMR’s flexibility, which is a positive attribute considering that the global policy environment in which the PMR is inserted is also a rapidly changing one, and thus contributes to its continuing relevance. However, for purposes of an objectives- or results-based evaluation such as the present one, it also creates a dilemma regarding which set of “aims” and “core objectives” to use in order to assess the PMR’s performance to date. Accordingly, in undertaking the first independent assessment of the Partnership, as is also reflected in elaboration of the proposed evaluation framework for the PMR, the DPMG/USC evaluation team has considered both the initial and most recent statements of such objectives in its analysis. It is nonetheless important to bear in mind that evolving objectives over time also represent a “shifting of the goal posts” in a dynamic context such as that involving national and international policies and efforts to mitigate climate change. Thus, while donor – and, in this case, PMR – flexibility in seeking to help countries to increase their effectiveness in this regard is essential, both how the PMR’s objectives were initially framed and how they appear to have subsequently evolved should be kept in mind in order to assess program performance over time.

---

<sup>14</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Annual Report April 2013-14*, Washington D.C., May 2014, pg. 6. It goes on to affirm that “countries use PMR support to improve their technical and institutional capacity to mitigate GHG emissions. Such ‘market readiness’ includes strengthening capacity, e.g., GHG monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV); data management; baseline setting; policy mapping and modeling analysis; and stakeholder engagement.”

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pg. 6 (emphasis in the original). These “core objectives” are further highlighted by being placed in a Box. They are also largely the same as those presented a year earlier in a similar Box in the *Annual Report* for FY 2013.

## Supply-side Relevance

25. With this initial methodological caveat in mind, there is ample evidence that there is an increasingly strong scientific and growing international political consensus that global climate change is occurring, most likely accelerating, and that global action is required both in order to mitigate its principal anthropomorphic causes, GHG emissions, and to adapt effectively to its probable severe adverse social, economic, and environmental impacts, which will disproportionately affect the poor and most vulnerable. The Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), issued in 2013, for example, affirms that “warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia.” It also notes that “each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the Earth’s surface than any preceding decade since 1850,” while “atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide have increased to levels unprecedented in at least the last 800,000 years.” And it concludes that “human influence on the climate system is clear. This is evident from the increasing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere, positive radiative forcing, observed warming, and understanding of the climate system.”<sup>16</sup>

26. Similarly, there is an increasingly strong consensus that, unless concerted and coordinated proactive mitigation measures are taken by the international community, this situation is likely to worsen over time. According to the World Bank’s flagship World Development Report for 2010 on the topic of *Development and Climate Change*, for instance, “we must act together, because climate change is a crisis of the commons.” More specifically, “climate change cannot be solved without countries cooperating on a global scale to improve energy efficiency, develop and deploy clean technologies, and expand natural ‘sinks’ to grow green by absorbing gasses.”<sup>17</sup> Elsewhere this report affirms that “pricing carbon (whether through a tax or through a cap and trade scheme) is the optimal way of both generating carbon-finance resources and directing those resources to efficient opportunities” and that “the next phase in constructing a global carbon market must put developed countries onto a low-carbon path and provide the financial and other resources needed to assist the transition of developing countries to a lower-carbon development path.”<sup>18</sup>

27. In response to this situation, as the *Design Document* for the PMR itself asserted, the World Bank established the PMR “to help interested countries, through grant funding and technical assistance, build capacity and pilot market instruments, and to provide a platform for technical discussions, South-South exchange and collective innovation on market instruments.”<sup>19</sup> Launched at the 16<sup>th</sup> Conference of the Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC in Cancun, Mexico in December 2010, the PMR’s initial expectation was to mobilize US\$ 100 million in contributions from developed countries over the next several years in order to finance PMR activities. As of May 2014, more than US\$ 126 million had been committed to the PMR by twelve industrialized countries and the European Commission (EC), of which more than US\$ 106 million had been received by that time, the largest donors being the EC, Japan, Germany, Australia and Switzerland.<sup>20</sup> These 12 countries and the EC constitute the Contributing Participants (CPs) of the PMR, most of which have been engaged in the PMR from the time of its organizational meeting in Bangkok in April 2011 and the first Partnership Assembly (PA1) meeting in Barcelona the following month.

---

<sup>16</sup> International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2013 The Physical Science Basis: Summary for Policymakers*, 2013, pp. 4, 5, 11 and 14.

<sup>17</sup> World Bank, *Development and Climate Change*, World Development Report 2010, Washington D.C., 2010, Foreword, pg. xiii.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 272.

<sup>19</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Design Document*, Washington D.C., May 24, 2011, pg. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR), *Annual Report April 2013-2014*, Washington D.C., 2014. The other CPs, in the order of their financial commitments, are the United Kingdom, Sweden, the United States, the Netherlands, Norway, Finland, Spain, and Denmark.

28. The engagement and financial contributions of the 13 CPs bears witness to the significance of the PMR in terms of its “supply-side” relevance. Even though the response rates were low and, thus, cannot be considered fully representative, this appears to be supported by the evaluation survey results. Among the CP representatives who responded to the questionnaire, for example, more than 85 percent indicated that the PMR’s current objectives were highly or substantially relevant to international needs, priorities and strategies regarding market readiness and/or carbon pricing, and the remaining ones judged that they were modestly relevant. Similar percentages were recorded by the participating Technical Experts, while three of the four PA Observers who responded to the survey also find these objectives highly relevant, although one indicated that they were only modestly so. These data are presented in Table 1. Most tables referred to below, however, will be presented in Annex 2.

**Table 1:** Relevance of PMR Objectives in Relation to International Needs, Priorities and Strategies according to Several Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don’t Know
<b>CP Representatives</b>	71.4	14.3	14.3	0	0
<b>PA Observers</b>	75.0	0	25.0	0	0
<b>Technical Experts</b>	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73.7</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

29. Some survey respondents also elaborated on their ratings with brief written observations. One CP representative commented, for example, that “PMR was established as the key instrument to boost a new generation of market instruments. Their objectives, as established in its instrument, were the main reason for participants (especially contributors) to be there.” A second one noted that market mechanisms were at “the heart of any solution for the CO<sub>2</sub> problem,” while yet another argued that “the objectives are highly relevant as they are focused on market readiness; however, the design of the Partnership and its activities could be better focused on identifying and addressing in-country needs.”

30. A PA observer stated that “the PMR fills a needed gap in international market design. That said, its objectives are too numerous/vague, its design sometimes seems haphazard, and its activities seem repetitive.” More will be said about the relevance of PMR design and activities below, but a second PA observer asserted that “the PMR is the most credible resource for governments and government agencies to turn to for support in the design and implementation of carbon pricing.” A Technical Expert added that “I have not seen any other group that can convene the high-level stakeholders to discuss carbon market design issues, as well as provide support” and a second one affirmed that “the PMR in its implementation has helped shape the next generation of carbon pricing initiatives, whether by providing infrastructure for markets or advanced studies on carbon pricing and taxation.”

31. Among the Delivery Partners involved in the PMR who also responded to the survey (exclusively World Bank staff), over 70 percent affirmed that the PMR’s objectives were a high priority for their professional work and the remainder as a substantial priority. However, as seen in Annex Table A1, these objectives were seen as being a lower priority for the World Bank sector management units – now called Global Practices (GPs) – in which, and the Country Management Units (CMUs) for which, they work.

32. In commenting on their responses, one World Bank staff member indicated that “climate change mitigation overall is a high priority in my work, and PMR is a substantive part of it,” and a second one stated that “PMR is a strategic initiative. Due to its size and its potential (including funding and crediting NAMAs [Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions]), it is of major importance at the country level,” and a third observed that “the objectives are a high priority but not so much the activities, as many times

colleagues and management may not fully understand them and their importance and link to the World Bank's objectives." With regard to GP and CMU priorities, World Bank respondents reported that "climate change is a high priority for my unit and GP. However it may not be the absolute highest priority for the CMUs" with which he worked, and another added "CMUs many times do not understand the rationale or importance of the activities. Many times they are seen as small (given funding allocated) and lack of understanding of country policies and priorities." On the other hand, a third one responded that "country uptake is good - and is becoming better - but faces some fairly strong industrially-based opposition (i.e., to the ETS). But the [World Bank's] Country Management is supportive of what we're doing."

### **Demand-side Relevance**

**33.** Even though representatives of fewer than half of the ICPs<sup>21</sup> responded to the survey – eight of eighteen (including Kazakhstan as Technical Partner) -- expressed views regarding the relevance of the PMR's objectives to country needs, priorities and strategies that were consistent with those reported by country PMR stakeholders interviewed during the DPMG/USC evaluation team's earlier visits to China, Mexico, Turkey and Vietnam.<sup>22</sup> These views were all quite positive even though these countries were at distinctly different stages in relation both to carbon market development and the advance of PMR activities.<sup>23</sup> Among the three case study countries, *China* has played an active and important role in the PMR to date. PMR activities have also been of considerable relevance for the country, even though they are only part of the numerous climate change mitigation initiatives in which the government is presently engaged, many with international support, and the concrete steps it is taking with the purpose of significantly reducing its CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHG emissions. To date, moreover, China is the only ICP that has requested, and been approved by the PA to receive, an implementation grant of more than US\$ 3 million. It has received the largest grant amount available, US\$ 8 million. Most importantly, it is one of the most advanced ICPs in terms of the actual piloting of a new market-based carbon emissions mitigation mechanism, regional Emissions Trading Schemes (ETS), which are now underway in seven key metropolitan areas and provinces, and are intended to provide the basis for scaling up to a national ETS in the years ahead with assistance from the PMR and others sources.

**34.** Those interviewed by DPMG/USC in *Mexico* were likewise universally positive with respect to the PMR's relevance in terms of country policies, strategies and priorities for GHG mitigation and carbon market development. Even though Mexico is also comparatively advanced among developing countries in terms of its existing knowledge and approaches regarding GHG mitigation, interviewees in the public, private and NGO sectors all pointed to the relevance and usefulness of the information exchange and technical support provided by and through the Partnership. This has occurred both directly through PMR-

---

<sup>21</sup> The original 15 ICPs were, by date of admission to the PMR, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mexico, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine (April 2011), China, Morocco (May 2011), and Brazil, India, Jordan, South Africa, Vietnam (October 2011). Peru was admitted in October 2012 and Tunisia in March 2014. Although not an ICP, Kazakhstan has received assistance from the PMR as a "Technical Partner," a new category of participant established by the PA in early 2014.

<sup>22</sup> Even though Vietnam was not a formal case study country, an evaluation team member took advantage of his presence in Hanoi in June 2014 to interview the focal persons for the PMR in Vietnam in both the Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI) and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE), as well as a local World Bank senior environmental economist who was engaged in PMR activities there and two representatives of the Asia Development Bank, which is the co-Delivery Partner with the World Bank for the Partnership in Vietnam.

<sup>23</sup> Only Turkey had actually begun implementing the grant received by the World Bank to finance its Market Readiness Proposal (MRP), which had been approved during PA6 in Barcelona in May 2013, China's grant agreement was only approved by the Bank in May 2014, although its MRP was approved at PA 5 in Washington, DC in March 2013, as was Mexico's MRP. However, the associated grant agreement for Mexico has not yet been approved, while Vietnam's final MRP is only expected to be approved at PA10 in Santiago.

sponsored events and indirectly as a result of subsequent exchanges with individual PA members on a bilateral basis.

**35.** In *Turkey*, finally, the PMR is likewise regarded as relevant or highly relevant by the key Ministries of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) and of Energy and Natural Resources (MENR) as well as by other stakeholders interviewed with respect to the PMR's main focus in the country, its support for capacity building with respect to MRV (Monitoring, Reporting and Verification) issues. However, its short-term relevance has been lower in terms of helping to build market readiness for carbon pricing and establishing a voluntary carbon market (VCM) because the Turkish Government has not adopted market mechanisms so far, and a VCM is still incipient but growing<sup>24</sup>. However, many energy and heavy industries, which are less keen about adopting the European Union's ETS approach because of its possible economic impacts nevertheless appreciate PMR activities, especially MRV capacity building. MRV is regarded as a tool for benchmarking emissions and future decision making with regard to participation in carbon markets.

**36.** In addition to the above interview-based findings, 37.5 percent of the ICP respondents to the survey rated the PMR's objectives as "highly relevant" in terms of their country's needs, priorities and strategies, and the remaining 62.5 percent indicated that they were "substantially relevant." Specific comments from one ICP respondent were that "developing countries need to learn and prepare for carbon markets for...GHG mitigation in the country, so PMR objectives, design and activities could help countries including [mine]." A second one affirmed that "[the country] is developing different carbon pricing policies and PMR has been a good support in providing technical assistance and networking," while a fourth indicated that "it supports [our] initiative for Climate Change Policy and the National Development Plan." A fifth respondent also agreed with the relevance of the Partnership and observed that "carbon trading [can have] a very important role in climate change mitigation," but he/she also recognized that "until now [our] government's policies are not too strong," testifying to the diversity of situations among the participating ICPs.

**37.** In addition to being relevant, the PMR's objectives were also seen as generally realistic in terms of their countries' needs, strategies and priorities from the standpoint of those ICP representatives who responded to the survey. The only difference was that two of the respondents (25 percent) indicated that these objectives were only "modestly realistic," compared with the majority who replied that they were either "highly" (25 percent) or "substantially" (50 percent) realistic. In this regard, one CP representative stated that the PMR's objectives "are realistic in terms of being highly flexible to adapt to countries' political and economic situations and needs," while another noted that they had "become more realistic now, considering that new regulations on carbon pricing have been approved."

**38.** There was a greater variety of views with respect to the relevance of the PMR's strategy, governance and management structure, roles and responsibilities to their countries and organizations among the small number of ICP representatives who responded to the survey. These responses, which on the whole were nonetheless generally positive, are summarized in Table A.2. Written comments in this regard were also more diverse. Whereas one respondent observed that "flexibility and quick responses have improved PMR's influence in [my country's] developments by financing workshops, meetings and capacity building in a very effective manner," another noted that "more flexibility [in] resource mobilization and faster delivery" were needed. A third observed at greater length that the "PMR has been successful in terms of promoting its aims, approaches and benefits, especially to donor partners, which in turn has resulted in an initiative that has concrete funding available to implementing partners. Resource mobilization in this sense has been very successful; it has gone beyond the original goal! The PMR has a very solid governance and management structure, with decisions being taken by donor and implementing countries on an equal footing

---

<sup>24</sup> Between 2008 and 2012, total 218 VCM projects were registered with an annual emission mitigation estimate of 16.3 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e.<sup>24</sup>

(which makes it a very unique initiative). The timing for decisions on funding and other matters, such as capacity building, has improved over time as the PMR gains more experience. The PMR Secretariat is the heart of the system, and as such, has been very efficient in moving the initiative forward all the time. This means...that implementing countries have benefited and have received the support needed. In terms of actual transfer of resources to implementing countries, it has been a bit delayed....The time between funding decision and actual transfer should be shortened.”

**39.** These are important observations to which we will return in the sections on efficiency and governance and management below, but support a generally positive assessment of the PMR’s relevance on the part of those to whom its services and support are primarily being provided. This was also the case when the ICPs were asked the extent to which the PMR’s approach to capacity building and the MRP process had been relevant for their countries or organizations. Again, the responses were either “highly” or “substantially” relevant in both cases, as indicated in Table A.3.

**40.** Although not explicitly asked, three of the respondents who submitted written comments on this question referred specifically to the value of PMR-sponsored workshops. One said simply that all the workshops had been “essential,” while another observed that “PMR has not only organized specific Workshops for the Latin American region, but also helped [national] officials to get capacity building elsewhere. The process also has been helpful by accepting to hold a PA in [the country] making the PMR well known among...officials throughout the government and other institutions.” The third added “the workshops have been very useful so far to our own involvement as Focal Point to the PMR. In terms of capacity building, the organization of regional workshops/meetings with the participation of implementing countries would be a useful approach. The support of consultants in our MRP preparation phase was essential to both, improving the proposal and positively influencing decision making by the PA.”

**41.** DPMG/USC also specifically surveyed a large number of PMR technical workshop participants about the relevance of these events for their countries and organizations. Altogether there were 30 responses to this survey, the vast majority of which were positive, as summarized in Table A.4. These included workshops on a variety of pertinent subjects in a number of countries and involved participants from a range of organizations, including academia, NGOs and the private sector. As a result, one or more responses came from workshop participants from 13 different developing countries, as well as from several developed countries.

**42.** Among the many written comments received in response to this question the ones below from ICPs are representative and also point to the range of topics covered in the PMR’s technical workshops to date:

- We are all learning about NAMAs and MRV. It is highly relevant to have an opportunity to share our challenges and lessons learned, and to learn from others.
- Stakeholder Engagement is one of the key areas for work in [my country’s] MRP.
- [My country] is currently [carrying out analysis to] design its ETS for the power sector. The conference was very interesting to find out the success stories and experience of firms participating in the EU ETS.
- Some NAMAs are currently under development in [my country] and an MRV system is necessary for their implementation. Such a system is not yet ready and capacity building and experience-sharing are required.
- [My country] is now developing its National Emissions Trading System and topics of the workshops/meetings cover all major elements of an ETS and the experiences/lessons from existing systems.

- We are developing our [carbon tax] design. So this workshop was extremely useful for us.
- It's really useful to get the information on several carbon pricing initiatives and also on the infrastructure needed to support the initiative. This information will support the country in further analysis.
- Learning about the GHG inventories and MRV systems in other countries served to adapt the MRV system for our SME [small and medium enterprise] NAMA.

43. Finally, ICP survey respondents indicated that the PMR has been less relevant, although not irrelevant, to date in terms of helping their countries to establish or consolidate their legal and regulatory frameworks for GHG mitigation and to establish globally recognized GHG mitigation standards. The pertinent response data are contained in Table A.5. Two respondents commented that they were “just beginning” in this regard, but others observed that this situation could be improved “by creating a healthy and effective networking among partners that makes possible information exchanges” and “by keeping a good level of attending officials and guests in PMR meetings.” However, another observed that “we are preparing [a] framework in the country, but we can learn from the forum on this issue and we [have received] support for the study of legal framework for ETS.”

### **Horizontal Relevance**

44. The PMR is seen by many as having created a unique platform and set of opportunities for the exchange of useful knowledge and experience among its Contributing and Implementing Country Participants, together with the provision of grant funding and technical assistance, which some ICPs are receiving from numerous donors on both a multilateral and bilateral basis. Thus, as in the case of China, which is also receiving support from the European Union and the Norwegian Government, among others, to help build its domestic institutional and technical capacity for market readiness and carbon pricing instruments,<sup>25</sup> many ICPs are taking advantage and coordinating the use of external grant funding and technical cooperation from various international, as well as domestic, sources for this purpose, including the PMR. In addition, other UN programs, especially the United Nations Development and Environment Programs (UNDP and UNEP, respectively), have specific capacity building programs to assist developing countries with respect to their capacity building needs in relation to climate change mitigation. Box 1 provides a brief description of these two initiatives.

---

<sup>25</sup> See World Bank, *Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of US\$ 8 million to the People's Republic of China for a China Partnership for Market Readiness Project*, Report No. PAD 784, March 3, 2014 (hereafter *China PMR Project PAD*).

**Box 1: UNDP's Low Emissions Capacity Building (LECB) Program and UNEP's Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation (FIRM) Project**

The **Low Emissions Capacity Building (LECB) Program** was launched in January 2011 as part of a joint collaboration between the European Union (European Commission and member states) and the United Nations Development Program. It presently includes 25 participating countries, including nine PMR ICPs -- Chile, China, Colombia, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Peru, Thailand and Vietnam -- among others. This collaborative program aims to strengthen technical and institutional capacities at the country level, while at the same time facilitating inclusion and coordination of the public and private sector in national initiatives addressing climate change, but utilizing global networks and the substantial experience that UNDP has gained around the world. It is part of UNDP's larger Green, Low Emission Climate Resilient Development Strategy.

More specifically, LECB is a four-year program to strengthen capacities in participating countries to: (i) develop greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory management systems; (ii) identify opportunities for NAMAs; (iii) design systems for measuring, reporting and verification of proposed actions and means to reduce GHG emissions; and (iv) facilitate the design and adoption of mitigation actions by selected industries in some countries. It has two types of primary stakeholders: public sector agencies directly responsible for climate change policy, monitoring and reporting and high-emissions industries such as cement, iron and steel, petrochemicals and fertilizers, as well as business organizations and small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs). Specific projects supported by the program are implemented by the appropriate national institutions in the participating countries.

The **Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation (FIRM) Project** financed by the Government of Denmark and administered by the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) has as its main objectives: (i) contributing to develop the conceptual basis and practical understanding of low carbon development as well as the analytical and methodological approaches to NAMA development and MRV systems; (ii) linking the outcomes of the Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) exercise and other work on identification of mitigation options with national low carbon development planning processes to identify priority NAMAs; (iii) supporting formulation of NAMAs in identified priority areas and in that context pilot identified activities for overcoming of non-financial barriers that hinder NAMA implementation in developing countries; (iv) enhancing efficient use of resources, including energy, creating enabling environments for uptake of clean technologies, and improving human well-being and the environment; and (v) fostering south-south cooperation and mutual learning.

Four PMR ICPs – Costa Rica, Indonesia, Morocco, and Vietnam – are among FIRM's participating countries, while two others, Mexico and South Africa, also receive support to develop analytical inputs aimed at fostering south-south learning and cooperation in low carbon development strategies (LCDS) and NAMA processes. FIRM has three main components: (i) developing a national low carbon development framework and NAMA priorities; (ii) supporting national processes for development and formulation of NAMAs ready to be implemented; and (iii) developing analytical materials and sharing project experiences and analytical results, including through regional and international networks.

45. While there are some important similarities between these initiatives and the PMR, including their substantive focus, emphasis on technical cooperation, South-South exchange and mutual learning, and their involvement in many of the same countries, there are also significant differences. These UN programs are smaller in terms of the resources available to support their activities and, at least in the case of UNEP's Facilitating Implementation and Readiness for Mitigation (FIRM), narrower in scope with a clear priority given to providing technical and analytical assistance for the development of Nationally Appropriate

Mitigation Strategies (NAMAs), while, if anything, the focus of UNDP's Low Emissions Capacity Building (LECB) Program is broader, at least in terms of its direct support both to large industries and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in "emission-intensive" sectors. However, these UN programs do not function as global partnerships with decision responsibilities shared by participating countries for the activities to be supported -- and resources to be mobilized to implement them -- in the same way as the PMR and numerous climate finance facilities managed by the World Bank or by other multilateral financial institutions.<sup>26</sup>

**46.** In short, the PMR appears to be unique in the international arena both in terms of the range and importance of the country participants it incorporates and in the focus and scope of its activities. In addition to the growing international consensus regarding the need for such an initiative (i.e., both "supply-side" and "demand-side" relevance, as suggested above), this reflects the World Bank's strong convening power together with its accumulated experience over the past decade both in the area of carbon and climate finance as well as with the management of global partnerships and programs.<sup>27</sup> The PMR also seems to be taking the lead, together with the UNFCCC and in a more informal way, in terms of advancing the international dialogue on and directly supporting a large number of important developing countries with the use of innovative market instruments, including alternative ways of pricing carbon emissions, to mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases in a cost-effective manner.

### **Vertical Relevance**

**47.** The PMR likewise appears to be consistent with the subsidiary principle, in the sense that the particular activities it supports in terms of filling gaps, efficient delivery, and responsiveness to the needs of its IPCs are being carried out at appropriate levels. PA meetings occur on a regular basis and involve CPs and ICPs, as well as an increasing number of external observers, including the UNFCCC and some other countries and subnational organizations. The venues of these meetings have alternated between and been hosted by various CPs (Spain, Germany, Australia, and the United States, to date) and ICPs (Thailand, Turkey, China, Morocco, Mexico, and Chile, thus far). Numerous Side Events, Technical Workshops, including regional as well as national ones, South-South exchanges, and Training events have also been carried out in conjunction with PA meetings or separately in partial implementation of the PMR's Technical Work Program, which is presented to PA meetings.<sup>28</sup> Box 2 lists such events that were implemented between April 2013 and October 2014.

---

<sup>26</sup> These include, for example, the more recently established Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), which became operational in 2008, the Carbon Partnership Facility (2009), the BioCarbon Fund Initiative for Sustainable Forest Landscapes (2013), and the Carbon Initiative for Development (2013), as well as the PMR and a number of previously created carbon funds, managed or supported by the World Bank to "pioneer full range of flexibility mechanisms created for the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period," according to and briefly described in the most recent World Bank *Annual Report for Carbon Finance for Sustainable Development* covering FY 2013, issued in May 2014.

<sup>27</sup> For greater information in this regard, see the report cited in the previous footnote and Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), *The World Bank's Involvement in Global and Regional Partnership Programs*, Washington D.C., 2011.

<sup>28</sup> See, for example, Partnership for Market Readiness, *PMR Technical Work Program: Report on FY 14 Activities and Proposal for FY 15*, Washington D.C., May 2014

**Box 2: PMR Technical Workshops, Training and Other Events between September 2013 and October 2014**

Regional Training Workshops on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) in Beijing, China (September 2013), Mexico City, Mexico (March 2014) and Ankara, Turkey (September 2014)

South-South Exchange on Developing Domestic Offset Schemes, funded in part by the UK's Department of Energy and Climate Change, in Mexico City, Mexico (March 2014)

Public event on Stepping Up to the Challenges: Domestic Climate Action and Carbon Pricing Instruments, in Mexico City, Mexico (March 2014), featuring speakers from Brazil, China, the European Commission, Mexico, South Africa, and the United States who discussed innovative and cost-effective approaches to GHG mitigation, including carbon pricing initiatives, such as domestic emissions trading schemes and carbon taxes.

Technical Meeting on Carbon Taxes in Cologne, Germany (May 2014)

Business-Government Dialogue on Preparing for Carbon Pricing Policies in Cologne, Germany (May 2014)

Technical Workshop on "MRVing" GHG Emissions under Existing and Development Pricing Mechanisms in Bonn, Germany (June 2014)

Sources: PMR *Annual Report April 2013-2014*, *PMR Newsletter*

**48.** Targeted country-specific activities have also been organized by the PMR to address specific operational issues. An example is the donor coordination meeting held by the Secretariat and representatives of the co-Delivery Partners, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank, with other active development partners active in GHG mitigation activities in Vietnam and several government ministries – specifically for Ministries of Planning and Investment (MPI), Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE), Industry and Trade (MOIT), and Construction (MOC) -- concerning Vietnam's NAMAs and other mitigation measures in April 2014. This was followed by a two-day meeting between the Secretariat, World Bank, and ADB, with the same key government agencies/focal points on the status of the preparation of the country's MRP at the World Bank's Hanoi office.<sup>29</sup> Feedback received by the DPMG/USC evaluation team during its visit to Vietnam in June 2014 with regard to these two meetings both from MPI's and MONRE's and from the donors' (i.e., local World Bank, ADB, and UNDP) participants was universally positive regarding the helpfulness of these meetings in terms of moving the MRP preparation process forward.

**49.** In terms of nationally-focused events that have also involved other participant countries, a two-day Technical Workshop on domestic emissions trading schemes (ETS) was held in Shenzhen, China in March 2012 in conjunction with the "Extraordinary Meeting" of the PA there during the same week, with the purpose of informing policy makers on key features of such schemes and to exchange lessons from existing and proposed ETS experiences elsewhere in the world. A similar workshop on international experiences and lessons to inform the development of Mexico's domestic ETS was held in Mexico City in May 2014. Again, feedback concerning their relevance and usefulness from participants in both of these events in response to DPMG/USC's recent survey of PMR technical workshop participants more generally has been positive. Finally, MRPs, such as those for China and Mexico, directly involve subnational – i.e., state and

<sup>29</sup> See PMR, *Donor Coordination Meeting Agenda*, Hanoi, April 22, 2014 and PMR, *Vietnam: Expert In-Country Visit – MRP Feedback Process: Draft Market Readiness Proposal (MRP) Agenda*, Hanoi, April 23-24, 2014.

local – governments as well as central ones and the private and/or state-owned enterprise sectors, in their design and implementation.

### Relevance of Partnership Design

50. Relevance of design refers to the extent to which the strategies and priority activities of the PMR are appropriate for achieving its objectives. In addition to the countries visited by the DPMG/USC evaluation team, the various stakeholder groups surveyed as part of this first evaluation were asked to express their views in this regard. The results in terms of the ratings given by each group are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Relevance of PMR Design according to Different Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
ICP Representatives	25.0	75.0	0	0	0
CP Representatives	28.6	57.1	14.3	0	0
PA Observers	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
Technical Experts	75.0	12.5	12.5	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

51. Here again, the responses were largely positive. Even though, as noted above, the response rates were low – and, thus, may not be fully representative, it is nevertheless interesting to observe, in comparison with the results presented in Table 1, that a smaller share of the CP representatives, as well as a somewhat smaller share of the ICP ones, rated the relevance of PMR’s design “substantially” rather than “highly” relevant, although only one CP respondent and none of the ICP representatives who responded to the surveys rated the Partnership’s design as being only “modestly” relevant.

52. The written observations from survey respondents do not shed much additional light on the reasons for these differences. One CP representative stated with respect to PMR design and activities, however, that “looking into the new climate change regime, we can affirm that the PMR constitutes an example of what many parties want. More and more countries are already undertaking pilot initiatives, developing different market-based instruments and showing their trust in carbon markets as a valuable tool to reduce emissions in a cost effective manner.” However, he/she also noted “PMR can’t host all countries in its partnership.” A second one affirmed that the PMR’s “objectives are highly relevant as they are focused on market readiness, however the design of the Partnership and its activities could be better focused on identifying and addressing in-country needs. Every country is different, but the program could benefit from greater clarity,” although the respondent did not specify which aspects of the Partnership would “benefit from greater clarity.”

53. One of the ICP respondents, in turn, argued that “if the [PMR’s] activities could extend for a longer period, it could help countries to do some pilot tests instead of just [design] studies.” As noted above, a PA observer who responded to the survey indicated that the Partnership’s “design sometimes seems haphazard, and its activities seem repetitive,” although it is not clear exactly what is meant by this statement, or which activities are deemed “repetitive” or in relation to what. And one of the Technical Experts surveyed affirmed that “PMR’s current activities are in line with current desire of developing international carbon market. However, I am not sure about design of PMR. It appears to create consensus among participating countries. However, the number of participating countries is too small given the nature of task.” The same respondent likewise asserted that, “more money is required to be allotted to PMR to ensure more participation. Also,

[the] quantum of money per country is too small for emerging BRICS<sup>30</sup> economies making PMR activities irrelevant in those countries.”

**54.** Thoughtful responses from two other Technical Experts who commented on the PMR’s design and activities also merit reproducing. One observed that “it appears that many countries are very interested, but are lacking tools and training to developing reporting programs. Therefore, it seems that more targeted work in this regard would be particularly relevant.” The other stated that the PMR could be more helpful “by more closely aligning the bottom-up requests of participating countries with the international discussion on accounting modalities and offset standards’ options in a future climate policy regime. From a national perspective, it would be important to think through...which mechanisms can be used to increase buy-in at departmental and governmental level across the relevant units in Governments.”

**55.** Finally, considered strictly in terms of the inherent structure and relations reflected in the PMR’s proposed logical framework, which is the partial subject of the proposed Evaluation Framework document that is being presented in parallel by DPMG/USC to the PA for its consideration during PA10, it would appear that the PMR intends – and appears to currently be on track – to provide the kind of assistance and knowledge sharing support that can, indeed, help its ICPs to strengthen their technical and institutional capacity to design carbon pricing or other market readiness instruments and “infrastructure” and that the eventual application and/or implementation of such instruments are likely to have a positive impact in terms of the GHG mitigation at both the individual, country and global levels over the longer-term. However, it is also evident that, while necessary, establishing this domestic capacity, will not, in and of itself, be sufficient to generate this desired outcome in the absence of several other critical factors. Among which the most important of these are a conducive or enabling global policy environment, adequate national legal and regulatory frameworks and business climate, the needed financial resources, technology diffusion and, above all, strong national and international political commitment to pilot, test and scale-up implementation of the carbon pricing and other market readiness instruments being supported by the PMR and other multilateral and bilateral sources.

---

<sup>30</sup> “BRICS” refers to Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, all but the Russian Federation, in fact, being PMR ICPs, and more generally to large developing or “emerging market” countries.

### III. Partnership Effectiveness to Date

**56.** The observations immediately above lead directly into a consideration of the PMR's effectiveness in terms of its ability to meet – or, more appropriately, at this stage of its still relatively young existence, likelihood to meet – its declared objectives and to achieve its desired impacts over time. Again, it is possible to turn to findings from the visits by DPMG/USC evaluation team members to three key implementing countries by DPMG/USC in June and August 2014 and to the survey responses for initial findings regarding Partnership effectiveness, both (selectively) at the individual country level, and more broadly. The main highlights of these visits and surveys regarding program effectiveness are summarized below.

**57.** The objective of the PMR's support to *China* is to help the country design a new national carbon emissions trading scheme (ETS), as one of the two main options – the other being a carbon tax – presently under consideration to help it reduce GHG emissions using market mechanisms in a cost-effective way. The purpose and contents of China's PMR project, to be partly financed by an US\$ 8 million grant channeled through the World Bank, is set out in its final MRP, which was approved by the fifth Partnership Assembly (PA 5) meeting in Washington DC in March 2013, and is summarized in the World Bank's Project Appraisal Document (PAD) for this grant, which was approved on May 30, 2014, well over a year after the implementation funding was initially approved by the PA. Local sources interviewed by DPMG/USC attributed this delay mainly to the implementing agency's unfamiliarity with World Bank appraisal, procurement, financial management, disbursement, and other procedures and requirements. The objective of this project is to help the country to elaborate a comprehensive proposal for a national ETS.<sup>31</sup> While this is only part of what the Chinese Government is presently doing with the aim of significantly reducing the country's GHG emissions and the carbon intensity of its rapidly expanding and still transforming economy, it is a potentially important element in this broader effort.

**58.** PMR activities in China are seen by those interviewed by DPMG/USC in Beijing as having been very effective to date. The workshop held in Shenzhen in 2012, for example, was helpful in terms of providing an opportunity to bring national officials together and introduce them to external experience regarding MRV and other ETS elements. Subsequent to this, the National Development Reform Council (NDRC), which coordinates PMR activities for China and will be primarily responsible for implementing the associated grant, has organized workshops for other ministries on low carbon development taking advantage of some of the information and knowledge provided or facilitated by the PMR, together with complementary financial and technical support from the European Union and other sources. However, NDRC recognizes that additional domestic capacity building is required with respect to carbon trading, to help capture the lessons of experience with the recently initiated regional ETS pilots and to systematically explore the possibilities of incorporating State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and the power sector into the proposed nationwide ETS, and to help formulate pertinent policy recommendations and provide the evidence and arguments to support them for consideration – and eventual approval -- by higher authorities. This is, thus, viewed as one of the fundamental potential contributions that continued PMR support can make in the years ahead as the grant is implemented and generates its planned outputs.

**59.** As concerns MRP implementation, more specifically, in the meeting with the DPMG/USC evaluation team member in Beijing in June 2014, the NDRC representative stressed that one important milestone had already been achieved in that a high-level Steering Committee to oversee this initiative had already been established and was expected to be essential in terms of enabling coordination of project activities across the different ministries involved. Another step forward was the use of the MRP preparation grant in order to prepare the Terms-of-Reference for some of the key studies to be carried out under the project. In summary, PMR's assistance to date is regarded as having been very important for MRP preparation and, as an additional result, once this proposal was approved by the PA, NDRC senior

---

<sup>31</sup> See World Bank, *China PMR Project PAD*, *op. cit.* for the details of this project.

management had reportedly become confident that the Climate Change Department (CCD) would also be able to deliver its planned project outputs.

**60.** *Mexico*, together with Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Thailand, Turkey, and Ukraine, was among the first ICPs to be confirmed as PMR participants. Together with all the same countries, except Ukraine, but plus China, it was also among the first for which the PA1 meeting in Barcelona (May 2011) approved a MRP preparation grant of US\$ 350,000. And it was among the first four countries, together with Chile, China, and Costa Rica, whose final MRPs were allocated funding and for which implementation funding was allocated during the fifth PA meeting in Washington in March 2013. Except for China, for which, as indicated above, an US\$ 8 million implementation grant was approved, all of these grants, including that for Mexico, have been for US\$ 3 million. As of mid-October 2014, however, the required grant agreement between the Mexican Government and the World Bank has not been finalized.

**61.** As in the case of China, the actions supported by the PMR in Mexico are only part of the Government's efforts and instruments in this regard, including a recently approved carbon tax on fossil fuels and a planned domestic ETS for the power sector. The proposed PMR project features NAMAs for integrated urban mobility (i.e., urban transport), new urban development investments (including both housing and associated water, sewer and public lighting infrastructure and solid waste management services), and the replacement of GHG-containing refrigerators. Even though the ultimate impact of these activities in terms of the volume of GHG emissions reduced will be comparatively small in relation to overall national mitigation targets, they represent an innovative part of the program of actions toward the objectives of Mexico's new National Climate Change Strategy and its Special Climate Change Program (PECC) for 2013-2018.

**62.** Thus far, however, effectiveness of PMR activities in Mexico has been mixed. On the one hand, the PA meeting and subsequent workshops in Mexico City in March and May of 2014 (and mentioned in Box 2 above) are perceived by participants who were interviewed by DPMG/USC in August 2014 as having generated some important benefits. One of the most significant of these has been enhanced visibility of the PMR and its activities within the national Government and in the country more broadly, in addition to the useful exchange of pertinent information and experience with other PMR participants, both CPs and ICPs. It has likewise been useful in helping the country to identify and arrange new – and hence additional – bilateral assistance with respect to climate change mitigation with Germany, Denmark, and the European Union, among others.

**63.** On the other hand, implementation of the approved MRP has been essentially at a standstill to date because the main actions to be financed by the implementation grant have not yet begun. This is due to an extensive delay in finalizing the grant agreement with the World Bank, largely because the new national Climate Change Fund (CCF), whose creation was authorized by Mexico's pioneering Climate Change Law (CCL), approved in June 2012 and through which the PMR grant resources were to be channeled, took nearly another two years to become operational.

**64.** *Turkey* was among the three first countries whose MRPs were endorsed and implementation grants authorized by the PA, and the first country to sign the Grant agreement with the World Bank. *Turkey* joined the PMR in April 2011. A preparation grant to begin work on an MRP was allocated by the PA in May 2011. Turkey submitted a draft of this document to the PMR Secretariat in February 2013, and presented it at PA5 in Washington, DC in March 2013. Implementation funding was allocated at PA6 in Barcelona, Spain in May 2013. Based on the MRP, a Grant Agreement signed on December 17, 2013 by the Turkish Treasury with the World Bank for US\$ 3 million defines the activities to be funded, the implementing agency, eligible expenditures, grant withdrawals, financial management, procurement, reporting requirements etc., and is complemented by a Disbursement Letter with detailed instructions on the grant withdrawal and disbursement arrangements. The Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) was

responsible for preparation and will also be for implementation of the project through its Climate Change Department (CCD). The grant aims to support implementation of Turkey's MRV system, together with training and analytical studies on market-based instruments for GHG mitigation.

**65.** Views on the effectiveness of PMR program to date among those interviewed by DPMG/USC in Turkey were mixed with respect to its main focus, capacity building in relation to MRV issues. Representatives of key ministries, public sector electricity producers, and industry associations regarded PMR's capacity building activities to date as effective or highly effective, but private sector electricity producers were somewhat critical of what they perceived as the non-participatory design and implementation of the first MRV training session. MoEU, for example, regards the PMR as being very effective because of its country-driven approach. PA meetings are also seen as having been effective in providing feedback from other countries, as have the technical experts mobilized by the PMR and the PMR Secretariat, which it sees as having done a very good job in organizing technical workshops. The Secretariat is also credited with continually updating participating countries on technical issues and helping them to better absorb information provided at PA meetings. Unlike the situation in both China and Mexico, moreover, the PMR grant finalization process in Turkey has proceeded without significant delay and the Partnership is regarded as being catalytic in designing and implementing technical work to help ICPs prepare for market readiness, more generally. National progress in this regard is considered more rapid due to PMR assistance than it would have been in the absence of this support.

**66.** PMR activities for other ministries, industries and stakeholders to date have been capacity building and training. MRV training was regarded as very effective by MENR, industry associations and public sector electricity generators. However, private sector power generating companies gave a mixed review of PMR effectiveness. A training workshop organized by MoEU with representatives of the Electricity Producers Association (EUD) took place earlier in 2014. According to EUD, however, some issues became more "confusing" after training by the participating experts, but it is expected that, with further sector-specific training, participants should be better able to adopt basic MRV principles. Apparently, some attendees did not possess a strong basic understanding about MRV systems prior to the workshop, and there may have been insufficient communication between those responsible for developing the training sessions and EUD specialists while these activities were being designed. It should be observed, however, that this training workshop primarily targeted Turkish Government staff within MoEU and MENR and not the private sector. A one day launch event will be organized by MoEU in Istanbul in late October 2014 to introduce the PMR activities to an extensive range of stakeholders from the private and public sector, academia, and civil society, and discuss their engagement in PMR supported activities going forward.

**67.** Results from the surveys undertaken by DPMG/USC provide additional information regarding how stakeholders view the effectiveness of the PMR to date. ICPs were asked, for example, to indicate how effective had the PMR been thus far in terms of contributing to the establishment or consolidation of such core technical components or "infrastructure" for market readiness as MRV systems, registries and other data management systems, as well as such instruments as domestic emissions trading schemes (ETSS), scaled-up emissions reduction (ER) crediting mechanisms, carbon taxes, or other pertinent instruments. These responses are presented in Tables A.6 and A.7 respectively.

**68.** The written comments with regard to these questions confirm that some ICPs are still at a very early stage and, thus, are only now beginning to get started with respect to the establishment of such systems. However, one ICP respondent stated that "MRV is the key component of mitigation and every country should have it in place. We can learn from the PMR activities and our staff attended the workshop that was held by PMR." A second one observed that "carbon pricing is a policy under construction in [my country] and PMR has been helping to develop it."

**69.** Table A.8 summarizes the results with respect to another question posed to the ICPs: how useful has the exchange of knowledge and experience between CPs and ICPs regarding alternative approaches to market readiness and carbon pricing been for your country and organizations to date? Here the responses were generally more positive. Written comments included the following: “We can learn from other countries’ experiences that could help us to take the pros and cons of each instrument to support the decision” and “PMR provides a vast environment on exchange of knowledge and experience, but still there is need for more, particularly on carbon pricing.” A third ICP respondent elaborated further: “in almost every PMR meeting held to date, there is a segment dedicated to the exchange of experiences among participants. Examples of different schemes, carbon pricing instruments, problems encountered, data needed, political decisions, timing [for] implementation, among other issues, have been addressed. To learn about others’ experiences, where common ground and differences are clearly established, is always useful to be considered in our own processes.” One of these respondents also affirmed that “promoting more exchange of knowledge and experience among implementing countries, following a regional approach, would be something worthwhile to consider.” Although they did not respond to the survey, a very similar suggestion was expressed by the country PMR focal points interviewed by DPMG/USC in Vietnam in June 2014.

**70.** Six of the eight (75 percent) ICP survey respondents also indicated that there had been unexpected positive (and no unexpected negative) consequences of PMR support for their countries to date. One ICP respondent indicated that this had taken the form of “interest from other Ministries and Departments,” while a second stated that it had led to “additional cooperation from contributing members and South-South exchanges.” A third one noted that, as a consequence of its participation in the PMR, it had received support from other agencies, specifically the German bilateral assistance agency, GIZ, with respect to MRV practices, and a fourth referred to the establishment of a joint crediting mechanism between his/her country and Japan “using carbon trading principles” and also affirmed that “the knowledge and information from PMR are highly important.” Finally, a fifth ICP respondent observed that “the upstream policy analysis, a separate but complementary initiative under the PMR, [is] very useful now that the Government has the task of implementing the carbon tax (needing, for instance, further analysis on its interaction with energy policies in place).” This comment refers specifically to a new “work stream” initiated by the PMR in 2014, whose description in the Partnership’s *Annual Report April 2013-2014* is reproduced in Box 3. As of the time of that report, nine ICPs had expressed interest in receiving PMR analytical policy support.<sup>32</sup> It is too early to assess any results of this new work stream, but this should figure prominently in future PMR evaluations.

---

<sup>32</sup> The reportedly interested ICPs are Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Jordan, Mexico, Peru, and Tunisia.

### Box 3: PMR's Proposed Upstream Analytical Policy Support

"Many countries are at a cross roads in their decision to adopt a carbon pricing instrument as a means to deliver [GHG] mitigation objectives. Country experience shows that introducing a major policy or economic instrument requires solid and comprehensive analytical work to ensure coherence with existing policies. In consultation with Implementing Country Participants, it is also clear that setting mid- and long-term mitigation goals is critical in any country's choice of mitigation instrument. For this reason, the PMR launched a work stream to support upstream policy analysis in 2014.

To date, most of the ICPs that have expressed interest in receiving such support from the PMR are concerned with the analysis of policy options for post-2020 mitigation scenarios, but others have specifically indicated that they would either or also like the PMR's assistance in implementing a carbon tax as part of a "green tax", for target setting and sector selection for assessing a national carbon neutrality goal, scoping ETS design in the power sector and its role in a post-2020 mitigation scenario, determining nationally determined contributions under the UNFCCC and common indicators for assessing ambition and comparability of mitigation efforts, and to conduct analysis of cost-effective instruments to scale-up mitigation efforts and ensure coherence with existing policies."

Source: PMR Annual Report April 2013-2014

**71.** The ICPs were also asked how useful the various elements of the PMR's Technical Work Program have been to date, specifically the technical notes, technical workshops and training events, and South-South exchanges. The responses, which again were mostly positive, are presented in Table A.9. Written comments included: "experiences are provided by first hand stakeholders and actors" and "all events and products help countries to improve and connect in international environment." But one respondent acknowledged "we are not familiar with country-to-country exchanges," suggesting that not all ICPs may have been able to take advantage of these opportunities, which others have found to be either "highly" or "substantially" useful. These results are consistent with those from the interviews in the three case study countries in that the technical workshops and training events and country-to-country exchanges were found to have been more useful than the PMR's technical notes, in part because those questioned had been "too busy" with their day-to-day activities and responsibilities to read these notes. This notwithstanding, those ICP survey respondents that are familiar with them found them to be at least "substantially" useful.

**72.** ICPs were likewise asked to assess the usefulness of the expert consultants provided through the PMR, both in technical and operational terms, in helping them to prepare their MRPs. The results are generally positive (Table A.10). Written observations included that "the technical advice on the MRP content has been highly helpful," and "they [i.e., the experts] gave some comments and suggestions based on their experiences that are very useful for us in developing the MRP." However, another ICP respondent affirmed that the consultants' "points of view have been of help [but did not lead to] great changes" and yet another stated "I don't know. In many cases projects are new and experts can't know much."

**73.** Finally, ICPs were asked to what extent have the Partnership Assembly Meetings, PA Side Events, Technical Workshops, and the PMR website provided effective platforms for the exchange of useful information and knowledge to date. These results are contained in Table A.11. Among these activities, the PA Meetings and workshops were both considered to be highly or substantially effective, but the side events and the website had some detractors among ICP respondents. There were fewer written comments in this regard, and one respondent was not familiar with PA side events, but another one stated that "PA assembly meetings are always very useful. It is a very open forum in terms of discussions. Technical workshops and trainings have been very useful so far, as well as the PMR website, which has a lot of useful information." However, another ICP respondent indicated that "the PMR website should have more than one user." This view corresponds with the DPMG/USC evaluation teams' independent assessment based on its own review of the PMR website's contents and organization, more specifically that it could be used more effectively to

support both PMR participants and the potentially much larger external audience of other interested stakeholders. Accordingly, this appears to be somewhat of a missed opportunity to date.

**74.** Other stakeholder groups were also posed similar questions to some of those discussed above. CPs, for example, were asked how effective the PMR had been to date from their perspective in helping ICPs to develop or refine their legal and regulatory frameworks and establish national standards for GHG mitigation, how effective PMR support has been in helping ICPs to establish or consolidate certain core technical market readiness components, and the same with regard to various carbon pricing and other market instruments for GHG mitigation. The responses to these questions are summarized in Table A.12. These figures are subject to the same caveat as those for the ICPs above, in that only six of the thirteen CPs, or 46 percent of the total, responded to this part of the survey.

**75.** These ratings are universally lower than those to the same questions by the ICP respondents, which suggest an interesting difference in perspectives. However, the CP responses also reflect difficulties in generalizing across the entire set of ICPs. As one CP respondent said in his/her written comments, “the PMR has 17 ICPs, each of which is at a different stage of development. It's impossible to average out answers to these questions across all ICPs” and a second one stated: “this is very hard for me to assess, so I was tempted to click 'don't know' in all three cases.” Yet another one observed that it “varies from country to country.” However, one CP respondent usefully affirmed, “I have mentioned to the PMR Secretariat the potential benefit in producing 'templates' for various readiness components, which countries could then take and implement as they see fit. This could work similarly to the OECD's model tax treaties.” And, as refers to the carbon pricing and other GHG mitigation instruments, more specifically, one respondent noted, correctly, that “it's probably too early to tell, as no MRPs are even halfway through their implementation, and most have yet to begin.” Essentially agreeing, a second one indicated, “it's too early to answer these questions, especially averaged out over all ICPs.” This respondent also observed that “things are moving forward slowly, but advances depend on political processes, which are necessarily slow and often de-linked from the work of the PMR.”

**76.** The small number of Technical Experts involved in the PMR's activities who responded to the survey was asked the same questions. Their percentage distribution of their responses is contained in Table A.13. While “don't know” answers predominated, in most cases they were followed by “modestly effective” ratings, the main exceptions being with respect to MRV systems, registries and/or other emissions tracking systems, and carbon taxes. Several of those who did respond in writing also indicated that it was too early to make a judgment in this regard, but one, who was from an ICP, observed that “the PMR is helping our country in our capacity building, such as allocation method, MRV, registry, etc., which is quite beneficial.” A second one observed that “the PMR discussions have in fact led to the emergence it would seem of more carbon taxes and in particular of mixed instruments such as "tax and offsets.”

**77.** CPs were likewise asked to express their views on the usefulness of the PMR's Technical Work Program to date, as well as that of the Partnership Assembly Meetings, PA Side Events, Technical Workshops and the PMR Website. These results are presented in Table A.14. Here too the ratings were less positive than from the ICP respondents. It is interesting to observe, however, that the usefulness of the Technical Workshops and the Partnership Assembly Meetings were rated higher by both the CP and ICP respondents than other PMR events and activities.

**78.** CP respondents were not very aware of the contributions of country-to-country exchanges, but, as indicated in Table A.9 the ICP representatives who responded to the survey found them quite useful. There was only one written comment with regard to these ratings, however, and that was: “I know that there are grand plans for the Knowledge Center within the PMR website, which have yet to be realized. I think that for now the main benefit of the website has been access to the technical and meeting papers.”

**79.** Participating Technical Experts were asked a similar question in relation to the usefulness of the Partnership’s Technical Work Program. The responses are summarized in Table A.15. Once again, technical workshops and training events received the highest rating although the technical notes were also found to be either “highly” or “substantially” useful by those respondents who were familiar with them. Among the accompanying comments were that “workshops have high quality,” but also that they “have limited outreach.” A third respondent observed that he/she was “not aware of any 'country to country' exchanges. But it appears to be a useful idea. Technical workshops as well as training are good.” But he/she also suggested that “some effort should be made to involve the private sector.” This was also one of the findings of the DPMG/USC evaluation team’s interviews with key national interlocutors during its earlier visits to China, Mexico and Turkey. Another Technical Expert stated that “as a university expert, I could be leveraged more to work with individual countries.”

**80.** The CPs, finally, were asked the extent to which the exchange of knowledge and experience between themselves and the ICPs regarding alternative approaches to market readiness and carbon pricing had been useful for their countries and organizations (Table A.16). Here, interestingly, although there were no written comments, half of those CP representatives who responded to the survey found these exchanges through the PMR to be at least “substantially” useful for their own countries, as well as for the ICPs.

**81.** PA observers were likewise asked to indicate the extent to which they have found the Partnership Assembly Meetings, Side Events, and other PMR-sponsored activities useful to date, as indicated in Table A.17. As with the other groups surveyed, technical workshops and the PA were considered by most to be quite useful, and the very small number of PA observers who responded to the survey found the PMR website to be so as well. There were also several written comments, one observer noting that “it is obvious that the Assembly has not only the task of transmitting knowledge, also administrative and governance issues are discussed,” while a second one indicated that its member companies “very much appreciated the PMR-BPMR Dialogue held [in Cologne, Germany] in May 2014 and hope that future opportunities for business-government dialogue can be arranged in the future.” One PA observer who responded to the survey also suggested, however, that these events could be made even more useful by “giving a much broader access to the knowledge platform to other governmental actors that are relevant to the implementation of markets, carbon taxes, climate policies and not just those attending the PA.”

**82.** Participating Technical Experts, in turn, were requested to rate the quality and innovativeness of the technical guidance and advice provided by the PMR to the ICPs. Their responses are summarized in Table A.18. Once again, the ratings were generally positive, although technical quality was rated higher by some respondents than innovativeness. One respondent commented “I think the PMR brings the up-to-date knowledge in the international [arena, it is] of high quality in the technical and innovative aspects,” but a second one stated “design of the program, i.e. in-country design and partnership structure, puts limitation on 'innovativeness'. However, quality of technical input is very high.”

**83.** Finally, the surveys also attempted to gauge the perceptions of various stakeholder groups regarding the quality of the PMR Secretariat’s preparation and follow-up of Participant Assembly Meetings, PA Side Events, and Technical Workshops to date, which are among its critical responsibilities (see chapter on Partnership Governance and Management below). These generally positive responses are posted in Tables A.19 through A.24. These results are also pertinent to the PMR Secretariat’s efficiency and to its management of the PMR more generally, about which more will be said in the next two chapters of this report.

**84.** Comments from CP respondents with respect to these questions were the following: “time management is a big problem with PMR PA meetings” and “it would be great to receive the PA papers earlier before the meetings, as there is a lot of reading involved and it is important to consult a wide range of colleagues in other teams and departments.” The only comment from an ICP respondent, however, was

that the “PMR team is highly capable and experienced.” Similarly, one of the PA Observers affirmed that “the PMR Secretariat is extremely professional and well respected by [my organization] and its member companies.” One PA Observer, however, suggested that “to share with [greater] time the papers and power point presentations would improve the results [and] using more discussion format will improve the results.”

**85.** As noted above, finally, a specific survey was also carried out among Technical Workshop attendees and some of its results are also of relevance with regard to overall PMR effectiveness to date. Table A.25 presents the distribution of survey responses with respect to the usefulness of the information and knowledge shared during the workshop(s) attended and on the extent to which it influenced the participants’ subsequent professional work. Participants were also asked to assess the quality of workshop preparation and follow-up, as well as of the presentations and discussions in the event, with the results indicated in Tables A.26 and A.27, respectively. Attendees were likewise asked whether the time allocated for their workshop was sufficient and how well the time available was managed by the coordinators. These figures are contained in Table A.28

**86.** Once again, while, on the whole, the responses were positive, there was a range of written comments, both positive and some more critical in relation to the various questions posed above. A sample of these observations is contained below:

- It was highly useful to learn from businesses’ experiences with EU ETS, as practice is quite different from theory.
- The information shared is useful since it allows a better understanding of what should be improved or done; however the real implementation is not easy to do.
- Information was useful [to] understand the status of policy development in many different countries. Given the diversity of the MRPs and the fact that some of them are a long way from development of actual market mechanisms, [this] has not influenced our work as much as I would have liked.
- Very useful for elaborating NAMAs. The knowledge helps when there is the chance of working with NAMAs.
- Much of the effectiveness was not due to information shared in the workshop, but rather to informal contacts made during the event.
- The PMR training helped us to have some interesting scenarios and cases to follow.
- Qualified experts are invited to share information/experience/lessons. Suggestions are usually sought for improvement of the organization/preparation of the workshops.
- Venue was small and a day was not enough.
- MRV was an important topic and the workshop was well organized.
- The event was well organized, but there was limited follow-up on the projects of participants.
- The presentations were very interesting; however the discussions were not very rich.
- "Team" work was not very productive, poorly organized.
- The quality was as good as could be expected from a mix of technical and non-technical people, working under ambiguous international guidelines.

**87.** Participants’ suggestions as to what improvements could be introduced for future technical workshops also ranged widely, for example:

- The case studies were very interesting, so maybe if the speakers had more time, we could have [had] a better chance to discuss more in depth.
- In the future if we have possibility with the PMR to focus on verification bodies competency and other more technical issues (determining installation boundary, calculation methods, standard or mass balance, determining emission sources and streams, proper tiers and factors for the installation) with [respect to] verification, it would be more useful from an accreditation point of view.
- More information resources and country case studies could have been made available.
- Ensure that actions discussed are monitored and followed up with all participants.
- Despite the organization of a very interesting and relevant workshop, there seems to be a lack of continuity in considering the issue in the PMR. There also is little material on the issue made available by the PMR.
- More appropriate support, including logistics, should be provided to qualified experts to encourage their participation in the workshops.
- Addressing conceptual concerns as to the direction and focus of some of the work areas in a more substantive way.
- Plan 2-3 day workshop to discuss all elements
- Maybe visiting local organizations to know what are they doing regarding the workshop topic.
- The topics were very interesting and complex, so I think more time should have been allocated to be able to discuss more in depth.
- The Moderator should have been more proactive with respect to time management.

#### IV. Partnership Efficiency

**88.** Efficiency refers to the extent to which program inputs have been used to produce outputs in a timely and cost-effective way, and, in the case of the PMR, how well the PMR has used its available resources more generally. Taking the second of these questions first, according to the *Annual Report April 2013-2014*, the PMR has effectively mobilized commitments from the thirteen Contributing Participants of US\$ 126.5 million as of May 2014, of which US\$ 106.5 million had been, or was expected to be, received as of that time.<sup>33</sup> As observed earlier in this report, this substantially exceeds the PMR's initial fund raising target of US\$ 100 million. Total investment income earned by the PMR Trust Fund by May 2014 was US\$ 730,000, bringing the accumulated total to US\$ 107.23 million.

**89.** PMR resources have been utilized for various purposes, including to finance PMR preparation grants (US\$ 350,000 each), which had been approved for all seventeen ICPs by March 2013, for a total of US\$ 5.95 million, and MRP implementation funding for nine countries (Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Thailand, and Turkey) for a total US\$ 32 million.<sup>34</sup> However, to date only three World Bank Grant Agreements, totaling US\$ 14 million, have been finalized, with China, Turkey, and Chile in December 2013, May 2014, and September 2014, respectively. In addition, Kazakhstan, as the PMR's first "Technical Partner" was allocated US\$ 1 million at PA 8 in Mexico City to support development of its domestic ETS. This brings the total of PMR resources committed for PMR activities in ICPs and Technical Partners to date to US\$ 38.95 million.

**90.** PMR resources are also utilized to finance PMR management, Trust Fund Administration by the World Bank, and the operational support provided by participating World Bank regional staff. According to the *Annual Report April 2013-2014*, these costs were expected to be on the order of US\$ 4.41 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 (i.e., July 1, 2013-June 30, 2014), compared with a PA-approved budget of US\$ 4.744 million for this period.<sup>35</sup> These figures are broken down in Box 4 below. As the Box indicates the largest expenditure category was "country delivery support and advisory services," followed by knowledge management, PA meetings and workshops, and management and communications. The World Bank is also paid a fee to cover the costs of Trust Fund management.

---

<sup>33</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR), *Annual Report April 2013-2014, op. cit.*, pg. 22. The minimum contribution from a CP was set at US\$ 5 million in the Partnership's *Governance Framework* (PMR, *Design Document, op. cit.*, para. 4.7 (a), pg. 26). The latter total included US\$ 7.5 million expected to be received from the United States in May 2014. Recent contributions received were US\$ 5.4 million from Spain and an additional US\$ 6.68 million from Germany, bringing its total to US\$ 13.3 million. In addition to Germany, the largest contributors as of May 2014 were the European Commission (US\$ 19.7 million, of which only US\$ 3.2 million had been received), Japan (US\$ 13.6 million, all paid in), Australian (US\$ 12.5 million, also all paid in), and Switzerland (US\$ 12.5 million, of which US\$ 9 million had been received).

<sup>34</sup> All of these grants except that to China (US\$ 8 million, the maximum amount available), have been for US\$ 3 million. The most recent implementation grants approved by the PA were to Colombia and Morocco at PA9 in Cologne, Germany in May 2014. Three other ICPs, Brazil, Vietnam, and Ukraine, also presented their draft MRPs at that meeting. See *PMR Newsletter* July 2014 for further information.

<sup>35</sup> PMR, *Annual Report April 2013-2014, op. cit.*, Table 5, pg. 23. The expenditure figures for FY 14 included actual expenditures through March 31, 2014 and estimated expenditures for April 1-June 30, 2014.

**Box 4: FY14 PMR Budget: Use of Funds (in US\$ thousands)**

<b>Use of Funds</b>	<b>FY14 Budget</b>	<b>FY14 Actual Expenses</b>
<b><i>PA Meetings and Workshops</i></b>	<b>696</b>	<b>830</b>
<b><i>Country Delivery Services and Advisory Services</i></b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>1,919</b>
<i>MRP Expert Feedback Process</i>	490	271
<i>Country Delivery Support</i>	1,653	1,648
<i>of which Secretariat Country Support</i>	900	688
<i>of which World Bank Regional Support</i>	753	960
<b><i>Knowledge Management</i></b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>958</b>
<b><i>Management and Communications</i></b>	<b>690</b>	<b>615</b>
<b><i>Trust Fund Management</i></b>	<b>65</b>	<b>88</b>
<b><i>Contingency</i></b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total FY14 Use of Funds</b>	<b>4,744</b>	<b>4,410</b>

Source: PMR, *Annual Report April 2013-14*

91. These figures reveal that, on most items, the PMR remained well within its approved operational budget for FY 14, the only exceptions being the actual costs for PA Meetings and Workshops and for Trust Fund administration, which together absorbed the funds initially allocated for contingencies. A paper presented by the Secretariat to PA 9 in Cologne in May 2014 explains in further detail the costs that are referred to in each of the categories listed in Box 4. These are reproduced in Box 5. The budgetary resources expected to be utilized for PMR management in FY 14, as indicated in Box 4, or US\$ 4.41 million, represent roughly 3.5 percent of the resources mobilized by the PMR, including Trust Fund investment income, to date.

92. The budget proposal for FY 2015 submitted to the PA by the PMR Secretariat represents a substantially higher amount than that utilized for the previous fiscal year, raising the total to US\$ 9.825 million,<sup>36</sup> a 123 percent increase, or 7.2 percent of the total resources mobilized as of May 2014. This notable increase is due largely to the addition of a new budget category for upstream policy work (briefly described in Box 3 above) with a requested allocation of US\$ 5 million, or nearly 51 percent of the total. This signals a significant shift in the focus of the PMR's Work Program, which one former CP representative interviewed by DPMG/USC sees as potentially diverting the Partnership from its original PA-endorsed core purpose, i.e., to help countries build capacity and to pilot and test carbon pricing and other market-based instruments for GHG mitigation. The Secretariat justifies this new emphasis as follows: "in FY 14, the PMR has achieved an important milestone in initiating Upstream Policy Analytical Support [which] will help countries identify a package of effective and cost-efficient instruments to achieve mid- and long-term mitigation objectives. The support will complement countries' ongoing efforts to prepare their "nationally determined contributions" for 2015 agreement under UNFCCC."<sup>37</sup> In this context, it proposed inclusion in the FY 15 budget of the US\$ 5 million "envelope" to support: (i) country analytical

<sup>36</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Presentation of the PMR FY 14 Expenses and Proposal of the PMR FY 15 Budget for Approval*, PMR Note PAP-2014-3, Washington D.C., May 2014, Table 5, pg. 9.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

work; (ii) common methodology and framework (including modeling); (iii) international and national technical meetings and workshops; and (iv) the World Bank staff time.

**Box 5: Expenditure Categories in PMR Administrative Budget**

**PA Meetings, Workshops and Other Events:** Costs associated with PA meetings as well as workshops and other events (e.g., public events) organized on the margins of the PA meetings include meeting venue hire and catering; audio-visual equipment hire; and travel and accommodation expenses for ICP representatives, invited PMR experts and the PMR Secretariat.

**Country Delivery Support and Advisory Services:** These costs comprise (i) MRP Expert Feedback groups and (ii) the technical assistance provided by Delivery Partners and the PMR Secretariat to ICPs for the preparation and implementation of their MRPs. These costs include staff time from both the PMR Secretariat and World Bank Regional Offices, consulting fees associated with the MRP Expert Feedback Process, and associated travel costs.

**Knowledge Management:** These costs cover those associated with the PMR's Technical Work Program, including the preparation of technical notes, organization of working groups – for Baselines, MRV Systems, and Domestic Offsets – and expert meetings, technical training events organized under the Technical Work Program streams, and other events (e.g., South-South exchanges). In addition, they cover expenses for design and maintenance of the PMR website, as well as PMR monitoring and evaluation activities.

**PMR Management and Communications:** These costs comprise day-to-day operating costs of the PMR Secretariat in managing and coordinating PMR activities.

**Trust Fund Management:** These costs are associated with setting up and managing the PMR Trust Fund, including legal, budgeting, and accounting services.

**Contingency:** A contingency amount is included to cover any unforeseen expenses that the PA deems appropriate.

Source: PMR Secretariat, *Presentation of the PMR FY 14 Expenses and Proposal of the PMR FY15 Budget for Approval*, May 2014

**93.** It was difficult to get a very specific sense from the interviews carried out by the DPMG/USC evaluation team in the three case study countries earlier in 2014 as to how efficiently PMR resources were being used, as most of the interviewees were not directly familiar with this aspect of the PMR's operations. However, there were some interesting common views and pertinent suggestions based on the experiences in these three countries to date.

**94.** In *China*, for example, PMR efficiency and that of the PMR Secretariat in particular were seen as quite good, especially in terms of PA meeting and technical workshop organization and coordination. However, it was suggested that there should be greater participation of private sector companies and individuals, including verifiers and lawyers, in PMR events to provide advice based on their experience and that the technical workshop could have made greater use of national expertise. The MRP preparation process in the country also went smoothly, but NDRC was not sufficiently well-prepared to meet the additional requirements of the World Bank's project appraisal process, which led to the delays in finalizing the grant agreement mentioned earlier in this report. This was seen as the principal source of inefficiency in the PMR process in the country to date.

**95.** Among the PMR stakeholders met by DPMG/USC in *Mexico*, most were not sufficiently familiar with the PMR to have a view regarding its efficiency to date. However, those who have followed the PMR’s activities more closely indicated that both the program in general and the PMR Secretariat in particular have been quite responsive to date and have given timely support and feedback when requested. Comments were especially positive regarding the Secretariat’s efficiency and helpfulness with organization and coordination of the PA 8 meeting and associated technical workshops in Mexico City in March 2014. The efficiency, technical knowledge, and helpfulness of the expert reviewers was also praised and their assistance in helping to prepare the MRP was likewise considered to have been quite helpful, as were the comments and suggestions on the draft MRP document received from other PA members. Those interviewed were less positive in relation to the World Bank’s efficiency as Delivery Partner, and the speed with which the pending grant agreement can be finalized and negotiated is seen as an important test in this regard.

**96.** In *Turkey*, only MoEU and the local World Bank specialist interviewed by DPMG/USC were able to address program efficiency in a detailed fashion, since other stakeholders were not familiar with the funding and use of resources for PMR implementation. However, the coordination, use of human resources and funding and technical capacity of the PMR Secretariat and of the World Bank were regarded as generally efficient by these sources. However, since project procurement activities must follow both national and World Bank requirements, this process was found to be time-consuming and less efficient. It was also felt that there should be more detailed rules for the PA decision-making process for additional funding for studies, etc. as well as for the dissemination of study results.

**97.** These interview findings<sup>38</sup> were echoed in the survey responses regarding the efficiency of the PMR to date. ICPs, CPs, PA observers, and Technical Experts, for example, were all asked about the Secretariat’s efficiency in managing and coordinating PMR activities and providing quality and timely services to date? The responses are presented in Tables A.29 through A.31 in which, even though the numbers are small, there were some noteworthy differences. In general, the ICP representatives were the most positive, but also more knowledgeable about the services provided by the Secretariat, as well as in terms of its management and coordination of the PMR, than were those of the other three groups, even though all the numbers of respondents were small.

**98.** However, even among the ICPs, one respondent was less positive regarding the timeliness of the Secretariat’s support than its quality. Only one PA observer provided a written comment: “the management of the Secretariat is excellent. Everything is on time, experts are relevant and make a good organization of side events and workshops” and one Technical Expert stated that he/she was not aware “of complaints on the management of PMR activities or the timeliness of services.”

**99.** Both CPs and ICPs were also asked about the PMR Secretariat’s efficiency in the mobilization of resources to finance PMR activities and consultant services to date. These responses are presented in Tables A.33 and A.34. Again, the ICPs appear to have a more positive view than the CPs with respect to the mobilization of consultants, but not resources, although the number of respondents in both cases was small. Even so, two of the seven ICP respondents indicated that mobilization of resources to support the PMR by the Secretariat was only “modestly” efficient.

---

<sup>38</sup> One former CP representative interviewed by DPMG/USC also indicated that the fact that it was taking too long for ICPs to be able to implement their PA-approved MRPs, and, thus, that the program was proceeding more slowly than initially hoped and expected, was the main negative factor about the PMR’s performance to date, the most positive element being the successful establishment of a platform for the exchange of international knowledge and experience regarding market readiness and the use of carbon pricing and other non-regulatory instruments for GHG mitigation.

**100.** The Technical Experts were asked to rate the PMR Secretariat's efficiency in contracting consultants and its effectiveness in matching their skills with ICP needs and the requirements of the various elements in the PMR's Technical Work Program. These responses are contained in Table A.35. Written comments included: "in my experience, the PMR Secretariat has indeed been quite efficient in all contract related issues" and "they are quite efficient in signing the contract and answer our doubts quite quickly. Also they will give us suggestions for the topics since they have collected the needs from the ICP." However, another expert observed that the "PMR needs to develop experts from emerging economies as these people would have better idea of what can work in given social-economic and political scenario. It has been noticed that sometimes suggestions are extravagant."

**101.** All five stakeholder groups, including World Bank staff involved in the PMR but not the Secretariat, finally, were asked to assess the extent to which the PMR Secretariat possessed the financial and human resources (both in terms of the number of staff and their technical, operational, and managerial skills) needed to efficiently manage the PMR. These responses are presented in Tables A.36 and A.37, respectively. A range of comments on these two aspects were received from different stakeholder groups. One CP respondent, for example, stated with regard to the Secretariat that "it's a very effective and high-performing team, with a budget well over the target of \$100 million," but another one observed "it's not clear what the human resources available to the Secretariat are (viz. number). At the Cologne 2014 meeting the Secretariat was not able to answer a relatively simple question related to financial allocation, which is alarming, nor have they followed up on that. Financial resources themselves, on the other hand, are very available." An ICP respondent, in turn, simply affirmed that "human and funding resources are never enough, especially for this relevant initiative." A Technical Expert declared, "I think the personnel in the PMR Secretariat are quite competent in [doing] their job, they are excellent" and a second one noted that "my own experience to date has been very positive in relation to these dimensions," but a third one observed that he/she would "like to see better leverage of expertise that I know exists in the academy. There is too much of a disconnect." Finally, the Secretariat's World Bank colleagues expressed a variety of views, stating the following:

- The staff is excellent and it would be great if more people could support the secretariat tasks.
- [There are] more than enough staff and sufficient funding. In fact, there is a danger of the staffing and funding to design activities for which there may not be deep client demand (and become supply-driven).
- Some more in-house expertise and processing capacity would seem important to gain, in particular as countries are moving to the implementation phase and the Bank needs to be able to provide high quality implementation support.
- The PMR Secretariat seems well-equipped, but doesn't make sufficient use of the country office resources and also doesn't attempt to fit into other parts of the country engagement. It needs to make the links across the whole portfolio. I don't personally know how 'stretched' the PMR is for people - but as a rule anyone at the Bank is normally doing the job of two people (if not more). My hunch is that the PMR's portfolio is larger than what the staff can adequately handle, but I do not see any quality issues as a consequence of this. The [Trust Fund resources] they receive seem to adequately handle the requests, but again I don't know the specifics of whether their current envelope can meet current demand. I believe it is meeting demand though.

**102.** The CP, ICP, PA observers, and participating World Bank staff were likewise asked about the extent to which the combined use of expert reviewers of the MRPs, PA review and approval, and World Bank due diligence represented an effective and efficient process for ensuring the quality of the MRPs and associated project appraisal documents and Grant Agreements. The responses are presented in Tables A.38 and A.39. There were few written comments in relation to these questions, but one CP respondent affirmed

“the grant agreement process is not timely, and takes far too long. Quality-wise MRPs are usually fairly good, and have become more so with time, as things have gone forward.” An ICP respondent had a similar observation, “the grant agreement process is taking more time than expected.” These views, moreover, as noted above, were very similar to those heard by the DPMG/USC evaluation team members in their earlier interviews with PMR participants in China, Mexico, and Turkey, as well as that of a former CP representative who was also interviewed in Mexico City.

**103.** Participating World Bank staff had a number of comments on these questions. One said, for example, that “not all expert reviewers are aware of specific client country perspective, are too focused on market instruments for mitigation, and do not fully recognize the broader development objectives of the clients.” Another echoed this, affirming that the “problem with expert MRP reviewers is that they don't know the country context, so getting thrown in just for the assessment mission has limited effect.” He/she also believed that “PA review and approval is a weak and political mechanism.” A third one asserted that “the process takes time, but there is not much one could do about it. This will also vary by country significantly, depending on how long it takes for the grant to be processed on their side.” And a fourth observed that “at the Bank there is a tradeoff between timeliness and quality. The Bank's procedures can be a timely process, although it does ensure quality control. This is just the cost of having it in place. I think vetting proposals through the Partnership Assembly would be enough; however, right now each accepted proposal then has to become a project in the Bank and subject to the Bank's procedures, which can be slow and inefficient.” Another one posited that “the new streamlining of procedures in the Bank may make a difference -- we'll have to see,” but then added “my hunch is that it won't change that much.”

**104.** A number of suggestions were also offered by participating Bank staff as to how this situation might be improved in the future: (i) “PMR has to be part of a larger strategy and work program of the Bank to engage specific clients on carbon pricing;”(ii) “one could separate out some tasks for Bank execution, which could be somewhat faster, but would on the other hand reduce client ownership” (iii) “making other countries templates/examples readily available for all teams;” and (iv) “it would be much better to engage the relevant expertise of the country teams within each country office, depending on the sectors of operation. However, not just on an *ad hoc* basis, i.e., if time allows during the mission. There needs to be ownership of the cross-cutting team in the country office from the beginning of the process.”

**105.** ICPs were specifically asked both whether the human and other resources provided by the World Bank other than from the PMR Secretariat had been adequate for efficient implementation of PMR activities in their respective countries to date and the extent to which consultants hired by the World Bank and/or the country itself to assist with MRP preparation and those contracted by the PMR Secretariat for MRP review had been efficient. These responses are portrayed in Tables A.40 and A.41. While the ratings were positive, there were no written comments to elaborate upon them.

**106.** Participating Bank staff were likewise asked to assess the extent to which the human and other resources provided by the Bank other than through the PMR Secretariat had been adequate for implementation of the PMR mission in the country or countries in which they worked. These answers are presented in Table A.42. Written comments provided by one Bank staff member in connection with these answers stressed: “insufficient engagement by CMUs [Country Management Units]. Engagement by non-PMR staff depends on specific TTL's interest rather than unit/CMU/GP priority.” Another also agreed that “there is not enough buy-in from other units,” while a third stated simply that “all financial resources are coming from the PMR Trust Fund.” In order to improve the situation, it was suggested that it would be important to make sure CMUs and other Bank units better understood the importance of the PMR and that was a “need to develop a broader carbon pricing program of which PMR is a part.” A third one, however, affirmed “We are crossing our fingers that the number of steps to get a project going in the Bank decreases,” but admitted that “the crystal ball is a little foggy at this point.”

**107.** Finally, there was an open-ended question as to whether the respondents had any other comments regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the PMR to date and how they might be improved. Some of the responses and suggestions by those among the various stakeholder groups who responded to the surveys are reproduced below:

- **Contributing Partner (CP) respondents:** “it’s difficult to answer some questions about efficiency of PMR as we are still in the middle to process and we are still waiting results” and “set up some kind of a system of donor coordination of programs/projects in Implementing countries to create more transparency what everybody is doing and to have more effectiveness and efficiency.”
- **Implementing County Partner (ICP) respondents:** “PMR takes high responsibility and gives always support in an effective and efficient manner;” “PMR is an exceptional organization in the otherwise too political arenas working in carbon financing. It has shown a great influence on countries willing to assess carbon pricing;” and “during assemblies, open more time for discussions and reduce time of presentations.”
- **PA Observers:** “The PMR is a groundbreaking partnership between participating countries, experts, and increasingly the private sector. It can serve as a model for future similar activities of other organizations” and “We hope that the PMR and [our organization] can have more opportunities to do joint work in the future.”
- **Technical Experts:** “The PMR Secretariat needs to be expanded so that better engagement with developing countries is possible. Also, PMR needs more money for the Secretariat as well as to provide grants to countries. Some mechanism [should] be developed to provide big grants to big countries that can make an impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.”
- **Delivery Partners:** “The PMR has played a catalytic role over the past 2-3 years to build interest and commitment on the use of market instruments. It now has to drive a process for deeper engagement with countries and the GPs [i.e., the World Bank’s Global Practices]; “PMR is doing highly relevant work that builds on the Bank’s experience and reputation in the carbon markets, and is a useful contribution in the current uncertain environment, [but the] Bank could do more, and expand the PMR gradually to cover more countries;” “I am not sure PMR is so effective in countries that cannot/do not want to commit to market-based mitigation policies at this time; and “there is a growing consensus among Senior Bank Management that we should get out of some businesses funded through Trust Funds since it makes us more scattered or fragmented. Some people think the PMR may be one case in point. However, I think the PMR brings a lot to the Bank’s table in terms of providing client countries with very technical advice and support.”

## V. Partnership Governance and Management

**108.** The PMR's governance and management arrangements were established in the *Design Document* and its annex *PMR Governance Framework* that were endorsed at PA1 in Barcelona in May 2011. They remain largely unchanged to the present time. As concerns PMR governance, more specifically, the *Design Document* stated the following:

The Partnership Assembly (PA), as the ultimate decision making body of the PMR, consists of the following participants: (i) all countries that have submitted an EoI [Expression of Interest] to participate in the PMR and whose participation has been confirmed at the organizational meeting of the PMR or any meeting of the PA (the "Implementing Country Participants" [ICPs], and (ii) all donors that have contributed financially to the PMR and have entered into an administration agreement with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development [i.e., the World Bank] (the "Contributing Participants") [CPs]...Decisions of the PA will be made on a consensual basis, and any PMR Participant who holds a different view may request to record its view as a note to the decisions. If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted and no decision has been reached, decision will be taken by two-thirds majority of the ICPs and CPs present and voting at the meeting of the PA, on the basis of one (1) vote per PMR participant.<sup>39</sup>

**109.** A provision was also made for establishment of a smaller decision-making group, to be known as the Partnership Committee (PC) and composed of an equal number of ICP and CP representatives, for purposes of approving funding allocations and performing other functions designated by the PA, once ten of each type of participants had joined the Partnership, if the participants so chose. However, to date, the PA, which now contains a total of 30 participants – 17 ICPs and 13 CPs – has resolved not to create such a Committee and all decisions are still taken by the full PA based on the rules cited above. Provisions were also made for Observers to the Partnership Assembly meetings, including "the countries, organizations and entities relevant to the activities of the PMR and the delivery partners,"<sup>40</sup> and for the participation of technical experts, including those drawn from a "roster of experts" established by the PMR Secretariat, who "may be engaged to facilitate the work of the PMR, including attending the meetings of the PMR to provide expert advice, and may provide technical assistance to ICPs for readiness preparation and implementation." The roster of experts, more specifically, was expected to serve two purposes: (i) act as a staffing resource for technical expertise for capacity building associated with the PMR; and (ii) serve as a single source of information on professionals operating in climate change and carbon-related fields. Support from this source was expected to be "supplemented by local expertise that will handle design and implementation in country."<sup>41</sup>

**110.** The PMR Secretariat, in turn, would be provided by the World Bank, which would also furnish support for the day-to-day operations of the PMR. According to the *Design Document*, the PMR Secretariat would, among other services, maintain "a PMR website with all relevant documentation and details regarding meetings" and the World Bank would also serve as the trustee of the PMR Trust Fund, to be capitalized with the CP's financial contributions.<sup>42</sup> In addition, the World Bank would be the principal "delivery partner" for the Partnership, although the governance framework also stipulated that "in some cases, the PMR may rely on other multilateral development banks (MDBs) and UN agencies to provide

---

<sup>39</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Design Document*, *op. cit.*, para. 31, pg. 16.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 32, pg. 16

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 33, pg. 16. It also stated that "the roster of experts includes, for example, representatives from organizations active in capacity building, consultants specializing in carbon markets, and academics and practitioners that have been involved in designing and implementing carbon market instruments."

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 34, pg. 16

support for grant implementation, as some of these agencies may have pre-existing relationships or on-going work in countries also working with the PMR.”<sup>43</sup> All delivery partners, however, would be responsible for collaborating with the respective ICPs “to assist them in carrying out the activities of the PMR, supervising grant implementation and providing technical support as needed.”<sup>44</sup> The PMR governance framework also specified the roles and responsibilities of both the Partnership Assembly and the PMR Secretariat, which are shown in Box 6. Finally, the PMR was expected to provide support “as long as there is demand from countries for market readiness capacity building and piloting” and it was expected that “the PMR will operate until June 2021, unless otherwise decided by the PA, the World Bank and other entities serving as the delivery partners, if any.”<sup>45</sup>

**Box 6: Roles and Responsibilities of the PMR’s Partnership Assembly and Secretariat**

According to the *PMR Governance Framework* document, the specific roles and responsibilities of the **Partnership Assembly (PA)** are the following:

- (a) provide strategic guidance for the operation of the PMR;
- (b) confirm the participation of countries that have submitted an expression of interest to participate in the PMR;
- (c) approve the allocation of PMR resources to the ICPs;
- (d) approve the budget for the operation of the PMR;
- (e) monitor the operation of the PMR;
- (f) decide on other matters related to the operation of the PMR;
- (g) provided guidance to the Partnership Committee, if established; and
- (h) exercise other functions as the PA may deem appropriate to fulfill the purposes of the PMR.

The roles and responsibilities of the **Partnership Secretariat**, in turn, are:

- (a) propose a provisional agenda for the meetings of the PMR;
- (b) provide secretariat services to meetings of the PMR;
- (c) develop guidelines for allocation of funding for consideration by the PA;
- (d) review funding proposals for completeness and quality;
- (e) propose a budget for approval by the PA;
- (f) prepare updates or consolidated progress reports on the individual activities of the PMR and on the PMR as a whole, for the meetings of the PA;
- (g) maintain a website with details and relevant documentation about the PMR;
- (h) disseminate knowledge gained under the PMR; and
- (i) perform other functions necessary for facilitating the operation of the PMR

**111.** To date, the only significant changes in the governance framework agreed at the outset of the PMR have been, with the PA’s agreement in 2014, to establish a new category of PMR participant, the “Technical Partner,” which the *Annual Report April 2013-2014* described as consisting of “countries and subnationals that are already in the advanced stages of developing or implementing a carbon pricing instrument, are

<sup>43</sup> To date, a delivery partner other than the World Bank, and in this case a co-delivery partner, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), has only been appointed in the case of the PMR’s activities in one ICP, Vietnam.

<sup>44</sup>Partnership for Market Readiness, *Design Document, op. cit.*, para. 35, pg. 17. It also observed that “the selection of delivery partners for a specific country/activity will be determined on a case-by-case basis.” In addition, each delivery partner would be “responsible for the use of funds transferred to it under the PMR and the activities carried out therewith in accordance with its own policies and procedures” and each would report and be directly accountable to the PA.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 42, pg. 18.

willing to engage in PMR collaborative activities, and, if needed, will receive technical assistance.”<sup>46</sup> In addition, the PA has established a number of technical “Working Groups” to further discuss and elaborate PMR activities with respect to Baselines, Monitoring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) Systems, and Domestic Offsets, as well as to oversee this first independent evaluation – i.e., the Evaluation Working Group (EWG) referred to at the beginning of this report.

**112.** The three country case studies (i.e., China, Mexico, and Turkey) focused on PMR activities (MRPs, PA meetings and side events, technical workshops and training activities) within each country and, thus, did not systematically seek to assess Partnership governance and management more generally in part because many of the local stakeholders with whom the evaluation team met were not directly familiar with these aspects. However, those interviewed by DPMG/USC who were more familiar with the PMR, especially the country focal persons, for the most part expressed positive views, particularly with respect to the actions and support of the PMR Secretariat. This was also the case in Vietnam..

**113.** The surveys with representatives of both CPs and ICPs likewise included questions related to the transparency of the mobilization of resources and consultants by the PMR Secretariat and whether this latter process has been free of conflict and the consultants’ independence ensured. The responses to these questions are presented in Tables A.43-A.44. Again, the ICP responses were more positive than the CP ones. In the written comments, one CP respondent stated that “there is not transparency with regard to mobilization of resources. The Secretariat conducts bilateral consultations with potential donors who announce (additional) contributions at PA meetings. There is perhaps not a way to change this. On the other hand, there is no transparency regarding selection of consultants either, at both the overall level (is there a roster? how do you get on it?), as well as with regard to individual assignments.” A second one indicated “I don’t know how the PMR Secretariat hires consultants, which suggests that if there is transparency it is reactive. However, I don’t necessarily think that it need be any more transparent.”

**114.** The same divergence of views between responding CP and ICP representatives is also evident with respect to the extent to which consultant selection is perceived as having been free of conflict and consultant independence (Tables A.45 and A.46) ensured, although “don’t know” had the largest number of responses in each case, especially among the CP representatives, and were the absolute majority with respect to the first question. In the only written comment, one of the CP respondents affirmed “expert consultants are appointed by the Secretariat. Their appointment is not transparent nor does the PA hear of how they were appointed. To be fair to the Secretariat though, the PA has never asked this.” However, an ICP respondent stated “I do not recall being previously informed about the selection process...In any case, it resulted in a very efficient and effective process.”

**115.** CPs were also asked how transparent and accountable to their founding documents and operational principles have the Partnership Assembly and PMR Secretariat been in allocating resources to the ICPs to date. These results are contained in Tables A.47 and A.48. Written comments in relation to these questions by one CP respondent were: “the PA makes allocation decisions on the basis of the Secretariat’s recommendations, which are not transparent. There may be general criteria, but the Secretariat never touches below the surface when putting a number on the table.” A second one added, “there was some confusion in PA 9 about the level of discretion that the PMR Secretariat has in allocating funding in certain situations. There is also a lack of clarity (at least in my mind) about the processes for negotiating and the finalizing the grant agreements, what they say when completed, and how (if at all) they can be amended post-signature.” A third observation by a CP respondent was “it’s unlikely that any funding decisions have been made that would be against the founding documents and operational principles. An exception to this relates to upfront policy work, which the Secretariat introduced as a new “window” that couldn’t have been

---

<sup>46</sup> Partnership for Market Readiness, *Annual Report April 2013-2014, op. cit.*, pp. 7-8. Kazakhstan was confirmed as the PMR’s first “Technical Partner” at PA 8 in Mexico City in March 2014.

foreseen in the original documents. Nevertheless, there don't seem to be any criteria for allocating resources under this window, which gives the Secretariat a free hand (i.e., non-transparent).”

**116.** ICPs were likewise asked about the transparency and accountability of the PMR Secretariat in reporting on funding decisions, total PMR costs and administrative costs. These responses are summarized in Tables A.49 and A.50. Once again, the familiar pattern of more positive ICP than CP responses emerges. The PA Observers and Technical Experts were also asked as to the extent the governance structure of the PMR -- more specifically the Partnership Assembly and the Secretariat -- had been adequate to date for the delivery of its objectives to international standards, and the World Bank staff surveyed were asked how helpful the PMR Secretariat had been to date in providing technical and financial support to their country clients. These responses are presented in Tables A.51-53. There were only a few written comments from the Technical Experts one of which was: “I do not have much contact with the PA, but for the Secretariat, I think they (sic) are very efficient in delivering its objectives.” However, another one affirmed, without being specific, “some structure between Secretariat and Assembly is required to quicken the process.”

**117.** The participating Delivery Partners rated the Secretariat more highly with regard to the provision of technical, as opposed to financial, support, but this may mainly reflect the relatively small size of the grants available to ICPs through the PMR when compared with most regular Bank operations, including those for climate change. The Delivery Partners who responded to the survey with written comments, however, were generally complimentary toward their PMR Secretariat colleagues. One wrote, for example, “the PMR Secretariat has good experts in-house and as consultants” and another stated that its “support has been excellent.” A third one agreed, observing that Secretariat staff had provided “good technical support, especially, sporadically during missions.” However, he/she also commented that “outside missions, it has been more difficult to maintain the momentum and to keep the bar high.” A fourth engaged staff member noted, finally, that the Secretariat staff “have made themselves available 24/7 to provide advice on how to proceed with various aspects of Kazakhstan's ETS, and since Kazakhstan already has an ETS, they created a new partner category (a ‘Technical Partner’) that it could qualify for and thus receive grant funding to help support its ETS. While this category was not explicitly created just for them, it was created with them in mind (i.e., for some countries [that] already have systems, but need technical support that the PMR can provide).” Bank staff members also suggested that, looking ahead, the Secretariat should consider having “external experts on retainer/on-call for teams and clients to utilize as needs arise” and that a “key issue” would be to find financing for NAMAs or other emissions reductions projects.”

**118.** Finally, Delivery Partners were asked how effective the communication been between the PMR Secretariat and their teams and units had been and how helpful the various forms of Secretariat outreach (i.e., emails, brown bag seminars or lunches -- BBLs, website) had been in terms of sharing useful information with them. These responses are indicated in Tables A.54 and A.55. The participating Bank staff who responded to the survey also provided a number of written comments in relation to both of the above questions. In the case of the former, one staff member reported that the “Secretariat has been an integral part of the project throughout. The unit/management have also been regularly briefed by the team and the PMR Secretariat, and management obviously has been part of the [project] appraisal process.” Similarly, a second affirmed that “communication has been strong with teams and is very good (and improving) with the unit” and a third one that “the PMR has been working with us in developing the TORs for activities to support [our country’s] ETS. They are always available and have a lot of background experience which is useful to tap (since some of us are new to ETSs).” However, another noted: “Bit inconsistent. Sometimes I get updated, sometimes I don't. Regularly get left out of relevant e-mails, etc.”

**119.** There were also some useful suggestions. One Bank respondent simply encouraged the Secretariat to “continue informing the unit and staff on importance and kind of activities being supported,” while another proposed establishing a “PMR country-mailing list that includes all relevant colleagues across all the GPs. Communicate with this group prior, during and after missions to keep us updated on what is going

on. Link this mailing list to what is happening at the global level, including new developments during the PAs, relevant links to website, newsletters, etc.” Another Bank TTL interviewed by DPMG/USC in China suggested that greater resources be made available so that task team members could participate in PA meetings and other PMR events on a more regular basis and also indicated that the supervision budgets for complex projects may need to be augmented, especially when there will be a need to hire specialized technical experts to review TORs for studies and the resulting products.

**120.** As concerns the various means of communication, in turn, Bank staff comments included the following:

- Email communication is effective. Not aware of many BBLs in recent months. Regional staff do not appear to be invited or made aware of many PMR events.
- Outreach products are very good.
- All these forms of communication are useful but "indirect."
- Some of the global mailings are very useful, including resources on carbon pricing, setting of baselines, etc. More of this should be done.
- They [i.e., the Secretariat] have frequent trainings for clients and are very responsive to our requests. The website is great as a resource since there are a lot of activities and countries with great material to draw from.

**121.** Similarly, there were a number of interesting suggestions: (i) there is a need for the Bank to have “a more substantive program on carbon pricing than just the PMR, so that staff can set aside time in their work programs to engage. In its current form working on the PMR in one country is sub-optimal; (ii) “even more targeted, one on one, direct communication between the PMR Secretariat and Region/Country Management Units/Global Practices/Sector units would be useful;” (iii) “maybe the PMR secretariat, together with teams, could organize more country-focused BBLs and sessions;” and (iv) “I am interested in getting updated on the climate financing; what are the PMR Secretariat's plans for the next few years in terms of establishing a possible fund that will cover credited NAMAs, etc. Establish better links to the UNFCCC process.”

## **VI. Conclusion**

**122.** As stated at the outset of this report, the first independent evaluation of the PMR remains a work in progress and, thus, no explicit conclusions and recommendations are put forward at this time. The DPMG/USC evaluation team looks forward to the opportunity to supplement the preliminary findings summarized in the pages above with more face-to-face and telephone interviews with key PMR stakeholders, including as many of the country focal persons as possible, before, during and after PA10 in Santiago and to receiving feedback from PA Participants and Observers in relation to the proposed Evaluation Framework and the findings reported to date. As also observed in the Introduction, once these additional inputs are reflected, the draft final first independent evaluation report will be distributed to the PA's Evaluation Working Group (EWG) and the PMR Secretariat before the end of the year, and later sent to the full PA for its comments and suggestions, with the definitive version of the report to be distributed prior to PA11 in late February/early March 2015. The proposed organization and contents of this draft final first evaluation report are annexed below, but are subject to modification based on subsequent discussions with the EWG and PMR Secretariat and comments from the full PA.

**Draft Final Report for First Independent Evaluation of the PMR: Proposed Contents**

Executive Summary

- I. Introduction
  - II. The PMR: An Evolving Partnership
    - a. Objectives and Operating Principles
    - b. Scope
    - c. Partners and Other Key Actors
    - d. Funding Sources
    - e. Institutional Arrangements and Procedures
    - f. Activities to Date
  - III. The First Independent Evaluation
    - a. Background and Objectives
    - b. Evaluation Framework and Approach
    - c. Methodology: Sources and Instruments
    - d. Time Frame, Challenges, and Limitations
  - IV. Evaluation Results by “Cluster”
    - a. Relevance (have Partnership objectives and design been relevant to date?)
      - i. Supply-side Relevance (international consensus that global action is required)
      - ii. Demand-side Relevance (consistency with needs, priorities, strategies of ICPs)
      - iii. Horizontal Relevance (comparison with of alternative sources for services provided)
      - iv. Vertical Relevance (consistency with subsidiarity principle)
      - v. Design Relevance (are Partnership inputs and outputs likely to achieve desired outcomes and objectives?)
    - b. Effectiveness (have inputs resulted in desired outputs, outcomes, impact?)
      - i. Inputs Utilized
      - ii. Outputs Delivered
      - iii. Early Outcomes Observed
    - c. Efficiency (have resources and inputs provided to date been adequate and timely?)
      - i. Resource Mobilization
      - ii. Grant Approvals and Disbursements
      - iii. Administrative Budget and Operating Expenses
      - iv. Technical Assistance by Secretariat and Consultants for MRP Preparation
  - V. Governance and Management Performance (relevance, effectiveness and efficiency to date)
    - a. Partnership Assembly
    - b. PMR Secretariat
    - c. The Delivery Partners
  - VI. Conclusions and Recommendations
    - a. Conclusions and Lessons Learned
    - b. Recommendations
- Annexes (to be determined)

### Tables Containing Additional Survey Results to Date

**Table A.1:** Relevance of PMR Objectives in Relation to Staff Professional Work and for Sector Units and Country Teams according to World Bank Delivery Partners Teams Involved in PMR Activities

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
Delivery Partners	62.5	25.0	12.5	0	0
Delivery Partner Institution's Sector Units	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5
Delivery Partner Institution's Country Management Units	0	25.0	25.0	37.5	12.5

**Table A.2:** Relevance of PMR Strategies, Governance and Management Structure, Roles and Responsibilities, and Resource Mobilization according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
PMR Strategy	25.0	62.5	0	0	12.5
PMR Governance and Management	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5
PMR Roles and Responsibilities	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5
PMR Resource Mobilization	25.0	50.0	12.5	0	12.5

**Table A.3:** Relevance of PMR Approach to Capacity Building and the MRP Process

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
Approach to Capacity Building	62.5	25.0	0	0	12.5
MRP Process	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5

**Table A.4:** Relevance of PMR Technical Workshop Attended for Participant's Country and Organization according to Workshop Participants

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
Relevance for Country	56.7	36.7	3.3	0	3.3
Relevance for Organization	40.0	46.7	13.3	0	0

**Table A.5:** Relevance of PMR for Establishment of ICP Legal and Regulatory Frameworks according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Relevant	Substantially Relevant	Modestly Relevant	Negligibly Relevant	Don't Know
Legal Framework	0	37.5	37.5	0	25.0
Regulatory Framework	0	37.5	37.5	0	25.0
GHG Mitigation Standards	0	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5

**Table A.6:** Effectiveness of PMR Support for Establishment/Consolidation of Core Technical Components according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Effective	Substantially Effective	Modestly Effective	Negligibly Effective	Don't Know
MRV System	12.5	50.0	12.5	0	25.0
Registry	0	50.0	12.5	0	37.5
Other Data Management System	0	50.0	0	0	50.0

**Table A.7:** Effectiveness of PMR Support to Date for Establishment/Consolidation of Carbon Pricing and Other Market Instruments for GHG Mitigation according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Effective	Substantially Effective	Modestly Effective	Negligibly Effective	Don't Know
Domestic ETS	12.5	50.0	12.5	0	25.0
Scaled-up ER Crediting Mechanisms	0	50.0	12.5	0	37.5
Carbon Taxes	0	62.5	0	0	37.5
Other Instruments	0	50.0	0	0	50.0

**Table A.8:** Usefulness of Exchange of Knowledge and Experience between CPs and ICPs according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Ratings (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful	Don't Know
Exchange of Knowledge	50.0	37.5	12.5	0	0
Exchange of Experience	50.0	37.5	12.5	0	0

**Table A.9.** Usefulness of Various Elements of PMR Technical Work Program to Date according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful	Don't Know
Technical Notes	25.0	50.0	0	0	25.0
Technical Workshops/Training Events	62.5	25.0	0	0	12.5
Country-to-Country Exchanges	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5

**Table A.10:** Usefulness of Consultant Technical and Operational Advice Provided through PMR according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful	Don't Know
Consultant Technical Advice	25.0	37.5	12.5	0	12.5
Consultant Operational Advice	12.5	37.5	15.0	0	12.5

**Table A.11:** Effectiveness of PA Assembly, Side Events, Technical Workshops, and PMR Website to Date according to ICP Respondents

Item/ Rating (%)	Highly Effective	Substantially Effective	Modestly Effective	Negligibly Effective	Don't Know
Partnership Assembly	62.5	37.5	0	0	0
PA Side Events	37.5	37.5	12.5	0	12.5
Technical Workshops	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
PMR Website	37.5	50.0	0	12.5	0

**Table A.12:** Effectiveness of PMR Support to ICPs on Various Elements to Date according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Effective	Substantially Effective	Modestly Effective	Negligibly Effective	Don't Know
Legal Frameworks	0	0	50.0	16.7	33.3
Regulatory Frameworks	0	16.7	50.0	0	33.3
GHG Mitigation Standards	0	0	50.0	16.7	33.3
MRV Systems	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7
Registries/Tracking Systems	0	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7
Other Data Management Systems	0	0	16.7	16.7	66.7
Domestic ETS	0	16.7	83.3	0	0
Scaled-up ER Crediting Mechanisms	0	0	100.0	0	0
Carbon Taxes	0	0	83.3	16.7	0
Other Instruments	0	0	33.3	0	66.7

**Table A.13:** Effectiveness of PMR Support to ICPs on Various Elements to Date according to PMR Participating Technical Experts

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Effective	Substantially Effective	Modestly Effective	Negligibly Effective	Don't Know
Legal Frameworks	12.5	0	12.5	25.0	50.0
Regulatory Frameworks	12.5	0	37.5	0	50.0
GHG Mitigation Standards	12.5	12.5	25.0	0	50.0
MRV Systems	12.5	50.0	12.5	0	25.0
Registries/Tracking Systems	12.5	37.5	12.5	0	37.5
Other Data Management Systems	0	25.0	12.5	0	62.5
Domestic ETS	12.5	12.5	37.5	0	50.0
Scaled-up ER Crediting Mechanisms	0	12.5	37.5	0	50.0
Carbon Taxes	0	37.5	12.5	0	50.0
Other Instruments	0	25.0	12.5	0	62.5

**Table A.14:** Usefulness of Elements of PMR Technical Work Program and Major PMR Events according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful	Don't Know
Technical Notes/Other Analytical Products	16.7	16.7	50.0	0	16.7
Technical Workshops/Training	0	66.7	16.7	0	16.7
Country-to-Country Exchanges	0	0	33.3	0	66.7
Partnership Assembly	0	50.0	16.7	16.7	16.7
PA Side Events	0	33.3	33.3	0	33.3
PMR Website	0	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7

**Table A.15:** Usefulness of Elements of PMR Technical Work Program according to Participating Technical Experts

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful	Don't Know
Technical Notes/Other Analytical Products	37.5	37.5	0	0	25.0
Technical Workshops/Training	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
Country-to-Country Exchanges	12.5	25.0	0	0	62.5

**Table A.16:** Usefulness of Exchange of Knowledge and Experience according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful
Exchange of Knowledge	16.7	33.3	33.3	16.7
Exchange of Experience	0	50.0	33.3	16.7

**Table A.17:** Usefulness of the Partnership Assembly Meetings, Side Events, Workshops and Website according to PA Observers

Item/Rating (%)	Highly Useful	Substantially Useful	Modestly Useful	Negligibly Useful
Partnership Assembly	50.0	25.0	25.0	0
PA Side Events	50.0	25.0	0	25.0
Technical Workshops and Trainings	75.0	25.0	0	0
PMR Website	75.0	25.0	0	0

**Table A.18:** Quality and Innovativeness of PMR Advice to ICPs according to Participating Technical Experts

Item/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
Technical Quality	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5
Innovativeness	12.5	50.0	25.0	0	12.5

**Table A.19:** Quality of PMR Secretariat's Preparation of PA Meetings to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	83.3	16.7	0	0
ICP Respondents	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
PA Observers	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table A.20:** Quality of PMR Secretariat's Follow-Up to PA Meetings to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	66.7	33.3	0	0
ICP Respondents	37.5	62.5	0	0	0
PA Observers	50.0	0	50.0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table A.21:** Quality of PMR Secretariat's Preparation of PA Side Events to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	83.3	16.7	0	0
ICP Respondents	37.5	50.0	0	0	12.5
PA Observers	75.0	0	25.0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5.6</b>

**Table A.22:** Quality of PMR Secretariat's Follow-Up to PA Side Events to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	33.3	50.0	16.7	0
ICP Respondents	25.0	62.5	0	0	12.5
PA Observers	25.0	25.0	50.0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>5.6</b>

**Table A.23:** Quality of PMR Secretariat’s Preparation of Technical Workshops to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	66.7	16.7	0	16.7
ICP Respondents	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
PA Observers	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5.6</b>

**Table A.24:** Quality of PMR Secretariat’s Follow-Up to Technical Workshops to Date according to Various Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	16.7	66.7	0	16.7
ICP Respondents	25.0	62.5	0	0	12.5
PA Observers	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>38.9</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11.1</b>

**Table A.25:** Extent to which Technical Workshop Content Was Useful and Influenced Participants Professional Work according to Workshop Participants

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Content Useful	39.3	57.1	3.6	0	0
Influenced Professional Work	17.9	50.0	28.6	0	3.6

**Table A.26:** Quality of Technical Workshop and Follow-Up by PMR Secretariat according to Workshop Participants

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
Preparation Quality	57.1	35.7	3.6	0	3.6
Follow-Up Quality	28.6	39.3	21.4	3.6	7.1

**Table A.27:** Quality of Technical Presentations and Discussion in Workshops according to Participants

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
Presentation Quality	46.4	42.9	7.1	0	3.6
Discussion Quality	35.7	46.4	19.7	3.6	3.6

**Table A.28:** Sufficiency of Time Allocated for the Workshops and Quality of Time Management by the Coordination according to Workshop Participants

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
Time Allocated	42.3	38.5	11.5	3.9	3.9
Quality of Time Management	30.8	53.9	11.5	0	3.9

**Table A.29:** Efficiency of PMR Management and Coordination and Provision of Timely and Quality Services by the PMR Secretariat according to ICP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Management of PMR Activities	71.4	28.6	0	0	0
Coordination of PMR Activities	71.4	28.6	0	0	0
Provision of Timely Services	57.1	42.9	0	0	0
Provision of Quality Services	71.4	28.6	0	0	0

**Table A.30:** Efficiency of PMR Management and Coordination and Provision of Timely and Quality Services by the PMR Secretariat according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Management of PMR Activities	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0
Coordination of PMR Activities	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0
Provision of Timely Services	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0
Provision of Quality Services	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0

**Table A.31:** Efficiency of PMR Management and Coordination and Provision of Timely and Quality Services by the PMR Secretariat according to PA Observers

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Management of PMR Activities	50.0	25.0	0	0	25.0
Coordination of PMR Activities	50.0	25.0	0	0	25.0
Provision of Timely Services	50.0	25.0	0	0	25.0
Provision of Quality Services	50.0	25.0	0	0	25.0

**Table A.32:** Efficiency of PMR Management and Coordination and Provision of Timely and Quality Services by the PMR Secretariat according to Technical Experts

Item/Rating	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Management of PMR Activities	50.0	25.0	0	0	25.0
Coordination of PMR Activities	25.0	50.0	0	0	25.0
Provision of Timely Services	25.0	50.0	0	0	25.0
Provision of Quality Services	37.5	37.5	0	0	25.0

**Table A.33:** Efficiency of the PMR Secretariat in terms of Mobilizing Resources and Consultants according to ICP Respondents

Item/Ratings (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Mobilization of Resources	57.1	14.3	28.6	0	0
Mobilization of Consultants	57.1	42.9	0	0	0

**Table A.34:** Efficiency of the PMR Secretariat in terms of Mobilizing Resources and Consultants according to CP Respondents

Item/Ratings (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Mobilization of Resources	0	100.0	0	0	0
Mobilization of Consultants	0	60.0	20.0	0	20.0

**Table A.35:** Efficiency of PMR Secretariat in Contracting Consultants and Its Effectiveness in Matching Their Skills and ICP and Work Program Needs according to Technical Experts

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
Efficiency in Contracting Consultants	62.5	0	12.5	0	25.0
Effectiveness in Matching Skills with ICP Needs	50.0	12.5	0	0	37.5
Effectiveness in Matching Skills with Work Program needs	50.0	12.5	0	0	37.5

**Table A.36:** Extent to which the PMR Secretariat Presently Possesses the Financial Resources to Efficiently Manage the PMR according to Different Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
CP Respondents	40.0	60.0	0	0	0
ICP Respondents	42.8	28.6	14.3	0	14.3
PA Observers	0	25.0	25.0	0	50.0
Technical Experts	37.5	25.0	0	0	37.3
World Bank Staff	25.0	50.0	0	0	25.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25.0</b>

**Table A.37:** Extent to which the PMR Secretariat Presently Possesses the Human Resources to Efficiently Manage the PMR according to Different Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
CP Respondents	40.0	40.0	20.0	0	0
ICP Respondents	42.8	28.9	14.3	0	14.3
PA Observers	50.0	0	25.0	0	25.0
Technical Experts	37.5	25.0	12.5	0	25.0
World Bank Staff	12.5	37.5	25.0	0	25.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>28.1</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18.8</b>

**Table A.38:** Extent to which Combined Use of Expert Reviewers, PA Review and Approval and World Bank Due Diligence Ensures Effective Quality of PMR Projects according to Different Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	60.0	40.0	0	0
ICP Respondents	42.9	57.1	0	0	0
PA Observers	0	25.0	0	0	75.0
World Bank Staff	25.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>4,8</b>	<b>14.3</b>

**Table A.39:** Extent to which Combined Use of Expert Reviewers, PA Review and Approval and World Bank Due Diligence Ensures Efficient Processing of PMR Projects according to Different Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0
ICP Respondents	42.9	57.1	0	0	0
PA Observers	0	25.0	0	0	75.0
World Bank Staff	12.5	12.5	62.5	12.5	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>47.6</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>14.3</b>

**Table A.40:** Extent to which Human and Other Resources Provided by the World Bank were Adequate for Efficient Implementation of PMR Mission in Participating Countries according to ICP Respondents Staff

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Human Resources	71.4	28.6	0	0	0
Other Resources	57.1	28.6	0	0	14.3

**Table A.41:** Extent to which Consultants Hired by the World Bank and/or the country for MRP preparation and by the PMR Secretariat for MRP quality assurance Have Been Used Efficiently according to ICP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
For MRP Preparation	71.4	28.6	0	0	0
For MRP Review	71.4	28.6	0	0	0

**Table A.42:** Extent to which Human and Other Resources Provided by the World Bank were Adequate for Efficient Implementation of PMR Mission in Participating Countries according to Bank Staff

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Not	Don't Know
Human Resources	0	62.5	12.5	0	12.5
Other Resources	0	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5

**Table A.43:** Transparency in the Mobilization of Resources to Date by the PMR Secretariat according to CP and ICP Respondents

Stakeholder Group/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	40.0	40.0	20.0	0
ICP Responders	71.3	14.3	14.3	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table A.44:** Transparency in the Mobilization of Consultants to Date by the PMR Secretariat according to CP and ICP Respondents

Stakeholder Group/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
CP Respondents	71.4	28.6	0	0	0
ICP Respondents	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table A.45:** Extent to which Selection of Consultants Has Been Free of Conflict according to CP and ICP Respondents

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	0	0	20.0	80.0
ICP Respondents	57.1	14.3	0	0	28.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55.5</b>

**Table A.46:** Extent to which Independence of Consultants Is Ensured according to CP and ICP Respondents

Stakeholder Group/ Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
CP Respondents	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0
ICP Respondents	57.1	14.3	0	0	28.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>41.7</b>

**Table A.47:** Extent to which the PA and PMR Secretariat Have Been Transparent in the Allocation of Resources to ICPs according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Not	Don't Know
Partnership Assembly	20.0	40.0	40.0	0	0
PMR Secretariat	0	40.0	20.0	0	0

**Table A.48:** Extent to which the PA and PMR Secretariat Have Been Accountable in the Allocation of Resources to ICPs according to CP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Not	Don't Know
Partnership Assembly	0	40.0	20.0	0	40.0
PMR Secretariat	0	40.0	20.0	0	40.0

**Table A.49:** Extent to which the PMR Secretariat Has Been Transparent in Reporting on Partnership Funding Decisions, and Total and Administrative Costs according to ICP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Not	Don't Know
Funding Decisions	57.1	42.9	0	0	0
Total Costs	42.9	57.1	0	0	0
Administrative Costs	42.9	42.9	14.3	0	0

**Table A.50:** Extent to which the PMR Secretariat Has Been Accountable in Reporting on Partnership Funding Decisions, and Total and Administrative Costs according to ICP Respondents

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Not	Don't Know
Funding Decisions	71.4	14.3	14.3	0	0
Total Costs	71.4	14.3	14.3	0	0
Administrative Costs	57.1	28.6	14.3	0	0

**Table A.51:** Extent to which PMR Governance Structure Has Been Adequate to Date for Delivery of the Partnership's Objectives according to PA Observers

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Partnership Assembly	50.0	0	0	0	50.0
PMR Secretariat	25.0	25.0	0	0	50.0

**Table A.52:** Extent to which PMR Governance Structure Has Been Adequate to Date for Delivery of the Partnership's Objectives according to Technical Experts

Item/Rating (%)	Highly	Substantially	Modestly	Negligibly	Don't Know
Partnership Assembly	12.5	25.0	12.5	0	50.0
PMR Secretariat	25.0	37.5	0	0	37.5

**Table A.53:** Helpfulness of the PMR Secretariat to Date in Providing Technical and Financial Support to their Client Countries according to Delivery Partners

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Not	Don't Know
Technical Support	50.0	37.5	12.5	0	0
Financial Support	37.3	25.0	37.5	0	0

**Table A.54:** Effectiveness of Communications between PMR Secretariat and other World Bank Staff Participating in Partnership Activities according to these Staff

Item/Rating (%)	High	Substantial	Modest	Negligible	Don't Know
Communications with Team	50.0	25.0	25.0	0	0
Communications with Unit	25.0	25.0	50.0	0	0

**Table A.56:** Helpfulness of Various Forms of Communication between PMR Secretariat and other World Bank Staff Participating in Partnership Activities according to these Staff

<b>Item/Rating (%)</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Substantial</b>	<b>Modest</b>	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>Email</b>	25.0	62.5	12.5	0	0
<b>Brown Bag Seminars</b>	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5
<b>PMR Website</b>	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5	0