

PMR First Independent Evaluation: Preliminary Findings

PA 10 Meeting, Santiago, Chile – November 3, 2014

John Redwood III
Development Portfolio Management Group,
University of Southern California

Preliminary Evaluation Findings

- I. Introduction
- II. Relevance
- III. Effectiveness
- IV. Efficiency
- V. Governance and Management
- VI. Conclusion

Introduction

- This is primarily a **learning** rather than an accountability evaluation although there will be elements of both.
- Findings are **preliminary** based on PMR document review, three country case studies (China, Mexico, and Turkey), six surveys with different stakeholder groups, and interviews with PMR Secretariat, some ICPs, CPs and Delivery Partners, to be complemented by further interviews with CPs, ICPs and PA Observers here and later.
- It is **too early** to assess PMR outcomes and impacts since implementation of the vast majority of MRPs has not started; the first evaluation is thus a **formative** one and focuses on use of inputs and generation of initial outputs.
- Survey responses **to date** have been **low**, even though survey responses and evaluation team interviews together covered more than 60 percent of CPs and half of ICPs. However, more data is needed for results to be more fully representative.

Introduction II

- It is also important to recognize that the PMR is a “*moving target*” in that it has undergone some significant changes since the time of its inception in late 2010/early 2011.
- Both the way the PMR’s objectives have been expressed and its scope have clearly evolved during the past three and a half years, reflecting considerable flexibility.
- This is understandable given the dynamic and uncertain global policy environment in which the PMR is operating.
- But it is also significant *from an evaluation perspective*, as the PMR’s performance and results need to be assessed in relation to its declared (and PA endorsed) objectives and how they have evolved over time.

Relevance

Relevance = the extent to which PMR's objectives and activities are suited to the policies and priorities of its participants and, since it is a **global program**, meet the identified needs of the international community more generally with respect to market readiness and the use of carbon pricing and other market-based instruments.

Perspectives:

- *Supply-side relevance*
- *Demand-side relevance*
- *Horizontal relevance*
- *Vertical relevance*
- *Relevance of PMR design*

Supply-side Relevance

Is there an international consensus that a global initiative such as the PMR is needed?

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

Survey responses from different stakeholder groups suggest the PMR is relevant in this regard.

Demand-side Relevance

Do the participating implementing countries (ICPs) agree that an initiative such as the PMR is relevant in terms of their own national priorities and needs?

- The field interviews (China, Mexico, Turkey, and Vietnam) and survey results strongly suggest that this is indeed the case.
- Among the ICP representatives that have responded to the survey to date, 37.5% indicated that the PMR was “highly relevant” in terms of their own priorities and needs with respect to market readiness and 62.5% stated that it was “substantially relevant.”

Horizontal Relevance

Does the PMR provide services that are unavailable from other sources or in other significant ways differs from them?

- Comparison with two other UN programs (UNDP's LECB and UNEP's FIRM) that also provide capacity building support for GHG mitigation indicates that, while there are some important similarities and a number of overlaps in terms of participating countries, the PMR's resources are much greater and its set of participants, including CPs as well as ICPs, is much larger.
- In addition, it is a Partnership rather than a program, with different governance/decision-making arrangements, which makes it unique in comparison with other multilateral service providers in this field.

Vertical Relevance

Is the PMR relevant at different levels of global governance – international, national, and subnational?

- As a global partnership involving the most important – and GHG emitting – countries in the world, PMR is clearly relevant at the international level.
- Through the MRPs, PMR will support many important ICPs (and Technical Partners). There are also likely to be benefits at the national level to PMR involvement for many CPs as well.
- In addition, at least some MRPs (e.g., China, Mexico) will entail actions at the subnational level, thus also including state/provincial and municipal governments and the private sector in their implementation.

Relevance of Design

Does PMR's design – i.e., its planned inputs and activities -- seem likely *a priori* to be able to achieve its declared objectives and, thus, to generate its desired outputs, outcomes, and impacts?

- The PMR has the potential to provide the types of financial, technical and institutional support needed by ICPs to build and/or strengthen their market readiness capacity -- although other resources will also be needed -- as well as to help CPs to refine and consolidate their capacity in this regard.
- However, the ultimate outcome in terms of the use of carbon pricing and other market-based instruments for GHG mitigation will depend on other factors as well – the global policy environment and political will at the national level, being among the most important – which go beyond the control of the PMR, although it can also potentially have a positive influence.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness = the extent to which the PMR has achieved -- or appears likely to achieve -- its declared objectives.

- Country case studies, survey results and interviews indicate that PMR effectiveness has been mixed to date.
- As noted, it is still too early to assess outcomes and impacts, but use of inputs appears to have been generally effective (and appreciated) to date in terms of information exchange and support for MRP preparation.
- However, only three grant agreements have been signed thus far despite a much larger number of PA approvals, so MRP implementation is just now starting to get off the ground.
- In general, ICPs have a more positive view than CPs in this regard.

Effectiveness II

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

Effectiveness III

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

Efficiency

Efficiency = the extent to which PMR inputs have been used to produce outputs in a timely and cost-effective way, and how well has the PMR used its resources more generally.

- PMR has substantially exceeded its initial target in terms of resource mobilization, incorporated more ICPs and established a new category of participants (Technical Partners).
- PMR Secretariat has managed its PA-approved budget well through FY 14, but FY 15 will present new challenges due to initiation of a new “work stream.”
- Those surveyed regard the Secretariat as generally quite efficient in terms of the services it has provided to date, but again there appear to be somewhat different perceptions by ICPs and by CPs.

Efficiency II

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

Governance & Management

The PA, Secretariat and Delivery Partner(s) constitute the principal elements of PMR governance and management.

- Initial findings suggest that these arrangements are generally working well, although there is also room for improvement.
- Survey results indicate a concern on the part of some CP and ICP respondents with the transparency of the Secretariat regarding resource mobilization and consultant selection.
- Survey results also suggest that the PMR's knowledge sharing and management activities could be strengthened as could communication between the Secretariat and Delivery Partner operational units.

Governance & Management II

Transparency in the Mobilization of Resources to Date by the PMR Secretariat according the 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
Total	41.7	25.0	25.0	8.3	0

Governance & Management III

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
Total	41.7	25.0	8.3	25.0	0

Conclusion

It is important to reiterate that, pending further stakeholder interviews and (hopefully) additional responses to the surveys from CPs and ICPs, the findings reported here are ***preliminary*** and thus subject to change.

For the same reasons, ***no firm conclusions or recommendations can be presented at this stage.***

Feedback on the present report is greatly welcomed and will provide ***additional inputs*** for the first independent evaluation of the PMR.

A draft of the first evaluation report will be presented to the EWG for review ***before the end of the year*** and the revised version to the full PA in ***early 2015***.

Thank You!

Jredwood3@gmail.com