

Minutes of Project Board Meeting
Held on
October 12, 2012 at 10:00 a.m.
Clement Jackson Meeting Room
Planning Institute of Jamaica

Present were:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart -
{Chair} | - | External Cooperation Management Division PIOJ |
| Mr. Easton Williams | - | Director, Social Policy, Planning and Research Division, PIOJ |
| Ms. Keisha Livermore | - | Head of Office, IOM Kingston |
| Mr. Glen Smith | - | National Programme Office, UNFPA |
| Mrs. Toni-Shae Freckleton | - | Manager, Population & Health Unit, SPPRD, PIOJ |
| Ms. Sonia Gill | - | Assistant Resident Representative & Governance Advisor, UNDP |
| Ms. Itziar Gonzalez | - | Governance Programme Analyst, UNDP |

Secretariat:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Ms. Chadine Allen | - | Project Manager, Migration Policy Project Unit |
| Mrs. Rukiya Brown | - | Project Associate, Migration Policy Project Unit |

Apologies for Absence:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Ms. Marlene Lamonth | - | Project Manager, EU Delegation |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. by Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart, Project Board Chair.

2. Prayer

Prayer was offered by Ms. Chadine Allen

3. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart welcomed the Project Board members to the meeting.

4. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were tendered on behalf of Mrs Marlene Lamonth.

5. Confirmation of Minutes of July 27, 2012

The minutes were confirmed by Mrs. Toni-Shae Freckleton and seconded by Ms. Itziar Gonzalez.

6. Matters Arising

a) Update on National Consultations

Ms. Allen advised that during the quarter six (6) consultations were held in four regions, namely: Kingston, Mandeville, St Ann and Montego Bay. Approximately 330 persons participated in the consultations and six international experts provided technical expertise. She indicated that the consultations held outside of Kingston followed a particular format and participants deliberated on policy issues across the eight thematic areas of the Draft Policy on International Migration and Development. Ms. Allen noted that there were three (3) consultations in Kingston and St Andrew where specific thematic areas were grouped together and deliberated on. For instance the first consultation in Kingston and St Andrew focussed on Data, Research and Information Systems; Return and Reintegration; and Labour Mobility and Development.

i. Main Points

Ms. Allen noted that the recurrent query throughout the consultations related to how the Jamaican Diaspora would be engaged in the policy development process. She also advised that suggestions were made to incorporate a foreign policy thrust as well as health and migration into the Policy. Ms. Allen indicated that many of the issues raised during the consultations did not differ substantially from those identified in the deliberations of the sub-committees. She further noted that the main outcome from the consultations was that input/feedback was obtained on the Policy from other key stakeholders and the general public.

ii. Feedback from International Experts

The Project Board was advised that a meeting was held with the international experts on September 26, 2012 where their feedback on the draft Policy was discussed. Ms. Allen further advised that the main suggestion made was that the Policy should be a strategic document which should be concise, succinct with clear language. They also recommended that the Plan of Action should be a separate document focussing on specific actions. Ms. Allen indicated that the international experts would be submitting their written feedback on the Policy to the MPU.

b) Launch of Extended Migration Profile

Ms. Livermore advised that the Migration Profile was successfully launched on September 4, 2012 and was well attended by local stakeholder as well as members from the local international development partners community. She noted that over 60 persons attended which was more than expected. Ms. Gill noted that there was much visibility for the event in the national print and broadcast media, especially of the lead consultant, Prof. Thomas-Hope's keynote address. Ms. Allen also indicated that three (3) radio interviews were held in the lead up to the launch. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether the main objective of the launch was to publicise the document. Ms. Livermore responded that in line with Jamaica's 50th year of independence it was believed that the development of the first Migration Profile for the Caribbean region was a great achievement. She noted that the launch was also an opportunity to inform the public of the upcoming Policy and Plan of Action.

c) Update on ToRs

Ms. Allen noted that at the last Project Board meeting it was discussed that the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the upcoming consultancies would be drafted during the quarter. The ToRs were for the consultancies to develop the Implementation Plan, Capacity Development Strategy and Monitoring and Evaluation framework. She further noted that during the meeting it was agreed that the ToRs would have been circulated for the Project Board members' feedback/approval to start the recruitment process at the beginning of the current quarter. Ms. Allen advised however, that the MPU was not able to complete the drafting of the ToRs or advertise the positions. She indicated that this delay was partly due to recognising that in drafting the ToRs there were areas where the MPU needed to collaborate with other departments within the PIOJ. She noted that during the month of August, 2012 it was particularly difficult to meet with or contact the various departments due to the relevant persons being on vacation leave. In addition to this, Ms. Allen advised that during the month of August the MPU was busy planning a number of events and activities as well as reviewing deliverables submitted by the Policy Development Consultant.

Ms. Allen advised that the MPU recognised that the activity to recruit the consultants was set back by approximately three weeks. She noted that the MPU had developed a strategy to mitigate against further delays. Ms. Allen indicated that in preparing the draft ToRs it was recognised that the areas were related. She noted that due to this, the MPU was proposing that the three (3) consultancies be merged into one. Ms. Allen further advised that the proposal was to recruit a Consultancy Team to conduct the merged consultancy. She indicated that the MPU believed that the proposal, if approved, would ensure that the original timelines were met. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that the individual ToRs and a merged ToR had been circulated. She requested that the Project Board members submit their feedback and advise whether they approve of merging the ToR by close of business on October 16, 2012. Ms. Allen advised that the MPU had identified a number of Consultancy Teams that appeared to have the capacity to undertake the assignment. She further advised that if a Consultancy Team was recruited then it would be expected to complete the assignment by February 2013. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether any of the Project Board members wished to respond to the MPU's proposal. Mr. Smith responded that he believed the proposal was a good suggestion as there would be obvious links between the activities and deliverables. He recommended that in identifying a consultancy team it would be prudent to request the curriculum vitae's of the team members.

d) Update on Communication Plan

Ms. Allen updated the meeting on the possible development of a communication strategy. She advised that at the last meeting suggestions were made to contact the University of Technology (UTECH) or CARIMAC at the University of the West Indies (UWI) to request possible assistance from students with development of the strategy. This was specifically to target students who were undertaking a communications programme with a requirement to develop a communication plan as part of their course. Ms. Allen advised that she had contacted UTECH and the director for the programme there advised that they were unable to develop a communications plan. She further advised that she had also contacted CARIMAC but was awaiting a response. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried what the next step would be if CARIMAC were unable to assist. Mrs Freckleton advised that

the Policy Development Consultant had submitted a communications plan for the policy. She suggested that Ms. Gill could perhaps assist with reviewing the document since she had expertise in the area of communications. Mrs. Freckleton also advised that in the event that there was a follow-up project the development of a communications strategy would be included.

e) Update on MIEUX II

The meeting was updated on the request for technical assistance submitted under the Migration EU Expertise (MIEUX) II initiative. Ms. Allen advised that MIEUX II was of the opinion that the technical assistance requested was already adequately covered under the various project activities. She noted that it advised that an application could be resubmitted for areas where no funding had been identified. Ms. Livermore queried whether the MIEUX II application submitted was for technical expertise. Mrs. Freckleton stated that the submission requested technical expertise because this was what MIEUX II covered. She advised that their issue was that the EU was a part of the Migration Profile process as well as involved with the Global Migration Group. Therefore, they were of the opinion that it would perhaps seem as though the assistance through MIEUX II would be duplicating efforts. She noted that they would prefer that an application for assistance be submitted once the current project was completed.

7. New Business

a) Next phase of consultations

Ms. Allen advised that the MPU was in the process of organising sub-committee workshops to enable members to review the draft Policy submitted. The workshops were scheduled for October 13 to October 31, 2012. She further advised that during the first phase of consultations there were a number of specialized groups which the MPU did not get to engage. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that consultations would be held with children and youth groups, immigration lawyers and the diplomatic corps.

b) Arrangements for Contracts for MPU staff

Mrs. Freckleton advised that initially when the project started in 2011 the MPU was comprised of only two members of staff; the Project Manager and Project Associate. These staff members were given full-time IOM contracts. However, 50% of the Project Associate's salary was reimbursed to IOM through UNDP/GMG funds. Mrs. Freckleton noted that the IOM contracts ended on September 30, 2012 which meant that the staff members would be fully paid from UNDP/GMG funds and given PIOJ contracts. She advised however that the arrangement for the Project Associate was similar to the original agreement, where they would be given an IOM contract. However, she also noted that the Project Associate would be part-time at PIOJ and part-time at IOM. Therefore the Project Associate's salary would be 50% of what was originally budgeted.

Mrs. Freckleton informed the meeting that the PIOJ had assessed the performance of the interns assigned to the MPU and made the decision to contract two of the interns up to the end of March 2013. She advised that the other 50% allocated from UNDP funds for the Project Associate would be used to cover the salary for one of the additional staff members. Therefore two part-time Project Associates

would be paid from UNDP funds. The other person contracted would be paid from GOJ counterpart funds and will be Research Assistant for the MPU. Mrs. Freckleton advised that a copy of the contracts of the project staff paid from UNDP funds would be sent to UNDP. Ms. Gill noted that the quarterly work plan and budget would need to reflect that the MPU now had two part-time Project Associates.

c) Quarterly Progress Report July - September 2012

Ms. Allen indicated that the main points from the quarterly progress report had been discussed. She noted that one of the main challenges during the quarter related to the quality of work submitted by the Policy Development Consultant. However, Ms. Allen advised that the MPU had taken measures to try to improve the quality of work submitted.

Ms. Gill advised that it was important when preparing the progress report to report against the targets in terms of measurable progress. She noted that whilst the funds allocated may not have been spent; if the targets were achieved then it demonstrates that the work was still being done. Ms. Gill further noted that this was important to ensure that the donors did not review the delivery rate in the reports and conclude that the project was not performing. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart advised that the progress report would be revised based on the feedback submitted by the Project Board members. Ms. Gill queried whether the progress report was approved. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart indicated that the report was approved subject to the revisions being incorporated. It was agreed that the revised quarterly progress report would be circulated by October 17, 2012.

8. Any Other Business

Mrs. Freckleton advised that the MPU had a de-briefing meeting with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade (MFAFT) on October 10, 2012. She noted that the meeting identified that a drafting committee should be established to review and revise the Policy to ensure that it is written in line with government requirements. Mrs. Freckleton indicated that although the deadline for the Final Policy was November, 2012, there would be government procedures that should be followed prior to Cabinet submission. She further indicated that this process should be completed by March 2013. Ms. Gill advised that since the end date of the project was March 31, 2013, this would require the project operations to end in February 2013 in preparation for the wind up activities which should be completed before the end of March 2013. These activities would include auditing and project evaluation.

Ms. Livermore queried who the drafting committee would be comprised of, when the committee would be established, and for how long it would be operational. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the PIOJ and MFAFT would be discussing the composition of the committee in the coming weeks. She indicated that they would ensure that sub-committee members would not sit on the drafting committee. She also advised that the committee would not convene until the revised draft of the Policy had been submitted by the consultant. Mr. Williams recommended that the Policy Development Consultant sit on the drafting committee. He noted that the committee should not be independent outside of the consultancy and should comprise of both technical and literary experts. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart agreed that the consultant should be involved in the drafting committee process. Ms. Livermore suggested that an addendum be added to the consultant's contract to include the requirement for him to sit on the drafting committee.

Ms. Gill queried what was the status of the first draft of the policy submitted, because UNDP had already shared the document with the donors. She noted that it was their intention to use it at the GFMD Conference in Mauritius scheduled for November 2012. The Project Board members agreed that the draft policy should not be shared in Mauritius. Ms. Gill indicated that she would contact the donors and advise that it was a preliminary draft and should not be used in Mauritius.

Mr. Smith queried whether a committee would be established or the NWGIMD would review the plan of action. Ms. Livermore queried whether the same drafting committee reviewing the Policy would review the Plan of Action. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the Plan of Action would not be reviewed by the drafting committee, as it would include more specific details and would require more technical input. Ms. Livermore suggested that the international experts also be asked to review and provide feedback on the Plan of Action based on their area of expertise. Mr. Williams recommended that the sub-committees also review the specific thematic areas included in the Plan of Action.

Ms. Gill informed the meeting that as part of the UNDP's standard monitoring process they would be visiting the MPU in November to assess the project's compliance with UNDP regulations. She advised that the MPU would be sent correspondence regarding the visit and would be given a minimum of 10 working days' notice. Ms. Gill further advised that the results of the monitoring visit would be shared with the implementing partner.

Mrs. Freckleton noted that the PIOJ was contacted by UNDP headquarters to advise of a proposed phase two for the GMG project. She advised that the phase two would be for a period of two to three years and would include countries other than the pilot countries. However, UNDP advised that pilot countries that have made good progress during the first phase may be included in the phase two.

a) Approval and Signing of Workplan October 1– December 31, 2012

Ms. Livermore advised that she would provide the MPU with updated figures for the IOM component. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether the International Experts would be travelling to Jamaica during the quarter as indicated in the Quarterly Work Plan (QWP). Mrs. Freckleton responded that these funds would be utilised to cover the costs related to engaging an International Expert who would develop a Diaspora Policy. She reminded the meeting of the discussions at the last Project Board meeting where they were advised that once the National Policy on International Migration and Development was completed a specific policy related to Diaspora would be developed. Mrs. Freckleton noted that at the time an International Expert for Diaspora was not identified. She advised that the PIOJ and MFAFT had since identified an International Expert. However, Mrs. Freckleton indicated that the expert would need to be given an honorarium as well as their travel expenses covered. She therefore advised that the MPU was requesting the approval of the Project Board to use US\$6,000 of the funds originally allocated for travel for the International Expert. This would be reflected under a line item for a Consultant on the QWP. The Project Board granted their approval. However, Ms. Gill recommended that the development be included in the Quarterly Progress Report to support the revision to be made in the QWP.

Ms. Gill suggested that the MPU circulate the revised QWP for October 1 to December 31, 2012, prior to the Project Board granting approval. The Project Board agreed and it was decided that the revised QWP would be sent via email for their approval.

Ms. Gill noted that during the last quarter only US\$18,000 of UNDP project funds was expended which was just a slight increase over the previous quarter's delivery rate. She noted that the current proposed QWP indicated that over US\$100,000 would be expended during the quarter. Ms. Gill queried what measures had been taken by the MPU to ensure the increase in expenditure. Ms. Livermore noted that the amount included IOM funds which had already been committed for final payments to the Policy Development Consultant at US\$30,000 as well as US\$8,000 for workshops. Mrs. Brown noted that if the decision was made to merge the three (3) upcoming consultancies then this would mean that the QWP would be revised to reflect the merger. She further noted that the amounts budgeted for the quarter would probably be reduced if a team of consultants was hired to conduct the assignment.

9. Adjournment

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart thanked the Project Board members for their input. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Action Sheet

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. Revise Quarterly Work Plan; October 1 – December 31, 2012	MPU
2. Advise GMG not to use the draft policy at the GFMD Conference in Mauritius	UNDP
3. Revise Quarterly Progress Report for July 1 – September 30, 2012	MPU
4. Circulate merged ToR for the consultancy to develop an implementation plan, capacity development strategy and monitoring and evaluation framework	MPU