

**Minutes of Project Board Meeting  
Held on  
November 17, 2011 at 2 p.m.  
Hibiscus Training Room  
Planning Institute of Jamaica**

---

**Present were:**

Mrs. Andrea Shepherd Stewart -External Cooperation Management Division PIOJ  
{Chair}

Easton Williams - Director (Actg) SPPRD, PIOJ  
Keisha Livermore - Head of Office, IOM Kingston  
Glen Smith - National Programme Officer, UNFPA  
Itziar Gonzalez - Governance Programme Analyst, UNDP  
Toni-Shae Freckleton - Manager (Actg), Population & Health Unit, SPPRD, PIOJ

**Secretariat:**

Chadine Allen - Project Manager, Migration Policy Project Unit (MPU)  
Rukiya Brown - Administrative Assistant/Project Associate, Migration Policy Project Unit (MPU)

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 2.10 p.m. by Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart, Chair.

**2. Prayer**

Prayer was offered by Ms. Allen.

**3. Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart introduced herself and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She made a slight adjustment to the Agenda placing the discussion on the Quarterly Progress Report July – September and then ‘Challenges during the quarter’ directly after the ‘Apologies for absence’.

**4. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were tendered on behalf of Ms. Sonia Gill, UNDP and Ms. Marlene Lamonth, Delegation of the European Union to Jamaica

## **5. Items to be Discussed**

- **Summary discussion of the Quarterly Progress Report July - September**

Ms. Allen informed the meeting of some of the highlights for the Quarter July 1 to September 30 which were included in the Quarterly Progress Report. She noted that during the quarter a meeting of the National Working Group for International Migration and Development was held, and the Consultant to develop the Migration Profile was recruited. Ms. Allen advised that the Situational Analysis had been merged with the Migration Profile and this began in September. She further advised that the Migration Project Unit (MPU) during the quarter, had also revised the Migration Profile Terms of Reference (TOR) due to a number of concerns raised by the Consultant. Ms. Allen noted that another highlight was the development TORs for the Sub-Committees, International Consultants and the Consultant to develop the National Policy on International Migration and Development.

- **Updates**

- a) **Challenges during the quarter**

- i. **Operational Modality**

Ms. Allen advised that the MPU had encountered a number of challenges during the quarter. She noted that one major challenge that affected the activities during the quarter was the delay in receiving the GMG project funds from UNDP. She further informed the meeting that the MPU received a letter on September 21, 2011 from UNDP Bureau for Policy Development (BDP), New York proposing a change in the operational modality of the project. The proposal was for UNDP BDP, New York instead of UNDP Country Office (CO) Jamaica to directly transfer funds to the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) in order to expedite the process of transferring project funds for quarters 3 and 4. Ms. Allen noted that the change in operational modalities meant that new requirements were stipulated by UNDP BDP, New York. A substantial amount of time was spent by the MPU revising the GMG Project Document, Annual and Quarterly Work Plans and the Letter of Agreement.

Ms. Allen indicated that the delay in receiving project funds has had implications on the planned project activities, including the recruitment of International Consultants to give technical expertise to the Sub-Committees which was scheduled to begin during quarter 2. She noted that this has now been pushed back to quarter 4 due to the MPU not having the requisite funding to undertake the activity. Ms. Allen also noted that the Project Associate's salary was another major implication due to the delay in the transfer of project funds. She informed the meeting that the PIOJ and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) have an agreement that IOM would pay the Project

Associate's full-time salary and 50 % would be reimbursed by PIOJ through GMG project funds. Ms. Allen advised that PIOJ has been unable to reimburse IOM for the 3 months' salary paid to the Project Associate so far, due to the lack of project funds disbursed.

## **ii. Extended Migration Profile Consultancy**

Ms. Allen informed the meeting that during the quarter, the MPU held several meetings with the lead consultant developing the Migration Profile. She noted that the PIOJ and IOM had made the decision in July to merge the Situational Analysis and the Migration Profile (MP). This decision was made based on the fact that elements of the Situational Analysis would be covered in the Migration Profile. Ms. Allen advised that as a result, the Terms of References (TORs) for the Situational Analysis and MP had to be merged. She further advised that the MPU had extensive dialogue with the lead consultant, Prof. Elizabeth Thomas-Hope in terms of the timeframe that the MP could be completed based on the requirements outlined in the TOR. Ms. Allen noted that due to revisions made to the MP TOR to incorporate elements from the Situational Analysis and thus requiring additional work, the lead consultant had negotiated an increase in remuneration to enable her to get a team of consultants to assist with conducting the study. She advised that the lead consultant had expressed concern that aspects of the scope of work were too ambitious for the timeframe stipulated. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that the PIOJ and IOM decided that the areas of the Situational Analysis that could not be addressed in the MP would be incorporated into the policy development phase of the project. This was corroborated by Ms. Keisha Livermore. Ms. Allen noted that the PIOJ remained concerned about the results to be yielded from the MP in relation to the elements of the Situational Analysis that were expected to be covered. She further noted that the lead consultant had advised in the Implementation Plan (first deliverable) submitted, that the nexus between Migration and Development was complex and could only be assessed in a limited way in the Migration Profile.

Ms. Allen advised that a strategic meeting between PIOJ and IOM would be held the following day to revise the list of sub-themes proposed by the Migration Profile consultant, as well as to discuss/reevaluate the way forward for the remainder of the project.

Mr. Williams noted that one of the major concerns for him related to the actual output of the Migration Profile. He further noted that based on how things were proceeding, he was not satisfied that the Migration Profile consultant team were equipped to conduct the consultancy based on PIOJ's expectations.

Ms. Livermore in response to the concerns raised informed the meeting that she and Ms. Tamara Keating from IOM, Brussels, received an email from the Migration Profile consultant advising that while she can provide an analysis on migration and development, she is hesitant to evaluate the impact in the framework of the study. She advised that this email was forwarded to Mr. Frank Laczko, the Head of Migration and Development and Research at IOM, Brussels.

Ms. Livermore noted that in response to the email, Mr. Laczko advised that the concerns the consultant raised often happens as MP's tend to be descriptive. He also noted that IOM is in the process of working on a new Migration Profile template. Ms. Livermore further noted that IOM colleagues have advised that in the interim an impact study could perhaps be conducted simultaneously with the Migration Profile. Mr. Williams noted that impact studies are difficult to carry out. Ms. Livermore agreed and noted that Ms. Keating had advised that they take a lot of time and money. However, she informed the meeting that both Ms. Keating and Mr. Laczko suggested that the 'Development on the Move' study could be used as a background for the impact study. Mr. Williams noted that PIOJ had a lot of background information that could be utilized. He further advised that he was concerned that once the policy development phase begins, the amount of work to be done in the set time-frame would be too much. However, Ms. Livermore noted that since a number of International Experts would be recruited this should make the process of developing the policy much easier.

Mrs. Freckleton informed the meeting that PIOJ with the approval of IOM Kingston, have proposed for a separate Situational Analysis to be conducted using the original IOM 1035 funds allocated for the study. She advised that the Situational Analysis will now be conducted during the policy development phase. Mrs. Freckleton noted that this decision was made because the PIOJ do not feel comfortable that what was expected from the Situational Analysis will be fully addressed in the Migration Profile.

#### **b) Development of a Stakeholder Communications Strategy**

Ms. Allen informed the meeting that based on recommendations from the NWGIMD, the MPU have decided that the development of a Communications Strategy for the project, may be necessary for public sensitization of the policy as it is being developed. She noted that a Communications Specialist would need to be recruited for approximately 20 working days to develop the communications strategy. Ms. Allen advised that the MPU suggest reallocating funding from other planned activities to cover the related costs.

#### **• Project Extension**

Ms. Allen advised the meeting that the MPU believes that the challenges related to revising the TOR for the Migration Profile, and the delay in receiving GMG projects funds, may affect the end date of the project. She noted that the MPU may have to request a 3 month extension of the project, due to the fact that the transfer of funds for the GMG component was severely delayed and this has affected the commencement of planned activities. Ms. Allen further advised that the Migration Profile was set to start in July, but due to on-going dialogue with the consultant regarding revisions to the TOR, the Migration Profile study did not commence until September. She noted that upon the completion of the Migration Profile there will approximately 6 -7 months remaining to develop the policy. The Migration Profile consultant has advised that the link between Migration and Development is complex and cannot be fully covered in the Migration Profile. Ms. Allen noted that the development of the policy will be more complex than initially thought, and may therefore require additional time.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether an estimate can be given on the additional amount of time needed to develop the policy. Ms. Allen responded that during discussions with Mr. Easton Williams, he

advised that the policy development phase could take approximately 12 months. However, she also noted that the Migration Profile will be beneficial to the policy development phase, and may therefore reduce the 12 month timeframe. Mr. Williams noted that the development of the policy will require a number of consultations and refining, as well as some of the issues to be addressed being controversial. Ms. Keisha Livermore noted that the policy development consultant will not be doing all of the work, since other consultants will be recruited. She queried whether this would help to reduce the timeframe estimated. Ms. Livermore advised that from an IOM perspective she is unsure of the possibility for an extension as the projects funds are coming from the IOM 1035 facility. She noted that normally projects with funding from the 1035 facility take 12 months, whilst funds for this project were granted based on an 18 month timeframe. Therefore, Ms. Livermore noted she was unsure whether it would be possible to now extend the project beyond 18 months to 21 months. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart requested that Ms. Livermore enquire whether a time extension on the project will be possible. Ms. Livermore advised that if she requests a project extension from IOM Headquarters, it will have to be proven to them that separate from the consultancies other activities are being conducted.

Mr. Glen Smith queried whether in order to reduce time, there could be an overlap of the consultancies to be conducted after the Migration Profile has been developed. Ms. Allen advised that there is already an overlap between consultancies based on the current Annual work plans. She further noted that based on the MPU's experience with recruiting the Migration Profile consultant, it seems that the dialogue regarding the expectations of the consultancy is time consuming.

Ms. Itziar Gonzalez enquired whether the request for an extension would have any implication on the funding. Ms. Allen responded that the project extension would require no additional funding as the MPU have reallocated funds and reduced the budget for certain activities. She noted that the changes have been reflected in an Alternative Annual Workplan prepared by the MPU. Ms. Gonzalez recommended that UNDP Headquarters be advised as soon as possible of the proposed 3 month project extension with no additional funding. She advised that they do realise that there was a big challenge in project implementation due to the delay in the transfer of project funds. Ms. Gonzalez further advised that the formal process was for the PIOJ to write to UNDP Country Office and they would then forward the request to Headquarters. She further advised that the project extension request would have to be approved by the Project Board, and the Project Board Minutes should be attached to the letter.

- **Review Alternate Annual Workplan**

Ms. Allen advised that once the national consultations commence, the MPU believe that it will be necessary to procure a laptop and projector for the project. She noted that the MPU were currently using equipment provided by the Information Systems Unit (ISU) at PIOJ. However, she advised that as the national consultations will be outside of the PIOJ, the MPU will either have to consider rental or procurement of equipment. Ms. Allen noted that the MPU suggests that the laptop and projector be purchased, as it will be more cost effective than rental over the lifespan of the project.

Ms. Allen informed the meeting that the MPU had prepared an Alternative Annual Workplan for 2011 and 2012 based on the original approved funding, but reflecting a project extension of 3 months. She noted that this was done by reducing and reallocating funds between various activities. Ms. Gonzalez noted that because the project was originally scheduled to end December 2012, the proposed 3 month project extension means that the project would end March 2013. She recommended that the MPU also prepare an Annual Workplan for 2013 to reflect the proposed 2013 project end date.

- **Review TOR for Sub-committees, International Experts and Consultant to develop the policy**

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart informed the meeting that Terms of References (TORs) had been developed for the Sub-committees, International experts, and the Consultant to develop the National Policy. She asked Ms. Allen to give an update on the status of the TORs. Ms. Allen advised that based on the original Annual Workplan, a consultant was to be recruited to develop the TOR for the sub-committees, however, based on the fact that GMG project funds had not been received, the MPU decided to draft the TOR. She also noted that the drafting of the TOR's for the International Experts and the Consultant to develop the National Policy had just been completed. Ms. Allen suggested that she send the electronic copy of the TOR's to the Project Board for them to review and submit feedback by November 22, 2011. Mrs. Freckleton advised that ideally they require this feedback so this can be incorporated into the revised TOR's so they can be circulated to the NWGIMD during the meeting scheduled for November 24, 2011.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether a TOR had been developed for the proposed Communications Specialist. Ms. Allen responded that this TOR had not yet been drafted. Mrs. Freckleton asked Ms. Gonzalez and Mr. Smith whether UNDP or UNFPA had an existing TOR or an example of a communications strategy that could be shared with the MPU. Ms. Gonzalez advised that UNDP had hired a consultant in 2010 to develop a Communications Strategy and recommended that she would share the TOR for the consultant with the MPU.

## **6. Approval and Signing of Quarterly Work Plan**

The Project Board approved the Quarterly Workplan (QWP) for October 1 to December 31, 2011, and the project tolerance was set at 20%. The QWP was signed by Mr. Williams and Ms. Gonzalez.

Ms. Gonzalez noted that the QWP presented in the meeting was different from the one included in the UNDP Quarterly Progress Report for July 1 to September 30, 2011. Mrs. Rukiya Brown advised that the QWP presented during the meeting was an integrated QWP which included all three Migration Projects, whilst the QWP in the UNDP Quarterly Progress Report related to the UNDP budget only. Ms. Gonzalez recommended that the integrated QWP be included in the progress report to reflect the project in its entirety.


## **7. The Way Forward**

Mrs. Freckleton advised the meeting that a request was made to UNFPA for funding support for a Project Documentalist/Coordinator. She noted that it was discussed during the last Project Board meeting that there was a need for at least one additional person to support the work of the MPU. She asked Mr. Smith for an update on the status of the request. Mr. Smith responded that he had submitted the request. He advised that one of the concerns of UNFPA was that although they have a representative on the Project Board, they also want to document the entire process of the project so that other countries can benefit from this information. Mr. Smith advised that he would follow up on the request.

**8. Adjournment**

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart thanked the Project Board members for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 3.20 p.m.

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. Revise Alternative Annual Workplans to include Annual Workplan for 2013	MPU
2. Prepare formal letter requesting project extension	MPU
3. Revise UNDP Quarterly Progress Report	MPU
4. Email TOR's for Sub-Committee's, International Experts and Consultant to Develop National Policy to Project Board for their feedback by November 22, 2011	MPU
5. Send sample UNDP TOR for Communications Strategy Consultant	Ms. Itziar Gonzalez (UNDP)
6. Follow up on status of request made to UNFPA for funding for a Project Documentalist/Coordinator	Mr. Glen Smith (UNFPA)
7. Check with IOM Headquarters whether a time extension for the project is possible.	Ms. Keisha Livermore (IOM)

*EMERSON WILLIAMS*  
  
*12/2/12*