

Minutes of Project Board Meeting
Held on
July 27, 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 (Actg) SPPRD, PIOJ
Ms. Keisha Livermore	-	Head of Office, IOM Kingston
Ms. Marlene Lamonth	-	Project Manager, EU
Mr. Glen Smith	-	National Programme Office, UNFPA
Mrs. Toni-Shae Freckleton	-	Manager (Actg), Population & Health Unit, SPPRD, PIOJ
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

1. Call to Order

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

- Ms. Sonia Gill, UNDP

5. Confirmation of Minutes of April 10, 2012

The minutes were confirmed by Ms. Keisha Livermore and seconded by Mrs. Toni-Shae Freckleton, subject to the following correction:

- Page 1 - Remove Ms. Marlene Lamonth from the list of persons present

6. Matters Arising

a) Update on Policy Development Consultancy

Ms. Chadine Allen updated the meeting on the Policy Development Consultancy. She advised that the Policy Development Consultant had submitted four deliverables including the Implementation Plan, draft Policy Principles, Situational and SWOT Analyses. Ms. Allen advised that the draft Policy Principles and Situational and SWOT analyses had been reviewed by the internal team. She noted that feedback on the documents had been sent to the Consultant for him to incorporate into the revised drafts. She informed the meeting that for the third quarter three deliverables should be submitted. This included the Policy Goal Statements and Objectives which should have been submitted on July 17, 2012 but was slightly delayed due to the Consultant needing more time to incorporate the sub-committee members' feedback. Ms. Allen also advised that the first draft of the Policy and Plan of Action was due to be submitted on August 30, 2012 and the final draft on September 30, 2012. Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart inquired what the end date for the consultancy was. Ms. Allen responded that it was November 30, 2012.

b) Update on the Migration Profile Publication and Launch

Ms. Livermore informed the meeting that she had consulted with the GoJ through PIOJ, IOM and the EU regarding the date for the Migration Profile Launch and they indicated that the first week in September was the most convenient time. She advised that the launch had been scheduled for September 4, 2012. She further advised that IOM would be responsible for the logistical arrangements for the event, although they would require support from the PIOJ in relation to media advisories. Ms. Livermore noted that she was trying to find out the exact budget available for the event from IOM Brussels. She advised that it was also important to adhere to the EU visibility guidelines. She also indicated that the Regional Director for IOM, Mr Robert Paiva, would be in attendance.

7. New Business

a) Procurement of Communication Devices

Ms. Allen advised the meeting that the MPU sent a number of emails to the Project Board requesting their retroactive approval for the procurement of Blackberry CUG devices for the MPU. These devices were procured to facilitate access to the PIOJ Closed User Group (CUG) and the PIOJ email system offsite in order to effectively carry out the Unit's function when out of office. Ms. Allen noted that these devices were included in previous work plans under the heading Communications. She advised that whilst approval was granted based on what was originally presented, the procurement of Blackberry devices was not explicitly stated. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that the MPU had proceeded with procuring the devices in February 2012 with the funds disbursed by UNDP in quarter four of 2011. She indicated that it had been realised that the procurement of the devices needed to be explicitly stated and expressed retroactive approval granted by the Project Board. Ms. Gonzalez queried which staff members received the devices. Ms. Allen responded that the three devices were assigned to the two

members of the MPU (Ms. Chadine Allen and Mrs. Rukiya Brown) and the Manager of the Population and Health Unit (Mrs. Toni-shae Freckleton) who has direct supervision of the MPU. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart asked if the Project Board members had any objections. No objections were raised by the members and retroactive approval for the procurement of the Blackberry devices was granted.

b) Delivery Rate of the GMG Project

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart raised the issue of the 5.2 per cent delivery rate of the project. She noted that while this seemed low there should be justification for this as the MPU was doing a great amount of work on the project. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart also advised that a lot of the work being done did not necessitate cash expenditure. Ms. Gonzalez noted that UNDP was concerned about the delivery rate. Although UNDP was aware that a lot of work was being done on the project, expenditure was still an important factor for the donors. She advised when the delivery rate is low the donors may believe that either the project was not delivering what was in the work plan or that the funds were not needed. Ms. Allen responded that initially funds were assigned for workshops and consultations that the MPU believed would have already taken place. She also advised that originally it was decided that eight international experts would be identified and travel to Jamaica to conduct workshops and training. However, due to some of the extensive ground work that took place with the sub-committees, some of the workshops had not yet been held. Also, workshops had not been held offsite which was initially included in the budget. Ms. Allen advised that only four international experts were identified as opposed to eight. Therefore, she noted that the funds budgeted for the experts travel, accommodation and Daily Subsistence Allowance would not be fully expended. In addition, Ms. Allen stated that due to meetings being held virtually with the experts they had not yet travelled to Jamaica and this meant that the funds budgeted were not expended.

Ms. Allen advised that the MPU had preliminary discussions with UNDP Country Office to address the delivery rate and to revise the work plan. She noted that the funds would be utilised but some would need to be reallocated between outputs and activities. Mrs. Freckleton informed the meeting that a teleconference was also held with Ms. Sarah Rosengaertner from UNDP New York. She advised that the MPU made suggestions to Ms. Rosengaertner about how the annual work plan could be revised and funds reallocated. Mrs. Freckleton noted that Ms. Rosengaertner indicated that there was flexibility in terms of reallocating funds. Ms. Rosengaertner also gave permission to reallocate funds as long as they were within the agreed outputs included on the original work plan.

c) Revised Annual Workplan 2012

Mrs. Rukiya Brown informed the meeting of the changes made to the Annual Work plan. She advised the meeting that Annual Work plan had been revised to reallocate funds between outputs and activities. She noted that the revisions made were as follows:

- Output 2 – Travel (71600): budget reduced from US\$28,000 to US\$12,000. The funds remaining were reallocated to capacity building component under Output 2 of the 2013 Work plan.

- Output 1 – Service Contract Individuals: budget reduced and funds reallocated for Communications Strategy Consultant (see below)
- Output 1 – Consultant: US\$8,000 was allocated to hire a consultant to develop a communications strategy
- Output 1 – Training/Workshops/Conferences: Budget increased from US\$10,000 to US\$14,000

Ms. Gonzalez indicated that based on the last Project Board meeting she assumed that a communications strategy consultant would not be recruited. Ms. Allen clarified that it was determined in the last meeting that the funds allocated for the communications strategy was not enough. However a final decision was not made in terms of not developing a communications strategy. She advised that in the last meeting it was determined that the strategy would perhaps need to be developed toward the end of the Policy development phase to incorporate the issues identified in the policy. Ms. Gonzalez queried whether the US\$8,000 allocated would be enough and when the development of the strategy would begin. She stated that it would take time to hire a consultant and develop the strategy. Ms. Gonzalez also emphasized that US\$8,000 to develop the strategy was a small amount. Ms. Livermore suggested that the MPU contact the University of Technology (UTECH) and request that one of their marketing students assist with developing the strategy. She advised that as a part of the Marketing course at UTECH, the students were required to develop a marketing plan for various companies. Ms. Livermore suggested that the CARIMAC department at the University of the West Indies could also be contacted to assist with the strategy. Ms. Gonzalez stated that contact would need to be made as soon as possible so that the development of the strategy could commence.

Mrs. Brown suggested that if UTECH students were used to develop the communications strategy, this would allow for the US\$8,000 allocated to be reassigned to the budget for training/workshops/conferences component under Output 1 of the Work plan. She advised that the US\$14,000 allocated in the revised Annual Work plan may not have been enough to fund the number of consultations expected to be held. The Project Board members agreed that the islandwide consultations would probably cost more than budgeted for, and agreed to the funds for the communications strategy consultant being reallocated to the training/workshops/conferences component.

Ms. Gonzalez advised that once the Annual Work plan had been revised as per the suggestions made, it should be circulated to the Project Board for their approval.

d) Quarterly Progress Report: April – June, 2012

Ms. Allen gave an overview of the activities undertaken during the quarter. She informed the meeting that Sub-committees focussing on eight thematic areas were established during the quarter. She noted that most of the work undertaken during the quarter related to organizing and conducting Sub-committee meetings and workshops to elaborate the policy issues and areas that needed to be addressed in the policy. Ms. Allen advised that the Consultant had prepared concept papers for each sub-committee. She stated that to date three (3) sub-committees had not convened workshops; these

were i) Family, Migration and Development; ii) Governance and Policy Coherence; and iii) Human Rights and Social Protection. She noted that a number of strategies to engage the sub-committees were used during the quarter, which included delivering presentations and the preparation of background papers. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that from the MPU's perspective the work of the sub-committees was more than had been previously envisaged. She advised that much time was taken in terms of coordinating meetings and workshops. She also noted that some sub-committee members required more than one meeting to fully understand their role.

Ms. Allen indicated that four (4) international experts had been identified and assigned to sub-committees to provide technical assistance. She advised that efforts had been made to identify additional experts; a concept paper was prepared by the MPU and an application for technical support was submitted to Migration Expertise (MIEUX) 2. Ms. Allen advised that the MPU were experiencing a slight challenge in terms of scheduling conflicts based on the International Experts availability to physically attend the meetings. This had resulted in the experts participating in the discussions virtually via Skype. However, Ms. Allen indicated that the MPU were still working on getting the experts to come to Jamaica so they could participate in sub-committee workshops.

The meeting was advised that the MPU had recruited four (4) Summer Interns during the previous quarter, to assist the Unit with providing secretarial support to the sub-committees as well as assisting with administrative tasks. In addition, Ms. Allen advised that a strategic meeting was held between the MPU, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade (MFAFT) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss a strategy for communicating the policy to the different audiences. Ms. Allen noted that from this meeting it was recommended that a Champion be identified to promote the policy to persons. It was also decided that an official communique for the Policy should be formulated with the MFAFT. Ms. Itziar Gonzalez queried whether any further action had been made in relation to the Policy Champion. Ms. Allen responded that no progress had been made in terms of identifying a Champion but MFAFT had advised that they would consider this further. She noted that the MPU would follow up with MFAFT on the matter. Mrs. Freckleton added that the MPU had another meeting with MFAFT on July 4, 2012. This meeting focussed on engaging the diaspora in relation to the Policy. She noted that the MFAFT wished to identify a Champion who was able to reach out to the diaspora.

Ms. Marlene Lamonth queried when the diaspora's input on the policy would be sought. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the Consultant had participated in two Diaspora Conferences, one in Boston, U.S.A and the other in Canada. She noted that he had therefore already been consulting with diaspora groups. Mrs. Freckleton advised that during the July 4, 2012 meeting with MFAFT, it had been decided that the diaspora would not be fully consulted until after the final draft policy was completed in November, 2012. This decision was made due to the diaspora requiring a more concrete document before requesting their feedback. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the **National Policy on International Migration and Development** would be finalized in November and the diaspora and development sub-policy would be used to formulate a separate Diaspora Policy. Consultations on the Diaspora Policy would then be held November 2012 through to June 2013 when the Diaspora Conference is scheduled to be held. The Diaspora Policy would be the main area that would be discussed during the conference

and finalized thereafter. Mrs. Freckleton further advised that this meant that whilst two policies would be developed they would be completed at two different points in time.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart asked whether the MPU were satisfied with the International Experts input to date. Ms. Allen responded that the current experts were very committed to the process, however, the MPU had identified that the virtual meetings were not enough. She noted that the input of the experts was twofold; they would help the policy development process through their review virtually, but it had also been determined that the experts would need to physically attend meetings in Jamaica. She advised that experts would not only participate in the process, but would also help to build the capacity of the local experts who were members of the sub-committees. Ms. Allen further advised that the MPU would be working closely with the experts throughout the consultation period during the last two weeks in September. She indicated that the MPU would invite them to physically attend the National Consultations. Ms. Livermore suggested that an email be sent to the experts as soon as possible to advise them of the consultations and to confirm their availability. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether the MPU had determined what the experts would be assisting with when they attend the consultations. Ms. Allen responded that an initial meeting was held with the experts in May 2012 to discuss how they could contribute to the process. One of the ways identified was sharing experiences of the projects the experts were involved in. She advised that when the experts come to Jamaica it is envisaged that they would be conducting seminars and workshops with the sub-committees. Ms. Allen stated that this would help the sub-committee members to make the link between international migration and development and the key issue areas. She also advised that the MPU believed that the experts would be able to assist in identifying Jamaica's institutional capacity and the resources that would need to be mobilized.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried whether the MPU would share the experts' itinerary for their visit to Jamaica with the Project Board members. Ms. Allen responded that once the MPU had worked out the schedule for the consultations, an action plan would be formulated and shared with the Project Board. Mr. Williams queried whether the experts would be sent the draft policy. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the draft policy would be submitted by the consultant on August 30, 2012 and this would then be sent to the experts, the working group and sub-committees for them to review. Ms. Livermore emphasised the importance of having the experts attend the meetings in Jamaica. She noted that previously, technical difficulties had been experienced during virtual meetings via Skype. She advised that this meant that experts were not able to fully participate.

Mr. Williams queried whether there would be both general consultations and separate consultations focussing on specific thematic areas. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the plan was to have both national and sectoral consultations. Mr. Williams queried whether the experts would be able to attend both types of consultations. Mrs. Freckleton advised that this would be dependent on the experts' schedules. She further advised that it was decided that four national consultations would be held in the following locations: Kingston, Mandeville, St Ann and Montego Bay. In addition to this, she noted that specific sectoral consultations would be held in Kingston.

Ms. Livermore suggested that the experts be asked to co-chair some of the consultations. Ms. Allen advised that after an internal discussion the MPU envisage that a core team would be needed to attend the consultations. This team would comprise of international and local technical experts and PIOJ staff. Mrs. Freckleton noted that the chairs and co-chairs of the sub-committees would be asked to be part of the core team to act as facilitators during the consultations.

Ms. Allen informed the meeting of the challenges experienced during the quarter. She advised that one of the challenges was the volume of work due to the establishment of the sub-committees. Ms. Allen noted that the MPU perhaps underestimated the amount of resources needed. She further advised that it was not envisioned that some of the sub-committees would require so much background and preparatory information, to get them at the level where they could deliberate policy issues and actions. Mrs. Freckleton advised that this was one of the reasons why it was important for the international experts to physically attend meetings, because there were still members of the sub-committees who were struggling to make the migration and development nexus.

8. Approval and Signing of Quarterly Work Plan, July – September 2012

The Project Board approved the Quarterly Workplan (QWP) for July 1 to September 30, 2012 subject to the following changes:

- Output 1, Activity Result 2: increase amount from US\$14,000 to \$20,000 for Training/Workshops/Conferences
- Output 1, Activity Result 2: increase amount from US\$2,500 to \$4,500 for Travel

The Project Board members were advised that once the changes were made, the revised QWP would be circulated for the relevant parties to sign.

Ms. Allen advised that the Quarterly Work Plan indicated that consultants would be recruited during the quarter to develop an implementation plan, a monitoring and evaluation framework and to conduct a capacity assessment. She advised that in the coming weeks the Terms of References for the consultants would be shared with the Project Board for their feedback.

Mrs. Freckleton advised the meeting that although the capacity assessment was originally scheduled for 2012, the MPU recognised that the policy did not need to be completed for the assessment to begin. She further advised that they were contemplating moving the schedule for the capacity assessment forward.

9. The Way Forward

Ms. Gonzalez queried whether workshops would be organized for the three sub-committees outstanding. Ms. Allen advised that the MPU would try to schedule workshops before the draft policy was submitted. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried what issues the MPU were having with the sub-committees that had not had workshops. Ms. Allen responded that the Family, Migration and Development sub-committee initially struggled to grasp the key issues. However, she noted that a

strategy had been employed to resolve this issue by having presentations identifying specific areas in order to focus the sub-committee discussions.

Ms. Allen advised that the MPU did not necessarily believe that all of the sub-committees needed to have workshops. She noted that some of the sub-committees such as Remittance and Development came up with substantive outputs prior to having a workshop. Ms. Livermore queried whether the Human Rights and Social Protection sub-committee was not focused. Mrs. Freckleton responded that this was not the case. However, she noted that the Chair of the sub-committee advised her that the key outputs from the meeting had not been incorporated into the documents prepared by the Consultant. Ms. Lamonth queried whether the issue with some of the sub-committees was due to the Consultant. Ms. Gonzalez noted that UNDP was not impressed with the work of the Consultant. Ms. Allen advised that for the Family, Migration and Development sub-committee the issue was that the Chairperson lacked focus, but with the Human Rights and Social Protection Sub-committee there had been an issue with the Consultant.

Ms. Lamonth suggested that the Consultant needed to perhaps engage more with the sub-committee members and incorporate their feedback into the relevant documents. Mrs. Freckleton advised that this had been raised with the Consultant previously. She noted that the Situational Analysis submitted did not include some of the key issues that came out of the sub-committee meetings and documents shared by the MPU. Ms. Lamonth and Ms. Gonzalez noted that based on their review of the concept papers for their respective sub-committees, the issues were not adequate. Ms. Gonzalez also noted that the feedback she and other sub-committee members had submitted on the Governance and Policy Coherence Concept Paper had not been incorporated into the revised document. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the MPU and IOM would be meeting with the Consultant after the Project Board meeting to discuss the various issues they had with the consultancy.

10. Adjournment

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

Action Sheet

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. Revise Quarterly Work Plan; July 1 – September 30, 2012	MPU
2. Revise 2012 and 2013 Annual Work Plan	MPU
3. Contact UTECH regarding Marketing students to develop communications strategy	MPU
4. Circulate action plan for Consultations to the Project Board members	MPU
5. Circulate ToR's for the following consultancies: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development of the Implementation Plan• Development of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework• Capacity Assessment	MPU