

**DISABILITY RIGHTS INITIATIVE CAMBODIA (DRIC)
PROGRAMME BOARD MEETING**

March 20, 2014

Venue: UNICEF

09:30 – 12:00

ATTENDEES:

Ms. Claire Van der Varen	UN Resident Coordinator (Co-chair)
H.E Sem Sokha	Secretary of State , Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY) (Co-chair)
Ms. Setsuko Yamazaki	Country Director, UNDP
Ms. Rana Flowers	Country Representative, UNICEF
Dr. Momoe Takeuchi	Senior Programme Management Officer, WHO
HE Prof. Heng Tay Kry	Secretary of State, Ministry of Health
Nicholas Wolf	Second Secretary, Australian Embassy
HE Yi Veasna	Adviser to the Royal Government of Cambodia, Representative of People with Disability
Ms. Sun-Ah Kim	Deputy Representative, UNICEF
Ms. Anne Elizabeth Lubell	UNICEF
Mr. Napoleon Navarro	Deputy Country Director, UNDP
Mr. Velibor Popovic	UNDP
Ms. Lang Sok	UNDP
Mr.Darryl Barrett	Australian Embassy (Regional Adviser Disability)
Mr.Tokyo Bak	Australian Embassy
Mr.Chhaya Plong	UNICEF
Ms.Bunmey Yat	UN RC Office
Ms. Anya Thomas	UNDP

I. OPENING REMARKS AND OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

Co-chairs **H.E Sem Sokha**, (MoSVY) and **Ms. Claire Van der Varen** (UNRC) welcomed participants to this inaugural meeting of the Disability Rights Initiative Cambodia (DRIC) Programme Board. The meeting was acknowledged the programme to be an important step forward in moving towards improved protection and quality of life for people with disabilities in Cambodia. It was highlighted that this is the inception phase of the programme - the coordination team recruitment is still in the underway. The participating UN Agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, WHO) are providing various support as a temporary secretariat role to the Programme Board. Co-chairs provided an overview of the agenda and invited the Board members and Technical Review Committee members to introduce themselves.

II. OVERVIEW OF KEY FUNCTIONS AND ROLE OF PROGRAMME BOARD AND ADOPTION OF WORKING MODALITIES

Ms. Claire Van der Vaeren, (UNRC) provided an overview of the Board's key roles and functions as laid out in the draft Terms of Reference (TOR), and indicated that the co-chairs had reflected on some key decisions that would need to be taken as the Board goes through the TOR. It was also highlighted that there had been some consultation on process for appointing and endorsing Representatives for People with Disability and that the second nominated person should be a woman as per the programme document.

The five decisions that required discussion are as follows:

1. Approval of the ToR for Programme Board
2. Members of the board – endorsement and appointment of representatives of persons with disabilities
3. Frequency of the meetings
4. Conditions for moving funds across budget lines and clarity on auditing frequency
5. Role of the Programme Board in programme monitoring activities

1. Members of the Board – endorsement and appointment

Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) endorsed the nomination of the HE Yi Veasna, Adviser to the Royal Government in the Kingdom of Cambodia as Representative of People with Disability, and for the second nomination proposed that Australia DFAT, in an independent role, take the lead in a consultative process with civil society and the disability movement to identify the second representatives of persons with disabilities to the Programme Board. The Programme Board is to make the final selection out of the nominations put forward.

HE **Yi Veasna**, (Representative of People with Disability) recommended that nominations should start promptly and that perhaps MoWA could be consulted if the second nominee is to be a woman. It was also recommended that the next member be a government official as one purpose of the project is to educate the government on disability rights. Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) acknowledged the suggestion that the second representative come from government; however she reminded the members that the original plan was to have the second member come from the civil society.

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf**, (Australian Embassy) indicated that the process should not be overcomplicated and indicated that there had been some talks of two nominees who had already been proposed. It was clarified that this was not the case. Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) agreed that the process should not be made too complicated, but highlighted the sensitivity of the issue. In order to avoid the perception of programme led (top down) decision making, it was recommended that civil society organisations should be invited to come forward with nominations.

HE **Yi Veasna**, (Representative of People with Disability) pointed out that a conflict of interest may arise if NGOs receives grants from the programme. The issue had been raised at a previous meeting, specifically that the Board need to have a mechanism to ensure no conflict of interest by the Board members.

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf**, (Australian Embassy) asked whether nominations could come from organisations only, or also from individuals. It was agreed both would be accepted.

Decisions:

The second Representative of People with Disability should be a woman; nomination to be submitted through civil society consultation and final decision to be taken by the Programme Board.

DFAT will approach the relevant civil society organisations and networks to facilitate a list of nominees.

MoSVY will also gather information on potential candidates, particularly women with disability from its own NGO networks.

At the next board meeting, the proposed nominations will be presented to the board for final selection.

2. Frequency of meetings

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator shared that as per the TOR, the frequency of PB meetings is set at every six months, but recommended that in this inception phase of the programme, the Board meet every three months, proposing the next meeting for June 20th. The Board would decide when it would like to switch to every six months. Mr. **Nicholas Wolf**, (Australian embassy) also suggested that a meeting at the end of the year be held in order to plan for the following year. Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, (UNRC) proposed that the meetings be held in May and November, annually. All members agreed. Ms. **Setsuko Yamazaki**, (UNDP) raised the point that the next instalment is due in August and thus recommended a meeting shortly thereafter either at the end of August or September. The Board members agreed to decide whether such an ad hoc meeting is necessary at the next Board meeting on June 20th. Mr. **Nicholas Wolf**, also highlighted the timing of reporting as something to consider for timing of the meetings. It was agreed that the Board will meet twice annually and that the timing of the meetings will be revisited to discuss accommodating fiduciary management requirements.

Decisions: The next meeting will be held on Friday June 20th from 9:30-12 (venue to be confirmed) and will include the following agenda items:

1. Review and approve nominations for the second representative for people with disabilities.
2. Scheduling of meetings with consideration for reporting and fiduciary calendar.
3. Decision on whether an ad hoc meeting after the August budget instalment is required.
4. Update from TRIC on work progress.

Following the inception phase of the project, the Board will meet twice annually including one meeting at the end of the year (November) in order to plan for the following year

3. Modality under which UN agencies can move resources across budget lines

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, (UNRC) proposed two rules to govern cross budget line management:

1. Within any six month budget period, the transfer of resources between operational and personnel lines be brought before the Board, and;
2. There be a flexibility of transfer for up to 10% of the budget; beyond 10% the decision be brought to the board.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator clarified that “operational lines” is in reference to anything that isn’t personnel-related. Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) agreed with proposed rule number one, but suggested a 20% ceiling rather than 10% for flexibility of transfer. Ms. **Setsuko Yamazaki**, (UNDP) highlighted that contributions will fluctuate due to foreign exchange differences while the budgets/expenditures are denominated in US dollars and the costs relating to the staff are likely to increase. And it would be difficult to assess its impacts on the budgets at this stage. HE **Yi Veasna**, (Representative of People with Disability) suggested the participating agencies undertake economic forecasting related to inflation and anticipate potential increases in cost of staff. Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator suggested contingencies lines be added to the budgets (if not already included) in order to absorb exchange rate fluctuations, salary increases etc. Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy), pointed out that such currency fluctuations and agency-mandated changes to personnel costs are unavoidable and do not need to be brought before the Board, but it might be good to ensure that proposals to change the classification or number of staff are brought before the Board. The members agreed that a 20% ceiling was preferable and that budget changes within this

limit do not need to be reviewed by the Board. Changes such as decisions to increase or decrease number of personnel or change the classification of personnel must be brought before the Board.

Decisions: 20% ceiling for cross budget line management

Decisions to increase or decrease number of personnel or to change the classification of personnel should be brought to the attention and decision of the Board.

4. Roles and responsibilities of the Board with respect to audits

Ms. **Setsuko Yamazaki**, (UNDP) informed the Board that once the Multilateral Trust Fund Office has distributed the funds to the three participating agencies, the funds will be managed under the rules of each agency, including audits according to each individual agencies' auditing rules and practices. UNDP will conduct audits in accordance with the guidelines applicable to the project implementation modality. Ms. **Rana Flowers** (UNICEF) indicated that UNICEF conducts annual audits and that the disability project funds will be subject to the annual audit. Dr Momoe Takeuchi (WHO) indicated WHO books of accounts are audited annually (by both internal and external auditors) and the reports will be available. Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator proposed that the agencies further clarify the year and month of these expected audits so they can be included in the project activities calendar. H.E **Sem Sokha (MoSVY)**, indicated it was unclear when during implementation of the programme the participating UN agencies will audit. Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator, suggested that the auditing calendars/practices of each agency be included as an annex to the notes of the next Board meeting on June 20th.

Decision: UNDP, UNICEF and WHO will make available, information on their auditing practices so it can be consolidated and included as annex to the meeting notes of the next meeting.

5. Monitoring Activities

The members discussed the method of monitoring, particularly with respect to the involvement of the Board. H.E **Sem Sokha** suggested that while each agency will contribute its own technical team the monitoring process, it would still be useful for Board members to be involved to provide another layer of quality control.

Ms. **Rana Flowers** (UNICEF) highlighted that monitoring data would be reviewed by the Board and that perhaps these lines should not be blurred by Board member involvement in the actual monitoring process. She also made the point that the agencies' own monitoring processes tend to be very rigorous. However, a joint Board field visit is not a bad idea.

Dr **Momoe Takeuchi** (WHO) agreed that the Board oversees monitoring at a high level and more detailed monitoring would be done by each agency, which could be reviewed at the TRC level.

HE **Yi Veasna** (Representative of People with Disability) suggested only specific issues or reports be submitted for consideration of the Board. His Excellency also requested the Board take it under consideration to provide financial support the other nominated Representative of People with Disability member with any cost of travel related to Programme Board meetings or activities as necessary. .

Ms. **Setsuko Yamazaki**, (UNDP) agreed that the Board's key functions should remain high-level and that the Board should avoid micro-managing.

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy), suggested that monitoring should primarily be the responsibility of UN agencies and the Programme Coordination Unit, and one Board monitoring visit per year would be reasonable.

H.E **Sem Sokha (MoSVY)** agreed with the DFAT proposal of one visit per year emphasizing that such visits tend to be very useful in ensuring the Board is familiar with the programme.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator summarized the discussion: the technical review committee will submit monitoring reports to the Board for review, and the Board members will undertake an annual visit to the projects. She also confirmed that the Board will look into providing logistical support to the second nominated Representative of People with Disability.

Decisions:

The Board's focus will remain high-level and will undertake either an annual field visit

6. Additional discussion on Programme Board ToRs

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy), requested some clarifications on points in the Programme Board ToR including: a) what is meant by "high profile issues" under point 3 on page 2 of the Board's TOR. For instance, it would make sense for the Programme Board to approve grants to CDPO and DAC, b) what are the 'Rules of Procedures' mentioned in the ToRs, c) specifically what reports the Board will be required to review and how often because the design notes annual, semi-annual and quarterly reports, and; d) whether or not the Board can make changes to the programme design.

Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) requested that the reference to quarterly reports in the Programme Document be removed, as every six months is sufficient, in particular as donor reporting is usually on an annual basis. This would then see on six month report and one annual report a year.

Ms. **Setsuko Yamazaki**, (UNDP) clarified that the legal documentation, the Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA) signed between the Government of Australia and MPTF Office,–Section 5 clearly defines annual progress and financial reporting provided by the MPTF Office to the donor. However, frequency of informal reporting can be determined by the Board. As it stands, the cut off for the annual report is May 31st.

Dr **Momoe Takeuchi** (WHO) indicated that the WHO systems requires to register a timing of the mandatory /formal reporting when funding is received, which can be determined by the decision of the Board (whether semi-annually or annually).

In response to the questions from Mr. **Nicholas Wolf**, UNICEF proposed that the Technical Review Committee should decide what is considered a "high-profile" activity. Though the Multilateral Trust Fund reporting is meant to be annual, but prior to signing, there was agreement that is reflected in the minutes of that meeting, that there would be a semi-annual report and that each agency would give a progress report at the Board meetings.

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy), posed the question whether the Board wanted to have lessons-learned reporting, referenced in the Programme Board TOR.

Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) said that in the reporting templates are to be prepared by the Technical Review Committee, "Lessons Learned" would be included as a section.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren** (UN Resident Coordinator), confirmed that lessons learned reports are standard requirements. She suggested that this can be tabled at the next Board meeting at which

time the Board can agree on a practical timeframe for when the documentation should be prepared for the Board to make requests which will then be formalized through the first annual meeting minutes. Ms. Van der Vaeren further agreed that the Technical Review Committee propose a list of “high profile” program activities and summarized that reporting will be semi-annually, not quarterly.

The Board agreed that members of the technical committee need to be identified and agreed upon. The question was raised whether advisory staff should be allowed to sit in on Board meetings. It was agreed that the Board should remain at a high, policy level.

Decisions:

The Board will look into providing logistical support for transport to the second nominated member/representative of people with disabilities if needed

Board members are free to bring technical staff from their respective institutions to PB meetings.

TRC members will be expected to participate in PB meetings to present reports and/or respond to questions

Reporting will be in line with MPTF requirements, i.e. formal report annually, with an interim informal report for monitoring purposes in mid-year.

Reporting templates will be developed by the TRC.

The TRC will prepare a list of ‘high profile activities’.

An updated Programme Board ToR will be presented at the next Board Meeting for approval.

7. Technical Review Committee ToRs

Draft ToRs for the Technical Review Committee were presented for discussion. Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy) agreed that it would be good if DFAT could be represented, at least as observers, and that DFAT could provisionally agree to the ToRs but would like to have time to consider them further. Few other comments were made and it was agreed ToRs should be agreed in principle, but finalised at the next Programme Board meeting.

Decisions:

A draft TOR of TRC was approved in principle. It was agreed that Board members would provide comments in writing in preparation for final approval at next Board meeting

8. Agency Workplans

Napoleon Navarro, (UNDP) presented the DRIC work plan which targets three levels of engagement – national, provincial and sub-national.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator suggested that once agreement has been reached on the timing of the Board meetings, then budgets per agency can be shared and approved. In the early stage, she proposed that the Board approve the budget broadly for the year.

Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) asked whether the Australian dollar at risk of falling in relation to the US dollar. Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy) replied that the dollar has been stable at 0.9 to the USD in recent period. He added that PB should monitor variations in exchange rates and act accordingly in case of significant changes.

Dr **Momoe Takeuchi** (WHO) informed the Board that their agency work plan is still being designed and proposed that a work plan will be submitted for endorsement at the next Board meeting, as recruitment is still underway. The aim is to have a staff person by May or June, and the workplan will be developed after the staff is in place, with technical support from the disability/rehabilitation expert in the WHO regional office.

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy) requested updates on recruitment from the UN agencies, emphasizing the need to speed up the process to the extent possible:

- UNDP – in progress; for the international position, UNDP received over 160 applications for the position and three people have been shortlisted and are going to conduct a written test tomorrow (March 21). For the national position they are waiting for acceptance. A coordination team is also being recruited – advertising will take place next week.
- UNICEF – recruitment for the national position is being finalized and testing for the international candidates is March 21 2014.
- WHO – there are six to seven candidates on the shortlist who will be invited for an written test and interview. The selected candidate will begin as soon as they are available.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator suggested that it would be useful for the agencies to present the detailed budgets at the next PB meeting in June. Ms. Van der Vaeren highlighted that there are two provisions in the programme document to adjust for exchange –rate losses and that resource mobilization will be undertaken if necessary, though stated that is was still a little premature as 2014 is fully covered by the current budget. However, she stated that a review will be necessary in due course to get a sense of whether there are any foreseeable shortfalls. The budget will be adjusted accordingly which would be undertaken in consultation with the MPTF. She further highlighted that no provisions currently exist to mitigate losses incurred by exchange rate fluctuations.

Decisions:

The proposed workplan and activities were approved by the board in principle.

The TRC will provide an update at the next Board meeting in June

9. AOB

Mr. **Nicholas Wolf** (Australian Embassy) requested that the agencies follow DFAT branding requirements, particularly as some early UN position advertisements did not acknowledge any associated with DRIC, or Australia’s funding. He also suggested that is would be good to have a signing ceremony or a formal event to launch publicly the programme.

H.E **Sem Sokha** (MoSVY) agreed and said that it was important to show government and the international community what is happening, and suggested the venue be the Australian Embassy.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator stated that the co-chairs agree that there can be an ad hoc signing ceremony and suggested the technical review committee organize it.

Ms. **Rana Flowers**, (UNICEF) reminded the Board members, in the context of public communications with programme stakeholders, to bear in mind that there is some concern regarding the slow-pace with which things are moving forward and that there is a need to be sensitive in how the programme is presented, in particular as the implementation has been delayed and it is only in inception phase.

Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren**, UN Resident Coordinator summarized that the next priority event is to be a signing ceremony followed by the second Board meeting in June.

Decisions:

The technical review committee will discuss and propose timing and format for a launch event; to be held before 20 June. Suggested period is May 2014. It was agreed that Australian Embassy should organize the event

The meeting concluded at 12:14pm.