

**Minutes of Project Board Meeting
Held on
April 10, 2012 at 10 a.m.
Hibiscus 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. Sonia Gill	-	Governance Advisor & Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP
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:

Chadine Allen	-	Project Manager, Migration Policy Project Unit
---------------	---	--

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 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 introduced welcomed the Project Board members to the meeting.

4. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were tendered on behalf of:

- Rukiya Brown, Migration Policy Project Unit (MPU)

5. Confirmation of Minutes of January 16, 2012

The minutes were confirmed by Mrs. Freckleton and seconded by Mr. Williams.

6. Matters Arising

a) Recruitment of Policy Development Consultant and International Experts

Ms. Chadine Allen updated the meeting on the recruitment of the Policy Development Consultant and International Experts. She advised that the Policy Development Consultant position was advertised in February, 2012 in local newspapers as well as on the internet. Ms. Allen indicated that the Migration Policy Project Unit (MPU) received 14 applications which were evaluated by an internal panel at PIOJ. Four candidates were subsequently shortlisted and selected to attend an interview on March 16, 2012. She advised that one of the candidates indicated that they were no longer available for the position; therefore only three candidates were interviewed. Ms. Allen noted that two candidates were shortlisted after the interviews; Mr. Trevor Hamilton, and Mr. Kevin Morrison. The overall score for both candidates was close based on the evaluations done in the interviews. She advised that as part of the final shortlisting process and in order to decide on the successful candidate, the MPU requested submission of a financial proposal and references. Ms. Allen further advised that Mr. Morrison's proposal was in line with the US\$42,000 budgeted for the consultancy, whilst Mr. Hamilton's proposal was substantially over the budget allocated. Therefore, a decision was made to offer the consultancy position to Mr. Morrison.

Ms. Allen indicated that the MPU met with Mr. Morrison on April 5, 2012 to discuss the Policy Development Consultant Terms of Reference (ToR) and the deliverables. Mrs. Freckleton also advised that the Consultant would be travelling soon and has already contacted persons in the Diaspora and will meet with Diaspora groups whilst overseas. Ms. Allen added that the Consultant indicated that he wished to start the consultations with the stakeholders as soon as possible. Therefore, she advised that the MPU would send a letter to stakeholders indicating that Mr. Morrison has been contracted to undertake the consultancy and may contact them for information.

In addition, Mrs. Freckleton noted that the Consultant wished to arrange a meeting with the Chairs and Co-Chairs of the sub-committees. This was so he could give them an idea of how he intended to operate and utilise the sub-committees in order for him to complete the work. She also informed the meeting that the Consultant had indicated that based on the intricacies within Government, he wanted to complete the draft Policy document by August 2012. This would ensure that once stakeholders return from their summer break they would have a document to review, and National Consultations would then commence. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried when the Consultants contract was scheduled to end. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the consultancy would conclude at the end of November, 2012.

Ms. Sonia Gill sought clarification on whether the Consultants work relied on the Migration Profile being completed. Mrs. Freckleton noted that the profile was almost complete and should feed into the Policy development phase. She advised that the last deliverable for the Migration Profile study was submitted. Mrs. Freckleton further advised that the MPU/PIOJ has reviewed the final draft of the Migration Profile and has recommended some changes with respect to some of the data included in report. However, she noted that the revisions would not affect the analysis included in the report. Ms. Gill queried when Mr. Morrison would be able to review the document. Ms. Allen responded that he had been given the draft Migration Profile with the relevant data amended. Ms. Gill also sought clarification on how the overall Policy would relate to the sub-policies. Mrs. Freckleton responded that Mr. Morrison would be working with the sub-committees to delineate the sub-policies which would eventually formulate the overall policy. Ms. Allen noted that Mr. Morrison would develop the framework. Mrs. Freckleton advised that Mr. Morrison did not want to be restricted by the sub-committees in terms of him being

dependent on them. She noted that he intended to mobilise the sub-committees by preparing documents for them to review.

Ms. Gill queried whether the International Experts would be working in a team with the Consultant. Ms. Allen clarified that the International Experts would be working with the sub-committees. However, she noted that there would be communication between the International Experts and the Policy Development Consultant, in order to elaborate the thematic areas. Ms. Allen advised that the MPU recognised additional support might be necessary as migration and development was a fairly new area in Jamaica. Therefore it was expected that the sub-committees may need support in terms of breaking down issues and providing feedback on the deliverables. Ms. Allen indicated that the MPU would be scheduling a meeting of the sub-committee Chairs and Co-Chairs, as well as a meeting via Skype with the International Experts.

Ms. Allen updated the meeting on the International Experts for the sub-committees. She advised that International Experts had been identified for five of the eight thematic areas. Ms. Allen informed the meeting that International Experts had not yet been identified for the following thematic areas: Diaspora and Development, Remittance and Development and Governance and Policy Coherence. She further advised that the PIOJ had recently received a letter regarding the Migration EU Expertise (MIEUX 2), which was an initiative that offered technical assistance to governments. Ms. Allen noted that this had been discussed internally and a letter would be sent to MIEUX 2 requesting technical assistance for the thematic areas outstanding. She also advised that during a meeting with Mr. Williams he proposed that it might be a good idea to have more than one expert for all thematic areas. Ms. Livermore enquired how the team would incorporate the additional experts and ensure that no conflicts arise. She also queried how it would be determined which of the experts would be invited to Jamaica to attend meetings/workshops as the budget allocated would probably not be sufficient to cover travel costs of additional experts. Ms. Livermore emphasized that she did not have a problem with having additional experts, however, she wanted to ensure that everyone knew what their role would be. She queried whether there would be a lead International Expert for each sub-committee or if the experts would all be working together at the same level. Mr. Williams advised that most of the experts would participate in the process and sub-committee meetings virtually by email and Skype. He further advised that the number of experts to be invited to Jamaica would be minimal.

Ms. Livermore informed the meeting that she made the initial contact with the International Experts, and they all stated that conducting meetings via Skype would be convenient. However, she also advised that the experts have all requested that they be advised of the meeting dates well in advance. Ms. Livermore suggested that a Dropbox be set up to enable the experts to access any relevant documents. Ms. Gill also suggested that she could request that the Migration for Development (M4D) website could also be utilised. Mr. Williams noted that the World Bank had a lot of expertise that could perhaps be utilised. Ms. Livermore responded that she had contacted them via email but had not received a response. She noted that the problem was that many potential experts were not willing to provide technical assistance pro bono. Ms. Livermore advised that the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) had initially expressed interest, however once she informed them that they would not be remunerated the MPI advised that they were unable to participate in the process.

b) Update on Request for Project Extension

Ms. Gill advised that the MPU had submitted the request and supporting documents for a project extension to UNDP Country Office (CO). The UNDP CO forwarded the documents to the Global Migration Group (GMG) team who subsequently sent an email agreeing to a no cost project extension up to March 31, 2013. She further advised that this was conditional on the reallocation of the funds not impinging on achieving any of the targets outlined in the Annual Workplans. Ms. Gill noted that the UNDP CO requested the funds for 2012 and they expected the funds would be released shortly. Mrs. Freckleton enquired whether UNDP had received a formal letter from GMG granting approval for the extension. Ms. Gill responded that it was unlikely that UNDP would receive a formal letter indicating the approval. Mrs. Freckleton queried whether the email from GMG would suffice. Ms. Gill confirmed that the email would be sufficient evidence of their approval of the project extension.

c) Update on Extended Migration Profile Consultancy

Mr. Williams advised that the Migration Profile would not sufficiently cover the Situational Analysis necessary for the Policy development phase. He noted that the Policy Development Consultant would have to prepare a comprehensive situational analysis. Mrs. Freckleton responded that it was previously agreed that the Policy Development Consultant would need to do a Situational Analysis. Ms. Gill queried whether the terms set out in the Migration Profile Terms of Reference (ToR) could have been more detailed. Ms. Livermore responded that this was not the issue. She advised that the Migration Profile template had certain limitations in terms of analysis of the data in the report. Ms. Livermore further advised that it was now expected that Situational Analysis to be conducted would use the Migration Profile to analyse the situation in Jamaica. She informed the meeting that IOM had re-drafted the Migration Profile template to include a more comprehensive analysis component. Mrs. Freckleton also emphasised that the new template would also include the development component and not just migration. She noted that a focus on migration and development was lacking in the original template.

d) Update on Interns

Ms. Allen informed the meeting that a ToR for the Interns had been drafted. She advised that the MPU in collaboration with Ms. Livermore had identified eight potential candidates from the University of the West Indies (UWI). Ms. Allen further advised that the MPU would be shortlisting the candidates to determine the four Interns needed. Ms. Gill queried whether the UWI Interns would be available in May since exams are normally during that month. Ms. Allen responded that the Interns identified had completed their degree.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart enquired whether arrangements had been made for the Interns to be remunerated. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the Interns would be paid a stipend and these funds would come from GOJ Counterpart funds allocated for the project. She advised that she had requested that GOJ funds allocated for 2011/2012 be utilised this financial year (2012/2013) to cover the stipends. Ms. Livermore suggested that although the MPU had decided to give the Interns a stipend at a monthly flat rate, it would probably be best to calculate what the Interns are paid based on how often they are used throughout the month. She noted that some Interns may be assigned to sub-committees that have meetings more often than others. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the MPU would discuss this internally.

7. New Business

a) Quarterly Progress Report, January – March 2012

Ms. Allen advised that a Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) for October to December, 2011 was not previously prepared due to her being on sick leave in December/January. She advised that this report had now been prepared and circulated to the Project Board. However, Ms. Allen queried whether it would not be necessary to go through the report since the areas addressed were included in the 2011 Annual Progress Report. Ms. Gill advised that UNDP required the Project Board to approve the report so they could enter it into their records. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart requested that the Project Board members indicate their approval of the report. Ms. Gonzalez noted that she had a few minor suggested changes which she would submit to the MPU. However, the Project Board members present approved the QPR for October to December, 2011 pending the suggestions to be submitted by Ms. Itziar Gonzalez.

Ms. Allen gave an overview of the main activities and challenges included in the QPR for January 1 to March, 2012. One of the highlights during the quarter was the appointment of a new Minister of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade (MFAFT), the Honourable Arnaldo Brown. Ms. Allen advised that the Minister of State would be the new Chair of the National Working Group on International Migration and Development (NWGIMD). She further advised that the MPU/PIOJ and IOM had a briefing with Minister Brown on March 12, 2012 to discuss the overall project. At the meeting Minister Brown proposed that the thematic area on Diaspora and Development be led by MFAFT and be expanded to produce a Diaspora and Development Policy. Ms. Gill suggested that before embarking on the proposal made by the Minister, the PIOJ should perhaps get a formal commitment from the MFAFT to show that it is properly a part of their operational plan and within the specified project timeline. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the MPU/PIOJ had drafted a letter to the MFAFT in that regard. Ms. Gill queried whether the letter indicated that the work on the Diaspora and Development Policy could be initiated under the project but may need additional time to be completed under another project. Mrs. Freckleton responded that this was not included in the letter as the MPU/PIOJ did not want to pre-empt or commit to there being a second phase of the project. Ms. Livermore suggested donors may be interested in funding the development of a Diaspora and Development Policy if the scope of the work was too much to be completed under the current project. She noted that Guyana was trying to obtain funding for a Diaspora Policy and IOM was confident they would receive the financial support. In this regard, Ms. Livermore noted that the fact that Jamaica would have started the process for the Diaspora and Development Policy may be viewed favourably by donors and enable the country to obtain additional funding.

Mrs. Freckleton advised that the Global Migration Group (GMG) have discussed the potential for a second phase to the project. She therefore noted that the completion of the Diaspora and Development Policy could be incorporated into the second phase. Mrs. Freckleton noted that the MPU/PIOJ's concern was whether the development of the Diaspora and Development Policy would be completed within the projects set timeline. Ms. Livermore suggested the letter to the MFAFT state that additional funding would have to be sought if the Diaspora and Development Policy could not be completed within the project timeline. Mr. Williams noted that the scope of work in the Sub-committee Terms of Reference

(ToR) needed to be carefully reviewed by the MFAFT. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the letter to be sent to them would refer to the generic Sub-committee ToR and advise that MFAFT would have to amend it to suit their intended scope of work.

Ms. Allen informed the meeting that a National Consultation on the Migration Profile for Jamaica was held on February 9, 2012. She noted that feedback received from the National Consultation was integrated into the final draft of the Migration Profile. Ms. Allen indicated that the Consultant Team advised the MPU that some of the feedback submitted should be addressed in the Policy and not in the Migration Profile. She also advised that there was a delay in completing the final draft of the Migration Profile due to the extensive feedback received which needed to be integrated. Mrs. Freckleton noted that this resulted in the deadline for the final draft being extended twice. Ms. Allen also advised that a report of the National Consultation was prepared and circulated to the National Working Group on International Migration and Development (NWGIMD) members.

b) Update on Communication Strategy Consultant

Ms. Allen advised that one of the challenges encountered during the quarter was in relation to the recruitment of the Communication Strategy Consultant. She noted that the position was advertised on February 14, 2012 and 40 applications were received. An internal panel at PIOJ reviewed and shortlisted the applications. Four candidates were subsequently shortlisted for interview. Ms. Allen advised that the interviews were held on March 28, 2012. However, she noted that at the interviews two issues arose; candidates had a misconception on the deliverables that were expected from the consultancy, and the approach was not clear in terms of how it would be integrated with the work of the Policy Development Consultant. She further advised that Ms. Gill suggested that the MPU revise the Communications Strategy Consultancy ToR and then conduct a limited tender to request technical and financial proposals. Ms. Gill noted that the position advertised seemed to request expressions of interest. She therefore advised that her suggestion was to conduct a follow up requesting technical and financial proposals. Ms. Gill further advised that this request would only be sent to candidates originally shortlisted and would not involve re-advertising.

Ms. Allen noted that the MPU discussed the Communication Strategy consultancy with the Policy Development Consultant. Based on the Consultants proposed workplan, the MPU recognised that there needed to be further discussion on the approach at the Project Board level. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried what the Policy Development Consultants opinion was concerning the Communication Strategy. Mrs. Freckleton responded that his view was that the communication aspect would be on-going throughout the Policy development phase and upon its completion. She recommended that the Policy Development Consultant meet with the Project Board to discuss the approach. Mrs. Freckleton noted that a Communication Strategy was a critical area under the **Mainstreaming Migration into National Development Strategies** project. However, she further noted that national and sectoral consultations have been incorporated into the process and this was part of a Communication Strategy. Ms. Allen advised that the Policy Development Consultants work programme included a Communication Strategy component. However she advised that this component would be upon completion of the Policy development phase.

Mr. Williams indicated that he believed it would be possible to cover the stakeholder consultations without a Communication Strategy as this was normal practice for the PIOJ. He also suggested that the Communications Specialist at the PIOJ could also be utilised in this regard. He further advised that upon completion of the draft Policy, a Communication Strategy would probably be needed to ensure buy-in from the public and wider stakeholders. Ms. Gill queried whether this was to ensure buy-in in relation to what the Policy contained so that it did not get major resistance from interest groups. She emphasised that this would not require a media campaign and advised that the candidates interviewed for Communication Strategy Consultancy mainly focussed on media campaigns including websites.

Ms. Gill suggested that further thought be given to who the Communication Strategy would be aimed at, what needed to be communicated, and the action it was hoped persons would take once the message had been communicated. Mrs. Freckleton advised that the communications aspect was partially covered when the project was designed. She indicated that most of what was expected would come at the national and sectoral consultations. Ms. Livermore suggested that the PIOJ may wish to distribute documents related to the Policy during the consultations. The Project Board agreed that distribution of communication materials would be necessary but a Communication Strategy may not be needed. Ms. Gill advised that the communication materials to be developed and distributed would need to relate to the specific project targets. She further advised that the Quarterly Workplan (QWP) would need to be revised to reflect the changes discussed. Ms. Gill indicated that the Project Board could approve the QWP for April to June, 2012 conditional upon the revisions being made as agreed.

8. Approval and Signing of Quarterly Work Plan, April – June 2012

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

- Output 1, Activity Result 4.2: for the Migration Profile launch, move the 'x' from the April to May 'timeframe' column.
- Output 1, Activity Result 5: amend Communication Strategy activity to reflect that this would now be development and distribution of communication materials.
- Output 2, Activity Result 1: Add identify and recruit Interns as an action

Once the changes were made, the revised QWP would be circulated for the relevant parties to sign.

9. Adjournment

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart thanked the Project Board members for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Action Sheet

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. Revise Quarterly Work Plan; April 1 – June 30, 2012	MPU
2. Revise letter to MFAFT regarding Diaspora and Development Policy	MPU
3. Include Project Delivery per cent on Quarterly Progress Report; January 1 – March 31, 2012	MPU