

**Minutes of Project Board Meeting
Held on
April 12, 2013 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
Mrs. Rukiya Brown	-	IOM Kingston
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
Ms. Monique McLean	-	Project Associate, Migration Policy Project Unit
Ms. Suwayne Trowers	-	Research Assistant, Migration Policy Project Unit

Apologies for Absence:

Ms. Keisha Livermore	-	Head of Office, IOM
Mr. Glen Smith	-	National Programme Office, UNFPA
Ms. Marlene Lamonth	-	Project Manager, EU Delegation

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m. by Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart, Project Board Chair.

2. Prayer

Prayer was offered by Mrs. Andrea Shepherd-Stewart.

3. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart welcomed the Project Board members to the meeting and advised that the outstanding outputs had to be achieved in the remaining months. She stated that it was also important

to achieve the outcomes that were originally targeted. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart advised that the second phase of the project had been confirmed, but re-iterated that the first phase should be able to stand on its own. She added that the first phase would end on June 30, 2013. She noted that there were consultancies that had not yet begun and this process should be expedited and effectively executed.

4. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were offered on behalf of Ms. Keisha Livermore, Ms. Marlene Lamonth and Mr. Glen Smith.

5. Confirmation of Minutes of January 11, 2013

The minutes were confirmed by Mrs. Toni-Shae Freckleton and seconded by Ms. Sonia Gill.

6. Matters Arising

a) Update on National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development

Ms. Allen updated the members that a Multi-Agency Working Group was established to review the National Policy and Plan of Action on International Migration and Development. She stated that a total of six meetings were held between January and March 2013 and advised that the policy document was in its Green Paper stage. Ms. Allen stated that the policy and Cabinet Submission had been sent to four key stakeholders: Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, Ministry of Labour and Social Security and Attorney General's Chambers, for the final feedback from their senior officials.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart inquired about the process of submission of the policy to Cabinet. Mrs. Freckleton responded that the submission to Cabinet would be done by the end of April. She indicated that the deadline for feedback from the four agencies was April 12, 2013. She stated that the proposed changes would be made, which would facilitate the send-off to Cabinet. Mrs. Freckleton stated that it would be a joint submission between the Ministry of Finance and Planning (MOF) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade (MFA&FT). She stated that the policy would be sent to MFA&FT first, as the Minister was more engaged in the process and then to MOF.

Mrs. Freckleton advised that Cabinet could ask for further consultation or accept the policy. If the policy is accepted then the next step would be submission to parliament, where it would be presented as a white paper. Mr. Williams noted that the Cabinet Secretariat would have to be informed before it was sent in order for them to put it on the agenda. He stated that there was the possibility of the policy being sent to the Human Resource Council (HRC) before going to Cabinet.

b) Update on Diaspora Policy Consultancy

Ms. Allen updated the members that the process for the Diaspora Consultancy was led by the MFA&FT. She advised that a Consultant had been recruited and that the contract was signed in February. She stated that the first deliverable, the concept paper and inception report, were received and that they were in the process of transferring the funds for payment to the MFA&FT. She informed that the Consultant and the MFA&FT were in the process of coordinating consultations which will be held in the United Kingdom (UK) and New York. Ms. Allen indicated that the consultant was scheduled to travel on

April 17th and that a number of meetings were arranged with different Diaspora groups. She advised that local consultations will also be held in addition to those overseas.

c) Update on Activities for Outputs 3 and 4

Ms. Allen advised that the tender process to recruit the Capacity Development Strategy, Implementation Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Consultant began in 2012. She indicated that the first attempt was not successful and that a second attempt was made at the tender process. She stated that it was completed in January 2013 and that letters were sent to 10 firms to submit tenders. Ms. Allen informed that at the end of this process three bids were received and an evaluation meeting was held on January 31st 2013. However they were deemed non- responsive based on the criteria stated in the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Ms. Allen indicated that a third tender process was embarked on based on the approval of the project board. She stated that 6 candidates were identified and sent letters of invitation for the consultancies. Ms. Allen indicated that recommendations for consultants were received from UNDP, UNICEF and Human Resource Department of the PIOJ. She noted that deadline for submission was March 25th, and the evaluation was held on April 4th. She stated that the total timeline for the consultancy had been revised to 45 days. She explained that at the close of the deadline there were 3 submissions for Capacity Development Strategy but none for the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. She stated that one of the consultants was invited to submit a proposal for the consultancy to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework. She indicated that the consultant submitted a financial proposal of US\$21,260.

Ms. Allen stated that only one candidate achieved the minimum score, however, the financial proposal was outside of the budget. She stated that the work plan had a budget of US \$35,000 for all the consultancies. She explained that US\$15,000 was budgeted for the implementation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework and US\$20,000 for Capacity Development Strategy. She stated that the financial proposal amounted to US\$30, 090 and that the technical submission matched the criteria.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart questioned whether the cost was expensive or the budget was under estimated since US\$20,000 was budgeted for the consultancy and US\$30,000 was quoted in the financial proposal. Ms. Allen explained that only local consultants were considered when doing the initial budgets and that in the original estimation there was no allocation for air fare or Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA). She stated that the Consultant used an international rate of US\$ 500 per day as the base rate for formulating her cost and that in checking with the Human Resource Department, this is within the band of US\$350-500 dollars would be the range paid to Consultants.

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart inquired how the process could be expedited to get the work done and allow for time for review since the timeline was expected to be 45 working days. Ms. Allen stated that periods for review were considered when drafting the work plan. She stated that the contract had been drafted and that a list of documents that that the consultant would require were being put together.

7. New Business

a) Quarterly Progress Report January 1- March 31, 2013

Ms. Allen stated that initial comments on the Quarterly Progress Report were received from UNDP and incorporated into the document. Mrs. Brown recommended that a footnote be added to the balance

US\$215, 000 for output stating that the amount was reallocated in order to indicate that they weren't still available for travel. Ms. Gill congratulated the project on the high level of articulation with regard to the broader set of national develop activity in relation to migration. She also congratulated the project on the highlight of the Policy at the upcoming Diaspora Conference and added that this emphasized the work that was being done. She suggested that this be reflected under the summary of activities as it was a major achievement. Mrs. Stewart indicated that the content of the report was approved subject to the changes to be made.

b) Discussion of Project Evaluation

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart queried about when the evaluation would be undertaken. Mrs. Freckleton advised that based on the discussions held with Ms. Allen and the Capacity Development Consultant, which should end in June, the evaluation could take place in the last week of June up to mid-July. Mrs. Sheperd-Stewart asked whether the consultant was being recruited by UNDP. Ms. Gill replied that UNDP would be undertaking the recruitment that it would be an independent consultant that had not been directly associated with the project. Ms. Gill stated that the terms of reference had already been drafted. She advised that it was being done in consultation with the Global Migration Group (GMG) as it was the first time evaluating a GMG project and UNDP had to take GMG's guidelines into consideration . Ms. Gill stated that UNDP should be able to advertise the consultancy by the end of April, shortlist, recruit and have the person ready by the end of June.

Mrs. Freckleton stated that the budget had been cut for the project evaluation from US\$15,000 to US\$12,000. Ms. Gonzalez stated that the Project Evaluation was very important and would inform the design of Phase II. She advised that US\$12,000 would not be sufficient to cover the cost of the consultancy. She further stated that a minimum of US\$15,000 would be required. Ms. Gonzalez advised that UNDP could keep the funds for the evaluation consultant in the amount of US\$15,000 and PIOJ would send a new request for the remaining funds.

8. Approval and Signing of Work plan April 1- June 30, 2013

Ms. Allen advised that an alternate work plan was prepared. She stated that there were two options. The first of which is to continue with all three consultancies, and try to negotiate with the consultant for the reduction of the cost. The second option would be to pursue the Capacity Development Strategy in this phase and move the implementation plan and the monitoring and evaluation framework to the second phase, which would allow an opportunity to reallocate the funds. She stated that the Capacity Development Strategy could be done as a precursor in order to inform the Implementation Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

Ms. Shepherd Stewart stated that both proposals were now totalling US\$52,000. She asked the members whether it would be better to have negotiations with the Capacity Development Strategy Consultant to reduce the cost or move the Implementation Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to the next Phase. In view of the stringent timeline for the completion of phase 1, Mrs. Freckleton recommended that, it was in best interest of the project to move the implementation plan and monitoring and evaluation framework to the second phase of the project. She stated that the resources should be allocated towards the Capacity Development Strategy in order to facilitate the successful completion of Phase I.

Mrs. Shepherd indicated that the recommendation was that the Capacity Development Strategy be undertaken in this phase and the Implementation Plan and Monitoring and Evaluation be moved to Phase II. She stated that the project board would approve Ms. Freckleton's recommendation. Ms. Gill stated that a lesson learnt in going forward for this and other projects was regarding assumptions about the availability of skills locally and the time required to adequately fulfil the criteria of the GOJ procurement process. She stated that the risks against these should be mitigated in other projects.

Mrs Freckleton stated that the amount for the Capacity Development Consultancy was increased from US\$27,000 to US\$30,000 based on possible exchange rate losses. In order to guard against possible losses, Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart asked whether the consultant could be paid directly through UNDP. Ms. Gill replied that UNDP could only pay a consultant that they had contracted.

Ms. Allen stated that the modifications to the alternate work plan included the facilitation of the GMG mission and the South to South Cooperation with the Cape Verde team. Mrs. Freckleton stated that the trip was being planned for May 14- 17, 2013. She informed that Ms. McLean would be in communication with UNDP based on the schedule that was being discussed for the visit, as well as the date that was being discussed for the UNCT meeting and the meeting with IOM and UNDP. Ms. Gill advised that the UNCT was meeting the week before and that it would not be possible to have another meeting as many of the heads of agencies had a regional mandate and that they may not be in Jamaica. She stated that requests had been sent out to meet with Ms. Sarah Rosengaertner. She stated that they would coordinate so that the Cape Verde team could meet with Ms. Rosengaertner and the UNCT team.

Mrs. Freckleton stated that the launch of the policy would be facilitated in the next Phase. She explained that the launch would no longer be an activity result, as it would be based on the decisions of Cabinet , and therefore, would be moved into Phase II. Ms. Gill suggested that the launch should be rephrased as "finalized instruction from Cabinet".

Mrs Freckleton stated that they had requested the visibility of both policies along with Vision 2030. She stated that these would include funds dedicated to the participation of the team as well as the setting up of a booth space with a designated space for the consultant to meet with Diaspora members. She stated that these would amount to approximately US\$5000. Ms. Gill advised that that a fourth activity result could be added to specify the listed actions. She stated that the result would be that the IMD and Diaspora Policy would get significant visibility. Mrs. Freckleton stated that a new action was added regarding preparations for phase II to outline the activities for the five year period.

Ms. Freckleton stated that in communication with the MFA&FT, it was indicated that US\$13, 000 would be allocated for the Diaspora Policy; however, it was reflected on the work plan as US\$10,000. She stated that the GOJ portions allocated for Phase II would be used to assist in paying for the Diaspora Conference. Mrs. Brown queried what the US\$5000 budgeted for the conference would cover. Mrs. Freckleton replied that it included money to cover accommodation for the team, payment for the booth space, the production of the material.

Mrs. Freckleton stated that the PIOJ was confident that what was reflected on the work plan could effectively take us to the end of the project without having to return funds. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart asked whether the documents needed to be recirculated. Ms. Gill stated that the project board would approve the document based on the suggested changes made.

9. The Way Forward

Mrs. Brown asked Mrs. Freckleton whether a request could be sent to MFA&FT asking them to send an invitation to IOM for the regional representative based on the Guyana Diaspora mapping project. Ms. Gonzalez asked when the next project board meeting would be after the project closes. Ms. Gill stated that an end of project report had to be done outlining the overall achievements and lessons learnt. The project board would use this report to put its seal on the project. Mrs. Freckleton recommended that the board meeting would be at the end of June. Ms. Gill inquired whether it was practical to have this meeting with the upcoming conference and have all the reports done. Mrs. Freckleton stated that the process for preparing the reports could start as soon as possible. She stated that the lessons learnt document was due by the end of May and was in the final stages. Ms. Gill advised that the accounts team had to be notified of the statements. Ms. Gonzalez stated that the report would have to be prepared after June. Mrs. Freckleton indicated that the population unit could finalize the financials. Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart stated that there was much work to be done in light of all the reports that needed to be done.

10. Adjournment

Mrs. Shepherd-Stewart thanked the Project Board members for their input. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:07 a.m.

Action Sheet

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
1. Revise Quarterly Work Plan; April 1 – June 30, 2013.	MPU
2. Revise Quarterly Progress Report for January 1- March 31, 2013.	MPU
3. Communicate with MFAFT on Jamaica Diaspora Conference invitation for IOM	Mrs. Freckleton

