

**Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> DRIC programme Board meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2016**

**Venue; LAD Room, UNDP**

ATTENDEES:

Ms. Claire Van der Vaeren -	UN Resident Coordinator (Co-chair)
H.E. Prof.Heng Tay Kry-	Secretary of State, Ministry of Health
Ms. Ruth Stewart -	Deputy Head of Mission, Australian Embassy, Cambodia
H.E Yi Veasna -	Adviser to the Royal Government of Cambodia, Representative of People with Disabilities
Ms. Channtey Heng-	Representative of Persons with Disabilities
Ms. Setsuko Yamazaki-	Country Representative, UNDP
Ms. Debora Comini –	Country Representative, UNICEF
Dr. Dong-il Ahn -	Country Representative, WHO
Mr. Enrico Gaveglia-	Deputy Representative, UNDP
Ms. Natascha Paddison -	Deputy Representative, UNICEF
Mr. James Rarick-	Technical Officer and Team Leader, WHO
Mr. Bagival Pradeep -	Joint Programme Coordinator, DRIC
Ms. Anne Lubell -	Community Development Specialist, UNICEF
Ms. Mao Meas -	National Management Specialist, UNDP
Mr. Vivath Chou -	Technical Officer, Disability and Rehabilitation, WHO
Mr. Tokyo Bak -	Senior Disability Programme Manager, Australian Embassy.

**Opening remarks and adoption of the agenda**

The Co-chair Ms. **Claire Van der Vaeren** (UNRC) welcomed members and other participants to the 5<sup>th</sup> programme board meeting of the Disability Rights Initiative Cambodia (DRIC). The Co-Chair introduced the agenda to the board and as there were no further comments or suggestions from the members, the board adopted the proposed agenda. The Co –Chair and UNRC took this opportunity to welcome the new members of the board Ms. Debora Comini, Representative, UNICEF and Ms. Ruth Stewart, Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Australia. The Co-Chair also introduced Dr. Maya Thomas, Independent Consultant and the Team Leader of the DRIC mid-term review who shared her initial impressions of the review undertaken by her with the members of the board. In her remarks, Ms. Maya mentioned that DRIC is a large, ambitious and a complex program involving many stakeholders and works across multi-layers of management. Further in her remarks on the relevance, she said that DRIC is highly relevant and appropriate in accordance with its goal, policies, improvement of service delivery and in capacity –building of the

partners. In terms of effectiveness, she said that DRIC has been effective and has witnessed mainstreaming of disability in the society. The programme also has good collaboration with the multiple stakeholders including CSOs to improve rehab services, access to better services and in decreasing isolation of persons with disabilities. As far as sustainability is concerned, the capacity of the sub-national government is in the process of being built to ensure sustainability. With regards to efficiency, Ms. Maya said there have been some issues related to synergy, coordination, engagement with the stakeholders, monitoring and reporting systems and in sharing of lessons learned. She further commented that in the future, DRIC needs more engagement with the government to achieve its outcomes. There should be a road map developed including a plan for resource mobilization. Budget allocation from the government to key areas is of utmost importance.

In relation to relevance, H.E. Yi Veasna said that there should be comprehensive discussion with the stakeholders and it should be on the basis of the baseline collected by the programme during the design phase. Speaking in terms of effectiveness, he said that there seems to be some sort of confusion of the roles of the partners and lacks coordination apart from lack of proactivism from the government side.

The UNRC /Co-Chair stated that the PCT will circulate the draft MTR report to the relevant members for comments and suggestions and that the report will be endorsed in the next board meeting.

#### **Agenda #01; Follow –up on the decisions of the 4<sup>th</sup> Programme Board meeting**

The Programme Coordinator briefly explained the decision of the previous board meeting to keep the members updated on the implementation of the recommendations of the Functional Analysis Study commissioned by the UNDP. Accordingly, the Programme Coordinator informed the board that out of eight key recommendations, two recommendations have been implemented while six recommendations are in the process being implemented. The Programme coordinator informed the board that the M and E frame for the NDSP is yet to be approved by the government as it has now being realized that the ten strategic objectives of the plan are very aspirational and appears beyond the technical and financial capacity of the government. Regarding the second pending issue relating to the amendment of the disability law, the Programme Coordinator stated that in pursuance to the technical note developed and circulated by the PCT on the need for amending/revising the national disability law, the MoSVY had responded positively by agreeing to consult the stakeholders to propose amendment and revision to the required provisions of the national disability law. It was also informed to the members that a legislature reforms committee has already been constituted for this purpose.

The Programme Coordinator further informed the board members that as discussed with the Secretary of State during one of the meetings, the national law may not go through revision during the program cycle and therefore there is a need for amending the result related to the revision of the law. The UNDP representative, Ms. Setsuko appreciated the stand taken by the MoSVY in suggesting revision of the law in conjunction with the CRPD and stated that there should be a road map from the DAC which will clearly indicate the activities along with the time frame that will be undertaken to amend/revise the law before the programme ends. Agreeing to the comments of Ms. Setsuko, the Deputy Head of Mission from the Australian embassy, Ms. Ruth said that while there has been considerable progress in implementing the recommendations of the functional analysis report, there should be clear management plan for ensuring progress of the recommendations that are still pending. She further commented that while there is progress in terms of revision of the law, there is a need to ensure effective implementation of the existing provisions of the law as well. It was also mentioned by her that in the interest of the sustainability of the programme in relation to recommendation 08 and 09 of the Functional Analysis Report, the Cambodian government

partners should be encouraged to develop a road map with the involvement of the Ministry of Economy and Finance to ensure there is an increase in the allocation of financial resources for the disability sector.

One of the representative of persons with disabilities, Ms. Heng mentioned that access to health is an important right under the convention and this should be appropriately addressed while amending/revising the disability law. The Secretary of State for Health highlighted the need for identifying poor persons with disabilities and to ensure that they have access to medical services.

In line with the suggestions from the PCT, the board members agreed with the Resident Coordinator and Co-Chair of the board to re-phrase the result related to component 01 by stating that *'amendments and revision to some of the provisions of the Law on Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities will be proposed to be in alignment with the CRPD'*. The original result according to the programme design document stated that *'The Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and implementing legislation is revised in alignment with CRPD, CRC, CEDAW and other international conventions to which Cambodia is a party'*. It was also reiterated that a road map with a time frame will be developed to propose revision and amendments to the existing disability law. Responding to the request of Ms. Ruth to clarify further the process of revision and amendments, the Programme Coordinator explained that it is the responsibility of the DAC to propose revision to the law in line with Article 6 of the national disability legislation and the process usually starts with a comparative analysis of the national legislation with the CRPD involving active engagement with the stakeholders and participation of the key ministries. Adding further to the discussion the UNRC and Co-Chair said that taking into consideration the statement of the Secretary of State for MoSVY, that it may not be possible to revise the law during the programme cycle period, it is therefore the endeavor of this board to frame a result that is meaningful and achievable in the context of the joint programme.

H.E. Yi Veasna suggested that the community at the grassroots level should also take the ownership of implementing the law effectively. He further said that while it is important to implement the law, the revision of law would not lead to better implementation. He also emphasized the fact that the CRPD should be used as a resource to strengthen the law. Ms Setsuko mentioned that DAC should clearly state who is responsible within the council and draw a timeline apart from having consultations with the stakeholders on the draft proposal for the revision of the law. She further added that it is also imperative to mention the work done on the revision of the law in the report to be submitted to the CRPD committee. The UNRC and Co-chair reminded the members that as the issue of sustainability has been raised number of times during the discussion, the board will look at this issue during the discussion on the MTR report in the next meeting.

**Decision:** 1. PMG and PCT to monitor and report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Functional Analysis report in the next board meeting.

2. The board agrees to revise one of the result to component 01 which will now state that *'amendments and revision to some of the provisions of the Law on Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities will be proposed to be in alignment with the CRPD'*.

3. The DAC will develop a road map indicating the activities that will be completed for proposing amendments and revisions to the law and the time frame in which these activities will be completed. The board further recommended that the process for revision should be such that it deepens the national ownership as much as possible in developing the proposal for revision of the law.

**Agenda #2; Presentation from the Programme Coordinator on the 2015 Annual Report**

The Programme Coordinator, on behalf of the implementing agencies, presented the 2015 annual report to be submitted to MPTF office. In the course of his presentation, he highlighted the progress achieved collectively by the programme in realizing the intermediate outcomes and outputs apart from highlighting qualitative and quantitative data generated during the reporting period on the basis of the M and E framework. The Programme Coordinator informed the board about the risks that was flagged-off during reporting period pertaining to decrease in funding on account of currency fluctuations and the steps initiated to mitigate the same. The key challenges, delays and lessons learned were highlighted from annual report as part of the presentation apart from two good practices of the programme in realizing the rights of persons with disabilities. As part of the qualitative assessment of the progress achieved, the Programme Coordinator highlighted the key partnerships and how such relationships impacted the achievement of the results. Some of the cross-cutting issues were briefly mentioned that were pertinent to the results and the presentation concluded with information on the how the UN coordination has supported the programme on achievement of the results.

In response to the presentation, H.E. Veasna suggested that the programme should explore the possibilities of integrating its work with some of the NGOs having similar objectives. Ms. Ruth thanked the Programme Coordinator for the comprehensive presentation and mentioned that lots of work has been done under the programme. She further thanked the Programme for organizing the field visit to see the results of the programme at the community level. As a word of caution, she mentioned that the programme needs to pay attention to the delays in implementation of some of the activities and to keep the pressure on. Related to the National Disability Strategic Plan (NDSP), Ms. Ruth emphasized that the national government partners should expedite the process and also to ensure that the national budget is increased to support the implementation of the plan while the board members in their respective capacities should also advocate for the implementation of the NDSP.

Ms. Ruth mentioned that the Programme Coordinator has demonstrated very well his comprehensive experience and it is particularly important for the agencies to make use of the skills of the Programme Coordinator, particularly component 01 and 02 and also on cross-cutting issues of the components in terms of coordination. Ms. Chantey Heng requested for more information on the capacity-building of the DAC and how it is being measured. She further wanted to know if there will be any kind of assessment to measure the progress of DAC in terms of their capacity. Responding to this question, the Programme Coordinator responded by saying that the M and E framework has clear indicators and targets to measure the capacity building of the DAC and based on these indicators there will be periodic assessment conducted to measure the progress. He also mentioned some of the progressive steps taken by DAC in addressing the rights of persons with disabilities during the year.

The Programme Coordinator in response to the decision of the board members taken during the previous board meeting to report on the utilization of the disability expertise of the PCT by the three UN agencies, stated that the UNDP has been fully utilizing the expertise of the PCT in the programming and there has been marked improvement in the WHO availing the technical support of the PCT. Further, he also mentioned that UNICEF has been actively engaging the PCT and the Programme Coordinator has visited four of the CDIDF partners during the year apart from engaging with other government partners. It was further mentioned by the Programme Coordinator that the next two years is the defining period for CDIDF and PCT will support the work of the CDIDF partners in reducing barriers to participation as well as reporting to the board on how the sensitization programme has enabled sub-national government officials in achieving the rights of persons with disabilities.

Ms. Setsuko mentioned that the global MPTF website though has reported expenditure of the UNDP, there has not been much information on the 2015 expenditure of other agencies and wanted to know when this information will be made available. In response to this issue, the Programme Coordinator assured that this matter will be promptly taken up by the PCT with the MPTF office to update the website.

Decision:

The board will take note of the suggestions made by the board members and the annual report is approved for submission to the MPTF office.

**Agenda # 03; Presentation of the 2016-2017 work plan and 2016 budget**

The Programme Coordinator highlighted the details of the two year rolling work plan and the new activities that required approval of the board were highlighted during the presentation. He further justified the need for the new activities and informed the board that these activities are important for the programme in achievement of the results. On similar lines, the Programme Coordinator also highlighted the salient features of the 2016 budget and mentioned specifically the budget allotted for the new activities apart from highlighting the progress in terms of delivery rate for each of the programme components.

Ms. Ruth thanked PCT for engaging DFAT in the preparations of the work plan and budget which makes the discussion easier at the board level. She further mentioned that DFAT will be happy to support the activity on spinal cord injuries and consultancy for CSO capacity development. Regarding the salary for the Driver's position, DFAT is willing to support this cost as there has been savings in the salaries and with regards to the support to MoSVY on CBR, she emphasized the need to monitor the outcomes of this activity very clearly to make sure that it delivers the expected outputs. For the future budget planning, Ms Stewart suggested that the work plan and budget be approved early for implementation. The allocation under UNICEF budget for capacity development of the CSO partners was equally approved by DFAT.

Ms. Setsuko agreed with DFAT that we should start discussion of the budget work and work plan 2017-2018 early, perhaps in the next board meeting after having clearer picture of budget and actual expenditure. She agreed with the DFAT comments about the good services rendered by the PCT and that cost of the PCT is included under the UNDP budget. She further anticipated a situation where there could be programme fund balance at the end of the project but with no programme managers or the programme management support. Therefore it is essential to start talking about how the programme needs to be funded particularly for 2018 in the next board meeting. Ms. Setsuko said that any unspent funds at the end of the programme has to be returned to the MPTF and citing an example of a previous joint programme where some part of the funds were not spent, the Cambodian government had asked the implementing agencies as to why the funding was not fully utilized for implementation.

Agreeing with the point made by Ms. Setsuko, it was mentioned by Ms. Ruth that there should not be a situation where any unspent funds may have to be returned to the Australian government and supported the point for having a discussion in the next board meeting about funding for 2018. H.E. Veasna mentioned that there should be plan prepared in 2017 as to who will take the ownership of the programme and whether it would be MoSVY or the DAC. He also said that we need to inform the government properly, including meeting with the minister to inform him about this well in advance. Summing up her comments on sustainability of the programme results, the UNRC and Co-Chair said that the issue of sustainability from a practical point of the exit strategy and handover of the ownership to the government will be decided on the basis of the MTR report and it will also be clear as to which component will exit in 2018 and what might possibly continue with the government under their ownership. She suggested that PCT should take note of this and bring the issue of sustainability of the programme on the agenda of the board for the next meeting to be held this year.

#### Decision

1. The programme work plan for 2016-17 and budget for 2016 is approved.
2. The implementing agencies will ensure that the information on the expenditure for 2016 is made available for the 2017 board meeting to be held in the month of February so that the information can be used to discuss the financial and programmatic transition and also to ensure that the utilization of the resources for the programme is utilized to the maximum extent possible. PCT to take note of this and bring it on the agenda of the board meeting to be held in Feb 2017.
3. PCT to include the issue of sustainability of the programme and ownership of the government in the agenda for the next board meeting to be held in 2016.

#### **Agenda # 04; Discussion on the issue of resource mobilization to the extent of unfunded programme budget for the year 2018**

The programme coordinator highlighted the budget requirements for the year 2018 according to the programme document and also provided information about the actual programmable funding received and to be utilized till 2017. In response to the presentation, Ms. Ruth said that she may not be in a position to provide any information about the much anticipated funding for 2018 at the moment as there budgetary uncertainties on account of domestic and political factors. The federal budget discussion in May 2016 will perhaps provide an indication about the 2018 funding and also the elections to be held in Australia makes it harder to predict the future funding for the programme. The 2016-17 national budget information which will be available in mid-2016 will perhaps help DFAT to have a better picture of the future funding along with the recommendations of the MTR report. She opined that DFAT will be able to provide more information in the next board meeting.

During the discussion Ms. Setsuko also clarified the decrease in funding received till the end of 2017 in comparison to the figures mentioned in the programme document is on account of the currency fluctuations. The UNRC /Co-Chair suggested that the discussion on 2018 funding will be back on the agenda for the next board meeting.

Decision: The board will discuss the issue of resource mobilization for 2018 in the next board meeting to be held this year.

### **AoB**

It was suggested by the Co-chair that the PCT in consultation with the board members to decide on the next possible date for the board meeting. H.E. Veasna suggested that under the leadership of the UNRC, the board members should meet the Minister of MoSVY to seek an appointment with the Prime Minister of the RGC to appraise him about the work done under the DRIC programme. Responding to this suggestion, the UNRC /Co-chair suggested that the board will continue to discuss how strongly can the programme results be embedded in the national sector and agenda of the government and the MTR report can further guide this process. The board members unanimously agreed to this suggestion from the Co-chair.

The UNRC and Co-chair thanked all the board members and the PMG members for their participation and the PCT for organizing the meeting. She further reminded the PCT to take note on the key decisions and other critical elements of the discussion during the preparations of the minutes.