UKAC 10th December Consortium Meeting

Stephen Thompson, Mary Wickendon, Sally Chandler, Ben Thatcher, Pos Michalas, Ellie Margetts, Doug Smith, Alicia Cummins, Clare Mckeown, Tracy Vaughan-Gough, Alfred Hamadziripi, James Murdoch, Eleanor Lucas, Andrew Boys, Priscille Geiser, Liz Haverda, Ai Nakagawa (for first hour online), Susan Pieri, Brigitte Rohwerder (online), Khondoker Ariful Islam, Shafiqul Islam (first hour online), Laetitia Fremont

Alicia welcomes the meeting; opportune time to bring people together before the end of the year to take stock of what we have achieved so far and agreeing work streams ahead of 2019.

**Meeting objectives:**

* **To pause and reflect on our shared experience**
* **To review and finalise principles and values**
* **Ensure clarity around the design process – working towards the deadline in February**

**Brief Update**

A short update was given on the project:

- IATI is something that we will do in the new year.

- Comms planning – this has been moved to January

- Programme design has started (kick off meetings, IDS SITANs, TOC) We are currently in the phase of creating activities – creating a coherent programme across 4 countries – then we will think about what further consultation is needed.

- We will now be finalising partner budgets, programme inception.

- We will be using the same template for global and local-level budgets.

NPAC is DFID’s new way of capturing indirect cost – this will be done at an international level.

We will look (as a consortium) at ensuring that a wide range of partners are selected (in consolation with the local teams). We need to have transparency around how the DPOs are selected – it should not be perceived that some people are handpicked. We need to ensure that the criteria in which they are selected is clear and fair. We will use the principles and values to guide this. But we need to ensure that we are coordinating with other consortia – so that we are not overlapping stakeholders.

Kenya was identified as working for a coordination MOU with Leonard Cheshire; they could be an example to other countries.

Arif gave an update from Bangladesh that Leonard Cheshire are not selecting specific places –

ACTION: Arif will collect more information from Leonard Cheshire in Bangladesh and share

They are moving slowly, at discussion phase, but they may finalise in February (they have a consortium meeting in January in London). DPOs that we have engaged with have been invited to the Leonard Cheshire workshops.

**Pause and reflection**

Sally, Clare and Ellie then led the group with a task that asked three questions:

* What have been the key achievements for the consortium to date?
* What are the areas on which we need to improve as a consortium?
* What piece of advice would you give to a consortium just starting up?

The group then wrote their answers on post-its:

**Key achievements:**

* Country workshop
* The workshop process went well
* Execution/delivery of workshops
* Organising 4 country workshops at short notice
* Clear communication and prompt responses
* We did a lot!
* Signing PFAs (95%) on co-creation
* 1st set of reports approved by DFID on time and in good quality
* Good, regular email comms & useful face-to-face meetings
* Establishing interpersonal relationships
* Very open and transparent communications
* Effective planning and communication
* PMU takes partners suggestions and concerns seriously
* Regular meetings/catch ups/consultation with partners
* Openness to learn and improve
* Having all the design meetings
* Clarity of SSI PMU actions and plans
* PMU open to learning and feedback
* Partnership and openness
* Very supportive PMU
* Structural underpinnings of programme
* Triangle mechanism
* Very pragmatic approach to co-creation
* Open atmosphere for rookies
* DFID is impressed with consortium development process & plans for programme design
* Really good response from stakeholders -> collaboration
* DPO contributions in planning country projects have been powerful and influential

**Areas for improvement**

* Need to think about the balance of Sightsavers leading and the rest inputting!
* Communication
* Need to be more pragmatic
* Time
* Good to have more advance notice for travel or an explanation of when/why things would become clear
* More notice needed ahead of international travel
* Better interaction with other programmes (DID) to ensure there is no overlap and logistical support is coordinated
* Linkages between UK consortium and country teams staying up to date / info flows
* Consortium to take more ownership of specific roles/responsibilities
* Decision-making frameworks unclear
* Achieve more of a feeling of “us” rather than many organisations
* Clearer view of what is expected on each partner perimeter of activity
* Clarity on partners capacities in line with emerging strategic priorities
* It would be good to have a better understanding of what other orgs are doing/planning to do
* Need a programme technical group to agree conceptual approach
* Need more focus on content?! Process mania!
* Concern that the info coming out of the workshops doesn’t continue into the decision making
* Consultation mechanisms & criteria to ensure transparency
* Lack of understanding of CRPD and CRPD compliance
* Provision of proactive support & advice on inclusive approaches would be beneficial in advance of workshops/events as opposed to afterwards
* Increase representation of people with all types of disability
* More consideration of particularly excluded groups e.g. impairment/gender/other
* Engaging with DID and IW together difficult. Ways of working very different
* Understanding of DPOs and their role
* Inclusive practices to ensure participation of underrepresented groups of persons with disabilities
* Selection of DPOs for inception workshops & implementation
* Diversity & representation HOW/WHO/WHEN
* Breadth of DPO engagement – very significant gaps

Clare summed up the improvements into two key areas:

How DPOs are involved

There was concern about the representation of different types of disabilities – there should be more consideration for particular groups (especially women with disabilities). It was also emphasised that content of the programme must really focus on the outcomes of consultation.

Programme content/process arrangements/ways of working

Other areas for improvement were that ways of working have not been as efficient as they could be; that information/work flows are not necessarily communicated which makes it difficult for partners to understand the decision-making framework. This was also raised in relation to coordination with DID; that the two projects are working in different ways which makes it hard for those involved in both projects.

**Advice for new consortia:**

* Set up in-country consortium members coordination mechanism
* Start with scenario exercise to tease out different in approaches between members
* Get clarity from donor on process
* Agree areas of expertise and responsibility of each consortium member at an earlier stage
* In country partner selection criteria
* Work/roles for everyone; not just one lead doing everything
* Balance DFID requirements with meaningful participatory engagement
* Establish strong collaborative principles
* Ensure that roles are clear at the beginning of the design phase
* More involvement of local in country government agencies
* More active involvement of DFID in co-creation?!
* More thinking about inclusive methodologies
* Transparent call for application with criteria for diversity
* Meet as a group as early as possible – relationships
* More time
* Persons with disabilities in leadership roles towards consortium

Partners then spent time writing up specific actions/pledges for the rest of co-creation and beyond:

**Actions/Pledges**

* Think innovation! Not same old!
* I promise/pledge to be open to new ideas
* Work to clarify everyone’s role within the project
* More frequent email updates on global governance point/issues to all consortium members
* Establish a technical capacity coordination platform/mechanism – capacity profiles of consortium members for reference
* Setting up working groups for specific parts of the programme e.g. knowledge management, Source
* Support to lead agency in country?
* 2-3 global staff to do CO visits to unify and strengthen design process
* Pause and put people with disabilities in leadership roles – country gov. structure – including partner DPOs
* More sharing of individual works streams as we go along for alignment where feasible
* Broader DPO involvement in next stage consultations – outreach from all relevant partners
* More explicit work on what we mean by inclusion (IDS Workshop)
* Consortium members create space for exchange
* IDA Members coordinate – what’s not working, how to make it work, who
* Develop a better understanding of inclusion (IDS workshop)
* Recognise tension between wide collaboration and imperative to deliver
* Increased advice/guidance/input to process from IDA taking a proactive lead re: disability inclusion
* Anticipated, clear, transparent mechanism for partner selection
* Establish in country governance
* Strategy for building capacities of consortium members at all levels on CRPD compliance and cross disability engagement

Extra ideas:

Roles and Responsibilities document would support with some of the problems we are facing.

One agency would lead in country – coordinates, brings aspects together.

PMU will put out suggestions – but very open to have conversations to put this together in collaboration. (administrative role, and programmatic driver).

Project governance – beyond coordination. At some point, there will be mini projects with the projects – needs to be a mechanism to account for what it being done. Coordinate voices, bring feedback to consortium, embedding mechanism for impact.

Do we need to review the way that we have planned staffing? What does that look like or is there a separate governance process? How do we draw together all of the “points” and how does the lead organisation influence/guide the process.

**DPO involvement**

The next session will look at this – what does it mean in practice to look at DPO involvement?

If some points are not covered in the next session, we will rejig the agenda

**Principles and Values**

The objective of this session was to review the work undertaken by the Principles and Values working group on behalf of the consortium. Priscille and Doug led a discussion to provide an opportunity for partners to provide feedback on the principles and values in order to finalise the document and take forward subsequent work streams.

Keep in mind that some of the definitions may seem obvious but are not – engagement with the terms is not a given. It is not just theoretical – it is pragmatic.

We need to track the ways in which we are complying to our own principles.

Need something that would guide country project teams to implement this from the beginning. It has to be applicable to all circumstances – how do we embed it? Need to understand the implications of it on the work that they are doing.

How do we monitor that they are being enacted? As a part of the governance of the project.

Inclusivity checklists – being constructive and positive; learning from what has gone well/not gone well.

Some amendments to wording were suggested and this has been highlighted directly in the document. The working group will lead on suggesting alternative or additional text where relevant.

Additional actions from the session are as follows:

1. There was consensus that we need to identify a mechanism for monitoring progress towards upholding the principles and values, including a method for identifying where the document may need further strengthening development as we gain experience throughout the lifetime of the programme.
2. Linked to action 1, it was identified that we need to identify a methodology for assessing our own capacity building needs as partners for a strategy to be developed that can be implemented during implementation phase.
3. It was agreed that we need to identify strategies for practical application of the principles and values and that this may need to differ between different stakeholder groups and different programme levels.
4. Priscille highlighted that a useful piece of work that IDA could lead on during implementation would be to unpack CRPD article 4.3 and 2.4 for partners and stakeholders to strengthen their understanding.
5. It was agreed that the proposal narrative template needs to be updated to reflect the need to plan for engagement of under-represented groups in the programme

**Diversity and representation**

We have to be able to strengthen DPOs to be more inclusive. And we need to be mindful of what DPOs are voicing – the global/regional/personal voice? Need to understand what their roles are.

Having a criteria of persons with disabilities – to ensure that there is diversity in the room – so that we can amplify those who are traditionally not heard. How do we make sure we are apply this principle to what we have to do for the middle of Feb.

**Inclusivity and participation of persons with disabilities**

Understanding our capacity to engage with this issue – what do we as individuals/our organisations need to do to live this principle out/influence others.

A plan by the end of co-creation – IDS led training? So we are all on the same page in terms of participation.

We could commit to doing audits/identify different steps for different organisations –using tools (BDN/ILO) – need to have the challenging conversations.

Point 2. Iv. – commit to a plan by end of co-creation, not assessed.

Space for some honest personal reflection – accountability amongst the consortium.

ACTION: Principles and Values Working Group to think about the “how” this would happen.

DFID have released their Strategy – we should look at this and try to do it better – it might be that we are re-doing what DFID have already done. How can we feed into each other?

**Non-discrimination**

The nature of our types of work, the pace, the building etc. is discriminatory. We need to think more broadly/creatively around this.

The lack of time for proper engagement has some consequences. What are the ways we can facilitate the participation of DPOs without disempowering them?

E.g. not asking for quick turnaround on documents.

Meaningful engagement means giving enough time.

We need to build capacity of country teams – not take things for granted.

ACTION: Making sure that the implementation phase is done in a way that gives time for this to be done properly. Prioritise this conversation now (during design).

2nd consultation phase? We need to clearly show the process and what it will lead to.

**Accessibility and reasonable accommodation**

This is something very easy to fail on. How do we give proactive feedback to those who organised.

We need to make sure that we have adequate provision in implementation for reasonable accommodation.

Consolidate learning from IDA and from workshops.

ACTION: Sally to speak to Dorodi about key learning/overview from all 4 workshops.

Include country teams if they are coordinating.

ACTION: Sally to get in touch with in country staff about this.

**Accountability**

There is an inherent tension between equity, economy and efficiency.

**Openness and honesty**

It would be difficult if we were not open to voice a concern. This seems to be working well at the moment.

**Mutual trust and respect**

Setting deadlines that respect the ways in which consortium members make decisions (e.g. IDA is consultative).

Hierarchies in terms of the level of inclusivity of each partner? Main that respect as we are all at different stages of the journey – and to call each other out if this respect is being lessened.

**Adaptability, compromise and flexibility**

As long as it’s clear that we don’t compromise on the principles that we have set.

It’s around the respectful decision making, able to compromise – be willing to see it from others’ points of view.

ACTION: Move Compromise to the mutual trust and respect principle.

**Learning, improvements and linkages**

Change “Representing” to “engaging” (9.i)

Remove “in the co-creation phase” (9.ii)

ACTIONS:

Language amendments (P&V working group)

Identify ways to track and monitor (P&V working group)

Practical application – ensure that it is relevant (programme governance structure)

Project narrative template update to ensure it includes underrepresented groups (Doug)

Exploring how we are going to develop and hold ourselves accountable to our principles (P&V working group)

**Progress on strategic framework – overview**

Consolidation of all of the information we have put together so far.

Took time post workshop to digest what we had heard and put them into a consistent programme of work. Working in collaboration with country design teams.

The parameters align to the overall IW design parameters:

* Innovation (trying new things) – it’s easy to do things that don’t always challenge us to be creative. We have an opportunity and obligation to be creative.
* Sustaining future private sector- DPO-public sector innovation
* Change social norms – esp. BBCMA
* Systemic approach to inclusion - looking at different levels/actors
* Generating and leveraging evidence – documenting what we are doing; reflecting on evidence that already exists; thinking about what we are learning about the process and what is actually achievable in a 3-year project.
* Realistic and practical

The workshops came up with so many ideas – but we used the above bullet points to narrow down the outputs of the workshop.

Nigeria

Strengthen and amplify the voice of the disability stakeholders that will then support their ability to influence effectively government actors and in particular the development and implementation of effective legislation.

* Implementation of policies with regards to the federal structure
* Capacity building of DPOs
* Gender analysis of DPOs – understanding the socio-religious context – to show how we can improve women’s representation.
* Private sector engagement & initiatives on inclusive practices – private sector are not well educated on inclusion

Context:

* Disability Bill – now with the National Assembly Secretariat (still influence-able)
* Lack of coherence in DPO sector – different modes of engagement – impeding on each other.
* Lack of knowledge by employers

Illustrative outcomes (to be discussed at country team level):

* Stronger and united DPO movement developing & operationalising a coherent policy influencing plan
* Public has greater understanding & support of the rights of people with disabilities & inclusion
* Partnership between DPO sector, private sector & promotion of inclusive formal employment.

Reactions:

Are DFID asking for specific numbers of people with disabilities transitioning to employment?

The policy piece is important, but we will probably have parallel projects working with private sectors – discrete initiatives alongside the legislation change. (e.g. YCI could still run their programme there).

Policy analysis needed?

The document will be sent around for tweaking by Alfred; but the country teams are the ones who are using it.

Linking up with Bridge participants to look at the Disability Bill.

Making the business case for employment – using the initiatives as examples/models as leverage to other businesses.

Kenya

Implementation and operationalisation of the 5% quota and the commitments of the Global Disability Summit as a driver for systemic change. This would be achieved from amplifying the work of existing role models and supporting new sectors to become more inclusive employers.

Strategic focus:

* Legislation/policy implementation, amplifying existing work and networking

Outcome areas:

* Government demonstrates high-level commitment to operationalising the 5% employment quota
* And increase in role models demonstrating inclusive practice in the formal sector
* There is an increase in the visibility of women and men with disabilities in the public sphere – Safaricom – potential to use them to demonstrate within or outside of the sector as role models.

Reactions:

Leonard Cheshire wants to set up a Kenya business disability network – don’t want to duplicate.

The country-level TOC has much more detail than the strategic parameters…

Other private sectors to work with? Not just hotels, horticulture, production/food chains, value chains.

Alicia/Susan – conversation with DFID around the Kenya/UK partnership (GDS)

Brigitte’s question: Sorry meant to add on Kenya - was there any idea of doing work on the disability card - or is that felt to be the responsibility of others? " there is lack of awareness on the side of the individuals applying that by attaching their National Council Cards (which identify their disability) to their application, they are actually given an advantage to apply due to new legislation"

Uganda

Parameter: Strengthening and amplifying existing mechanisms and initiatives that seek to increase inclusive practices in formal employment (FUE, LFTW – amplifying existing work)

Focus:

* Innovation & strengthening existing initiatives

Contexts:

* Existing employer association, inclusive employment initiatives.

Outcomes:

* Employers demonstrate more inclusive practices
* Increase in women & men with disabilities accessing and progressing in the workplace
* Evidence/role models/case studies influence and shift wider attitudes and further action for inclusion in the workplace.

Bangladesh

Parameter: Amplifying existing work/impact and explore any ‘missed opportunities’ in line with IW programme objectives

Outcomes:

* Information and learning about disability inclusion in employment is shared and learning and practice are coordinated and amplified
* Disability inclusion successfully mainstreamed in other initiatives
* CSOs are aware and operationalising disability inclusive recruitment and retention of staff – by targeting NGOs, there will be a wide reach; demonstrating as NGOs will affect other sectors.

In instances where there is already stuff happening, but it is for specific impairments, if we are not very careful then we could end up exacerbating the gap…if we amplify a restricted range then we’re widening the gap.

Who else could we share this document with? And how could we share along the way?

Remember Benetech, DI – how can they feed into this? What aspects can they support with? They need to be proactive, but we also need to be thinking about how they can be involved.

Later this week, we will send, responsibilities, checklist, detailed calendars & frameworks.

Light for the World – amplifying the work in Kenya – very keen to collaborate…no specifics yet.

It is important to have the principles to guide partners/selection process – send to country workshops as soon as possible.

* Identifying the DPO partners – this doesn’t have to happen straight away, this depends on the context of the area.
* Inception workshops – being clear about the selection of partners, identifying criteria.
* Selection of DPOs would very much depend on the local context – national/grassroots/advocative etc.

We need to design, look at what the roles of DPOs could be then to select them.

It could be very political – whatever decision you make could have ramifications; be careful. Be transparent with very clear criteria. Get input from country teams – they will have better idea of the situation on the ground. Have them in the discussion of the criteria; or else they may reject it.

We have to make sure that the messaging in our country design process is not to worry about who to identify, but on what we want to achieve (identification of partners will be the next phase). \*\* (Bring this up straight away in the next design calls).

There are different levels and types of partnerships; not just direct funding contracts.

**Last session:**

Actions/pledges.

Ones that we have haven’t covered:

* The ways in which we support country teams – 2/3 global staff to do country visits to unify and strengthen the process.
* More sharing of individual work streams – we need to exchange information in order to avoid overlap and to ensure that all is covered. As we go along, country-level sharing of work streams (country design groups should be made up of relevant partners – that is where the decisions should be made…)
* More global governance emails – more updates on global governance; keeping people up-to-date with what is happening.
* More working groups: knowledge management/Source? (too many groups will limit meaningful engagement, but could they fit into MEL)
* Technical capacity coordination platform (made up of internal and external technical experts – think about what this would look like after Christmas).
* Pause and put people with disabilities in leadership roles (because of the pace of the project, it has been difficult to engage. When we move towards implementation, we should proactively provide time to put leaders into a meaningful role…into whichever groups are in the project; design, governance, work groups etc. at every possible level).
* Broader DPO involvement in next stage of workshops – we all need to be reaching out to DPOs.

Summary of meetings happening:

* There are 5 groups, global and 4x country groups.
* First meetings were process-orientated, looking at DFID deadlines. Now talking about strategic framework and stakeholder engagement.
* These will happen once a week, to see how progress is being made
* The PMU will focus this week on updating the calendar and design checklist to get clarity on who is doing what.

**Wrap up**

We will write out notes and highlight them and share them with everyone.

Next steps this week…we will send out the calendars etc. lots of information coming (note that as of 14/12 these are all on the consortium sharefile – please contact PMU if you haven’t got access to these).

Principles and Values, some changes to make to the document.

Meetings after Christmas/travel:

* Asking in design groups, how will travel be useful?
* Country launch workshop?
* Specific consultation pieces of works?
* Difficult to say exactly where/when we will go.

YCI planning to launch in Nigeria/Kenya – see how it can be incorporated with IWs workshops.

What about the compiling/consistency of the work at the end of January? We would hope to give a round of feedback before the 15th February. We will look at this with the calendars.

Consortium meeting end of January for review process? Would this be better as a group or bilaterally?