

**THE 2ND HENLEY INTERNATIONAL
TECHNICAL WORKSHOP - COST RECOVERY**

Robert Horvath

June 13-15, 1998

The evaluation report was conducted under the auspices of the United States Agency for International Development. The evaluation was conducted by the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund and War Victims Fund Contract (HRN-C-00-95-0004-00). The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or TvT Associates.

Additional information or copies of this report can be obtained by contacting:

Displaced Children and Orphan Fund & War Victims Fund
North Tower, Suite 405
1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20004
(202)789-1500

Table of Contents

I.	PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE	
II.	OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	A. International Funding	
	B. Insurance, Government Health Schemes, Compensation	
	C. Client Charges and Contributions	
	D. Fundraising Initiatives, Private and Voluntary Services	
III.	OTHER ISSUES	
	APPENDICES	
I.	PARTICIPANT LIST	
II.	WORKSHOP SCHEDULE	
III.	SHORT SESSION PRESENTATIONS	

I. PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

POWER and the Cambodia Trust recently held the second of three technical workshops in Henley on Thames. The topic of this years workshop was cost recovery mechanisms. The workshop ran 3 days, from June 13-15, 1998.

The workshop enjoyed varied participation, although attendance was not as robust as last year's workshop. Key organizations which DID NOT attend this year's workshop included: Handicap International (HI), International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC), UNDP, and UNICEF. Organizations which did send a representative included Landmine Survivor Network (LSN), Physicians Against Landmines, ISPO, and USAID/LWVF. See Appendix I for a complete list of participants.

The objective of the workshop was to *discuss, develop a consensus, and write a comminque on best practices of cost recovery mechansims which will provide funding for long term sustainability of programs for rehabilitation of disabled persons in low-income countries.*

The first day and half of the workshop was structured to allow short presentations by fourteen of the participants. Time was allowed for questions and answers in between each address. Each address and subsequent discussion was to be approximately 20 minutes long. The presentations were to be followed by small working groups focussed on particular topics.

As can be expected, the addresses and subsequent question and answer sessions immediately began to run very long. In fact, the first two addresses and discussions were over one hour long each. This put the workshop into a time crunch very early on. In order to move the program forward, the remaining twelve addresses on the second day were given one right after one another and one general question and answer session was offered at the end. This provided very little opportunity to really discuss individual experiences or process best practices.

The afternoon of the second day was spent in four breakout groups. Participants were given a choice as to which small group they wished to participate in; international funding; insurance/government health schemes; client charges/contributions; or fundraising

initiatives/private and voluntary sources. While on one hand this afforded people the opportunity to participate in a discussion which interested them, it left some groups (e.g. client charges) with only a couple of participants while others had seven or eight (e.g. international funding).

After group discussions and consensus was achieved, the individual groups' chairpersons and rappateurs met to develop a consensus document. This document was presented to the group and a lively discussion pursued. The document was reworked and again vetted to the group. Several drafts later, a final document was produced.

The final session in Henley was for the group to agree on next steps to be taken. This did not happen. Very little time was allocated for these discussions and it was clear from the start that certain participants had already decided what they felt the next steps should be. The group did not plan, nor were arrangements made or division of responsibilities discussed as to what would happen next.

A final document was generated and will be completed and distributed by POWER.

II. OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted above, individual presentations and subsequent questions and answers ran well over the allotted time in the initial stages. This left little or no time to discuss the majority of the presentations. In the future, either more time needs to be allocated for these initial presentations or greater active facilitation needs to take place.

Similarly, I found that one of the most important parts of the workshop, the “next steps” session was glossed over. I felt that this was a lost opportunity to get individuals and organizations to make specific time and/or task commitments. Instead, POWER and/or The Cambodia Trust will must keep the momentum moving forward.

Proposed as the workshop conclusion was group support for a Canadian initiative of a global NGO working group and victims fund. This conclusion was not supported by the majority of the participants at the Henley workshop. Instead, the group consensus was to indicate that such an initiative may have merit and a global role to play and is, therefore, worth further pursuit but that currently there are too many unanswered questions.

In addition to a general workshop conclusion, individual working groups made specific recommendations. These recommendations achieved group consensus (for the most part) and included:

A. International Funding:

- solicitation of greater amounts of money. While currently available, amounts are insufficeint to meet substantial needs.
- NGO community must educate the donors as to the nature of the need and the priorities for disbursing the funds. At the same time, the donor community needs to educate itself as to whom the players are and what the demand is.
- can NGOs and donors define a code of conduct which defines best practices?
- international standards should be set in terms of training, education, quality control, evaluation, etc. so that minimum standards are being met and donors are provided a yard stick by which to measure the success of individual programs and organizations.

- cost effectiveness studies should be conducted as soon as appropriate in order to educate donors and governments as to what the costs of NOT rehabilitating persons is as opposed to the current focus on the burden OF rehabilitation.

B. Insurance, Government Health Schemes, Compensation

- while private insurance, where the blame for the event cannot be pinned on one person or institution, is not possible, it may be possible to utilize private insurance to cover the costs of replacement limbs. If not a financially viable option, governments or some form of state health insurance system must cover the costs.
- in order to foster an insurance environment, NGOs should insure all of their employees and that insurance settlements should be handled by Trust Funds. Additionally, companies entering low income countries should be required to insure all of their employees and pay a premium which allows a Trust Fund to be set up.
- disabled groups and international agencies should lobby to get employee insurance established.
- G8 countries should be lobbied to take care of the disabled as one of the issues on its agenda; similar to refugees, women and children, etc.
- compensation from the armaments industry was noted as a manner in which funds may be generated; similar to compensation paid by the tobacco companies. This needs further investigation and promotion by NGOs and donors.

C. Client Charges and Contributions

- clients should be encouraged to make some contribution to the cost of services - either in cash or in-kind. Examples of in-kind commitments include commodities or volunteering to help out at the local orphanage, etc. It may be more feasible to apply a charge to subsequent limbs rather than initial limbs.
- all clients should be assessed as to their ability to pay when they come to the center. If there is a system of outreach, this should be used as an assessment tool as well. Assessments may be piggy backed on end user surveys or other information gathering events. Assessments should be as simple as possible.
- even if pursued, client charges are unlikely to produce significant level of contribution to the overall cost of services. An objective may be to cover the cost of local salaries using client charges.

D. Fundraising Initiatives, Private and Voluntary Services

- before starting any activity it should be clear who the beneficiaries are and how the money will be used.
- locally raised funds should not be used to pay international salaries or international NGO overheads

- NGOs and donors should lobby governments to give tax concessions to taxable individuals or corporations making donations.
- training for host country personnel should include fund raising; in particular those taking on responsibility for the services after international funding is withdrawn should be trained to undertake fundraising.
- a list of fundraising ideas was generated and will be forthcoming by the workshop. Furthermore, donors may add to the list by reviewing successful project initiatives.

III. OTHER ISSUES

A couple of issues were brought up at the Henley workshop that potentially affect our programs. They are:

1. Sri Lanka I was informed that at the invitation of FINS, POWER will be pursuing a program in Sri Lanka. The intention is to secure 150 Blachfords Atlas limbs and fit them through the FINS/Colombo workshop. In order to do so, POWER would need to update equipment and space. Subsequent discussions with the USAID/Mission in SL indicated a much larger role for POWER - including wanting to send in expat technicians. FINS has also indicated that the initiative came from POWER and not from FINS. I would not be surprised if POWER pursued funding for this initiative either directly from the LWVF or asking for a “contribution” from the LWVF money coming into FINS. It appears that POWER has dropped their previous initiative to build a new workshop in the northeast port city of Trincomalee.
2. Laos Mike Boddington informed me that it appears Dr. Thongchan, NRC, is on his way out. He evidently has a heart condition which is beginning to seriously affect his health. POWER sees this as a positive development as Dr. Thongchan has not been a dynamic leader. I’m attempting to confirm this through the Consortium and to get their read on this possible event.
3. Cambodia Carson Harte informed me that Helen Pitt has applied to be the ED of the DAC. This was a concern of ours. Carson sees this as very positive, but he has always been a fan of Helens. Others, such as Larrie Warren have not. The DAC must have an ED who is unanimously accepted by all. Carson indicates that Larrie is now supportive of Helen as ED. I tried to reach Larrie, but he is now in the US. I believe that he will be in the VVAF Washington office for some of this time. We should talk with him before we give an o.k. to Helen’s hiring as ED.

APPENDICES

I. PARTICIPANT LIST

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Thomason, George	Chairman	POWER
Heal, Robin OBE	Trustee	POWER
Boddington, Michael	Chief Executive	POWER
Hodge, Sarah	Administrator	POWER
Dixon, Philip OBE	Chairman	Cambodia Trust
Windass, Stan	Director	Cambodia Trust
Harte, Carson	Principal	CSPO, Cambodia Trust
Horvath, Robert	Field Representative	LWVF/USAID
Jacobs, Norrie	President Elect	ISPO
Duarte, Joachim	Mozambique, Ministry of	Social Affairs
Chidyausiku, Shiela	Director	Zimbabwe, Dept. Of Rehab., Ministry of Health and Child Welfare
Perry de Saravia, Jeanette	Director	CIREC, Colombia
Thompson, Howard	Director	HMT Insurance Brokers
Eitel, Susan	Program Coordinator	LSN
Sevier, David	Director	Mercy Ships
Jones, Larry	CPO	Mercy Ships
Quigley, Michael	CPO/Consultant	PALM
Barahona, Esteban	Consultant	Nicaragua
Ellis, Maggie	Representative	WRF

II. WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Saturday, June 13th

Morning	Assemble at Little White Hart, Henley on Thames
12:00	Welcome
12:30	Lunch
14:00-15:30	First Session <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Welcome and basis of meeting (George Thomason)- General Parameters (Mike Boddington)- Cost Recovery Principles (Stan Windass)- Short addresses by participants (see Appendix III)
16:00-17:30	Short addresses continued
18:00-19:00	Reception by Mayor of Henley
20:00	Dinner in Marlow

Sunday, June 14th

09:00-12:30	Short addresses continued
12:30	Lunch
14:00-15:30	Seeking Best Practices (facilitated by George Thomason)
16:00-17:30	Small working groups
18:30	Dinner

Monday, June 15th

09:00-11:00	Drafting of Best Practice Paper
11:00-13:00	Finalizing draft document
13:00	Lunch
14:00-17:00	Next Steps Session
19:00	Dinner

III. SHORT SESSION PRESENTATIONS

A. Experiences from the Field/Programmes

1. Carson Harte Cambodia
2. Michael Boddington Laos, Mozambique, Vietnam
3. Larry Jones Nicaragua
4. Esteban Barahona Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador
5. Jeannette Perry de Saravia Colombia
6. Maggie Ellis Lebanon and Uganda

B. The Government View

1. Sheila Chidyausiku Zimbabwe
2. Joachim Duarte Mozambique

C. The Western-Based Organizations

1. Sue Eitel Landmine Survivors Network (data collection)
2. Michael Quigley Physicans Against Landmines
3. David Sevier Mercy Ships
4. Howard Thompson HMT Insurance (The role of insurance)

D. The View from the International Agency

1. Rob Horvath USAID/LWVF
2. Norrie Jacobs ISPO