

DISABILITY ACTION COUNCIL ASSESSMENT REPORT

July 2001

Rob Horvath
Jeremy Condor

The evaluation report was conducted under the auspices of the U. S. Agency for International Development. The evaluation was conducted by the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund and War Victims Fund Contract (GPH-C-00-01-00017-00). The opinions expressed are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U. S. Agency for International Development or Cherry Engineering Support Services, Inc.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iii
Map	iv
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Comments On DAC’s Role	3
Recommendations	5
Principal Recommendations	x
Specific Recommendations for DAC	x
Specific Recommendations for the USAID Cambodia Mission and LWVF	x
Suggestions for the International DAC Membership	x
Suggestions for the Government of Cambodia	x
Suggested Outline for a Cooperative Agreement Proposal with LWVF	x
Conclusions	11
Observations	15
Appendix A: SWOT Analysis Regarding Future Institutional Orientation	19
Appendix B: Scope of Work	21
Appendix C: Assessment Methodology	23
Appendix D: Assessment Schedule	25
Appendix E: DAC Executive Board Participants	27
Appendix F: Bibliography	29

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The evaluation team would like to thank all those who participated in focus group meetings, briefings, and personal interviews during the assessment. Special thanks are due to the executive director of the Disability Action Council, Mr. Ouk Sisovann, for his openness, availability, and willingness to share his ideas about the Council's future.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ABC	Association of Blind Cambodians
CDPO	Cambodian Disabled Peoples Organization
CMAA	Cambodian Mine Action Authority
DAC	Disability Action Council
DCOF	Leahy Displaced Children's and Orphans Fund
HI	Handicap International
INGO	International NGO
LWVF	Leahy War Victims Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOSALVY	Ministry of Labor, Social Affairs, Vocational Training and Youth Rehabilitation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCDP	National Center for Disabled People
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Culture Organization
UNICEF	United National Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VI	Veterans International
WRF	World Rehabilitation Fund



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This reports commends the excellent work achieved by Disability Action Council (DAC) since its inception in 1997. Although it suggests that DAC's current proposal to the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) should not be accepted for funding, the report recommends that DAC revise the proposal to take a more integrated and strategic approach to its development as an organization.

The report proposes that USAID's Mission in Cambodia and the Leahy War Victims Fund (LWVF) in Washington, DC consider supporting DAC activities for an additional 3 years if DAC revises its proposal. The report also offers LWVF help to develop the strategy and the proposal, and to support the organization technically.

The report suggests that although considerable sectoral expertise has been gathered around and invested in DAC, little focused support has been given to developing the council as an institution with a future. It proposes and recommends that USAID/LWVF should support DAC in taking a much more strategic approach to its institutional development and its sustainability strategy, while at the same time taking a more strategic approach to its investments in programming.

In 3 years, DAC should not be facing a core costs funding crisis. It should not be facing collapse if one donor turns down a major funding request. It should not be looking to USAID or indeed to any single donor agency for ongoing support for \$500 thousand or more to cover operating costs. In 3 years, DAC's core operating costs should be covered by a diversified donor and, possibly, client base.

If, in three years, DAC is at the point where it is now, then a useful opportunity to strengthen the organization will have been wasted. This will indicate that little institutional progress has been made; that its international NGO (INGO) and other international members have simply used it for their own purposes and failed to support its development as an organization; and that its staff, members, and consultants have focused on sectoral issues to the exclusion of essential institutional development.

Clearly, the challenge that DAC accepted 3 years ago has not gone away. People with disabilities are poorly served in Cambodia, and they need all the opportunities that DAC can initiate with them and for them. Indeed, new challenges confront DAC just at a point when many of its founding organizations are beginning to phase down or phase out. This report suggests that the

moment to seize the strategic development opportunity is now. For USAID to commit to the next 3 years of DAC's development, the spirit of cooperation and synergy that brought DAC members together so successfully 4 years ago will need to be rekindled and redirected to support a DAC that is clear about where it is going and how it intends to get there. USAID can only play a limited role through the provision of some strategic funding and some technical assistance. It is time for other Cambodian and international partners to take a more active role.

INTRODUCTION

Since its founding in 1997, the Disability Action Council (DAC) has succeeded in becoming the focal point for governmental and nongovernmental bodies working in the disability sector in Cambodia. Its success as a coordination agency has been remarkable, and it has made great strides in advancing policy and standardizing methodology in disability issues.

The fact that the council came into being is a testament to the commitment of Cambodians and non-Cambodians who were determined that a strong mechanism should be created to ensure that people with disabilities were served coherently and effectively by both government and third-sector agencies. Since the Council came into being, however, it has operated without guidelines for its role as a semi-autonomous organization. Little wonder, perhaps, that there should be so much variety of opinion within the DAC membership about what “semi-autonomous” should mean.

In the history of humanitarian aid and development investment, it is almost unprecedented that NGOs coordinate their work effectively. There are even fewer precedents where NGOs and government bodies decide to work closely together in the interests of their clients. In this regard, DAC has broken new ground, and its external stakeholders and staff are to be congratulated for their tenacity and success in working together.

Crisis brought these stakeholders together and united them. Four years ago, all the stakeholders could find good reasons for establishing the DAC, even if their reasons differed and did not form a coherent picture of how DAC should evolve. Perhaps a sense of continuing crisis keeps them together. In any event, as the humanitarian crisis evolves into a development programming environment, the ongoing role of DAC is being called into question. Should it develop into an independent organization? Should it plan to go out of business as it gradually subsumes its functions into the ministries and departments with whom it currently works? Should its role be taken over by Cambodian NGOs?

The answers to these questions depend on whom you ask.

Other questions also arise: What should the role of the state be in the new Kingdom of Cambodia? Should the modern Cambodia be a state of democratic socialism, a service provider to the citizen, or should the state simply set policy, establish standards, collect taxes, apportion contracts, monitor progress, and get out of its citizens' ways? There is no consensus on this issue.

It is unsurprising that in such an environment little internal consensus is reached on the future role of DAC in the new Cambodia. Is this to be an agency of disabled people, or is it to be an

agency for disabled people run principally by the non-disabled? Should it continue with its currently politically correct, semi-autonomous status in order to keep what some members fear is a rather centralist-leaning government on board, or should it go for an autonomous identity? Views diverge widely on the direction DAC should take, even from within its membership.

As far as the future goes, there seem to be as many DACs as there are members. Skeptics might claim that the government pays attention to DAC because it is conspicuously supported by the international community of NGOs and funding agencies. Would the government of Cambodia listen to a fully independent Cambodian agency led, run, and owned by Cambodians? What happens when all the influential, foreign “advisors” move on? Political precedent suggests that such a development may be difficult to engender. For the moment, the presence of foreigners behind the scenes seems to be a major reason for the council’s credibility and its power to negotiate successfully. Indeed, one foreigner continues to countersign key DAC documents to government officials. Today, DAC has friends in high, well-funded places. What happens when the friends leave?

It would be easy for external evaluators to ask questions about grand strategy without acknowledging the highly complex socioeconomic and political environment in which DAC functions. This report recognizes the complexities of DAC’s environment and, nonetheless, suggests that without an operational and institutional strategy for the next 3 years, many of the gains made in the past 3 years could be compromised or lost. Without a strategic development plan—even a plan that is regularly revised—DAC be relegated to a reactive, rather than a proactive role.

DAC has arrived at something of an institutional and operational crossroads. It can continue with business as usual, look for continuity of funding, and respond to challenges as they present themselves, or it can do all in its power to become the master of its own destiny, even if that means deciding to put itself out of business when its work is done.

The authors want key DAC players to buy-in to the proposals outlined in this report. Also, the authors invite the reader to participate in an upcoming meeting by reviewing the report and providing feedback to the evaluation team. It is hoped that such an investment in strategic development will improve the situation of Cambodians with disabilities and enhance DAC’s work.

COMMENTS ON DAC'S ROLE

“DAC is (and will only be) as strong as its members’ commitment to it.”

Mr. Ouk Sisovann, executive director
Disability Action Council

“The government should take over DAC’s work as governmental capacity develops. DAC is performing an interim management role. Its functions should gradually be absorbed into each ministry.”

Dr. Mam Bunheng, secretary of state for health
Ministry of Health

“DAC should develop into a strong, semi-autonomous body. It will be needed in its current form for at least 10 years. But, ultimately we, the government, should take over the responsibility.”

Mr. Prak Chantha, secretary of state
Ministry of Social Affairs, Labor, Vocational Training and Youth Rehabilitation
chairperson, DAC

“DAC is, and should remain, a supporter of people with disabilities.”

Mr. Im Sethy, secretary of state
Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport

“DAC should become a forum for people with disabilities.”

Mr. Yi Veasna, executive director
National Centre of Disabled Persons

“We created DAC, and then we stepped back. Now the international organizations just take advantage of the structure we created.”

Mr. Larrie Warren, country director
Cambodia Rehabilitation Program
Veterans International

“Our job is to kick-start projects and programs and hand them over to others.”

Ms. Helen Pitt, consultant and advisor to DAC

“CMAA...will delegate its coordination responsibilities on victim assistance to the DAC.”

Mr. Sam Sotha, secretary general
Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority

“If I had the choice, I would suggest that DAC do national disability awareness raising campaigns.”

Ms. P.L. Padma Shastry, country representative, UNDP
World Rehabilitation Fund

“DAC just can’t say no.”

Comments by several DAC Members

“The state shall assist the disabled.”

From the “Constitution of the Kingdom of Cambodia”

“(Success) will also depend on the business and donor community to provide the funds required.”

From ‘DAC Strategic Directions, February 2001’

RECOMMENDATIONS

Principal Recommendations

1. USAID (LWVF) should not fund DAC on the basis of the current project proposal, “Supporting the Coordination and Initiation of Services and Assistance for and with People with Disabilities in Cambodia.”
2. USAID (LWVF) should consider a revised DAC proposal for the period January 2002–December 2004. It should consider giving preference to a cooperative agreement mechanism rather than to a grant.
3. DAC should consider revising its proposal to USAID (LWVF). The plan should be submitted to USAID by November 30, 2001. The revised proposal should incorporate a complete strategic development plan where institutional development, programmatic delivery, and core costs are complementary elements. The strategic plan should be supported by an action plan for each of the 3 years of funding.
4. DAC’s revised proposal should incorporate a re-planning element based on a program of joint monitoring and yearly assessment.
5. DAC reporting methodology should be co-designed with USAID (LWVF) as part of the proposal to provide useful information for both parties to measure progress, adapt strategy, and modify action plans accordingly.
6. USAID should select its monitoring partner organization based on its capacity to add value to the planned DAC strategy and to the planned outputs of the proposal.
7. USAID (LWVF) should make ongoing technical assistance available to DAC to
 - C Design the strategy and the proposal
 - C Support the implementation of the strategy through training, facilitation, and consultancy

Specific Recommendations for DAC

1. Design and develop a plan for DAC's strategic development.
 - C DAC should design a strategic development plan to ensure the viability and sustainability of the organization.
 - C The strategic development plan should clearly outline where the organization wants to be in 3 years and indicate how it intends to get there. Benchmarking progress would be a key element of the plan. Key benchmarking would include resource development (fundraising and other revenue generation) and communications.
 - C The strategic development plan should clearly outline the ownership/membership, leadership, management, and governance parameters of DAC. It should make distinct separation between advisory bodies and governing bodies.
 - C The strategic plan would be supported by yearly action plans to be revised as needed.
 - C The strategic plan would be revised yearly on the basis of external and internal reviews.

2. Include the following elements in the strategic development:
 - C Clarity regarding policy on "implementation" versus "coordination"
 - C Policy regarding new programming initiatives
 - C Proposals for revised DAC subcommittees
 - C Response policy regarding externally proposed programming initiatives
 - C Policy and targets regarding the recruitment of people with disabilities
 - C Proposals for revised DAC secretariat structures
 - C Communications and resource development plan, including how co-ownership and support could be extended to include business
 - C Fee-for-service policy
 - C Governance development plan
 - C Reporting mechanisms and procedures, focusing principally on qualitative operational and institutional impact and output indicators, categorized by objective
 - C Staffing re-focus and reallocation of tasks
 - C Exit strategies and plans for the continuing use of advisors (TA provision and Helen Pitt's exit strategy)
 - C A technical assistance plan to support existing or new elements in DAC's institutional development

The strategic plan could also include a small grants option where DAC would use some allocated funds to support implementing partners.

3. Consider the proposed funding mechanism.
 - C The strategic plan should be designed around a cooperative agreement structure, rather than a grant. The proposal would thus be designed around yearly work plans and supplemented by clearly defined benchmarks and performance indicators.

4. Capture the strategy in a revised proposal to USAID.
 - C The strategic development plan would form the basis of a revised proposal to USAID for 2002–2004. It would be designed around benchmarks and performance indicators. These benchmarks and indicators would form the basis of a redesigned reporting framework.
 - C DAC should use an externally facilitated, strategic planning framework to develop both the strategic development plan and a revised proposal to USAID for funding (2002–2004).
5. Rethink the use of remaining USAID funds.
 - C In discussion with USAID, DAC should reconsider the use of the remaining USAID funds for 2001. The remaining funds may be better used to extend the project and buy time for the development of a strong strategic development plan and proposal design.
6. Rethink new recruitment.
 - C DAC should consider postponing its recruitment of new staff until it has finalized its strategic development plan and proposal. In this way, new hiring would be fully informed by the strategy rather than by a reaction to the pressure of the current workload.

Specific Recommendations for the USAID Cambodia Mission and LWVF

1. Rethink the use of the remaining USAID funds.
 - C In discussion with DAC, USAID should reconsider the use of the remaining USAID funds for 2001. The remaining funds may be better used to extend the project and buy time to develop a strong strategic development plan and proposal design.
2. Provide technical assistance to DAC to support the process.

LWVF should consider providing technical assistance to DAC to support

- C Development of the strategic development plan and the proposal
- C Benchmarked institutional development targets identified in the proposal

USAID (LWVF) technical assistance would thus consist of the following elements:

Date	Proposed Input	Output Envisaged
September 2001	USAID Cambodia Mission participates in review of draft assessment report	Debrief and feedback from all stakeholders
September – October 2001	Evaluation team finalizes and distributes assessment report	Buy-in to final draft recommendations from all stakeholders
October – November 2001	Virtual consultancy to DAC leadership by USAID (LWVF)	DAC secretariat fully prepared for a strategic review, design process, and proposal preparation
November – December 2001	Strategic planning facilitation and direct consultancy to DAC leadership by USAID (LWVF)	Strategic development design and proposal drafted for approval by DAC board or boards
January 2002 – December 2004	Virtual consultancy to DAC leadership and secretariat team by USAID (LWVF)	As determined by results of strategic review, proposal and budget
January 2002 – December 2004	Direct consultancy and facilitation to DAC leadership and secretariat team by USAID (LWVF)	As determined by results of strategic review, proposal and budget
January 2002 – December 2004	USAID/LWVF participation in yearly reviews	Reports and revised benchmarks for the subsequent year

NB: Proposed technical assistance provision would be delivered in phases and would be non-residential.

3. Provide technical support for communications and resource development.
 - C USAID (LWVF) should consider providing ongoing TA support to DAC to strengthen and develop its communications functions and resource development capacity.
4. Use the strategic development plan and proposal as the basis for selecting a funding mechanism and quality reporting.
 - C USAID should use the strategic development plan and proposal to inform its decision making with regard to which international agency could most appropriately perform the monitoring role for this activity.
5. Encourage other USAID-funded organizations to contribute to DAC’s institutional development.
 - C USAID should consider using its leverage and influence with USAID-funded DAC member agencies in taking a longer-term and more strategic approach to their relationship with DAC. USAID should encourage its grantees to invest in DAC sustainability, as well as in its current programming. This effort might involve providing technical assistance or funding support to OD elements of the proposed strategic development plan.

Suggestions for the International DAC Membership

1. International organizations should reconsider their current investment in DAC's operational and institutional sustainability. They should participate fully in sharing the costs as well as the benefits of DAC facilities. Rather than simply continuing to support DAC with project-limited funding for activities or staff members, organizations should take an active role in DAC's investment in its own institutional viability and sustainability. Organizations that are already supporting staff costs should consider supporting broader OD investment as well.
2. In their home offices, many member international NGOs have expertise in a range of capacity areas that DAC sorely needs (e.g., communications and resource development). Such expertise should be made available to DAC as part of its strategic development plan.
3. International NGOs and funders should not use DAC as a base for separately funded projects where project staff would be dismissed as project funding ends.

Suggestions for the Government of Cambodia

1. The government of Cambodia should continue to demonstrate its commitment to DAC in its policy development and coordination role in the following manner:
 - C Support DAC's continuing status and identity as a semi-autonomous organization, at least in the short to medium term.
 - C Member ministries should commit funds, in-kind resources, and other needed resources to DAC to participate in its development and sustainability.

Suggested Outline for a Cooperative Agreement Proposal with LWVF

The revised proposal would not be designed or presented as a project. It would propose a strategic investment in DAC's capacity to become a viable and sustainable entity within 3 years. Although some extension of support for core staffing costs would be an integral part of the design, the proposal would focus principally on moving DAC from being dependent on USAID for core costs to developing its capacity to generate alternative funds for core costs. The proposal could be constructed along the following guidelines:

Section	Pages
Executive Summary	2
Overview of DAC's evolution and principal achievements since inception	2
Problem/Challenge statement	2
Response statement	2
Aim/s (maximum of 2) and measurable objectives (benchmarking)	2
Activities and investments to achieve each objective	4
Technical assistance inputs to support activities	2
M&E methodology	3
Reporting template	2
Budget outline (3 years)	1
Budget outline (by year)	3
Total pages	25

The proposal should be supported by the following documentation, in annex:

1. Vision
2. Mission
3. Problem tree
4. Objectives tree
5. Results planning framework (e.g., causal pathway)
6. Current organigram of function
7. Current organigram of responsibility
8. Profiles, roles, and scopes of work of external TA providers
9. Comprehensive 3-year budget
10. Comprehensive budget for 2002

CONCLUSIONS

Resting on its laurels?

LWVF, with input from some INGOs, has supported virtually 100 percent of DAC's running costs for the past 3 years, and it has been well worth the investment. Currently, however, no funder or international partner is investing in DAC's capacity to survive and prosper as a semi-autonomous (or indeed, a fully autonomous) organization. All the focus is on programming issues. If USAID were to continue to fund DAC by supporting core costs for the coming 3 years, it would be encouraging an ongoing reactive approach by DAC and indirectly discouraging strategic support for DAC by its members. In 3 years, DAC would have no funds to operate.

Meanwhile, some international organizations are taking advantage of the hard-won benefits available from DAC membership without making any significant contribution to running costs, DAC policy development, and governance or DAC institutional development.

DAC now needs more than funding

Organizations that have committed to DAC by supporting core costs have made a significant and valuable contribution. Four years into DAC's lifecycle, however, many international members have yet to think about redesigning their investment to enhance the value for donors' money and to strengthen DAC's continuity beyond their own current funding or project interest. To continue in this way may be irresponsible.

and more than disability-issue-based technical assistance.

Considerable, high-quality investment has been made in developing DAC's capacity in a broad range of disability issues. Such quality investment is still needed. However, a major investment in institutional development has become as pressing a need as expertise in disability issues. Without a significant and ongoing investment in this area, DAC may find itself sidelined or unable to choose where to focus its limited resources, thereby compromising the quality and sustainability of its program.

The current DAC proposal to USAID for 2002–2004 seems to suggest more of the same

The current project proposal to the LWVF suggests ongoing funding for ongoing work. Its presentation as a project may be inappropriate for the emerging needs of the council and the challenges ahead. The proposal does not provide a sense of what institutional challenges DAC faces, nor how it intends to respond. Overall, it does not suggest where DAC is going or how it intends to achieve its purpose. The proposal is thus incomplete, and should not be funded as currently designed.

problematic strategic investment at the moment, even for the willing international member organization.

International NGOs and other international agencies would be much more likely to invest in DAC's strategic development plans if they knew what they were and how success is to be measured. It is understandable that these NGOs are preoccupied with their programs and may find it hard to identify how to provide a more strategic investment to DAC. Many of them may think they have already done their duty in helping to establish DAC.

A revised proposal may provide a way forward

An opportunity is available to take the best aspects of the current proposal and to locate them in a more strategically-concerned proposal document. This would offer USAID and other potential donors an opportunity to continue to invest in an evolving organization at a crucial moment in its development.

using a different reporting format.

DAC has been reporting faithfully according to current project reporting requirements. But DAC is poorly served by these requirements that serve no useful purpose for anybody, least of all for DAC. The responsibility for this problem lies outside DAC's remit. Current reporting gives no sense of where DAC intends to position itself in the medium or long term or how it intends to get there. Again, an opportunity now presents itself to design a proposal in which the reporting format is a tool for all stakeholders to participate in strengthening DAC and monitoring its progress toward objectives.

Initiate, secure, and coordinate. At what level? And for how long?

Operationally, DAC is presented with a number of challenges. How far should it go in responding to assessed needs? If DAC seeks to jump-start an initiative with the intention of handing it over to another organization, what happens if there is no partner or inheritor organization with the capacity or funds to take over? This seems to be as much of a challenge in handing over an activity to governmental organizations as there is to non-governmental organizations.

The use of DAC as a base for separately funded projects and separate project staff is questionable, given the fragility of DAC and its need to build institutional stability. Such an approach has been shown to be damaging in the long term, even to well-established NGOs in prosperous economies.

United in adversity. For how long?

DAC policy documents emphasize participation by all sectors. This is an admirable approach that has been a major reason for the council's successes to date. Indeed, it is unlikely that USAID would have been involved in DAC had its intention not been to actively include nascent Cambodian NGOs.

The council advisor talks not just of synergies but of a desirable, symbiotic relationship between NGOs and government. But unless Cambodia evolves unlike any other society, the time is inevitably coming where independent organizations and government will go their separate ways. Some observers say the time has already arrived. The crisis that brought the sectors together will begin to lift, and NGOs will assert themselves as key players in a democratic Cambodia. The

question arises: how should DAC position itself as the different sectors begin to assert themselves?

Where does DAC want to be in 3 years? How does it intend to get there?

DAC programming focuses, understandably, on programmatic issues. In programming terms, DAC works strategically and is looking for long-term impact in its investments with and for people with disabilities. From an institutional perspective, however, DAC seems to have little material to indicate a sense of where it is going. This may be one reason why DAC finds it hard to respond to institutional challenges such as

- Good governance development
- Communications policy
- Resource development investment
- Fee-for-service policy
- Policy on the recruitment of disabled people
- Policy on what level of investment to make in government versus national NGO capacity building

It may be unfair to insist that DAC should come up with total clarity about its institutional future in such an uncertain environment, but without a strategic approach to both programming and the development of the institution, DAC may not be getting the most out of the opportunities and options that are available.

Support tool to the nascent NGO community, or a competitor to it?

One indicator that underscores DAC's strategic dilemma is the fact that national NGOs working with or for people with disabilities look to DAC for support in their institutional and programmatic development. These NGOs see themselves as the natural service delivery mechanism, and they see DAC as an enabling agency. Yet, at the same time that these NGOs ask DAC to invest at this level, they perceive DAC as a competitor for the very funds and program partnerships the NGOs believe should rightly be theirs. This situation has caused some resentment among Cambodian NGO members, and presents both an operational and institutional challenge to DAC.

Subsumed into the government or seeking further autonomy from it?

The tendency of ministry colleagues is to perceive DAC's work as being taken over progressively by government. But such a perception is vigorously opposed by other members. One way forward would be for DAC to continue its current operations, hoping that enough programmatic gains keep the interest high while an institutional solution presents itself. Such an approach would have more costs than benefits.

Is this the time to agree to disagree?

It may be easy to require DAC to develop a detailed strategic plan under such volatile and complex political and social circumstances. It is understandable that DAC should find itself responding more to opportunity and demand than taking a completely strategic approach. Any funder that required DAC to set out a full institutional development strategy and stick to it inflexibly would be condemning DAC to irrelevance and cause its responsive nature to be damaged—and at a time when it is needed. However, without an institutional development

strategy and regularly updated action plans to deliver it, DAC may condemn itself to slow decline instead of taking possession of the opportunities that present themselves, such as taking its future in its own hands.

A governance gap

DAC has been characterized as being a victim of its own success. Nowhere is this more noticeable than in the challenges it faces over its ongoing membership, ownership, and governance. The development of DAC's governance is a key issue in the Council's ongoing relevance and identity.

The fact that the advisory board and the executive board function as one body reflects DAC's institutional contradiction, as well as its search for synergy. It seems that these jointly operating bodies provide neither governance nor strategic oversight to DAC as an institution, and no supervision to its executive director. The role of these combined bodies seems to be more concerned with ensuring that the interests of all parties are represented. The strategic element seems to have been sidelined. By many accounts, board meetings are so long in terms of their productivity that some members have started to drop out.

DAC is composed of two key elements: (1) membership and (2) secretariat.

The current statutes require the participation of all the stakeholders that DAC's executive director would seek to include. Some members represented on the advisory board also sit on the executive board.

Membership

DAC provides services and structures to enable its members to achieve their purposes.

Secretariat

The secretariat currently provides the administrative structure to ensure that services to the membership can be provided adequately.

Participation of People with Disabilities

Three Cambodian NGOs are represented within DAC, and people with disabilities represent these members. Four of sixteen Secretariat staff are people with disabilities. Some interlocutors expressed concern that people with disabilities are not sufficiently represented and are not in sufficiently senior positions to influence the strategy and direction of DAC. Other interlocutors, while acknowledging the issue, thought that DAC should not recruit on the basis of "positive" discrimination, but rather should invest in the capacities of people with disabilities, and thus increase their representation without compromising capacity.

DAC Sub-Committees (Internal Functioning)

Several subcommittees are reported as providing very high levels of assistance to their members, and thus to have a useful impact in both project delivery and overall coherence and coordination. Several interlocutors, however, expressed the view that some subcommittees are less effective. DAC is apparently reviewing the effectiveness its subcommittees at the time of writing.

Leadership and Governance

To all intents and purposes, the executive board and the advisory board function as one body and meet together.

Several interlocutors mentioned that the board does not function as a governing body, but rather as the senior assembly of the membership.

No inputs on governance training or good governance development have been made and none are planned at the time of writing.

The CEO has been in-post for less than a year. He is supported by the outgoing expatriate CEO, who now functions as an advisor.

The term "advisor" is used to denote expatriate personnel who provide consultant or technical assistance to program or project staff. Most of the advisors are resident in Cambodia.

Membership of the executive board seems to be established informally, with a rapid throughput of expatriates. Several foreign interlocutors reported that their membership commitment to the

executive board waxed and waned according to their own organizations' programmatic priorities and the length and value of board meetings.

No business people sit on the advisory board or the executive board. DAC statutes state, however, that business people should be board members. Several interlocutors reported that the lack of involvement by business people may be due to the perceived wish of business people to distance themselves from the government.

Strategic Development

DAC documentation on future orientation tends to focus on procedures, administrative issues, and program content to the exclusion of broader strategic considerations.

Resource Development

DAC has launched several initiatives to generate revenue for the organization. However, there is no strategy in place that guides or informs the organization's approach or methodology regarding resource development. At present, DAC's executive director leads all resource development activities.

The chief executive estimates that \$200 thousand pa will be in needed for secretariat running costs over the coming three years.

Fee-for-service is a key resource development area where DAC has had success in responding to offers made by external clients or members. The issue seems, however, to be contentious for some members who express the view that in offering services for fees, DAC is taking resource development opportunities from the very sector it seeks to support.

Some DAC staff members are employed on specific project work that is funded by members. This funding has generated employment, and the project is clearly appreciated by the clients. However, the employment of staff to deliver specific projects seems to have caused dislocation in the dissemination of information within DAC and has compartmentalized information that some interlocutors believe should be readily available to all members. This project-led approach means that institutional memory may be lost when the project is complete and the project staff are dismissed.

Co-Ownership of DAC

All interlocutors expressed considerable satisfaction from the unusually high level of perceived success that DAC has had in bringing a wide variety of stakeholders together. This view was expressed particularly strongly by international organizations.

Foreign member organizations expressed generally positive opinions with regard to the role of DAC in enabling a coherent approach to project implementation.

The role of international organizations in strengthening DAC's institutional framework seems to be limited to areas where the concerned organization is directly involved in a particular issue or project. These organizations do not seem to have any overall strategic approach to investment in DAC's survival and sustainability as a Cambodian institution beyond their own programmatic investment or priorities. Some organizations have formalized their commitment to support DAC

financially by supporting the employment of staff or requiring their own staff to sit on DAC sub-committees. No organizations seem to have moved from this type of project-based commitment to a more strategic commitment.

DAC is currently the base for a separately funded project. Staff running the project are based in a distinct working area and will be dismissed as project funding ends.

Four staff members with disabilities work within a staff team of sixteen people.

Information Gathering, Documentation, and Reporting

DAC produces large quantities of information. By its own assessment it produces too much information for its members or for itself to digest. Also by its own assessment, not enough useable information is produced in Khmer.

Current reporting to USAID is done via Handicap International and focuses on a matrix and a narrative reporting format laid down in the grant agreement. All concerned interlocutors commented that both formats are of little use to them.

From the wide variety of reports reviewed during the course of the assessment, it was noted that DAC reporting tends to focus on quantitative rather than qualitative issues. For example, many current reports identify the numbers of meetings attended and the numbers of participants at meetings. Little interpretation or strategizing seems to have emerged from the gathering and reporting of such information.

USAID (LWVF) Funding and M&E

Neither HI nor DAC staff thought that the reporting methods currently in use are of any particular strategic or operational use to DAC. Discussions at the USAID Mission also indicated that reporting is of very limited value in its current form and that simplification and quality enhancement would be welcomed.

DAC's proposal to USAID of February 2001, in which DAC proposes another 3-year funding cycle from LWVF, is presented as a project rather than as strategic funding for the strengthening and development of the organization. Performance indicators are not clear, and a similar reporting format and approach is proposed to that of the past 3 years.

DAC has recently proposed a series of expenditures to utilize the remaining funds from its 3-year funding allocation. These expenditures focus principally on the purchase of equipment and materials.

HI currently manages the grant on behalf of USAID. Discussions with HI personnel suggest that while HI works to keep abreast of developments and progress at DAC, current reporting methods mitigate against HI being in a position to interpret or add value to DAC reports. HI also indicated that it does not monitor the effectiveness of DAC activities closely. It focuses principally on ensuring financial compliance issues are handled satisfactorily. HI did not make any suggestions as to an improved or upgraded reporting methodology.

APPENDIX A: SWOT ANALYSIS REGARDING FUTURE INSTITUTIONAL ORIENTATION

The USAID evaluation team facilitated the following SWOT/C analysis during a focus group meeting of the DAC board and advisory committee

DAC – Where are we now, and where are we going?

<p style="text-align: center;">Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Coordination role · Standardized approach (various sectors) · Contribution to programmatic sustainability · Credible support for the cause of disabled people · Cross-Sectoral linkage - NGO/govt. · Highly skilled/motivated people 	<p style="text-align: center;">Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Lower level of awareness of DAC’s co-ordination role by users at the provincial level · Govt. staff not employed by DAC · Implementation gap between DAC committees and govt. · Not enough documents in Khmer · Expatriate/National imbalance · Membership time constraints · Constant change of key players
<p style="text-align: center;">Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · To upgrade provincial level co-ordination · To develop and strengthen links between sectors and NGO/govt. (4*) · To strengthen capacity of stakeholder ministries (policy and services) (2*) · To work for the inclusion of disabled people within DAC · To support the development of NGOs (3*) · To deepen Cambodian ownership of DAC · To design HRD strategy and plan · To maintain an ongoing review of our purpose 	<p style="text-align: center;">Threats/Constrains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Limited HR and financial resources · Insufficiently diversified funding

* In the Opportunities quadrant, the bracketed figure indicates the number of participants who ranked the issue as a top priority.

NB: Participants agreed to depart from normal SWOT analysis procedure, and to explore internal opportunities as well as external ones. While such an approach is not in conformity with industry norms, the benefits were agreed to outweigh the disadvantages.

APPENDIX B: SCOPE OF WORK

DCOF/LWVF

Cambodia program

Proposed Scope of Work for an institutional Assessment of DAC

Proposed dates for Assessment: July 17–25

Background

Assessment of DAC and Project Proposal for 2nd Round

Aim of the Assessment

- a) Assessment program impact of current 3-year planning framework
- b) Assessment of program performance and its validity: outputs achieved versus inputs

Resources

The assessment team will be composed of the following human resources:

- Jeremy Condor, external consultant from USAID/LWVF
- Rob Horvath, program officer, LWVF/USAID

DAC Assessment Inputs

- Review current documents, publications, and reports relating to DAC
- Interview key actors within DAC
- Focus group meetings with the following:
 - i. DAC committees and working groups
 - ii DAC affiliated members including relevant govt. institutions
 - ii DAC funders (e.g., UNICEF, UNESCO, Nippon Foundation, WRF/UNDP, WHO, - FAO, CBM-International, etc.)
 - iv. DAC-secretariat staff members

Key Issues for Review During the Assessment

- a) DAC Committees and Working Groups
- b) Relevant govt. Ministries and NGOs

- c) The Cambodian Plan of Action (now renamed as Strategic Directions for Disability and Rehabilitation Sector)
- d) Initiated projects/activities (including education, disability awareness raising, rural income generation, group home, medical rehabilitation, etc.)
- e) Capacity building (training, mentoring, etc.)

Other Factors

- a) Process
- b) Communication and networking
- c) Participatory practices
- d) Ownership
- e) Transferring skills and knowledge
- f) Cost effective practices
- g) Change and controlled growth of DAC activities

Assessment Outputs

A full assessment report with recommendations on future directions/sustainability:

- Institutional
- Technical

APPENDIX C: ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The following methodology was used for the assessment.

1. Pre-Visit and Cambodia

Background and archive documentation study from the following sources:

- DAC
- USAID
- Government of Cambodia
- Cambodian NGOs
- International NGOs
- Economic and historical reviews

2. Cambodia

Meetings were arranged in the following manner:

- Briefing with USAID Cambodia
- Individual interviews with DAC staff
- Individual meetings with other key stakeholders, including INGOS, UNICEF
- Focus groups
- Advisors/Consultants
- A facilitated executive board/advisory board meeting
- Visits to the headquarters of three Cambodian member NGOs, and interviews with their CEOs and staff teams.

3. Cambodia

A debriefing was held at the close of the assessment to review findings and observations and to check the veracity of information gathered. The debriefing was attended by the DAC executive director, the DAC advisor, three USAID Cambodia personnel, a representative from HI and the assessment team.

4. Cambodia

The draft report will be reviewed by key DAC stakeholders in August/September, and subsequently finalized by the evaluation team further to stakeholder feedback.

APPENDIX D: ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE

Date	Activity
Thursday, 12 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation
Friday, 13 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation
Monday, 16 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Cambodia
Tuesday, 17 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel to Cambodia • Briefing with Rob Horvath, DCOF/LWVF • Briefing with Mr. Lee Forthsyth, USAID • Meeting with Dr. Mam Bunheng, secretary of state for health, Ministry of Health • Schedule preparation with Mr. Ouk Sisovan, Executive Director, DAC • Meeting with Ms. Prak Chanta, secretary of state, Ministry of Social Affairs, Labor, Vocational Training, and Youth Rehabilitation
Wednesday, 18 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Ms. Helen Pitt, advisor, DAC • Meeting with Mr. Ouk Sisovan, executive director DAC and Mr. Ngy San, assistant executive director, DAC • Focus group meeting with DAC executive board* (*See Participants List) • Documentation review
Thursday, 19 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Mr. Yi Veasna, executive director, National Center for Disabled People, and Mr. Long Li, Program Manager, NCDP • Meeting with Mr. Boun Mao, director, Association of Blind Cambodians • Meeting with Mr. Son Song Hak, executive director, Cambodian Disabled People's Organization • Meeting with Ms. Padma Shastry, country representative, World Rehabilitation Fund • Meeting with Mr. Roath Sith, information officer, DAC • Meeting with Mr. Ouk Sisovan, executive director, DAC
Friday, 20 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with Mr. Sam Sotha, CMAA • Meeting with Ms Myriam A Bord. Hugon, PRC coordinator, Handicap International • Meeting with Ms Eileen Velicky, rehabilitation director, Cambodia Trust • Meeting with Mr. Em Sothy, secretary of state, Ministry of Education • Follow up meeting with Ms Helen Pitt, advisor, DAC

Saturday, 21 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation review
Sunday, 22 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation review
Monday, 23 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting with Mr. Larrie Warren, country director, Veterans International• Meeting with Ms Brigitte Sonnois, project officer, UNICEF• Preparation of initial conclusions and recommendations• Documentation review
Tuesday, 24 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Debriefing with DAC and Dr. Kevin Rushing, chief, OGD• Travel to France
Wednesday, 25 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Travel to France
Thursday, 26 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collation and report drafting
Friday, 27 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report writing
Saturday, 28 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report writing
Sunday, 30 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Documentation review
Monday, 30 July	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preparation of draft report

APPENDIX E: DAC EXECUTIVE BOARD PARTICIPANTS

No.	Name of Contact Person	Organization	Address	Telephone Number
1	Mr. George Adams	Head of Delegation American Red Cross	P.O. Box 535 Corner of Street 51/360 Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 211 996 023 362 970 012 802 350
2	Ms. Abord Myriam	Acting Country Director Handicap International	P.O. Box 838 #18, Road 400, Boeung Keng Kang, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 217 300 023 217 298 012 819 973
3	Ms. Eileen Velicky	Director	P.O. Box 122 Calmette Hospital, Monivong Blvd., Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 368 241 012 817 176
4	Bishop Kike Figaredo	Representative JS-C	#96, Street 592, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 880 455 023 880 139
5	Mr. Son Song Hak	Executive Director CDPO	P.O. Box 2008 #37B, Street 113, Sangkat Boeung Keng Kang II, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 362 232 023 215 509 012 803 865
6	Ms. Yasuyo Kawabata	Project Manager AAR-J	P.O. Box 141 #63, Street 294, Boeung Keng Kang I, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 211 953 023 430 195
7	Mr. Yi Veasna	Executive Director NCDP	P.O. Box 170 #3, Norodom Blvd., Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 210 140 012 932 641
8	Mr. Laurent Chapuis	Advisor of NCDP	P.O. Box 170 #3, Norodom Blvd., Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 210 140 012 817 140
9	Ms. Seng Bou Adeka	Chairperson of Central Committee of CDPO	#37B, Street 113, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	012 804 718 023 215 509
10	Mr. Srey Vanthon	Program Manager ADD	P.O. Box 1123 #14, Street 412, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 213 305 012 803 394
11	Mr. Bun Mao	Director of ABC	P.O. Box 175 #1, Street 144, Phsar Kandal I, Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 213 882 012 914 983
12	Mr. Keo Soeun	Director, Department of Rehabilitation MOSALVY	#28, Street 184, Sangkat Chey Chum Nas Phnom Penh, Cambodia	023 427 292

APPENDIX F: BIBLIOGRAPHY

DAC promotional materials

Cambodian Plan of Action for the Disability and Rehabilitation Sector. Working Draft, September 1999

Cambodian Plan of Action for the Disability and Rehabilitation Sector. Final Draft, September 1999

Strategic Directions For the Disability and Rehabilitation Sector in Cambodia. Second Edition. February 2001

DAC Operational Plans and associated documents

DAC policy documents

DAC/Funder MOUs

Country Paper, National Coordination: DAC “Supporting the Coordination and Initiation of Services and Assistance for/with People with Disabilities, including Landmine Victims in Cambodia”

Report on Future Directions for the DAC Secretariat

Internal Review of the DAC Secretariat

Cambodia Donor Information

DAC Project Proposal: Supporting the Coordination and Initiation of Services and Assistance with Disabled People in Cambodia, October 1997

DAC Project Proposal, 2001

DAC Newsletters

DAC Annual Report, September 2000

DAC Organigrams and Relationship Charts

DAC quarterly reports

Status Report on the Disability Action Council, April 1999

Financial Statements and Report of the Independent Auditors, 31 December 2001. KPMG

Management Letter, 31 December 2001. KPMG

--

National Strategy for MSALVA and NGOs on the Rehabilitation Sector on Disability Issues and the Rehabilitation and Integration of Disabled People in Cambodia

Constitution of Cambodia

--

United States General Accounting Office briefing documentation on Cambodia

“Cambodia: Enhancing Governance,” Asian Development Bank

Country Reports from “The Economist,” Intelligence Unit

Cambodia reports, Far Eastern Economic Review

Concept Paper on Mine Victim Assistance in Cambodia. Final Draft. November 2000

Draft Five-Year Strategic Plans on Landmine Victim Assistance in Cambodia. (Undated)