

**ASSESSMENT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

Bangkok, Thailand  
19-21 October 2010

## **Summary Assessment**

The second session of the Committee on Social Development was held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 19-21 October 2010. A questionnaire was distributed towards the end of the session to obtain feedback from participants on its relevance, effectiveness and quality, to enable the secretariat to improve on its preparations for and servicing of future sessions. The response rate to the questionnaire was good with 73.9 percent or 17 of 23 participating delegations responding. However, it must be kept in mind that the overall number of Committee session participants was very low, which means that the responses cannot be generalized.

The present assessment has been conducted on the basis of the feed-back received from delegations together with a qualitative analysis of the draft report of the session, bearing in mind the terms of reference for the Committee on Social Development as contained in resolution 64/1 on the restructuring of the conference structure of the Commission.

### **I. Attendance**

The Committee session was not very well attended, with only 37% (N=23/62) of ESCAP members and associate members participating.

Seven respondents indicated that their delegation was from the Capital – Ministry of Social Affairs and or Disability focal point, three indicated that their delegation was from the Embassies in Bangkok, six indicated that their delegation was a combination of representatives from the Capital and the Embassy in Bangkok, and one did not specify the composition of their delegation.

Some delegations provided comments and suggestions on how to encourage higher and wider representation from their countries at the Committee sessions, including: (a) providing stronger justification to encourage countries to participate in the Committee session, especially since it involves just sharing experiences. (b) Officers from embassies should be invited for at least 3 days to foster collaboration and follow-up. (c) Invitations and letters should be sent to different departments of the same country.

### **II. Ownership**

The sense of ownership by participants of the Committee was strong, as demonstrated by 35% (N=6/17) of respondents indicating that the Committee session was owned and driven by member States to a great extent and 53% (N=9/17) to a good extent, and 41% (N=7/17) responding that the overall outcome of the deliberations was a result of a collaborative effort to a great extent and 53% (N=9/17) to a good extent. Twenty-nine percent (N=4/17) of respondents felt that the draft report adequately reflected the discussions, decisions and recommendations of the Committee to a great extent and 59% (N=10/17) to a good extent. Additionally, 47% (N=8/17) indicated that the secretariat's in session interventions contributed to effective conduct and outcome of the session to a great extent, and 47% indicated to a good extent.

### **III. Relevance**

The feed-back indicates that participants were of the view that the agenda items of the Committee were timely and relevant to issues and trends regarding social development in the Asian and Pacific region. 59% (N=10/17) of respondents agreed to a great extent and 35% (N=6/17) indicated to a good extent. Seven respondent 41% agreed to a great extent that the agenda items reflected the needs and priorities of their countries, while 47% of the respondents (N=8/17) agreed to a good extent, and 12% were neutral (N=2/17). Seven respondents (41%) agreed to a great extent that the benefits of their delegation's attendance justified the costs (travel, time opportunity cost of absence from the office), while 47% (N=8/17) agreed to a good extent, and 12% were neutral (N=2/17).

The most relevant agenda items for the delegations in attendance included (in order): (1) Mainstreaming disability into the regional development agenda in Asia and the Pacific, (2) Review of the status of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the Asian and Regional Pacific Region and (3). Review of regional trends and emerging issues in the field of social development, particularly social protection for the most vulnerable social groups.

### **IV. Efficiency**

The feed-back indicates that member States were satisfied with the efficiency of organization and conduct of the Committee session, with 35% (N= 6/17) indicating that they were satisfied to a great extent and 47% (N=8/17) indicating that they were satisfied to a good extent and 18% (N=3/17) were neutral. The responses indicate that the majority of participants were satisfied with pre-session documentation, with 35% (N=6/17) indicating that they were satisfied to a great extent and 53% (N=9/17) indicating that they were satisfied to a good extent. More than half of the respondents agreed to a good extent that the pre-session documents conveyed clear messages 53% (N=9/17), while 35% (N=6/17) indicated to a great extent. A majority indicated that the pre-session documents were issued in a timely manner, 53% (N=9/17) to a greater extent and 29% (N=5/17) indicated to a good extent while 18% (N=3/17) were neutral. More than half of respondents agreed to a greater extent that the Committee used efficiently the time provided 53% (N=9/17), while 29% (N=5/17) indicated to a good extent. The majority of participants also indicated that the conference services provided by the secretariat were efficient 41% (N=7/17) indicating to a greater extent and 53% (N= 9/17) indicating to a good extent while 18% (N=3/17) were neutral.

### **V. Outcomes in light of ESCAP resolution 64/1**

The responses regarding the outcomes relating to the general terms of reference for the Committee were positive the majority felt that the Committee was successful in addressing its Terms of Reference. The session of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific on Social development addressed effectively the issues outlined in resolution 64/1 that should be addressed by all Committees subsidiary to the Commission. The majority of participants indicated that they were satisfied with the committee session addressing its terms of reference in particular; to review and analyze regional trends, 35% (N=6/17) indicating to a greater extent, and 35% (N=6/17) indicating to a good extent , and 18% (N=3/17) were neutral.

Many felt that the committee session succeeded in identifying priorities and emerging issues 18% (N=3/17) to a greater extent while 65% (N=11/17) indicated to a good extent, and promote dialogue on regional and subregional approaches 24% (N=4/17) indicated to a greater extent and 59% (N=10/17) indicated to a good extent. Additionally many participants indicated to a greater extent that the committee session succeeded in promotion of a collaborative approach to address development challenges at the regional and sub regional levels, 29% (N=5/17) indicating to a greater extent and 47%, (N=8/17) indicating to a good extent. Overall the majority of respondents felt that the Committee was able to fulfill its terms of reference to a good extent. Of those 76% (N=13/17) felt that there was no need to further improve the way the committee had addressed its terms of reference, while 24% (N=4/17) felt that there was room for improvement such as:

1. Considering the benefits of collaborative regional approaches, sharing lessons opposed to national delivery mechanisms.
2. Enhancing collaboration between regional and national focal points
3. Improving collaboration with concerned government departments, NGOs and UN/International agencies.
4. Communicate in advance through email.

## **VI. Most and least successful**

Some participants felt that the most successful feature of the committee session included but not limited to; Stakeholder participation, involvement and commitment expressed by governments, Non government concerned with disability issues, the mainstreaming of disability issues into regional development of Asia and the Pacific and the launch of the campaign “Make the Right Deal” was seen as the highlight of the meeting. Other issues mentioned were good facilitation, organization by the secretariat and involvement of people with disabilities and time management.

Of the least successful features of the session were; absence or limited representation of Pacific government representatives, limited participation from those with hearing impairment, blind and mentally retarded persons, limited participation of international NGOs and participation of relevant UN organizations. Also, a need to have more substantive presentation of statistics and case studies to help delegations have a clearer understanding of regional trends.

## **Conclusion**

In general, participants at the second session of the Committee on Social Development were satisfied with the ownership, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Committee. However, this assessment concludes that the second session was affected negatively by the low participation of member States.

Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

**Annex I. Questionnaire results**

**A. Overall relevance of the session**

<b>1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
a. The agenda items were timely and relevant to issues and trends regarding social development in the Asian and Pacific region.	59 % (10)	35% (6)	6% (1)	-	-	-
b. The agenda items reflected the needs and priorities of my country.	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-	-	-
c. The benefits of my delegation's attendance justified the costs (travel, time, opportunity cost of absence from the office).	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-	-	-

**B. Organization**

<b>2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
a. The pre-session documents conveyed clear messages concerning the issues placed on the agenda.	35% (6)	53% (9)	6% (1)	-	-	6% (1)
b. The pre-session documents were issued in a timely manner.	53% (9)	29% (5)	18% (3)	-	-	-
c. The Committee used efficiently the time available for discussions.	53% (9)	29% (5)	12% (2)	6% (1)	-	-
d. The conference services provided by the secretariat were efficient.	41% (7)	53% (9)	6% (1)	-	-	-
e. The organization of work prior to/in between Committee sessions contributed to the effective functioning of the Committee.	35% (6)	47% (8)	18% (3)	-	-	-

## Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

### C. Substantive outcome of the session

<b>3. To what extent did the deliberations on the following substantive agenda items meet the expected outcomes as described below?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<p>a). Agenda item 4: Review of Regional trends and emerging issues in the field of social development, particularly social protection for the most vulnerable social groups</p> <p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States gain an overview of the key regional trends, issues and good practices in the field of social development, particularly as regards social protection policies and programmes, and identify areas that could benefit from regional cooperation.</i></p>	24% (4)	53% (9)	24% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
<p>b) Agenda Item 5, Thematic focus: Mainstreaming disability into the regional development agenda in Asia and the Pacific:</p> <p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States acquire greater understanding and knowledge of a range of good practices in promoting disability-inclusive development for possible adaptation in their respective countries.</i></p>	35% (6)	53% (9)	12% (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<p>c) Agenda Item 6, Review of the status of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the Asian and Pacific Region:</p> <p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States gain an overview of the successes and challenges of the ratification /accession and implementation process of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in the Asia and Pacific Region.</i></p>	35% (6)	53% (9)	12% (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<p>d) Agenda Item 7, Preparations for the High-level Intergovernmental Meeting on the Final Review of the Implementation of the Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons, 2003-2012:</p> <p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States gain an overview of the road map for regional preparations for the High-level Intergovernmental Meeting on the Final Review of the Implementation of the Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons, 2003-2012, and consider the outcomes of the three key stakeholders consultations, including their recommendation for the proclamation of a new decade to accelerate the promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities in the Asia and Pacific Region.</i></p>	35% (6)	53% (9)	12% (2)	- -	- -	- -

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

<b>3. To what extent did the deliberations on the following substantive agenda items meet the expected outcomes as described below?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
e). Agenda Item 8, Consideration of future Programme Focus: <i>Expected Outcome: Member States provide recommendations on the content of the secretariat's programme of work for the biennium 2012-2013 in the field of social development drawing from the recommendations on areas for regional cooperation resulting from the discussions under agenda item 4, 5, 6 and 7.</i>	29% (5)	53% (9)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (1)
f). Agenda Item 9, Consideration of draft resolution(s) for submission to the Commission at its sixty-seventh session: <i>Expected Outcome: Member States endorse proposed resolution(s) by member state (s) for submission for the consideration of the Commission, at its sixty-seventh session.</i>	24% (4)	53% (9)	6% (1)	6% (1)	6% (1)	6% (1)
g). Agenda Item 10, Other matters: <i>Expected Outcome: : Member States are informed and decide on any outstanding concerns related to the Commission on Social Development, including the timing of the holding of the third session of the Committee on Social development.</i>	29% (5)	35% (6)	18% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	18% (3)

#### D. Committee's General terms of Reference

<b>5. To what extent did the Committee Session succeed in addressing its Terms Of Reference?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
a. Review and analyze regional trends.	35% (6)	35% (6)	18% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	12 % (2)
b. Identify priorities and emerging issues, particularly those with implications for the work of the secretariat.	18% (3)	65% (11)	12% (2)	6% (1)	0% (0)	-
c. Promote dialogue on regional and subregional approaches and an exchange of experiences on policies and programmes.	24% (4)	59% (10)	18% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	-

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

d. Promote a collaborative approach to addressing the development challenges at the regional and subregional levels.	29% (5)	47% (8)	24% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	-
--	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-----------	---

### E. Participation

7. To what extent do you feel that...?	To a great extent (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Not at all (5)	No answer
a. The Committee session was owned and driven by member States?	35% (6)	53% (9)	0% (0)	6% (1)	0% (0)	6% (1)
b. The overall outcome of the deliberations is a result of a collaborative effort by members of the Committee?	41% (7)	53% (9)	0% (0)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
c. The draft report adequately reflects the discussions, decisions and recommendations of the Committee?	29% (4)	59% (3)	12% (2)	0% (0)	0% (1)	0% (0)
d. The secretariat's in-session interventions contributed to effective conduct and outcome of the session?	47% (8)	47% (8)	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

### 8. My delegation's attendance at the Committee session was:

41% (7)	mainly from the Capital – Ministry of social Affairs and/or Disability focal point
0% (0)	mainly from the Capital – Ministry of foreign Affairs
18% (3)	mainly by representatives in Bangkok (Embassy)
35% (6)	a combination of the above
6% (1)	other:



Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

<b>9. ESCAP is mandated to improve its facilities and services for persons with disabilities. To what extent did ESCAP facilities and services satisfy your accessibility needs?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<b>Transportation</b>						
a. Wheel Chair Accessible Van	24% (4)	35% (6)	0% -	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
<b>Language and Information</b>						
b. Committee Websites	18% (3)	35 (6)	6 (1)	- -	- -	41% (7)
c. Documentation in Braille	6% (1)	29% (5)	0% -	0% -	6% (1)	59% (10)
d. Documentation in CD	12% (2)	24% (7)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	59% (7)
e. Sign Language Interpretation	18% (3)	41% (7)	0% -	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
f. Real time Captioning	18% (3)	35% (6)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
g. Signage at UNCC	12% (2)	41% (7)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
h. Information in Elevators	6% (1)	47% (8)	12% (2)	0% -	0% -	35% (6)
<b>Facilities</b>						
i. Ramps to enter/exit from UN Conference center (UNCC)	24% (4)	29% (5)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
j. Ramps within UNCC	12% (2)	41% (7)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
k. Doors	12% (2)	29% (7)	6% (1)	6% (1)	0% -	47% (8)
l. Restrooms	12% (2)	29% (5)	0% -	12% (2)	0% -	47% (8)
m. Elevators	18% (3)	29% (5)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	47% (8)
n. Tables for Document/Information Distribution	12% (2)	47% (8)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	35% (6)
<b>Services</b>						

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

o.Assistance to facilitate accessibility -related Services provided by ESCAP staff	35% (6)	18% (3)	6% (1)	0% -	0% -	41% (7)
--	------------	------------	-----------	---------	---------	------------

### **Annex II. Additional comments**

*[Verbatim from the completed questionnaires]*

#### **1. What was the most relevant agenda item for your delegation?**

- Agenda 5 (mainstreaming) and agenda 6 (CRPD)
- Agenda item 4, 5 and 6
- Agenda 4, 5 and 6
- All the social issues discussed in the meeting including disability are relevant to my delegation.
- 4, 5, 6 and 7
- Agenda item 7
- Item no. 6
- Agenda 5, 6, 7 and 8
- 4, 5, 6 and 7
- Agenda item 7
- Agenda item 7
- 3D
- Mainstreaming ..
- Mainstreaming disability into Social development agencies of country.

#### **6. How can the Committee more effectively address its terms of reference (5 (a-d) above)?**

- Consider more carefully the benefits of collaborative regional approaches. Sharing lessons can be useful, but other regional programs (as suggested during the meeting) require more analysis on the benefits (effectiveness and cost-efficiency) of a regional approach, as opposed to national delivery mechanisms.
- Enhance collaboration between the regional and national focal points.
- To improve collaboration with concerned government department, NGOs, UN/International agencies.
- Give reading in advance through email.

## Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

### **9. Is there anything that could have been done to encourage higher and wider representation from your country at the Committee session?**

- India attaches importance to UNESCAP meetings and was represented by officials from Capital besides Embassy.
- Generally speaking, if the purpose of the meeting is just to share experiences on information, it's difficult to justify participation from capital
- Any officers from the Embassy of Pakistan in Thailand should have been invited for 3 days for future collaboration/follow up.
- Invitations/letter sent to the following in the Philippines: Dept. of Social Welfare and Development; Dept. of Health (Office of the President); Dept. of Education; Dept. of Labour and Employment; Dept. of Highways.

### **11. Please provide additional information that is relevant to the above-mentioned areas of accessibility.**

- The presence of disabled persons at meeting venue was an indication of success on part of secretariat in providing accessibility to persons with special needs.
- Captions should be a bit bigger and the screen should be placed on the both sides.

### **12. Is there anything that could have been done better to ensure easier accessibility at ESCAP for participants with disabilities?**

- To be more giving appreciation/recognition on the existence of disabled-people organization as well as the official delegation with disability.
- Early submission of country statements so that it could be presented in powerpoint.

### **13. What was the most successful feature of the Committee session?**

- High quality of papers.
- All stakeholders participation, Involvement and commitment expressed by the government, non government and other stakeholders in disable issues. The Committee affirmed the critical importance of mainstream disability into the regional development of the Asia and Pacific, Launching the campaign “make the right real”
- Launching the regional campaign on “make the right real”; focusing on the need to accelerate the implementation of the convention; treating disabled-persons friendly environment. Improve opening and closing ceremonies.
- The Committee session was successful. The facilities made available by secretariat were the highlight of the meeting.

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

- It was good that observers were allowed to take floor. It was also good to include persons with disabilities in delegation. Very focused discussion. Participation of persons with disabilities and DPO. Result-oriented process toward 2012. Ownership by governments of the issue. Opening session and closing session were impressive.
- Involving people with disabilities and listening to their voices and their opinions.
- Intervention from the NGOs.
- Food snacks and lunch; time management.
- The secretariat did an excellent job in organizing the session. The leadership of Ms. Nanda in facilitating was commendable.
- Preparation of documents.

#### **14. What was the least successful feature of the Committee session?**

- Lack of discussion (as opposed to formal interventions) and absence of Pacific government representatives.
- Punctuality.
- Partnership with other relevant UN organizations was not so visible.
- Less participation of people with Hearing impairment, blind and mentally retarded persons.
- limit participation of NGOs International.
- Sound and microphone system.

#### **15. Please provide any additional comments you may have on the Committee session and further suggestions on how we may improve on secretariat preparations for and the servicing of future session:**

- It would be useful to consider whether more support/advice could be provided to delegations in preparation of interventions to ensure they remain on topic.
- The participations of disabled, the efforts of secretariat to bring their voices at the session was commendable.
- Succession to the secretariat services: in order to get immediate information that the delegates able to make some corrections. We suggest the secretariat to send the draft via email, at the first.
- The deliberations and outcome of such events should be highlighted through electronic and print media, particularly through International channels like CNN, BBC etc.
- Please invite delegates from Philippines Depts: 1. Office of the President -National Council Disability Affairs; 2. Dept. of Social Welfare; 3. Dept. of Health; 4. Dept. of Education; 5. Dept. of Labor and Employment; 6. Council for the Welfare of Children; 7. National Federation of PWD Association

### **Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes**

- **There could be more substantive presentation of statistics and case studies to help delegations have a clearer understanding of regional trends.**

.....

## Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

Agenda Item	Substantive Outcome	Quantitative survey response	Qualitative assessment based on a review of the draft report of the session
<p>Agenda item 4: Review of Regional trends and emerging issues in the field of social development, particularly social protection for the most vulnerable social groups</p>	<p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States gain an overview of the key regional trends, issues and good practices in the field of social development, particularly as regards social protection policies and programmes, and identify areas that could benefit from regional cooperation.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appx. 24% agree to a great extent and 53% to a good extent that outcomes were achieved</li> </ul>	<p>The substantive outcomes were met to a good extent. Experience was shared and recommendations were made, however, the participant's views illustrate that there is room for improvement.</p> <p>Experiences were shared by the panelists with regard to the social and development including the respective national efforts on the establishment of more comprehensive systems of social protection through the development of roadmaps and multi-year action plans that facilitated coordination. Delegations shared practices and experiences in the development and implementation of social protection measures.</p> <p>The Committee recommended road maps with specific objectives, outcomes and action plans that were implemented by newly established councils. The Committee also requested ESCAP to promote regional cooperation in protecting rights of vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities, the elderly, women and children, while harmonizing national laws and policies with Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Committee requested ESCAP to build environment, transportation and information services to cater for people with disabilities.</p>
<p>Agenda item 5: Thematic focus: Mainstreaming disability into the regional development agenda in Asia and the Pacific:</p>	<p><i>Expected Outcome: Member States acquire greater understanding and knowledge of a range of good practices in promoting disability-inclusive development for possible adaptation in their respective countries.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appx. 35% agree to a great extent and 53% to a good extent that outcomes were achieved</li> </ul>	<p>The substantive outcomes were met to a good extent. Experience was shared and recommendations were made, however, the views of participants illustrates that there was room for improvement.</p> <p>The Committee shared experiences and lessons learned about policies and initiatives from countries in the region</p>

### Annex III. Achievement of substantive outcomes

		<p>related to mainstreaming disability into the regional development agenda in Asia and the Pacific. The Committee emphasized the need for mainstreaming disability in all aspects of the development agenda to achieve the MDGs as part of the Biwako Millennium Framework for Action, which were reinforced by the Convention on the Rights of persons with Disabilities (CRPD)</p> <p>Delegations made a wide range of interventions on disability mainstreaming and shared good practices in the region on mainstreaming disability in development efforts, especially that the region had 400 millions persons with disabilities.</p> <p>The Committee provided guidance on ESCAPs Programme of work emphasizing ESCAP's need to strengthen mainstreaming of disability into the regional development agenda , in particular the identification, documentation and dissemination of good practices in disability mainstreaming, monitoring and reporting and encouraging stakeholders to commit additional resources to meet needs of people with disabilities.</p>
--	--	--