

**Meeting Evaluation Summary
Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition
April 2006 Meeting**

Responses received from:

New Coalition Meeting Attendees: 3

Returning Attendees: 17

1. Were the overall meeting outcomes achieved? Specifically, did the Coalition:

a. Share understanding of the current Working Group priorities, challenges, and successes to date?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	3	16
No	0	1

Comments (Returning):

- We needed an update on working group’s achievements as well as work plans. Not enough time in the plenary session to report on achievements to date.
- A slow start, but developed well by the second day.
- Good time slot for reporting back to plenary and interaction.
- The challenges and successes of the working groups were not really presented across all working groups.
- Much variation in development and style of working groups. It would be useful for MDA working group to identify the “why” for each activity and increase between-meeting substantive products (not just drafts).
- Yes, particularly for RMA and SSWG; however, the “identity” of MDA remains fuzzy. Will MDA develop country priorities?

Comments (New):

- Did not have enough time to do everything we wanted, but did cover the most urgent tasks.
- Yes we shared understanding of priorities and activities, but the challenges and successes were not shared to such an extent.

b. Identify opportunities to increase coordination and collaboration among working groups on cross-cutting issues?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	1	16
No	0	1
Yes/No	2	4

Comment (Returning):

- Yes, but only after reporting of the working groups, which happened a bit late on the agenda.
- Important to coordinate working groups and RHSC projects and messages, especially going to countries; country lists; and background data/indicators/sources.
- Yes, but needs to be further strengthened.
- Recognized the need for cross fertilization and determined strength of ideas/collaboration between groups in increasing effectiveness of the coalition.
- We need to allocate specific time to discuss cross-working group issues.
- Working groups still need to find a way to talk with each other. Does not appear that having members attend each other's working group meetings is working.

Comments (New):

- Although the Global Programme and condom sessions identified areas of collaboration, it was never made clear how any of these brainstorm ideas would be put into action. Although some things were discussed briefly in the working group, no clear activities or expectations were set.
- Interaction could be improved by allowing time for working groups to discuss opportunities in an informal setting.
- Attempted to do this but the exercise seemed mismatched with the presentations and was not that productive.

c. Identify RHSC priority activities and outcomes for 2006?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	2	10
No	0	3
Yes/No	0	1

Comments (Returning):

- Yes, but would be good to have a couple of high priorities/big wins identified at the end of the meeting as well as accomplishments since the last meeting to help illustrate results, impact, and direction.
- Yes within working groups, not so much for RHSC as a whole.
- Priorities, yes; outcomes, no.
- Not enough time to reflect on priorities of the working groups.

Comments (New):

- Yes, especially key activities of the Secretariat and working groups.

2. Was there an effective mix of plenary and working group sessions?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	3	16
No	0	0
Yes/No	0	1

Comment (Returning):

- Plenary should have focused on achievements to date rather than new topics.
- Working group sessions could have been better managed and time constrained.
- Good!
- At one meeting a year, it would be useful for the working groups to meet for a full day, present in plenary, and then regroup to respond to full group.
- Much better than earlier meetings, more balance with small group sessions.
- Not enough chance to ask questions in the plenary.
- Yes for time, no on content. Working group sessions far more valuable. Many plenary sessions seemed out of scope (condoms), not relevant, suffered from lack of detail (Global Programme), and the second breakout on condoms was confusing.
- It felt like we were shoe-horning in the working group sessions. I suggest day 1 be the Executive Committee (and maybe working group meetings), day 2 be working group meetings (if not day 1), and day 3 be for the plenaries.

Comment (New):

- Allowed a good mix and facilitated full RHSC discussions while giving WGs a good amount of time to work.

3. Did you find the participatory format of the two sessions on Thursday, *Update on UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC 2006–2010 and Linking RH Supplies and HIV/AIDS: Taking a New Look at Condoms, effective and/or productive?*

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	0	9
No	3	2
Yes/No	0	4

Comment (Returning):

- Glad there was an update on the UNFPA Global Programme, but it was not very informative and the outcomes from brainstorming were not that useful.

- Groups need stronger ‘planned’ facilitators and group members need to receive and read what is needed to work effectively.
- Needed more clarity on, or circulation of, the UNFPA document to have allowed better understanding and discussion of the Global Programme.
- Session on condoms less useful.
- Got people talking, but not sure there was much substantive value.
- Format is useful but not sure these topics were ideal for this format. Could be more fitting for discussions about how the coalition functions or could function more effectively in future.
- Although content was not 100 percent relevant, some important issues were raised, small groups had engaged discussion and afternoon ‘slump’ was avoided. The essential list presentation could have benefited from the same format.
- Too little time to digest the detailed information presented in the plenary, it was therefore very difficult to reflect on them in an appropriate way.

Comment (New):

- It was an interesting exercise and facilitated a lot of discussion (especially Global Programme), but the overall objective was not always clear and some of the particular questions made difficult assumptions or went beyond information that participants had.
- The second one was too much—more time spent in the working groups would have had my preference.

4. How would you evaluate the interest and relevance of the following sessions?

Scale: 1 (poor), 2 (adequate), 3 (good), 4 (excellent)

<u>Thursday, April 27, 2006</u>	<u>Returning</u>	<u>New</u>
• Update on System Strengthening Working Group Financing Study	3.2	2.6
• Update on UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC 2006–2010 and Update on UNFPA Thematic Trust Fund	2.7	1.6
• Working Group Breakout Meetings	3	3
• Linking RH Supplies and HIV/AIDS: Taking a New Look at Condoms	2.7	2.3
<u>Friday, April 28, 2006</u>		
• New RHSC Director	3.4	3.3
• Working Group Breakout Meetings and Report Back	3.4	3
• Closing Remarks	3	

Comments (Returning):

- The Closing Remarks did not really pull out the key points, decisions or actions for the RHSC
- An update from WHO was missing.
- Not enough time to reflect on the condoms session.
- Update on the UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC was too high level/unspecific.
- More information should be made available on the update on UNFPA Global Programme.
- Regarding the condoms session, it was good to have enough time and breadth of focus to learn and discuss this topic.
- Not clear what the RHSC could do with the condom session topic.

Comments (New)

- Should have provided background material for the update on UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC.

5. Did the meeting provide opportunities to further the RHSC vision, mission and goals? RHSC Vision, Mission, Goals (from the TOR)

- The RHSC's *vision* is to protect people's health and improve livelihoods by ensuring sustained access to a choice of quality RH supplies.
- The RHSC's *mission* is to ensure that every person is able to obtain and use RH supplies.
- To achieve its mission, the Coalition's **goals** are to:
 - Improve access to and choice of RH supplies for low- and moderate-income consumers through public, private, and commercial sectors.
 - Increase political commitment and financial resources and their more effective use to serve the RH needs of poor and vulnerable populations.
 - Strengthen global, regional, and country systems for reliable and predictable supply of quality RH supplies.
 - Improve coordination and use of global-, regional-, and country-level information, knowledge, best practices, and lessons learned.
 - Formulate other strategic responses as needed to address the future demand for RH supplies

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	2	13
No	1	3

Comments (Returning):

- Yes, but looking forward to the Coalition Secretariat helping us think through what these objectives mean and what it will take, and how the coalition can help.
- Yes, but it should not be business as usual.
- No, I think these statements need to go down another level to: To achieve its goals, the coalition will..., the Secretariat will..., the members will...Statements about what we do as, and in, and through the RHSC, to help members (and non-members) understand us better.
- Except for goal 4, the goals require further commitments and decisions to be made by the RHSC members, which did not happen.
- I like the RHSC one page description a lot!

Comments (New):

- These things were not directly discussed and have been basically handled as a given.

6. What issues or activities would you like to see addressed in the Fall 2006 RHSC meeting?

Comments (Returning):

- Effective engagement of southern partners in the RHSC/or offering a panel of field-based logistics advisors to present and do Q & A with RHSC members about field realities related to RH supplies and supply management.
- Update feedback about “Global Programme” assuming it is still a factor.
- Interactive sessions such as a supply chain simulation.
- Working group time.
- Update about Gates and KfW’s financing mechanism study results.
- Market segmentation study results (by any and all members).
- Interlinks of working groups.
- More emphasis on making decisions about RHSC activities and how these will be implemented at a country level.
- We should be careful about introducing new issues. Working group plans are full and ambitious, they should drive the agenda.
- Focus on what can be done at the country level.
- Country selection.
- Greater involvement of Global Fund programmes in condom procurement and how to increase uptake.
- Do not add new issues, consolidate!
- Messages.
- Membership.
- Collaboration of RHSC members at the country level
- Link of RHSC work with national essential drug programmers.
- Trying to take a longer term picture of one or two objectives and how the coalition might endure over time.
- Finance study update.
- Communicate the decisions of the Executive Committee to members during general meeting.
- Interlinks of the working groups.
- Updating and progress on setting up Secretariat.

Comments (New):

- Measures to assess RHSC success and failure.

7. Do you plan to attend the Fall 2006 RHSC meeting in Bonn, Germany?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	2	10
No	1	4

Planning & Logistics

8. What did you think of the length of the Coalition meeting – was it

	New Members	Returning Members
Too long?		
Too short?		2
About right?	3	15

9. Do you feel that the agenda omitted key issues/concerns that the RHSC should be addressing?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	1	5
No	1	9

Comments (Returning):

- Yes, it is in line with the status and stage of the coalition.
- Need to spend more time reporting on working group activities.
- Global fund—lack of take up of funding for condoms.
- Report for Executive Community meeting.
- Open, transparent, and inclusive dialogue about membership considerations.

Comments (New):

- Let members of the different working groups talk together and see whether they do not derail in different directions.
- Membership in the Coalition and maybe the Executive board discussed.

10. Did you participate in the agenda development process?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	0	5
No	3	12

How could the agenda development process be improved?

Comments (Returning):

- Solicit anonymous input for topics several months ahead.
- Make this a more consultative process.
- A group process to select a theme.
- An open call for members to submit research/presentations and then a committee chooses from among them.
- One draft circulated to all for one round of comments.

Comments (New):

- Draft agenda circulated and comments solicited in advance.

11. Was the working group breakout session structured to enable your group to aid your strategy development and decision-making?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	3	13
No	0	1

Comments (Returning):

- Would rather have a larger block of time instead of fragmented blocks.
- Yes, but need strong leadership/facilitation skills to get things done.
- Day one could have been better prepared for by the leader.
- Day one breakouts need to be better managed.

Comments (New):

- Need more time for working group work.
- Involve the SSWG selected countries somehow in the next meeting.
- Having time on both days allowed us to hash out issues on the first day and create an agenda for the second day (which was completed).

12. Overall, were your expectations of the Coalition meeting met?

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	3	16
No	0	1

Comments (Returning):

- This group gets better and better.
- My expectations were low given the agenda and the lack of focus on making decisions/clear commitments, but I feel like we made good progress on work plans in the working groups.

Comments (New):

- I miss involvement of the countries we are focusing on; some sort of representation would help. If we wait too long we might run the risk of missing the point, or at least this is a possibility.

13. Additional comments:

Returning:

- Very fulfilling and empowering. It is encouraging to see the developments between members and increased openness between participants.
- Maybe arrange for some time off together/get fresh air/have half a day to do something together that has nothing to do with the coalition.
- Good meeting.
- RHSC should coordinate, plan collaboration, but not have their own activities.

- Could we consider for the October meeting a schedule with a day or weekend break between the Executive Committee and the RHSC. The Executive Committee seemed exhausted by the end of Friday.
- Still need to really look at amount and timing of materials.
- I think meetings should move to being once a year now there is a director and it is more mature.
- Delivery of background materials still needs streamlining. Too many multiple emails and no guidance on what was most important or germane. DIFD studies are useful, but were not discussed.

New:

- It is time to think why we are doing this and who we are doing it for; do they agree to what we are doing? Remember Ghandi!
- The reception was very nice and fostered exchange and relationship-building among coalition members.