

**Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition (RHSC)
Fall Meeting
October 6–7, 2005
The Hague, The Netherlands**

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Table of Contents

Executive Summary of Meeting Proceedings.....	iii
Draft Detailed Meeting Proceedings.....	1

Attachments

- A - Agenda
- B - TOR
- C - Strategic Plan Draft
- D - Slide by Peter Bachrach
- E - DFID Presentation
- F - WHO Presentation 1
- G - WHO Presentation 2
- H - UNFPA Presentation
- I - Working Group Priorities Related to Goals (meeting handout)

Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition (RHSC) Fall Meeting 2005

Overall Meeting Objectives

1. Provide a forum for working groups to revise/complete their work plans and share these with the other groups.
2. Member input into business plan.
3. Working groups linking of their work plans to support the medium-term strategic focus of the RHSC and business plan.
4. Approval of terms of reference (TOR).
5. Selection of chair.

Overall Meeting Outcomes

Coalition

- Approved the RHSC TOR (October 5, 2005, version).
- Provided input to the draft Business Plan (renamed Strategic Plan), which will provide a framework for the Coalition and its Working Groups' activities and collaborations during the next phase of the RHSC.
- Approved the cochairpersonship of Wolfgang Bichmann and Margret Verwijk for the term of two years.
- Discussed research supported by three of its members.
- Was informed of each Working Group's accomplishments and work plans for future activities.

Working Groups

- Identified goals, objectives, and priorities.
- Developed work plans that will move them forward to the point of tangible action to achieve their objectives.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF MEETING PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6

Welcome and Introductions

Margret Verwijk welcomed the RHSC on behalf of The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Elizabeth Lule, RHSC Chair, briefly described the background of the RHSC up to the present. All meeting participants introduced themselves and their organizations. Elizabeth Lule reviewed the agenda for the two-day meeting.

TOR Report and Approval

Jane Hutchings highlighted the main differences between the October 5 version of the RHSC TOR, which was approved by the Steering Committee at its meeting on October 5, and the May 17 version of the TOR that was distributed at the May meeting of the RHSC. Discussion focused on clarifying the role of the RHSC versus the role of its members and the proposed Secretariat. The general membership endorsed the TOR, with assurance that as it is further developed with a stronger Secretariat and full-time Director, the TOR will address the concerns voiced in the discussion, which included the need for: clarity around what the RHSC does as a group, versus an individual organization's work; clarity around work at the country level: the RHSC does not work at country level per se, although individual participants do; specificity around areas that the RHSC seeks to influence, and how; measurement of achievement; and Secretariat location.

Presentation of the Draft Business Plan

Peter Bachrach, consultant, presented an overview of the draft Business Plan (renamed Strategic Plan), which will provide a framework for developing work plans and strategies for the Coalition members and Working Groups as they move forward with plans for activities during the next phase of the RHSC.

Steering Committee Recommendations on Business Plan/Discussion

Margaret Neuse presented a summary of the Steering Committee's discussion on the draft Business Plan at its meeting on October 5. It is important to make clear that the RHSC is not another partnership moving into a country, requiring local support; RHSC members are implementing work at the country level on an individual organizational basis, and it is the Coalition's role to coordinate communication about these efforts to avoid duplication and encourage complementarity and harmonization.

A two-page description of the RHSC would be useful as a handout to be shared with RHSC members' country offices and other constituencies and inform them how RHSC work will be implemented at the international level and how it will interface with and complement country-level and country-led work on supply issues. The TOR is an internal document and should not be shared externally.

Update on Research Studies and the Role of the RHSC

- Adrienne Brown, Department for International Development (DFID) consultant, described the country-level research that is being conducted with the aim of building consensus among the DFID country offices on a long-term approach for improving supply security. The research includes case studies in four countries—Cambodia and Uganda (completed), and Nigeria and Zambia (still in process).
- Lena Sund of the European Commission (EC) reported that the EC is moving forward on a study on supply issues in several countries, with results to be available by the end of 2005. Countries under consideration are Mozambique, Madagascar, Benin, and Togo in francophone Africa; and India.
- Jacqui Darroch of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation announced that the Mercer Management Consulting report on the study commissioned by the Gates Foundation was

available to meeting participants in hard copy. Section 3 of the report discusses key supply issues, including donor funding and procurement, country planning and procurement, reaching the underserved, and targeting public funding. Section 4 lists key findings and recommendations to the field.

Discussion:

There is a sector-wide crisis, due to a shift of funding to other critical global health priorities. Research is needed to identify what is happening during this shift in regard to funding displacement, what development partners are doing in regard to SWAps, basket funding, etc., and how this affects reproductive health (RH) supplies. The RHSC should develop a research agenda that identifies information needs and the research that could fill these needs.

WHO Presentations

Hans Hogerzeil and Sophie Logez of WHO reported on WHO's progress in developing processes and tools to help countries ensure that their programs have appropriate drugs of high quality. WHO hopes to move toward full implementation of RH supplies prequalification in the coming year. WHO also has developed a RH essential drugs list, with the collaboration of UNFPA, and is finalizing guidelines for launching it in developing countries. In addition, WHO is working toward international consensus on standardization of essential non-drug RH items.

Discussion of UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC 2006–2010

Jagdish Upadhyay presented the UNFPA Global Programme, which is a framework for UNFPA provision of integrated, long-term assistance to help countries address supply security issues. The goal is to build greater capacity at the country level and bring participating countries to a higher level of self-sufficiency. Through the proposed Programme and funding, UNFPA seeks the stability it needs to ensure a consistent supply base and service delivery.

Discussion:

The proposed level of support of \$150 million per year over five years is not enough. Further development is needed to clarify mechanisms for implementation.

FRIDAY OCTOBER 7, 2005

Plenary Working Group Presentations/Discussion

Working groups reported on their breakout discussions and presented their work plans.

Market Development Approaches (MDA) Working Group

The MDA Working Group leader is Ben Light. The group's three primary objectives emphasize existing activities, generic manufacturers, and policy, respectively:

1. Synthesize and share existing knowledge to provide the base for development of models and actions.

2. Develop, test, and validate models for fully commercial markets that meet the need of lower-income consumers.
3. Generate information and coordinate at all levels to develop a supportive environment to further the goal.

As the group further develops its work plan it will identify indicators, countries to work in, and additional research needs.

Resource Mobilization and Awareness (RMA) Working Group

The Chief Advocate (Working Group leader position) will shift in 2006 from Terri Bartlett to Susan Rich. In working toward the goal of increased political and financial commitment on the part of RH supplies stakeholders, the group will seek to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Promote strategic international support for RH supplies and secure dependable funding flows.
2. Facilitate increases in domestic financing.

A priority for the Working Group will be to develop a comprehensive plan and a clear “ask.” The group requested the Consortium to reach a consensus on an approach for sustainable funding.

Systems Strengthening (SS) Working Group

The leader of the SS Working Group is Alan Bornbusch. The objectives of this working group are to:

1. Improve joint efforts for timely access to and use of standardized information to align financing and RH product flows to meet country requirements.
2. Develop solutions to drive increased reliability, predictability, and efficiency of public financing for RH supply needs, especially for poor and vulnerable populations.
3. Identify and support supply chain improvements for effective and efficient delivery of quality assured RH supplies.

The SSWG is identifying activities that they can accomplish within the next year and that will demonstrate the value of the RHSC and their working group.

Plenary Working Group Presentation/Discussion Wrap-Up

Margaret Neuse congratulated the Working Groups on their progress and their realistic work plans. She summarized the highlights of the Working Group presentations, including the importance of country leadership in addressing supply issues; the interest expressed in developing a long-term mechanism for preventing stock-outs, such as a buffer fund; the need for the Coalition to determine what support it needs and what to ask for; and the need for the Coalition to define what is in its manageable interest and identify ways to evaluate its work.

Selection of Chair

There were two nominees, Wolfgang Bichmann (KfW Development Bank on behalf of the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development – BMZ), and Margret Verwijk (The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The European Union (EU) members of the Coalition proposed that they should serve as cochairs. The nominees stated their acceptance and

the support of their respective governments for their role as cochair. The RHSC membership approved the co-chairpersonship of Wolfgang Bichmann and Margret Verwijk for the term of two years effective April 2006.

Closing Remarks

The Chair summarized the meeting and outlined the next steps, including the submission of a proposal to the Gates Foundation by PATH for funding for the RHSC Secretariat over a three-year period. Pending approval of funding, the Coalition will hold two meetings in 2006: the spring meeting will be April 27–28 in New York, hosted by UNFPA, and the fall meeting will be in Germany, hosted by DSW (dates to be determined).

DRAFT DETAILED MEETING PROCEEDINGS

The format of this meeting summary is based on the agenda, included as Attachment A.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2006

Welcome and Introductions

*Elizabeth Lule, Chair, RHSC and
Margret Verwijk, The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

Margret Verwijk welcomed the RHSC on behalf of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She briefly traced the historic highlights of the Van Kleffens meeting room where the RHSC was convened and wished the group success in their deliberations.

Elizabeth Lule, Chair, briefly described the background of the RHSC up to the present. She expressed regrets that two key staff who had helped prepare for this meeting, Sangeeta Raja (World Bank) and Mark Randolph (Supply Initiative/PATH) were unable to attend.

Introductions and Agenda Review

Session Outcome

Meeting participants introduced themselves. Elizabeth Lule reviewed the agenda for the two-day meeting, which included presentation of the RHSC Terms of Reference (TOR) as approved by the Steering Committee¹ at its meeting on October 5, for RHSC endorsement; selection of a new RHSC Chair; discussion of the RHSC future and the draft Business Plan that provides a framework for planning that future; and working group meetings to continue development of strategies and work plans.

TOR Report and Approval

Elizabeth Lule, Chair

Anticipated Outcome

Recommendations of the Steering Committee will be reviewed and the TOR will be presented for approval.

¹ The name of the Steering Committee was changed in the revised TOR to Executive Committee. In the minutes of this meeting, the name Steering Committee will be used when referring to that body historically, up to the point of the endorsement of the revised TOR. The name Executive Committee will be used when referring to the subsequent time frame.

TOR Report

Jane Hutchings (Supply Initiative [SI]/PATH) highlighted the main differences between the October 5 version of the RHSC TOR, which received Steering Committee approval (see Attachment B), and the May 17 version of the TOR that was distributed at the May meeting of the RHSC. The changes reflect the input of the TOR Task Force,² as well as Steering Committee members' input. The Task Force had worked on the TOR since early 2005 and most recently had addressed issues raised in the May 19–20 RHSC meeting. The results:

- A better articulation of the RHSC vision, mission, guiding principles, and goals (paragraphs 6–9, pages 2–3),
- A statement on the value added of the RHSC (paragraph 11 on page 3).
- Section IV, Executive Committee Operations (pages 7–8), includes a revised scope of work and role for the Steering Committee which is renamed the Executive Committee.
- Section V (page 9) outlines the revised functions of the Secretariat, which will represent increased responsibilities. The revisions in Sections IV and V reflect the RHSC Secretariat structure and operations outlined in the proposal for three years of Secretariat support (2006–2008) that the Steering Committee requested PATH develop and submit to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Discussion highlights and comments

- The RHSC must work within existing systems and mechanisms, rather than developing new systems or levels of operations.
- It is important to clarify the relationship of UNFPA to the RHSC.
- The RHSC must ask itself whether the objectives stated in the TOR fit what member organizations are doing.
- Clarity is needed concerning the role of the RHSC versus the role of its members: the RHSC as an entity/facility does not implement activities at the country level; that is done by its members who have in-country presence.
- The RHSC must demonstrate that resources are allotted against specific objectives.
- A better definition is needed in regard to the areas in which the RHSC as a group can effectively accomplish what none of its members can accomplish alone, and how the skills/value added of the Coalition can be harnessed; what the RHSC aims to achieve; and how its achievements will be measured.
- It is critical for the RHSC to be clear on what it is trying to solve compared with what is happening at the country level.
- The Secretariat will facilitate and coordinate RHSC and working group activities and encourage harmonization to avoid duplication; it will not implement activities.
- The proposed location of the Secretariat is Washington, DC; but PATH, which is the proposed host of the Secretariat, is open to change in location.³

² TOR Task Force members were: Elizabeth Lule, RHSC Chair, and Sangeeta Raja, World Bank; Alan Bornbusch, USAID; Jane Hutchings, SI/PATH; Jacqui Darroch and Blair Sachs, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Steve Sinding, International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF); Jagdish Upadhyay, UNFPA; and Terri Bartlett and Carolyn Vogel, SI/PAI.

³ Update: Based on continued discussion after the meeting, the Executive Committee agreed that the Secretariat should be located in Brussels.

- The appropriate location for the Secretariat is with UNFPA. The reason this cannot be pursued is the limitation it would place on the participation of some of its members.
- The decision to request PATH to host the Secretariat and acceptance of a Washington, DC, location represent the outcome of ongoing discussions within the Steering Committee, recognizing that there are good reasons to move the Secretariat out of the United States to Europe. The Steering Committee also weighed the time it could take for a transition of the Secretariat to a new organization.
- A looser partnership model is represented by the WHO Interagency Pharmaceutical Coordination group, which meets to:
 - Share work plans.
 - Coordinate activities that emerge.
 - Harmonize what all members say at the country level.
 This group has no secretariat.
- The Chair encouraged RHSC members to weigh in on discussions regarding documents, strategies, etc., early in the process so their concerns could be addressed.

Decision

Wolfgang Bichmann stated that the German Government welcomes the emergence of the partnership and also feels that country ownership is essential to success. He endorsed the TOR with support from the German Government, with assurance that as the TOR is further developed in the future, with a stronger Secretariat and full-time Director, it will address the concerns voiced in the discussion. The Chair stated that in the absence of objections, the general membership agreed to the endorsement.

Presentation of the Draft Business Plan⁴

Peter Bachrach, Consultant

Anticipated Outcome

Members will be provided with an overview of the draft Strategic Plan and key findings. (The revised plan is provided in Attachment C).⁵

Draft Strategic Plan Presentation

The plan brings together existing RHSC documents and integrates the revised TOR. A section on costs and benefits still needs to be developed. Annexes 1, 2, and 3 are intended to help working groups develop their strategies and work plans. The working groups are the action arm of the Coalition—their work is the reason for Coalition. Working group members should consider the following elements:

- Strategic thinking (how their activities will add value).
- Selectiveness (which priorities they will address).
- Efficiency (analysis of what they can do to make a difference).

⁴ The draft Business Plan will be referred to as the draft Strategic Plan from this point forward.

⁵ The Strategic Plan was revised after the meeting to take into account Executive Committee comments and new working group developments. This new version, titled Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition Strategic Plan, is attached.

- Effectiveness (how to measure the impact of what they have done).

(Peter's slide outlining these points is included as Attachment D.)

Peter Bachrach recommended additional analysis on key priorities for the RHSC. There does not appear to have been a systematic process to identify key areas for making things happen.

Steering Committee Recommendations on Strategic Plan and Discussion

Elizabeth Lule, Chair

Anticipated Outcome

The Steering Committee will discuss its review of critical issues and next steps for the RHSC in light of the Strategic Plan findings.

Elizabeth Lule stated that the draft Strategic Plan summarizes the thinking and debate of the RHSC over the past 18 months; it is a framework and a strategic plan, not a business plan. It will be up to the new RHSC Director to develop an actual business plan. If we do not have an effective work program, we do not have a Coalition and our existence is questionable. As we consider the RHSC work we need to ask:

- Have we made the right strategic choices?
- Can we measure and monitor results to make sure we are effectively using scarce resources?

Margaret Neuse presented a summary of the Steering Committee's discussion on the draft Strategic Plan at its meeting on October 5:

- Overall, Peter Bachrach did an excellent job of putting various documents into a form that will be useful as the Coalition moves from the talking to the doing stage.
- There is some overlap between the TOR and the draft Strategic Plan (vision, mission, goals).
- The Strategic Plan does not fully reflect RHSC priorities and how it will add value.
- More articulation is needed on how the RHSC priorities can be integrated/ implemented through programming; for example, through HIV/AIDS and MCH programs, and the RHSC needs to make linkages with these programs.
- The working groups and the Coalition as a whole need to articulate how they will work or collaborate at the country level.
- The Coalition needs to identify what it can hold itself accountable for and what is outside of its purview, i.e., how RHSC work is differentiated from that of its individual members.
- More work is needed to develop mechanisms for tracking what the RHSC does as a group.
- The working groups' reports and work plans will feed into the development of the RHSC Strategic Plan as the Coalition moves forward with the new Director.

Discussion highlights and comments

- Coalition membership represents global and bilateral organizations, but there is not enough representation of developing countries. We need to see issues at the global, regional, and country levels.
- RHSC efforts must complement efforts at the country level.
- The RHSC members are implementing work at the country level on an individual organizational basis; the Coalition's role is to coordinate communication about these efforts to avoid duplication and encourage complementarity.
- International partnership efforts require coherent support at the local level, and this is a huge drain on local resources. It is important to make clear that the RHSC is not another partnership moving into a country, requiring local support. What the RHSC can do is enable constituencies at the country level to advance RH supply security; this does not come across clearly in the Strategic Plan or other documents.
- The RHSC seeks to identify an approach that several countries will want to try, by identifying (1) a set of generic problems (reflected in the names of the three working groups), (2) ways the RHSC can, as an international group, tackle these problems, and (3) value the Coalition can add to members' existing activities at the country level. For example, the ad hoc RHSC group seeking to coordinate research has been coordinating very closely and this has been of great value.
- The working groups should share their work plans with their members' country offices.
- The Resource Mobilization and Awareness Working Group will focus on raising awareness and on effective use of resources, not on raising funds.
- The TOR is primarily an internal document to clarify working arrangements. The Secretariat could develop a two-page RHSC description that members could share within their organizations and with partners and collaborators.

Update on Research Studies and the Role of the RHSC

Georgia Taylor, Department for International Development (DFID)

Anticipated Outcome

Brief updates on the status of continuing or new research, and discussion of the role of the RHSC in research conducted by individual institutions.

DFID Update

To date, most research has focused on contraceptive supplies. To inform their work and that of their partners on supply issues, DFID conducted studies that looked at all RH supplies, not just contraceptives. Adrienne Brown, DFID consultant, described the methodology used for the country-level research. The research gathered information to build consensus among their country offices on a long-term approach for improving supply security. (Presentation slides are provided in Attachment E.) The research included four phases: (1) literature review and selection of countries for case studies; (2) country-based case studies in four countries—Cambodia, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia; (3) synthesis and local dissemination; and (4) wider dissemination. The studies in Cambodia and Uganda have been completed; the studies in Nigeria and Zambia are still underway. Findings of the studies in Cambodia and Uganda indicated commonalities in high maternal mortality, challenges in translating policy into action, and

dependence on external procurement. In Uganda, the issues of how funding is received, the process for allocation, and government priorities present challenges. In some cases it is easier for countries to access external funding than lobby for government funds. In both Uganda and Cambodia, development partners need to focus on building procurement capacity; there is a need for greater accountability in ensuring service delivery—and in that area the private sector could play a greater role. There is little substantial knowledge in regard to real demand for RH supplies.

DFID and Population Services International (PSI) are now collaborating on a new study on the total market approach.

European Commission Research

Lena Sund reported that the European Commission (EC) has retained a consultant and is moving forward on a study on supply issues in several countries. Countries under consideration are India and Mozambique, and Madagascar, Benin, and Togo in francophone Africa. The EC hopes to have the study results by the end of 2005 and is coordinating their research with DFID.

Gates Foundation Research

Jacqui Darroch

The Mercer Management Consulting report on the study commissioned by the Gates Foundation was made available to meeting participants in hard copy. The study diagnosed key issues affecting contraceptive commodity availability in developing countries, which are discussed in Section 3 of the report and include donor funding and procurement, country planning and procurement, reaching the underserved, and targeting public funding. In Section 4, three key findings are listed and each one is followed by recommendations to the field.

Finding #1: Initiative to enhance donor coordination will be crucial.

Recommendations:

- Create a stability fund.
- Further enhance coordination through the RHSC.

Finding #2: Some procurement inefficiencies can be addressed cross-country.

Recommendations:

- Develop an electronic procurement exchange.
- Investigate buyer groups.
- Develop more consistent prequalification practices.

Finding #3: Country-tailored initiatives are also necessary.

Recommendations:

- Establish innovation fund(s).
- Conduct pilots to develop and test innovative ideas.

Jacqui thanked RHSC members for their assistance to the Mercer group as they conducted the research and encouraged members to send their comments on the report and any suggestions to herself and Blair Sachs.

Discussion highlights and comments

- The finding that general funding displaces RH-dedicated funding represents a crisis.
- With regard to funding displacement, it is difficult to measure because one would have to measure what would have been allocated. It also is very challenging to disaggregate RH supplies from other supplies.
- The RHSC should develop a common research agenda that identifies information needs and the research that could fill these needs, as well as better understand and document what is happening to RH supplies.
- It would be useful to learn how the groups that have supported the research just described plan to use the findings in their work at the global and country levels.
- Although the DFID study found that funding was not an issue, it has been in the past and will be again.
- The DFID study also receives support from the Netherlands.
- UNFPA and WHO have been working to address the whole range of RH supplies (beyond contraceptives) and have developed a list of RH essential drugs.
- The research found that those sectors/programs that received funding from basket approaches were those that saw value for their program within the basket.
- The DFID study results are realistic in that they indicate that systems are weak and government officials are not adequately supporting family planning. The Coalition's work is needed to address these needs.
- In Cambodia there are separate forecasting and procurement systems in each program area. The private sector has little impact; the public sector and social marketing have the most influence.
- Data from the DFID studies highlight the need for and relevance of the RHSC.

WHO Presentations

Hans Hogerzeil and Sophie Logez, WHO

Prequalification update

Hans Hogerzeil (Presentation is provided in Attachment F.)

WHO hopes to move toward full implementation of RH supplies prequalification in the coming year through Phase 2 of the WHO/PATH/Gates partnership, which is expected to start in 2006.

- Prequalification as part of the procurement process is needed, as developing countries increasingly move toward procuring their own supplies and must choose from a wide range of manufacturers, including increasing numbers of generic manufacturers.
- Prequalification can help address problems of poor quality and counterfeit drugs.
- Expected outcomes include a list of products and manufacturers that have been approved by WHO, leading to better access to treatment, harmonization, and capacity building for developing-country drug regulatory authorities.

Selection and the WHO Model List

Hans Hogerzeil (Presentation is provided in Attachment G.)

- Essential medicines are selected according to disease prevalence, and WHO aims to include on its list the drugs that are most effective, safe, cost-effective, and affordable. Countries use the list to develop their own essential medicines list of registered products. To date, 56 countries have established an Essential Drugs List (EDL).
- Some new essential drugs are 30 to 40 times more expensive than old drugs (such as penicillin), which are no longer used due to drug resistance. Diagnostics are another added cost.
- WHO now has formulary text for each product on its list, provided in five languages on their website.
- WHO, in collaboration with UNFPA, has developed an RH EDL. The WHO Director General has approved new additions to the WHO Model List, which included some RH medicines. WHO is now finalizing guidelines for inclusion of RH essential drugs on national lists in preparation for launching the RH EDL. Another current effort is to reach international consensus on standardization of essential non-drug RH items, such as MVA equipment and consumables.

Discussion highlights and comments

- Quality can only be built into a product—not tested or assessed into a product.
- The Gates Foundation is supporting collaboration between WHO and PATH that includes prequalification of a core list of critical RH medicines. The prequalification activities should begin in 2006.
- Prequalification creates a challenging situation in that procurements are put out for bid and multiple manufacturers respond; however, at the same time, WHO, the World Bank, and UNFPA require manufacturers to be prequalified, which means that not all bids can be considered.

Discussion of UNFPA Global Programme to Enhance RHSC 2006–2010

Jagdish Upadhyay, UNFPA

Anticipated Outcome

RHSC members are informed of UNFPA Global Programme concepts and key issues and can discuss in working group breakout meetings.

The International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) assigned UNFPA the responsibility of assisting countries to deliver family planning products and services to clients. The UNFPA Global Programme is a framework for UNFPA to work with countries on an integrated, long-term effort to do this by addressing supply security issues. (Presentation is provided in Attachment H.)

- UNFPA is seeking funding of \$150 million per year over five years, of which \$100 million per year will be for financing commodities and \$50 million per year will be for building developing-country capacity to ensure RH supplies security and for financing an integrated, country-driven approach in selected fast-track countries.
- The Global Programme will be an integral part of the UNFPA Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS Programmes and is projected to be implemented in 15 countries.

- UNFPA plans to play three distinct roles: technical assistance partner, supplies partner, and procurement agent.
- The desired outcomes are greater capacity at the country level and graduation of participating countries to a higher level of self-sufficiency.
- UNFPA has a low level of funding for its ongoing work. The proposed Programme and funding would give UNFPA the stability needed to ensure a consistent supply base and service delivery.
- The concept of the Programme represents not what UNFPA will do, but what needs to be done. UNFPA would plan to work closely with other partners in implementing this program.

Discussion highlights and comments

- UNFPA needs to lay out more clearly how it will implement the proposed Programme, for example, spending mechanisms—whether it will disburse funds as grants, or spend funds itself.
- The funding level of \$150 million per year is not enough; UNFPA’s current level of funding is about \$135 million.
- UNFPA needs to make the case for the value added by the Coalition.
- The concept does not really lay out what UNFPA’s vision is with regard to technical assistance partners, UNFPA’s role as a supply partner, or UNFPA’s role as a procurement agent. Additionally, it would be useful to know how UNFPA views the role of the RHSC.
- The Coalition members see UNFPA as the global facility for contraceptives. This is one of the reasons donors did not fund the “facility” concept of the UNFPA Task Team.
- UNFPA supported the expansion of the Task Team into what has become the RHSC. It is important not to duplicate efforts and to achieve better synergy with current efforts. This is why UNFPA endorsed the RHSC.

Working Groups’ Topics and Issues of Focus

Elizabeth Lule, Chair

Anticipated Outcome

Working group leaders review current issues and pending work. Steering Committee and RHSC members have opportunity to provide input and are informed about the substance of the breakout sessions and directions of the working groups.

Systems Strengthening

Alan Bornbusch

The Systems Strengthening Working Group is focusing attention on three areas: information systems and flow of information; how to make financial flows more effective and predictable; and identifying product flows and developing supply chains. Working group members are developing work plans in these areas, and in their upcoming breakout session they will look at some short-term activities that can be accomplished in one to two years and prove the viability and value of the working group and Coalition.

Resource Mobilization and Awareness (RMA)

Terri Bartlett

The RMA Working Group has been successful in their efforts to build support for the RHSC in Europe, as shown by the increased participation of EC/EU organizations in this meeting. RMA worked through subgrants to several groups in various parts of Europe, as well as through networks at global and national levels. The working group is developing a work plan and needs to further strategize on how the Coalition can mobilize and raise awareness of supply issues. An important focus going forward will be how to work with civil society, looking especially at country-led and country-level involvement.

Market Development Approaches (MDA, formerly Total Market Approach)

Lester Chinery

Note: ICON distributed a report in hard copy: *Total Market Initiative—Summary of Baseline Studies* by Elizabeth Gardiner, September 2005.

The MDA Working Group has not selected a leader, but members are implementing some activities under the umbrella of the RHSC.

Update on ICON activities

ICON is conducting research to provide the basis for a pilot that would introduce the total market approach in six to seven countries. Countries being assessed for the pilot are Jordan, Honduras, El Salvador, Peru, Morocco, Romania, Moldova, and Ukraine to determine:

(1) interest on the part of the country government and stakeholders in participating in a pilot, (2) whether the country is appropriate for a second-tier market, and (3) quality and capacity of manufacturers. Business and marketing plans for each country will be developed and gaps identified by the end of 2005. These plans will be shared with stakeholders. It appears that significant reduction in RH supply costs could be realized through use of generics. Research to date indicates a need for segmentation and business intelligence studies, so the next phase of research will address those needs. ICON will prepare a full report on the research findings and share it with partners. A third activity is policy dialogue; a workshop will be held and endorsement solicited from stakeholders in selected countries.

The Chair read an email from Stan Bernstein reminding the group of the ten Millennium Development Goal (MDG) countries. The countries are as follows: Mali, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Malawi in Africa; Yemen, Tajikistan, and Dominican Republic outside of Africa.

Concurrent Working Group Breakout Meetings

Working Group Leaders, Facilitators

Anticipated Outcome

Breakout meetings will provide the working groups with the opportunity to further develop and refine their work plans, assess issues which impact the other working groups, identify opportunities for collaboration, determine actions required by the other working groups to overcome potential work plan implementation obstacles, and identify next steps in response to the Business Plan.

Guidance was provided to the working groups for their breakout sessions. A document developed by the Steering Committee, “Working Group Priorities Related to RHSC Goals,” was distributed to the working groups to help structure their discussions (see Attachment I). It related the five RHSC goals to the working group priorities and priority activities in Annex 2. Working groups were asked to:

- Identify, within the context of the RHSC goals, their work plan priorities.
- Consider, as they develop their work plans, these four elements: strategic thinking, selectiveness, efficiency, and effectiveness (particularly indicators that will make it possible to track success of their activities).
- Include in their work plans current and potential activities, persons responsible (within and outside of the working group), time frame, funding, estimated cost, and deliverables.
- Look at potential countries where coordinated efforts could be implemented.

FRIDAY OCTOBER 7, 2005

Plenary Working Group Presentations/Discussion

Margaret Neuse, Facilitator

Working Group Leaders

Anticipated Outcome

Working groups will present their revised work plans and members will discuss ideas for maximizing collaboration and impact across groups.

The Chair requested the working groups finalize reports on their work plans and send them to Peter Bachrach. Also, in the coming months, as they implement their work plans, the working groups will be asked to update them so they can be shared with the Coalition.

Total Market Working Group—now Market Development Approaches (MDA)

Peter Hall

MDA goal

To improve access to and choice of RH supplies for low- and moderate-income consumers through public, private, and commercial sectors.

Objectives

1. Synthesize and share existing knowledge to provide the base for development of models and actions (emphasis: existing activities).
2. Develop, test, and validate models for fully commercial markets that meet the need of lower-income consumers (emphasis: generic manufacturers).
3. Generate information and coordinate at all levels to develop a supportive environment to further the goal (emphasis: policy).

Initial activities

- **Existing activities.** These fall into four categories: models, manufacturing, countries, and tools. A consultant will be needed to pull together all the information and focus on what is most useful to move the group forward.
Team: Jacqui Darroch will take the lead, supported by Lester Chinery, Ben Light, and Claire Stokes. The team will then develop specific activities and a timeframe.
- **Generic manufacturers.** A list will be generated of generic manufacturers and potential manufacturers and the countries where they are operating and providing supplies. Based on identified gaps, the team will develop an action plan.
Team: Peter Hall will take the lead, supported by Jane Hutchings, Lester Chinery, David Smith, Hans Hogerzeil, and Sophie Logez.
- **Policy.** The team will look at countries' policies and identify where MDA Working Group activities could help influence appropriate policy.
Team: Claire Stokes will take the lead, with support from Alex Banful and Margret Verwijk.

The MDA Working Group activities will be based on the following principles:

- Coordination and transparency.
- Collaboration.
- Support for a safety net for the poorest.
- Work toward overall market growth.
- Development of expertise and knowledge capital at regional/local levels.
- Fully focused effort.

Ben Light is the new MDA Working Group leader, and a team has been assigned to each objective. The group will use the short-term, initial activities to build a longer-term strategy. The MDA Working Group will meet in late January in London to discuss the initial activities and outputs.

Discussion highlights and comments

- Four of the organizations in the MDA Working Group are doing some evaluation of generic manufacturing, and pulling together the results of their work will be an example of the value added of the RHSC in effective resource use and avoidance of duplication.
 - The MDA Working Group is addressing the first and fourth of the five stated RHSC goals, and their plans demonstrate how these goals will be achieved by working groups.
 - As the MDA Working Group develops its work plan it will identify indicators, focus countries, and additional research needs.
-

Lunch - Greeting from Paul Bekkers, Director, Department of Social and Institutional Development, The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Plenary Working Group Presentation/Discussion (Cont.)

Resource Mobilization and Awareness (RMA) Working Group

Terri Bartlett

The RMA Working Group elected Susan Rich of the United Nations Foundation as Chief Advocate of the group. Susan will work with current Chief Advocate, Terri Bartlett, of the SI/Population Action International (PAI), during a transition period, to be completed April 2006.

As activities are defined, the team will communicate via their listserv to identify lead organizations. The RMA Working Group will meet in early 2006 to refine their work plan and provide input on the next phase of the RHSC.

RMA goal

Increase political and financial commitment of RH supplies stakeholders by increasing effective collaboration, increasing and strengthening advocacy, and mobilizing additional resources by developing a comprehensive plan and a clear “ask.”

In working toward the following objectives the RMA Working Group will use the framework and language of September's MDG World Summit.

Objectives

1. Promote strategic international support for RH supplies and secure dependable funding flows.
2. Facilitate increases in domestic financing.

Activities

- Promote strategic international support:
 - Represent RH supplies interests and incorporate RH supplies messages into meetings and other key occasions.

- Find and identify strategic entry points for partnership, outreach, and collaboration, such as regional initiatives (West African Health Organization) and other existing alliances (Newborn Partnership, Rotary), as well as the next EU presidencies (Austria and Finland in 2006, Germany and Greece in 2007).
- Hold an open dialogue (a meeting) to determine a clear agreed-upon “ask” and advocacy strategy towards stable funding flows. This will involve PAI/SI holding a meeting of the RMA Working Group (and leaders of the other working groups, if interested) in January 2006 to develop messages and advocacy strategies, in particular, in regard to achieving stable funding flows. These will be proposed to the RHSC at the meeting in April.
- Develop and support feedback from countries where there have been supply shortages and feed input into policy and decision-making of donor countries/agencies.
- Facilitate increases in domestic financing:
 - Work to get RH supplies included in countries’ PRSPs, SWAps, and EU strategy papers.
 - Strategically map where donors are currently working.
 - Strengthen advocacy to reduce barriers in private and public sectors; collaborate with selected countries to develop advocacy materials.
 - Collaborate in selected countries identified during mapping, with the goal of strengthening and supporting capacity building.
 - Use national EDLs as a tool to secure budget support.

Discussion highlights and comments

- Development banks such as Asian Development Bank (ADB) are potential sources of support. The RMA has not yet approached them but should follow up on this possibility.
- In mapping donors’ support the RMA Working Group will look at how the RHSC can increase support at the country level, i.e., how to engage governments and ensure their support for supplies over the long term. RMA will identify countries where tools could be tested that have potential for use at the country level—for example, the POLICY Project’s RAPID Tool.
- The challenge with regard to countries is determining where we have the best possibility of collaborating to make sure domestic resources support RH and RH supplies.
- Innovative mechanisms are needed for sustainable fundraising.
- By the next RHSC meeting, the RMA Working Group will develop messages and advocacy strategies regarding the “ask” to be presented to the Coalition with the objective of reaching consensus on an approach for sustainable funding.
- Media engagement can be helpful, but supplies issues are difficult to communicate in a “sound byte”—and there is not a concrete solution for the media to communicate.
- The Supply News newsletter could function as an advocacy tool, providing semiannual reports on specific activities supported by donors and what has been accomplished.
- We need to develop advocacy and networks at the subregional level.
- John Snow Inc. (JSI), one of the prime contractors in the recently awarded PEPFAR-funded project on supply chain management, would be very happy to talk with representatives of the RMA Working Group to discuss what might be done to strengthen the supply chain for products other than ARVs. JSI will await a call from the RMA.

Systems Strengthening (SS) Working Group

Alan Bornbusch

Alan Bornbusch is the SS Working Group leader. The group is well along in developing its work plan. A priority in the group's discussions during this RHSC meeting was to identify activities that can be accomplished within the next year and demonstrate the value of the SS Working Group. The group considers it can provide added value through functions such as advising, monitoring, coordinating, standardizing, harmonizing, and communicating.

Objectives

The SS Working Group works in three areas—information, financing, and supply flows—that together are necessary to strengthen global, regional, and country systems for a reliable and predictable supply of quality RH products.

1. **Information flow.** Improve joint efforts for timely access to and use of standardized information to align financing and RH product flows to meet country requirements.
2. **Financing flow.** Develop solutions to drive increased reliability, predictability, and efficiency of public financing for RH supply needs, especially for poor and vulnerable populations.
3. **Product flow.** Identify and support supply chain improvements for effective and efficient delivery of quality-assured RH supplies.

Activities

- **Information flow.** One main activity for 2006 will be serving as the management group for the RH Interchange. This will include specific activities such as harmonizing forecasting methodologies and data and ensuring use by all parties, and incorporating UNFPA's 2015 projections of RH supply requirements in the RH Interchange. The SS Working Group will also work on the idea of a "one-stop" location, perhaps a web platform linked to rhsupplies.org, where one can find information on country status in regard to RH commodity security.
- **Financing flow.** Specific 2006 activities include continuing the Countries-at-Risk group and building on the Mercer and DFID studies to provide analytical support to examine the need and design options for a "stability" financing mechanism.
- **Product flow.** Activities in 2006 will include documenting best practices and identifying emerging issues in supply chain management (e.g., quality assurance, efficiencies). The SS Working Group will also help to monitor and provide technical advice to ongoing initiatives in prequalification and essential medicines lists.

Indicators

Some indicators include the frequency/number of stock-outs at country facilities and the number of countries using the RH Interchange for supply planning. In working to develop a monitoring and evaluation plan, the working group, and more generally the RHSC, needs to identify a meaningful accountability that aims neither too low nor too high.

Discussion highlights and comments

- An important element to consider in looking at systems is the availability of human resources to implement them. There are critical shortages of human resources, and this is mentioned in the Millennium Project as well as the UNFPA Global Programme.
- The shortages in human resources can be addressed in various ways:
 - Training and retaining more people.
 - Introducing greater system efficiencies.
- The one-stop information resource is relevant to the RMA Working Group activities.
- It would be useful to document success stories (e.g., in-country financing and procurement)—what worked and where. This would be a good advocacy tool; perhaps RMA can help support it.

Plenary Working Group Presentation/Discussion Wrap-Up

Summary

Margaret Neuse summarized the following highlights:

- Most of the working groups looked at realistic objectives—what they could accomplish in one year and could build on.
- It was suggested by several people that the Executive Committee and then the Coalition as a whole should sort out a way to structure a buffer fund that is not just an emergency fix, but an established long-term mechanism.
- Work must be country led.
- Human resources are a challenge and we need to keep this in sight.
- The following questions were raised:
 - What is the “ask”? What do we need, and can ask for, that will be a solution to what we want to accomplish? At the next meeting there should be time allowed to define this.
 - What needs to happen in order to identify the countries to work in, and how to work in them?
 - Are there some countries where alignment is such that we could harmonize efforts and where work could add up to more than the sum of its parts?
 - What do we (the Coalition as a whole, as well as the working groups) want to take responsibility for? What are successful indicators? What is in the manageable interest of the Coalition to accomplish? Are the indicators we have to date the right ones?
 - As we move on to 2006, how can we continue to make progress?
- All of the working groups are to be congratulated on their progress. They have moved forward to the point of tangible action.

Discussion

- Is there a need for a Donor Working Group? Is the RHSC at a place to help partners focus their resources? Should a Donor Working Group be established to develop its own work plan and indicators and report out to the larger membership?
- Donors are participating in existing working groups and do not need a separate group. Also, at this and previous meetings, they can meet informally.

- Margret Verwijk voiced interest in developing an RHSC fundraising strategy.
- All RHSC participants must develop a set of common messages to the field. Donors should consider sending an email to their field offices summarizing what is going on with the RHSC. It was requested that donors inform their country offices of the RHSC discussions.
- Margaret Neuse agreed and said that USAID would send an email to its field offices informing them about the RHSC, the issues it is addressing, and its activities.

Selection of Chair

Nominating Committee

Anticipated Outcome

RHSC member organizations will elect the new Chair, who will assume this role at the spring 2006 meeting.

Election

The Coalition approved the cochairpersonship of Margret Verwijk and Wolfgang Bichmann for the next two-year term.

Discussion highlights and comments

The selection process. The Steering Committee established a small Nominating Committee (Steve Sinding, Jagdish Upadhyay, and Elizabeth Lule) and issued a call for nominations. The Nominating Committee received the nominations and contacted the nominees to confirm availability and interest. This resulted in two candidates, Wolfgang Bichmann (KfW Development Bank on behalf of the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development – BMZ), and Margret Verwijk (The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs). The EU members of the Coalition met and proposed that they should serve as cochairs.

- The new chairs stated their acceptance and the support of their respective governments for their role as cochair.
- Margret stated that she is fully committed to achieving the objectives of the Coalition such as collaboration, harmonization, sustainability, and to the passion that the group can bring to addressing supply issues. She noted the comparative advantage of Coalition members and the importance of developing synergies. She will seek new ideas and resources and is willing to go the extra mile.
- Wolfgang expressed appreciation of Elizabeth's high standards in her role as RHSC Chair and the importance of these standards as the Coalition seeks to become a more robust force in resolving supply issues. He will encourage EU countries to increase their commitment to the RHSC and help them to join forces and use their combined experience to further the Coalition objectives. The core commitment is to public health and ensuring that it is on the agenda.
- Lena Sund expressed the pleasure of the EU countries in having cochairs from the EU. She will take on the task of bringing more Europeans around the table. She thanked Elizabeth for providing an excellent example and showing the way to continue.

Closing Remarks

Elizabeth Lule, Chair

Anticipated Outcome

The Chair will summarize the meeting.

Summary

- The excellent work of the working groups at this meeting has demonstrated the value of the working groups and the Coalition.
- The Coalition has taken the following steps:
 - Approval of the TOR.
 - A Strategic Plan that prepares the groundwork for a business plan, which will include a resource mobilization plan for activities that are not funded.
- The location of the Secretariat (European or United States) is a concern as we look ahead to the transition period. The RHSC Cochairs will have the responsibility of determining what is best.
- IPPF and UNFPA stated (at the Steering Committee meeting October 5) their willingness to provide support to the Secretariat, whatever situation is decided upon.
- The Coalition needs better clarity on what will be implemented at the global and country levels.
- Cost implications and indicators are important to consider.
- Research – the Coalition was informed of research into what is happening at the country level. DFID and EC are looking at the same methodology. The Chair voiced a personal request to the donors supporting the research to do a synthesis report that brings together the findings of the various studies.
- WHO – The Chair expressed appreciation to WHO for the participation of Hans Hogerzeil and thanked him for sharing WHO's work with the Coalition.
- UNFPA – In sharing its concept of a global facility for supplies and gathering input, UNFPA provided an excellent example of transparency.
- Work plans – The Chair asked working group leaders to send their revised work plans to Peter Bachrach. The Secretariat will send the updated work plans to all of the RHSC members.
- RHSC Secretariat – PATH has prepared a proposal for funding of a three-year period for the RHSC Secretariat that it will submit to the Gates Foundation in mid-October.
- RHSC Director – The Executive Committee will review the RHSC Director job description and when finalized will share it with the Coalition members. There is an urgent need for RHSC members to think of possible qualified candidates for the position and send names to the Executive Committee.
- Next RHSC meetings:
 - The first meeting in 2006 will be April 27–28 in New York, hosted by UNFPA.
 - The second meeting in 2006 will be in the fall in Germany, hosted by DSW.

Challenges

Elizabeth expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to serve as Chair and said it had been a fulfilling, positive experience. She noted the following challenges ahead:

- Communication – Each RHSC member represents a constituency. It is important to keep them informed. We must continue to work on communicating within the RHSC as well as with colleagues outside of the Coalition.
 - Promising too much – We need to take stock of what we can feasibly do.
 - The need to sustain energy, interest, and commitment.
 - Integrating supplies and RHSC activity with all the other global and country initiatives.
-

L:/Fall meeting 2005/Meeting minutes/RHSC Mtg minutes 11-10