

**Meeting Evaluation Summary  
Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition  
October 2005 Meeting**

Responses received from:

New Coalition Meeting Attendees: 3

Returning Attendees: 15

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

**a. Provide a forum for working groups to revise/complete their work plans and share these with the other groups?**

Yes - New: 3

Yes – Returning: 15

No – New: 0

No – Returning: 0

Comments (Returning):

- Not enough time to complete, but will continue outside meeting
- Although plans were not completed, per se, much was accomplished and plans are all more coherent and better synchronized. But it would have been good to have one-page handouts with the groups' report-outs.
- Glad for two blocks of time
- Please follow-up by sharing future revisions to RHSC members; need to develop indicators; need to develop activities for fundraising
- Much more specific work plans developed – but I do not expect to spend so much time on workplans in future
- A lot of work was achieved in the WG and showed with other groups

Comments (New):

- Limited time allotted. In future, working group meetings should be separate.

**b. Provide an opportunity for members to give input into the business plan?**

Yes – New: 0

Yes – Returning: 10

No – New: 2

No – Returning: 4

Comment (Returning):

- Not sure where we stand vis-à-vis the business plan
- Business plan was not completed
- Got the document fairly late and it was not clear what our role was and what would be expected.
- The plan still seems like a draft and so new input is required before finalization.

- The role of the business plan and what it will do was unclear, and further ways to provide input are unclear.
- Yes, through the Ex. Comm – confusing to members

Comment (New):

- No, although discussion on the work plans will help.

**c. Enable the working groups to link their work plans to support the medium term strategic focus of the RHSC and business plan?**

Yes – New: 2

Yes – Returning: 10

No – New: 0

No – Returning: 3

Comments (Returning):

- We didn't really get that far.
- Yes, in concept, but not in reality.
- Yes, conceptually, but cannot be truly realized until RHSC has objectives and indicators for WGs to orient activities toward.

Comments (New):

- Yes, although only in a general sense.

**d. Result in member approval of the TOR?**

Yes – New: 2

Yes – Returning: 12

No – New: 0

No – Returning: 2

Comment (Returning):

- Sort of. I gave some written suggestions during the meeting.
- Even though the vote ended up not objecting to TOR, still some unresolved issues (valid ones) are there – would rather see TOR update with new vote.
- Need to incorporate opinion of Europeans so they can build interest among their constituents.
- Yes, but it was lukewarm and did not feel conclusive
- Confusing information/presentation on TOR/B. plan – changes in focus, etc.

Comment (New):

- Yes, but not enthusiastically.

**e. Result in the selection of a Chair**

Yes – New: 3

Yes – Returning: 15

No – New: 0

No – Returning: 0

Comment (Returning):

- We are so lucky to have the co-chair outcome!

Comment (New):

- o Knowledge of nominations should have been known earlier.

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

Yes – New: 2

Yes – Returning: 12

No – New: 1

No – Returning: 3

Comment (Returning):

- o Too many presentations and not enough time to talk
- o Long plenary sessions, especially Day 1.
- o Well-balanced
- o Could use a bit more working group time, and limit technical discussion following technical presentations.
- o Good mix of both

Comment (New):

- o Not enough time for working groups sessions

**3. How would you rate the interest and relevance of the following sessions?**

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

<b>Thursday October 6, 2005</b>	<b>New</b>	<b>Returning</b>
TOR Report and Approval	2.3	2.5
Steering Committee Recommendations on Business Plan/Discussion	3.0	2.2
Update on Research Studies and the role of the RHSC	2.8	3.3
Working Groups' Topics and Issues of Focus	3.5	2.8
WHO Presentations	3.7	3.6
Discussion of UNFPA Global Program to Enhance RHSC 2006–2010	3.3	2.8
Working Group Breakout Meetings	3.0	3.0
<b>Friday October 7, 2005</b>		
Working Group Breakout Meetings	3.3	3.5
Plenary Working Group Presentation/Discussion	3.3	3.4
Selection of Chair	3.0	3.4
Closing Remarks	3.0	3.3

Comments(Returning): Good balance of plenary and working group.

**4. In sum, did the Coalition meeting provide enough opportunity to address the following issues of critical importance?**

**a. Issues related to global supplies needs and potential gaps**

Yes – New: 2

Yes – Returning: 10

No – New: 1

No – Returning: 4

Comments (Returning):

- The WG meetings always seem too short, but all made very good progress in the time given.
- The meeting provided some opportunity, surely, but not “enough.” Especially the issue of UNFPA’s role within the Coalition
- Coalition is moving toward coordinating to improve supply issues, but still seems to lack a framework that outlines the range of issues to help us prioritize which activities to pursue.
- Only in working groups, except for presentations of research.
- Didn’t really talk about this.
- Could use more definition of what this means – there are many levels of needs and gaps.

Comments (New):

- Not enough tangible and down to earth.

**b. Issues concerning the structure and operation of the Coalition itself**

Yes – New: 3

Yes – Returning: 9

No – New: 0

No – Returning: 6

If no, which issues should have been included?

Comments (Returning):

- People are interested in the proposal – only Exec. Comm. Has seen even draft of costs/staffing, etc.
- So many questions raised (relationship to countries, how to measure success), but not clear how/who will take on these questions – Secretariat? Exec. Comm?
- We need language on how we operate vis-à-vis each other and in relation to countries as well as how we prioritize activities.
- Agreement to the TOR was pro-forma and despite last-minute concerns voiced by a major member (DFID)
- There remains a concern about internal communications and ensuring timely participation by members in discussions, reviews.
- “work in progress”
- Needed to rewrite TOR.

Comments (New):

- Too much – we are about to create a new organization.
- Need more discussion on expanding membership, engaging new partners (especially commercial sector, other country programs).

**If no, which issues should have been included?**

- Role of UNFPA vis-à-vis RHSC
- Consensus on what RHSC success should look like

## **Planning & Logistics**

### **5. 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	12

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

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	2	5
No	1	8

#### Comments (Returning):

- Once the UNFPA “global programme” was placed on the agenda (late), it “hijacked” a good deal of people’s and groups’ time and attention, yet it was not dealt with explicitly or completely
- Whether or not we back the UNFPA global plan.
- We need to follow up on Jerry Chambers’ report and organize a meeting with private sector organizations.
- Just need a way to openly discuss issues.

#### Comments (New):

- Agenda too general in large parts.

### **7. Did you participate in the agenda development process?**

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	0	5
No	3	9

#### How could the agenda development process be improved?

- Start earlier. Figure out ways to reduce plenary time, especially on Day 1.
- It seems a very closed process, actually; couldn’t it be opened up some?
- Insist that members give feedback with clear questions.

### **8. 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):

- Very good facilitation from Margret.
- I think it would help if breakout groups met earlier the first day.

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

	New Members	Returning Members
Yes	3	12
No	0	1

### Comments (Returning):

- No, I had three hopes: (1) select a European chair; (2) make progress on our WG plan; (3) finalize/approve document that can be shared to say who we are. 1 and 2 were met, but 3 was not. The longer we remain an unknown to all but ourselves, the steeper the slope we will need to climb to say “we are here!”
- It’s imperfect as always, but it’s so good that the RHSC is clearly gaining traction.

## 10. What are your suggestions for how the RHSC can use meeting time to most effectively advance its mission?

### Returning:

- Continue the combination of plenary and working group sessions.
- Working group time important
- Consider themes for future meetings (maybe next time, “Global Programme”) with sessions surrounding it.
- It is good initiative. The outgoing Chair’s matured outlook and sustained efforts brought it to the focus. SI has added value to its efforts.
- A single topic focused on during day one – lots of working group time.
- More use of flipcharts, parking lots, facilitation, small group techniques as appropriate to specific agenda items.
- Technical presentations such as WHO were very interesting – but the discussion period was too long.
- More time on what we are doing, what we have achieved and how this is making impact.
- Packing a lot into 2 days, maybe 2.5 days?
- Challenge to get people to read ahead of time.

## 11. Additional Comments:

### Returning:

- The role of the consultant, Peter Bachrach, was not clear.
- Business plan needs “situational analysis” that Peter raised to help put Coalition in context.
- It was wonderful to have WHO so well represented to quickly and fully integrated into the work of the RHSC.
- The RHSC really needs to come to terms with how it is going to measure/document its success and global progress on RHCS. “Indicators” for a short-hard term, really should be a major item for discussion a the next

meeting, and/or if the working groups successfully complete the elaboration of their work plans to include specification of indicators of working group success.

- I think the Coalition needs to think very hard and soon about 2 things: (1) what will we be accountable for and what is meaningful? (2) I fear complacency that Gates will support us; they and we need to force the issue that Gates will not always be there. If donors do not see the value of the RHSC and come up with support for it, we are doomed.
- The meeting room was too large and formal.
- Thank you to Elizabeth for being such an effective and pleasant Chair!