Note for the Record – Monthly HDC Partners Meeting

Location: WebEx

Date: 20 February 2020, 16:00-17:00 CET

HDC Participants:	CDC (Ben Dahl, Carrie Eggers and Chris Murrill), PEPFAR (Mark DeZalia), PHCPI (Jeff Markuns), UNICEF (Jennifer Requejo, Chika Hayashi, Debra Jackson), UNAIDS (Peter Ghys, Taavi Erkkola), University of Oslo (Kristin Braa), PATH (Lauren Wall, Hallie Goertz), City University of New York (Jim Sherry), USAID (Bill Weiss), GIZ (Tessa Lenneman) Asia eHealth Information Network (Alvin Marcelo), UHC2030 (Marjolaine Nicod)
Working groups:	Digital and Interoperability (Garret Mehl, WHO) Civil registration and vital statistics (Debra Jackson, UNICEF) Epidemic intelligence Logistics management and information Community Data (Ana Scholl, USAID)
WHO secretariat:	Craig Burgess, Afnan Naeem

Objectives:
1. To approve final version of HDC governance document
2. To provide opportunity for inputs into March 19-20 face to face meeting agenda and objectives
3. To hear update from 5 working groups and ways of strengthened links to HDC

Agenda:
Introductions & roll call (5 mins)
Overview of final governance, inputs and brief update on HDC secretariat (5 mins)
- Verbal feedback (10 mins)

Overview of March 19-20 meeting agenda (10 mins)
- Verbal comments (10 mins) *written feedback will also be sought by email*

Brief update from Working Groups (15 mins)
Next steps (5 mins)

Summary of Discussion:

WHO (Craig): Welcome, roll call, overview of objectives and agenda. First point of governance document – can we live with this for now and move forward with principles?

1. Feedback on Governance Document

Co chair (CDC, Ben Dahl): There has been a lot of progress made over the last two months in terms of governance and we need to now focus on getting work done. Final draft - don't' see any necessary changes or red flags. Positive feedback given by email and verbally on last call, about right size 15 pages. Good to have last opportunity here to comment verbally. If majority feel the need to send for one last look before approval, it can be done, but would opt to move forward.

WHO (Craig): Any red flags / issues that partners really cannot live with as we move forward?

USAID (Bill Weiss): Still needs to be more explicit to have secretariat with one or more partner options in future.

WHO (Craig): Previous version gave the 3 options and these are still relevant, depending on levels of commitment from different agencies. It is still very much on the table and open to discuss as HDC moves forward – had thought wording was quite clear, but will make it even more explicit.

UNICEF (Chika): Recognize the need to reduce number of people on call and make the governance more streamlined, but please explain multilateral and intergovernmental organizations. Person representing needs to represent all views. How will all this translate into action? How would all views be represented?

WHO (Craig): The push for a constituency-based governance mechanism came out of discussions over the last year. Constituency definitions and how they represent one another are reflection of analysis of other GHIs. There are simply too many groups that make it difficult to move forward or make decisions, which is why constituency-based governance has been promoted over the last year. It is hoped that this way of working will actually strengthen collaboration and info sharing within and between constituencies and increase ownership, as representatives need to represent multiple view points. Offered support for each constituency on how to do this and secretariat can facilitate calls if necessary between now and March. However, ideally at March meeting each constituency could have a nomination for representative and alternate (in case representative unable to attend). Practically making it work will depend on dynamics in countries and relationships between partners / Govt and regional support. This will take consistent communications with HDC and approaches.

UNICEF (Debra): All partners in HDC should meet at least once per year beyond Stakeholder Representative Group (SRG). One meeting should allow all partners including WG representatives. Supports stakeholder re-group, by engaging all the groups once a year.

WHO (Craig): Agree – the Global Partnership Group will meet once per year – noted in document. However we will need to ensure that country points of view are prioritized (also noting the difficulty in getting country voices even for the HDC calls).

UNICEF (Debra): Suggest expanding this in document.

City University of New York (Jim Sherry): Within context of principles and governance words matter and where things are included or deleted are unclear. How much are some of things being vetted? Some elements require a little more precision, eg. list of organizations, principles and entities (eg. Countdown is not in the list, but SDG GAP is). What is in and what is out? Please make reference to previous WGs. Maybe prejudicial? Specific suggestions: in the language, not laying out the options for the future secretariat modality; other distinct options need to be on the table. Alignment with other efforts such as SDG gap need to be broader than purely SDG GAP. Constituency groups needs expanded in the description on what their role and responsibilities as representatives are.

WHO (Craig): Multiple opportunities to feedback into the governance process and document have been made and still welcome further inputs by email to ensure that we can move forward and continue to refine. WGs have all been listed – 12 found and it seems only 5 are functional (independent of HDC and suggested future of WGs is clear in document). Could consider one to one consultations if there are significant red flags or issues that will prevent things moving forward. Constituency groups: yes, it will need to be fleshed out and some roles and responsibilities will be suggested as email follow up with each constituency – but welcome suggestions, depending on how each constituency wants it to work. If we look at the # of entities, the collaboration and suggested alignment goes way beyond SDG GAP – have consulted UHC 2030, Every Woman Every Child, PHCI, PMNCH and many others listed on slides circulated in December. However SDG GAP does help align 12 agencies of HDC. It is not exclusive and we hope that we get more country driven approaches.

City University of New York (Jim): Inclusive list – no issue. It seems SDG Gap is the only one included within the secretariat structure.

WHO (Craig): Concerns in writing with some positive suggestions / options for way forward, it would really help. General points are well-taken. We could eventually have one paper for governance and separate one for objectives and principles. However let's stick with one document for now, with everything in one place - two documents may get too fragmented. Encourage all to continue feedback by email.

City University of New York (Jim): Happy to follow up by email to save time.

UNICEF (Jennifer Requejo): USAID flagged issues again for possible multi partner secretariat and UNICEF also recommends these issues be re-emphasized in the secretariat explanation. It may be worth emphasizing the tools, countries and ambition of HDC for 2023

WHO (Craig): Will rewrite the section again and welcome ways to make it happen as we move forward. But to make it work it may take resources (HR or financial) to make this happen.

UNICEF (Jennifer): will follow up internally in UNICEF.

WHO (Craig): Are there any other major red flags anyone feels cannot move forward with for the governance document?

GIZ (Tessa Lenneman): We will need clarity (on roles and responsibilities) and possible support from secretariat to make the constituencies work

WHO (Craig): Secretariat will follow up with each of the 7 constituencies and give you options of facilitating a phone call with opportunities to nominate yourselves and have you as a constituency vote on your representative. Secretariat can help convene this call or if you would

rather do it yourselves that is fine – email will be sent to each of the constituencies. Welcome ideas to make this happen.

City University of New York (Jim): Don't think CDC belongs in the current constituency of academia and technical networks – it is a US Government entity. Also DHIS2 is names as an example – suggest never to name specific software

WHO (Craig): It was a challenge, but we looked at other GHIs and Gavi board set a precedent and CDC is classified as Research and Technical Health Institute. So, suggest CDC goes in this constituency. Agree – will now strike out reference to DHIS2.

City University of New York (Jim): OK thanks. Will take it up in writing.

Digital and Inter-operability WG (Garret Mehl): Note previous requests for stakeholder group to have membership of one chair from each of the WG – it is important to strengthen links between HDC SRG and WGs. Suggest having one co-chair from each of the WGs. Echoed previous point of not calling out specific software products and suggests striking DHIS2 from the document.

WHO (Craig): We will strike out reference to specific software. In terms of WG: good point – we need to have stronger relationships with WGs and ensure they are regularly consulted and part of HDC. Unsure whether having a specific co-chair is best way forward, as each constituency is represented in WGs anyway and WGs may be time limited with discrete products in certain time lines. However definitely interested in exploring ideas to make this work and strengthen links between WGs and WGs to HDC – happy to take one to one for suggestions on representation in the SRG or whether this is seen as updating and work that goes on – each WG has a representative that could report and exchange info.

CDC (Ben): Want to engage more with WG, but many previously were too many in # and were time limited (ie. had to finish their mission)

WHO (Craig): Let's take offline and explore options for WGs with Ben and Garret take offline and explore options on how to do that.

WHO (Craig): Summary- there have been considerable progress and we really need to move forward. We have heard feedback during the call and will incorporate this. If there is further major feedback it would be good to have this in writing, so we can circulate a version for approval (ideally) at the March meeting.

2. *Planning for March Meeting*

WHO (Craig): Circulated a concept notes for reactions and ideas to ensure we are on track. Initial concept was on basis of previous discussions with partners and co-chairs. This initial meeting may only be partners, with a separate opportunity with countries possibly in April – that could be more country centric. Between now and March we could hear more from the four pathfinder countries on their experiences and needs – this will need extensive work with key in country partners to gather this feedback. March meeting is focused on partners and working with all partners. This call is for you to give us input.

City University of New York (Jim): Main concern is that the secretariat is getting ahead of consensus of the HDC and I question whether we should align with SDG Gap accelerator. There seems to eb lack of transparency on how the emphasis came up on SDG Gap accelerator – request more transparency.

WHO (Craig): Apologies if there is perception of lack of transparency on aligning with SDG GAP, but SDG GAP data and digital accelerator involves 12 key partners in HDC and has political buy in. On our last call, Samira outlined the SDG GAP processes and many on today's call are engaged with SDG GAP, so it may be worth supporting alignment. In terms of representation, hoping between now and March constituencies will be talking to each other to ensure the agenda reflects needs. Please suggest positive options for the two day face to face meeting if possible – what 2-3 things do people want to achieve?

UNICEF (Chika): Agree with Jim – committing to SDG Gap process is way beyond HDC. Should be more about asking countries what they would find useful from HDC and how we are going to be making a difference in these things? It is still not clear what the mission and aim of HDC

WHO (Craig): In terms of mission and objectives, these have had extensive inputs and are pretty clearly stated in the governance document – these are based on feedback from partners Nov – Jan. Agree we need to ask countries more from what they want from HDC and this is ongoing. What are 2-3 priorities that you would like to see from the March meeting. Are there things that gel and what is missing?

UNICEF (Jennifer): SDG gap data and digital accelerator group needs clarification – was on call and there seems to be much overlap between HDC and this group.

WHO (Craig): Co-chairs (UNFPA and WHO) of SDG gap are aware of overlap and Jennifer and Craig were on that call and Craig gave a brief update on HDC during the SDG GAP call.

UNICEF (Debra): After call discussion may be required if we are really going to talk about SDG GAP.

WHO (Craig): Agree and happy to facilitate a specific call on links with SDG GAP. Are there any other things that are required from the 19-20 March agenda?

GIZ (Tessa): SDG GAP should continue to be on agenda, but not be a priority. Priority should be the new country based theory of change and how it's going to achieve HDC goals.

WHO (Craig): Thank you Tessa – agree and hope this will be the main emphasis in our meeting – how we translate the ToC into reality and make sure the ToC sets the tone / framework for the HDC work plan.

PATH (Hallie): There are two emerging threads – alignment and ecosystem mapping. is a need for Ecosystem mapping to better understand where HDC fits in with the evolving Global Health environment and ensure greater clarity for partners and countries.

WHO (Craig): Great idea and this could really help the face to face meeting – this is work that will need done by a group of us as partners – we can ask for volunteers to support Hallie, and be clear this is mapping GHIs links, showing possible added value of HDC and also priority countries. Thanks for prompting that. Any other comments specifically on the agenda and concept note?

UNICEF (Chika): In terms of alignment, we need to hear from other groups and constituencies.

WHO (Craig): Thanks Chika – hoping UNICEF could be part of this work with Hallie and others to indeed plot from mapping an ecosystem in which HDC sits.

PHCPI (Jeff Markuns): It appears our meeting agenda could tackle three main issues: a) Landscape in which HDC sits and showing overlaps and possible added value of HDC (SDG GAP, other GHIs which could evolve from ecosystem mapping, b) getting governance right enough to move forward with and c) prioritization of countries and issues that HDC partners can work with, based on ToC and country needs.

WHO (Craig): Thanks for clarity and inputs – these definitely align with the concept and focus on country needs and ToC

GIZ (Tessa): Make sure that if countries can join it is clear there is protected time for them to talk and explain their needs – based on preparation and they know what they can expect from HDC through previous efforts.

WHO (Craig): Four pathfinder countries (Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, Cameroon)and two others (Indonesia and Uganda) who have expressed interest. It may be worth sorting out partner governance first before inviting a broad range of countries.

PEPFAR (Mark): Thanks for restarting HDC. Its success will be demonstrating added value in countries, documenting progress transparently and clear objectives, as laid out in governance document and align with ToC

3. Briefing from co-chairs (only 3/5 due to time constraints)
Digital and Interoperability WG (Garret Mehl, WHO): will continue to align with HDC as much as possible
Civil registration and vital statistics (Debra Jackson, UNICEF): UN Statistics commission in 2 weeks, WG is giving inputs and involved with this, CRVS will have its own legal entity with resources behind it
Community Data WG (Ana Scholl, USAID): may need separate call t update, but Community Health Information Systems group meeting in Dhaka, Senegal

Action points:
1. Clarification on who was on the call (27 people on call but not all names possible to collect) – ask by email;
2. **Governance document:** Follow up suggestions continue to be welcome by email so it can be approved in March. Based on feedback from this call, revised document will a) more explicitly state options for multi partner secretariat, b) strike out any reference to DHIS2, c) constituency groups again need to be spelled out more,
3. **Agenda 19-20 March**: Follow up suggestions welcome by email and secretariat will follow up with current co-chairs (NORAD / CDC) and recirculated for comments: a) to keep a session on SDG GAP (bit not main priority), b) to support partners understand the alignment and added value of HDC in global health ecosystem (volunteers to be asked), c) 4 countries approached for feedback, d) invites and logistics note will go out in week of 23 Feb
4. **Follow up on SRG representation:** Roles and responsibilities of representatives needs spelt out more clearly and secretariat will email out offer to facilitate calls with each constituency and look at options for private sector constituency
5. **Working Groups:** Secretariat will follow up with WG co chairs on strengthening links with HDC and representation as well as links to digital groups

Sent for info to: HDC
Sent for action to: WHO/HQ/DDI