

**STH Coalition Action Group Call
February 3rd, 2016
Meeting Minutes**

| Participants: | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| David Addiss, CWW | Neeraj Mistry, GNNTD |
| Kim Koporc, CWW | Lisa Schectman, Wateraid |
| Akudo Anyanwu, CWW | Grace Hollister, Evidence Action |
| Allison Snyder, CWW | Clayton Ajello, Vitamin Angels |
| Geordie Woods, Sightsavers | Peter Colenso, CIFF |
| Carol Wylie, World Vision | Johannes Waltz, GSA |

1. STH Coalition Bylaws

- Bylaws were adopted with the proposed amendments:
 - i. Section 8.3: Amend quorum requirement to: “a quorum is *half* of the full Action Group membership.”
 - ii. Section 11.1: Update to reflect new quorum requirement
 - iii. Clarification that both the Steering Committee & Action Group are involved in amending Bylaws

Discussion on Bylaws:

- Engagement of partners at a country level was noted as an area of importance for donors. This is a reoccurring theme in STH Coalition discussions, and it was agreed that STH endemic countries need to be represented.
- Within the Bylaws, the duties of the Steering Committee and Action Group have some overlapping responsibilities, and it was requested that the roles of each group are made clearer.
 - The proposed amendment to the bylaws about the process to amend the bylaws and each group’s role should provide clarification.
- Taking into account various time zones, travel, and work commitments, it was noted that a 2/3 quorum requirement for the Action Group call is high.
 - An option to enable or require proxy votes was proposed, but it was agreed that this had more disadvantages than advantages.
 - After discussing, Action Group members agreed that lowering the quorum requirement for the STH Coalition Action Group calls was the best way forward.
- The adoption of the Bylaws is the first major approval by the STH Coalition Action Group, and all members are thanked for their efforts in this task.

2. STH Coalition Action Plan Process

- Akudo has had discussions with workstream chairs about the outcome and output indicators that will be included in the workplan per Peter’s recommendation. Workstream chairs are having subsequent ongoing conversations within their workstreams to develop said indicators. Currently there are drafts of the indicators, which are in the process of being finalized. The workplan document has developed to include workstream challenges, gaps, and opportunities, in a document that has a proper preface and includes the workplans of all STH Coalition workstreams. This document is very helpful in defining the work of the STH Coalition.
 - Appreciation was shown to the workstream chairs for their hard work in developing the outcome indicators.

Discussion on Workplan:

- The question was raised about the role of a workplan versus a strategic plan. The consensus is that a Strategic Plan would be done at a higher level, and would have a broader time-span (3 to 5 years) than the Workplan (2 to 3 years).
 - There is agreement that the workstream system is working well for the STH Coalition, but there are some things that are important to the Coalition, yet have not been integrated into any one workstream. A larger, comprehensive STH Coalition plan (strategic plan or workplan) may be able to identify high-level goals and address any gaps between workstreams. There may be an opportunity to have another document which provides the big picture, and explains connections, and overall targets and goals.
 - The task of developing an overall STH Coalition Strategic Plan will be completed by David and CWW.*
 - The goal is to consult each member of the Action Group to develop a document that the Action Group owns.
 - * Further conversation with the Steering Committee on 02/04/16 indicated that the 1 year Workplan would be developed by CWW by March 2016, and the timeline for a larger Strategic Plan will come later.
- Action Group members noted the need for resources in order to implement the work outlined in the workplans. There are challenges in moving each of the workstream plans forward without identifying the needed resources.
 - Overall, this is part of the STH Coalition evolution process. Currently the implementation of the workplans relies on resources and leadership brought forward by the Coalition partners.
 - The hope is that as the process of planning moves forward, and as the STH Coalition defines activities needed going forward, then the Coalition can fundraise for those activities.
- Specific Workstream points:
 - Advocacy Workstream: The need for resources is most stark within this group.
 - SAC Workstream: There are some parallels between the challenges facing the SAC and Advocacy Workstreams. The country profiles, for example, require financial and technical resources. In many cases, funding defines what work is able to be done.
 - WASH Workstream: There may be an opportunity to rethink the WASH STH Coalition strategy. This workstream could function best as a technical support group to provide assistance to the other workstreams. This is a great opportunity to promote integration in a meaningful way, and move away from a “siloed” approach. Advocacy will be a focus within WASH activities and there is room for targeted support. The way this workstream has restructured work to be more collaborative means there is not a huge need for resources now. There is a question of what the Action Group thinks about the role that WASH can play, which will be an ongoing conversation.

3. Review of Meeting Notes

- December 2nd, 2015 Action Group meeting notes were adopted.
 - The proposed milestones for each indicator for the London Declaration Scorecard were approved.

Discussion on Meeting Notes:

- Page 3, Participant Expectations – This was also discussed earlier in the workplan discussion. It is important to note that this is an ongoing conversation and reoccurring theme.
- Table 3, items 5 and 6 – Lisa, Johannes, and the WASH Workstream will discuss these indicators further with David. It seems like there is a great opportunity to overlap with the work being done in the Schisto community, and to make WASH-specific recommendations.

4. Update on WHO Strategic Plan Process

- David provided an update from the CCC meeting in Geneva, which took place at the end of January 2016. There were 3 points of discussion that came out of the meeting between the drug donation programs, Pharma donors and WHO:
 - WHO will look at the STH strategy from 2012 and revise based on recent advances.
 - WHO has brought in Poppy Lambertson to review the document, go through it line by line, and update it through 2020.
 - She will analyze the current STH strategy, keeping in mind M&E challenges, the new WHO WASH strategy, and STH Coalition input.
 - Timeline: Information gathering will begin this month. A draft is expected by the end of the month (February). In March/ April there will be a meeting to pull together key STH stakeholders.
 - David has signaled to WHO to have full engagement by STH Coalition, and will provide an STH Coalition Action Group contact list to Poppy.
 - David anticipates that this revision of the strategy will emphasize M&E efforts, and likely won't be a huge departure from the current strategy.
 - WHO also reviewed progress in some countries and is really reaching out to us to scale up Indonesia in particular. It is a priority, high burden country that needs additional push in STH control efforts.
 - GAELF has settled on a meeting date in Oct (13th and 14th) in Brasilia. They are interested in bringing in the larger NTD group (Schisto and STH). More information to come.
 - It was noted that the NNN meeting is also around the same time, and there are multiple opportunities to host other meetings.