<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Geneva)</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 12:10</td>
<td>• Opening remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 - 12:20</td>
<td>• UHPR Timeline 2022 - 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 - 13:05</td>
<td>• Feedback from the TAG subgroup discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Subgroup 1 (Governance and Process): Conclusions and recommendations on the UHPR Commissions - Mona M’Bikay &amp; Clare Wenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Subgroup 2 (Indicators): Conclusions and recommendations on the UHPR indicators – Robert Agyarko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Subgroup 3 (Interaction and relation with other mechanisms): Conclusions and recommendations on the civil society (CSO) and community engagement in the UHPR process – Justin Koonin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:05 - 13:35</td>
<td>• Presentation of the new UHPR process and background documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions &amp; Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35 - 13:50</td>
<td>• Next Steps and way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:50 - 14:00</td>
<td>• Closing remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WHO shared an update on the general UHPR timeline for 2022-2023 highlighting, key events and UHPR pilots in volunteering countries, particularly the pilots in Dominican Republic, Sierra Leone, and the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), the revision of the UHPR background documents and the activities that the Secretariat will be working on over the next months.
For more information, please refer to the presentation

Feedback from TAG Subgroups

Feedback from TAG Subgroup 1, UHPR Commissions
Mona M’Bikay and Clare Wenham presented the recommendation on the Global Peer Review phase to the members of the TAG meeting on behalf of subgroup 1

Overview of the recommendations from Subgroup 1:
General recommendations:
• Develop ToR for members of the two commissions (EAC and GPRC), including roles and responsibilities between the two groups and how they will function.
• Ensure both commissions have membership of people beyond public health.
• Provide an opportunity to CSO and the community to contribute to the GPRC phase.
• Develop report templates for both commissions’ report to ensure they are consistent across the regions (same structure, content, lengths, etc.)
• Ensure that UHPR recommendations include relevant health-related UPR recommendations and are also contributing to the SDG
• Define a timeline that shows when the Commissions will provide their feedback to MS.

Specific recommendations on the EAC
• Share the EAC report with the country so the national report could be updated before being shared with the Global commission.

Specific recommendations on the GPRC
• Ensure all member states are part of the process and be wary of the selection of members of the GPRC (avoid politicization).

Discussions points from subgroup 1
1. Members from the Expert Advisory Commission should join the Global Peer-Review Commission meeting to provide additional details and to ensure that there is a dialogue between the 2 Commissions.
2. National ownership by the State, on the review is critically important. It is therefore paramount to allow states sufficient time to reflect on the recommendations they receive and make decisions on the recommendations they wish to support.
3. We need to keep reviews very simple, very agile, ensuring a spirit of cooperation, solidarity, & transparency.
4. We have to ensure that each country that has completed this exercise receives support for the highest priority recommendations that they have put forward.
Feedback from TAG Subgroup 2, UHPR indicators

Dr. Robert Agyarko presented the feedback on indicators for Subgroup 2 to the members of the TAG meeting.

Recommendations from subgroup 2 include:

- To ensure that indicators are simple and measurable.
- The indicators should be useful and relevant to help countries to improve their capacities.
- We should consider the heterogeneity within the country. Find a solution to capture the heterogeneity as opposed to a single metrics.
- Clarify the methodology to collect, analyse and compile data in the Country profile.
- Describe the complementarity between UHPR indicators and indicators from other review mechanisms like the JEE.
- Streamline the indicators, explain their relevance, and provide the rationale and source for all indicators.
- Clarify how to assess some indicators that may be difficult to measure (like community engagement).

Discussion points from Subgroup 2

- What support would be given to countries to address country specific indicators? (We gave countries the flexibility to do so, like in the case of CAR).
- Indicators should address government systems (especially, health information systems) financing, including the legal and policy environment, and what these countries are doing to scale up activities.

Feedback from TAG Subgroup Subgroup 3, CSO and Community Engagement

Justin Koonin presented the feedback on CSO and Community Engagement for Subgroup 3 to the members of the TAG meeting.

Recommendations from Subgroup 3 include:

- Consider the inclusion of an indicator/metric which measures the extent to which national, subnational and local strategies exist for community engagement and social participation.
- Ensure that the qualitative section of the review asks questions which gauge the extent to which national, subnational and local strategies exist for community engagement and social participation. Taking guidance from the Handbook on Social Participation for Universal Health Coverage.
- Ensure multiple seats for civil society/communities on the EAC. Suitable models include the Global Fund and UHC2030, which have separate seats for Global North CSOs, Global South CSOs, and Communities (or CBOs).
- Ensure that there are other processes for civil society and community engagement beyond formal engagement by government invitation to the national review. This includes ensuring that input is received from communities, and not just CSOs.
- Discuss other stakeholder reporting and provide recommendations to WHO on the coordination and process, and how such a procedure could practically work in the health preparedness space. This includes processes for ensuring protection for vulnerable CSOs engaging in a peer review multilateral mechanism such as the UHPR.
- Examine private sector engagement and make recommendations to WHO as where and how engagement with these stakeholders should fit into the UHPR process.
• Ensure there is a fair process in the selection of CSOs and the protection of CSOs that might be vulnerable, in parts of the world where civic space is not always respected.
• Seek to understand how these civil society engagements work in other peer review multilateral mechanisms.
• It is important to engage CSO and other actors as countries draft their reports to ensure that we have an objective and comprehensive understanding of the situation in the country, as well as in terms of monitoring and showing transparency and accountability in creating this national ownership.

For more information on the recommendations, please refer to the power point presentation

**Presentation of the updated UHPR process and technical documents**

The Secretariat gave a presentation on the updated UHPR Process and technical documents, and provided more details on the GPRC. The updated UHPR package includes:
1. The Technical Consideration document
2. Pilot Protocol (with annexes including the UHPR Metrics, Social Participation in the UHPR process, UHPR National Report Template.)
3. The GPRC document, and
4. The Advocacy package (Factsheet, FAQ & updates on UHPR)

The UHPR Secretariat has revised the UHPR documents, based on lessons learnt from the first four UHPR pilots, written comments from and several consultations with the TAG, WHO technical experts at the three levels of the organization, member states, as well as guidance from WHO senior management.

• **In the UHPR Technical Considerations document we:**
  o Revised the key concepts of UHPR (definition and scope, etc) to better reflect the UHPR’s focus on elevating findings to the highest level of authorities.
  o Clarified the linkages between the UHPR and key endeavors like the HEPR, IHR Amendments, Pandemic Accord (INB), FIF, etc.

• **In the UHPR Pilot Protocol document we:**
  o Made the UHPR process a lot lighter and simpler for countries and focused on high-level activities that add value to this process.
  o Revised the UHPR Metrics that has now less indicators with quantitative and qualitative data to review countries’ preparedness capacities in the areas of Governance, Systems, Financing and Risks.
  o Developed a draft version of guidance on Social Participation in the process that highlights indicators on CSO engagement in emergency preparedness and response activities. We will organize a Civil Society/Social Participation Stakeholders Briefing.
  o Revised the UHPR National Report Template to make it shorter (Max 7.000 word) with a guidance on how to compile data and information and use them in the report.
  o Developed additional guide, tools, templates and advocacy material to support countries engaged in the UHPR process.
• In the UHPR GRPC document we:
  o Developed new elements on membership, ToRs, methods of Work, etc.

• In the UHPR Advocacy package we:
  o Developed/updated the UHPR Advocacy package to address recurrent questions raised throughout the first round of UHPR pilots.

The updated Global Peer Review Phase
The global commissions, in a peer-to-peer modality, will externally review the national report of Member States that have undertaken a UHPR and contextualize the findings amid the regional and global context in supporting the priorities and gaps reported by a country. For this purpose, two global commissions are proposed: An Expert Advisory Commission (EAC) and a Global Peer Review Commission (GPRC).

Once a MS completes the UHPR pilot in their country and the national commission has finalized the national report identifying the gaps and national priorities, it submits the national report to the EAC for review. Subsequently, the EAC will prepare a report with technical recommendations. The EAC report and the national report will then be submitted to the GPRC for review.

The GPRC will then prepare a report containing strategic and technical recommendations for the MS and also play a role in following up with the countries which have undergone the UHPR process, to support the conduct of an optional mid-term review on request by the Member States concerned.

Next Steps and way forward
1. **Member States information session**
   There will be a member State Information Session in Geneva on December 14th, 2022 where countries that have completed the pilots will have a chance to share their experiences with MS.

2. **UP-Coming Pilots**
   Three countries (Sierra Leone, Dominican Republic, Republic of Congo) have expressed interest in hosting the UHPR pilot. Congo is already working on a road map for the Pilot.

3. **Global Peer Review Commissions**
   The UHPR Secretariat will wait for guidance from MS, TAG and WHO legal department on how to proceed

4. **Regional workshop on UHPR**
   A Regional workshop on the UHPR pilots will probably be held next year.

5. **Civil Society/Social Participation Stakeholders Briefing.**
   There is a plan to host a CSO briefing in Geneva in January.

6. **First Face-to-Face meeting with TAG Members**
   The UHPR Secretariat plans to organize a Face-to-Face meeting with Members of the Technical Advisory Group in the first quarter of next year.

7. **Documents**
   Members of the TAG have expressed interest to read the UHPR documents, and reports from the four pilot countries. The UHPR Secretariat will obtain permission from these countries to share their reports with TAG members.

8. **Thailand**
   TAG Members would like to meet to discuss the Thailand pilot, since Thailand has conducted both the UHPR and the JEE. The UHPR Secretariat will follow up accordingly.

9. **UHPR Website**
   The secretariat has developed the UHPR Website which will be launched soon.