

ANNEX 2: List of participants for stakeholder workshop and summary of issues discussed 6th May 2003

1. Participants

1.1 Government/Ministries

Ministry of Health

1. Ms. Nghiem Thi Xuan Hanh
2. Ms. Tran Khanh Hien

Ministry of Planning and Investment

3. Ms. Dao Trinh Bac,

Ministry of Education and Training

4. Mr. Nguyen Huu Chau, Vice Director, National Institute on Educational Science; Director UNFPA- assisted project

National Committee for Population, Family and Children

5. Mr. Nguyen Thien Truong, Vice Chairman
6. Mr. Le Dinh Phuong, Director
7. Mr. Pham Ba Nhat, Director, The Population Department
8. Mr. Dinh Huy Duong, Programme Manager UNFPA- assisted project

1.2 VINAFFPA

9. Prof. Pham Song, President of VINAFFPA
10. Chu Thi Xuyen, Vice president of VINAFFPA
11. Nguyen Hong Van, RAS/98/P19 - Project Coordinator
12. Do Hong Le, RAS/98/P19 - Project Secretary
13. Dr. Nguyen The Lap, Project Coordinator in Clinic Services
14. Dr. Le Thi Phuoc, Chairwoman of Danang province FPA
15. Mrs. Nguyen Thi Bay, Chairwoman of Hai Phong province FPA

1.3 UNFPA Viet Nam

16. Mr. Omer Ertur, Representative
17. Ms. Do Thi Minh Chau, Programme Officer
18. Dr. Phan Thi Le Mai, ARH Programme Officer
19. Mr. Hoang Hai Chau
20. Ms. Magali Romedenne

1.4 UNFPA-assisted provinces

Secretaries of Provincial Youth Unions of

21. Thai Binh
22. Da Nang

1.5 Local NGOs involved in the EC/UNFPA RHI programme

23. Ms. Phan Thi Hanh, President of Viet Nam Association of Midwives.
24. Dr. Nguyen Thi Hoai Duc, Director Centre for Reproductive and Family Health

25. Mr. Le Van Cau, Director, Centre for Population, Health and Environment education, Vietnam Youth Union
26. Mr. Ta Hai. Director, Vietnam Radio Youth programme
27. Dr. Nguyen Thu Giang, Director, Hanoi Youth House

1.6 INGOs involved in EC/UNFPA RHI programme

28. Ms. Pham Hoang Van, Representative of Care International in Viet Nam
29. Ms. Julie Forder, Representative of World Population Funds Viet Nam
30. Mrs. Sun Paranjothy, Director of Programmes, IPPF-ESEAOR
31. Ms. Bui Thi Thanh Mai, Management Board, Centre for Investment in Health Promotion
32. Ms. Hoang Thi Tu Anh, Management Board, Centre for Investment in Health Promotion
33. Ms. Hang Bich Nguyen, MSI Viet Nam
34. Mr. Le Ba Quynh - MSI Vietnam
35. Ms. Dinh Thi Nhuan - MSI Vietnam

1.7 Evaluation Team

36. Mr. Anthony Bondurant
37. Ms. Sophia Henderson
38. Mr. Nguyen Cuong Quoc

2. Summary of issues discussed

2.1 Group 1&2

Issues facing youth in SRH

Cultural issues

- Traditional barriers
- The SRH concept of leaders, parents, education system, youth them selves.
- Gender pressure.
- Geographic and religion

Poverty

- National economic policies
- Insufficient investment

Policy

- Have not got good policies and effective coordination

Information

- Difficulty in accessing information
- No national standards, guideline in SRH for youth
- Current SRH documents are scattered
- IEC documents are insufficient
- Approach/methods are not good enough to attract youth

Services

- Not really friendly
- Quality of service providers; attitude, counselling skills

- Lack of supporting documentation
 - Difficulty in accessing services
- HIV/ AIDs/STIs, drug addiction, unemployment

2.2 Group 3

Difficulties facing UNFPA

- Getting participation of Youth
- Cooperation among programs and partners
- Technical capacity of partners in approaching, working with youth
- Social, organisational, personnel, financial sustainability
- Equity between genders and among regions, youth group.
- Addressing HIV/AIDS

2.3 Group 4

Key issues facing VINAFFPA in addressing SRH needs of young people in VN

- Cultural /traditional barriers
- Insufficient/inappropriate understanding of gate keepers/stakeholders on ARH issues. Difficult for FPA in design and initiate ARH programmes
- Insufficient resources - recognition in theory of NGO role but actual allocation of financial resources is too modest (both domestically and external funding) - UNFPA does not invest, only EC/UNFPA initiate
- Successful model has not been replicated widely; Counseling and service centre of FPA has been replicated by Govt but at Govt's initiative; Has not been facilitated at satisfactory level to pilot ARH model; too little money has been spent on pilot of FPA's ARH model, let alone replication of the model. Can VAM's model be replicated? How can the model be replicated by Govt later on? Insufficient attention paid to FPA programme by Govt.
- Govt does not have ARH strategy in place yet - need to have specific operational plans so that NGOs could work toward the same goals and objectives.
- Service providers' capacity has not been enhanced. No special training/providing special skills such as counselling, psychological counselling for young people to contribute to behavioural change. Pressure of financial sustainability at FPA centres.
- Policy to create enabling environment for youth is not yet in place at FPA centres. Competition with GOV facilities which are fully supported by GOV but both GOV and FPA charge the same service prices.