Workshop on Policy Coherence for Local Pharmaceutical Production and Access to Medicines:
The Experiences of Thailand and Vietnam

Hua Hin, Thailand
6-9 September 2015

Organized with the cooperation of the
International Health Policy Program of Thailand and the
Drug Administration of Vietnam

Report

Background

This workshop was organized by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and German Technical Cooperation (GIZ) as a technical cooperation activity to support countries seeking greater access to medicines through, *inter alia*, local production. The workshop was the first of a series of events organized under an UNCTAD project entitled "Access to high quality and affordable medicines in Africa and South East Asia" and funded by GIZ. It brought together stakeholders from Thailand and Vietnam, two countries that have pursued local production as a means to improve access, albeit through sometimes different means. The workshop was organized in cooperation with the International Health Policy Program of Thailand and the Drug Administration of Vietnam. The workshop was attended by officials from national drug regulatory agencies, the ministries of health, commerce, industry and trade, science and technology, finance, planning and investment, the patent offices, and representatives of both countries' pharmaceutical sector.

Objective

The objective of the workshop was to enable participants to develop recommendations on how to address identified coherence gaps in domestic policies related to local pharmaceutical production and access to medicines. Recent work by UNCTAD and the World Health Organization in the area of local production under the Global Strategy and Plan of Action on Public Health, Innovation and Intellectual Property has pointed to the importance of having a coherent policy framework in place that does not undermine efforts to improve access. In examining what governments can do to support greater access through local production, this workshop was intended as a forum where stakeholders from Thailand and Vietnam could exchange experiences on the relationship between various sets of policies and their relationship to local production and greater access. The workshop was therefore structured to give maximum time to facilitated discussions allowing stakeholders to exchange ideas after a brief introduction to each topic, often in inter-country working groups.

Main lines of discussion/content

The workshop discussions proceeded along the following topics: (1) Intellectual Property; (2) Science, Technology and Innovation: Foundations for Local Production; (3) The Health and Industrial Policy Nexus; (4) The Role of Trade, Procurement and Investment Policies; (5) Making Market and Non-Market Dynamics Work for Greater Access; and (6) The Art of Coordination (see also Annex I to this report: The Workshop Programme).

(1) Intellectual property: The session started by an introduction to the use of flexibilities in multilateral intellectual property (IP) law for the promotion of generic production, especially under the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement). It also discussed certain IP enforcement provisions in Thai and Vietnamese law that potentially exceed the TRIPS minimum standards in

the areas of border measures and criminal sanctions. The Thai experience in the granting of several government use licenses (GULs) on anti-retroviral (ARV), cardiovascular and antineoplastic/cancer drugs in late 2006/early 2007 and early 2008 showed considerable increase in patients' access and important public health savings. On the other hand, the impact of the GULs on Thailand's exports was marginal with only one brief decrease after the third round of GULs and a quick recovery thereafter. Participants highlighted the importance of Thai exports to the ASEAN region. Foreign direct investment remained unaffected in 2007, but decreased in 2008, in particular from the United States and Japan. An important lesson from the Thai experience was the need to coordinate any granting of GULs with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, due to the implications for foreign interests. Other than Thailand, Vietnam is a Party to the recently concluded Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP). It became clear from the intervention by the Vietnamese delegation that the negotiation of preferential trade and investment agreements (PTIAs) is a complex task and requires a cautious assessment of competing interests. The Vietnamese government is hoping to generate trade opportunities from the TPP, especially the recognition of Vietnam by trading partners as a market economy. On the other hand, the TPP IP chapter contains a number of "TRIPS-Plus" provisions that by going beyond the TRIPS minimum standard obligations may have a negative impact on Vietnamese generic producers (e.g. patent term extension, new use patentability, exclusivity for pharmaceutical test data). The exchange of views with Thai participants revealed doubts about the trade benefits generated by PTIAs as compared to existing WTO membership and it was suggested that prior to PTIA negotiations, a government should collect economic data as evidence of the economic impact generated by a PTIA. A tool to delay the potentially negative impact of IP chapters in PTIAs on the domestic industry is to request a transition period as Vietnam has done. This also provides time for stakeholder consultations on how to implement remaining TRIPS flexibilities in a PTIA/TRIPS-plus context.

(2) Science, Technology and Innovation (STI): Foundations for Local Production: Despite considerable achievements in the formulation of drugs, both Thailand and Vietnam still lack innovative capacity in medicines development. Both countries however have programs in place to address this problem. The Thai National Biotechnology Policy Framework identifies various strategic sectors that are eligible for specific government support. Certain programs are in place in Thailand to promote R&D and increase the exchange of research personnel between the public and the private sector. The lack of R&D undertaken by the private pharmaceutical sector is a particular problem in Vietnam. The Vietnamese Ministry of Health through an Action Plan intends to steer research priorities to the production of those drugs contained in the national essential medicines list. It also envisages providing orientation for the private sector in applied research on the development of pharmaceutical raw materials as well as new technologies in the drug manufacturing process, in excipients, secondary packaging and the production of medicinal herbs. For certain products it may be difficult in both countries to determine whether they fall under the category of traditional / herbal medicine and what are the registration requirements. Quality control of herbal medicines appears to pose problems in both countries. Thailand applies

criminal sanctions to "counterfeiting" of (not only herbal) drugs, where the patient / consumer is falsely led to believe by a medicine label that a given drug meets regulatory standards. The intention in both countries to adhere to the Pharmaceutical Inspection Convention and Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S) triggered some discussion about the pros and cons of such move.

These STI-related issues were more thoroughly discussed in inter-country working groups, which identified a number of policy gaps in their respective countries, such as:

- The missing link between national STI policies and the development of primary health products.
- The missing or unsatisfactory link between academia and the private sector in product development.
- The lack of resources at universities for drug R&D.
- The need to provide incentives for local producers to engage in R&D.
- The need to favor local producers in the drug registration process.
- The lack of funding for human resource development in the drug regulation agencies.
- The need for increased recourse to government procurement to favor local producers.
- The difficulties to apply GMP, GDP, GSP requirements to herbal medicines, which would need specific requirements.

(3) The Health and Industrial Policy Nexus: The overall question to be discussed in this session was how a government can steer local production to respond to local public health needs. The session started with two introductions on how industrial and health policies can be used in this respect. An important issue in this context related to the WTO-compatibility of export subsidies granted to local producers and limitations under the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures.

Vietnam's declared policy goal is the production of high quality generic essential drugs at affordable prices. This includes herbal medicines for domestic use and export. A number of specific measures are in place to obtain this goal, such as for instance financial support, tax breaks, the promotion of foreign investment, and the standardization of herbal medicines. The government thereby seeks to provide incentives to the private sector to engage in R&D on incremental innovation such as new dosage forms and the application of new technologies, but also more fundamental R&D related to the development of raw materials, such as APIs. The practice of the government's holding shares in state-owned local firms is currently being phased out completely and therefore no longer provides a means of influencing firms' investment priorities.

Thailand's vision is universal access to medicines for all, rational use of drugs and national self-reliance. The latter point is the justification for the promotion of the domestic pharmaceutical sector. A big problem relates to the limitation of the current registration system to expedite

approval of product under development. There is no system for the stepwise registration for products under development, and the number and competencies of drug evaluators are limited. There is a system in place to provide direct support for domestic investment in incremental innovation such as the discovery of new uses of existing drugs (as opposed to the development of new entities, which is beyond most of the industry's current capacity). Such incentives are made available for products on the national essential medicines list, which includes domestic herbal drugs.

(4) The Role of Trade, Procurement and Investment Policies: Participants were introduced to the use of investment and industrial policies, as well as procurement, tariffs and subsidies for the promotion of local producers. Reference was made, *inter alia*, to tariffs on imported products (in line with GATT Article XVIII on infant industry protection) and the limitation of health insurance reimbursement to locally produced drugs. While under WTO rules Thailand and Vietnam are not obliged to apply national procurement rules without distinction between domestic and foreign bidders, Vietnam under the recently concluded Free Trade Agreement with the European Union appears bound to respect the WTO Government Procurement Agreement, which to some extent prevents favorable treatment of local bidders.

The Thai Government Pharmaceutical Organization (GPO) has the mission to make high class and affordable generic drugs, on a competitive basis. Its nature as a state enterprise under the Ministry of Public Health ensures a prioritization of products that respond to domestic public health needs, such as ARVs and vaccines. On the other hand, the ensuing discussion revealed some skepticism, among other Thai stakeholders, about the efficiency of state-owned enterprises as compared to the private sector, and the suggestion was made to change GPO's status to an autonomous agency to avoid bureaucracy issues. As to drugs procurement, GPO enjoys some privilege in competitive biddings over other domestic producers, but its market share has in recent years decreased. Thailand's laws and regulations seek to treat local producers favorably. The current procurement system has contributed to accessible prices and affirmed the role of Thai domestic producers in the market. On the other hand, price competition has the effect of reducing the margins available to domestic producers to invest in R&D and quality upgrading. New procurement rules will be put in place to address the issue of corruption and lack of transparency in tendering processes.

(5) Making Market and Non-Market Dynamics Work for Greater Access: This segment served the purpose of clarifying the important role of competition law and policy in the pursuit of making drugs accessible. The debate focused on (a) possibilities to monitor anti-competitive clauses in IP licensing agreements and (b) how to use competition law to address potentially abusive behavior by patent holders such as refusals to license essential facilities, the imposition of excessive prices and the payment of compensation to generic competitors to keep them out of the market, instead of engaging in infringement litigation ("pay for delay" settlements). It became clear that for both countries, it is important to raise awareness in their respective competition authorities about the interface between IP rights and competition law.

(6) The Art of Coordination: In Thailand, a great number of different government agencies (e.g. the Ministry of Public Health, GPO, the FDA and others) coordinate the management of orphan drug production and supplies. This system has resulted in alleviating the shortage of certain orphan drugs in Thailand and other countries of the ASEAN region. Vietnam has put several laws and policies in place to ensure access to medicines in terms of availability and affordability. The promotion of local producers is a cross-sectoral objective which informs both the investment law and the pharma law, providing for tax incentives, facilitated use of land etc. Likewise, the IP law and the drug regulations seek to enable early market entry of generic competition following the originator drug. Price controls seek to maintain drugs prices at an affordable level and drugs procurement is designed to favor local producers. There is much room for improvement as far as the rather inactive role of the local industry in the policy making process and the awareness and use of available IP-related flexibilities is concerned. While there appears to be considerable coherence among the laws and policies, their actual implementation proves to be quite challenging.

Outcome/recommendations

The participants were requested to meet in national working groups and develop a set of policy recommendations for their respective countries for the purpose of national follow-up work. These recommendations can also play an important role in informing international technical cooperation with the two governments. The sets of policy recommendations are reproduced below.

Thailand:

1. PRIORITY MEDICINEs

Challenges	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. LACK OF SHARED GOAL OF PRIORITY MEDICINE	Building national mechanism to prioritize essential drugs to ensure national security and health needs 1. Identify health needs 2. All paties need to establish priority medicines 3. Regular meeting and analysis	- Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Industry - Ministry of Public Health - Ministry of Education - Ministry of Science and Technology - Ministry of Commerce

2. PATENT APPROVAL SYSTEM AND INFORMATION

Challenges	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. PATENT DATABASE CANNOT EASILY ACCESS AT TIMELY MANNER 2. EVERGREENING PATENT AND PATENT W/O NEW INNOVATION 3. DELAY OF APPROVAL PATENT	1. Revise regulation & act 2. Improve patent database 3. Collaboration between MOPH and IP on patent mapping of priority medicine	- Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Public Health - Ministry of Science and Technology - Ministry of Commerce - Private sector

3. MARKETING AUTHORIZATION

Challenges	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. Duration from development to approval and unexpected time of approval)	1. Building scientific advice system into registration system to support R&D into industry level	- Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Public Health - Ministry of Science and Technology - Private scetor

4. PROCUREMENT

Challenges	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. No Privilege for local industry 2. Reluctant to use generic products	1. Conduct study on strength and weakness of local manufacturers 2. National procurement policy to purchase local generic and promotion of quality assurance 3. Promote and establish "National Good Procurement Practice Sytem"	- Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Public Health (NHSO) - Ministry of Education (UHOSNET) - Ministry of Science and Technology - Ministry of Commerce

In addition to these recommendations, Thai participants also expressed interest in learning more about the role of competition law, including its interface with intellectual property, in promoting access to medicines in developing countries.

Vietnam:

Medicine Policy

Challenge	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. Policy conversion not catch up with the socio-economic development and global trend. 2. Weak implementation of and assessment on the policy impacts	1. More capacity building for policy makers (short and long terms) 2. Capacity building on assessment and supervision of policy implementation.	- Ministry of Health - Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Industry and Trade - Ministry of Science and Technology - Pharmaceutical enterprises / associations - Vietnam Chamber of Commerce - NGOs

R&D

Challenge	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. Lack of enterprise's capacity on drug innovation and gov's suitable investment on R&D 2. Lack of incentives for manufacturing "first" generic drugs	1. Gov's selective investment in first generic drugs, vaccines and herbal medicines; Change mindset of local enterprises on R&D. 2. Policy incentives for research, production, registrastion, procurement and use of first generic drugs, vaccines and herbal medicines.	- Ministry of Health - Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Industry and Trade - Ministry of Science and Technology - Research institutes and universities - Pharmaceutical enterprises

Intellectural Property

Challenge	Recommendations	Who do we have to involve?
1. Lack of consistancy in understanding on patentability criteria in patent offices. 2. Enterprise's weak capacity on exploitment and application of IP flexibilities for drug production and registration. 3. Lack of active participation of local enterprises in the process of policy-making and FTA negotiations.	1. Institutionalizing criteria in the Patent Law and related legal documents 2. Increasing enterprise's awareness on IP flexibilities; IP office's supports in the application process. 3. Increasing enterprise's involvement in the process of policy-making and FTA negotiations.	- Ministry of Health - Ministry of Finance - Ministry of Industry and Trade - Ministry of Science and Technology (IP office and Inspection office) - Pharmaceutical enterprises / associations - Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry - NGOs

Evaluation

The workshop audience comprised 17 participants from Thailand and 12 participants from Vietnam. After the event, the participants evaluated the workshop in dedicated questionnaires. All participants (one no-reply) would recommend this workshop to others. 65% confirmed by "yes" that the workshop will be useful for their work, and 35% did so by replying "mostly yes". The workshop methodology and efficacy was considered "good" by 62% and "excellent" by 38%. The quality of the workshop discussions and presentations was assessed as "good" by 58%, as "excellent" by 35% and as "fairly good" by 7%. 60% considered the workshop facilitators' general expertise in their field as "excellent", and 40% as "good". As one of the goals of this workshop was the facilitation of exchanges between the two participating countries, the exchange of information and experience was also subject to evaluation: 54% assessed this as "good", 42% as "excellent" and 4% as "fairly good". For more details, see Annex III: The Evaluation Questionnaire.

Annex I: The Workshop Programme

Sunday, 6 September 2015		
14:00	Bus Pickup for Vietnamese Participants and Facilitators at Bangkok Suvarnabhumi International Airport	
15:15	Bus Pickup for Thai Participants at IHPP, Nonthaburi	
18:15	Arrival at Hotel in Hua Hin	
19:45	Registration and Welcome Dinner	
	Welcome Remarks	Dr. Suwit Wibulpolprasert Vice Chair International Health Policy Program Ministry of Health, Thailand Mr. Christoph Spennemann Officer-in-Charge Intellectual Property Unit UNCTAD Ms. Corinna Heineke Head of Global Project Access to Medicines GIZ Representatives of Thai and Vietnamese Delegations
Monday, 7 September 2015		
08:45-09:15	Local Pharmaceutical Manufacturing for Access to MedicalProducts: Developing a Multidisciplinary Framework to Improve Public Health	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
	Session 1 - Intellectual Property	
09:15-10:00	Understanding the Interface between Intellectual Property, Access to Medicines and Local Manufacture	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
10:00-10:20	Border Measures and Customs - Issues at the Crossroads of Anti-Counterfeiting Policies and Medicines Access	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
10:20-10:45	Coffee Break	
10:45-11:25	Thailand: Compulsory Licensing - Before and After	Dr Chutima Akaleephan IHPP, MOPH
11:25-11:55	Vietnam: Negotiating the TPP and the Possible Effects of IP Provisions on Local Industry and Access	Mrs. Vu Thi Hiep Head of Legislation and International Integration Division, Drug Administration of Vietnam (DAV), MOH
11:45-12:45	Facilitated Discussion on Patentability Criteria and Examination, Compulsory Licenses, Exceptions to Patentability, Data Exclusivity, and Linkage	Facilitated by Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
12:45-14:00	Lunch Break	
	Session 2 - Science, Technology and Innovation: Foundations for Local Production	
14:00-14:30	Science, Technology and Innovation Policy in Vietnam	Mrs. Vo Thi Nhi Ha Deputy Head of Clinical Trial Study

		and Product Management Division, Administration of Science, Technology and Training, MOH
14:30-15:00	Science, Technology and Innovation Policy in Thailand (with particular reference to the recent Science, Technology and Innovation Policy Review of Thailand)	Dr Sunun Siriraksophon BIOTEC, MOST
15:00-15:15	Coffee Break	
15:15-15:45	The Regulation of Traditional and Herbal Medicines in Thailand	Dr Ruchira Wangteeraprasert TFDA, MOPH
15:45-16:30	The Regulation of Traditional and Herbal Medicines in Vietnam	Mrs. Pham Thi Van Hanh Deputy Head of Pharmaceutical Business Management Division, DAV, MOH
16:30-17:45	Facilitated Discussion on STI Policies and Traditional and Herbal Medicines	Facilitated by Ms. Cecilia Oh UNDP
Tuesday, 8 September 2015		
	Session 3 - The Health and Industrial Policy Nexus	
09:00-09:30	Encouraging Local Pharmaceutical Manufacturing as Industrial Policy - An Overview	Ms. Corinna Heineke GIZ
09:30-10:00	Linking Local Pharmaceutical Production to Health Policies - Quality, Pricing and Product Registration drawing on International Examples	Ms. Cecilia Oh UNDP
10:00-11:00	Vietnam's Experience: Steering the Development of Local Pharmaceutical Industry through Health Policies	Mr. Nguyen Duc Toan Officer of Drug Quality Management Division, DAV, MOH
11:00-11:15	Coffee Break	
11:15-12:15	Thailand's Experience: Steering the Development of Local Pharmaceutical Industry through Health Policies	Ms Worasuda Yoongthong TFDA, MOPH
12:15-13:00	Facilitated Discussion on Health Policy Aspects of Local Production of Pharmaceuticals • Contribution of Health System to Choice of Medicines for Local Production • The Importance of Having Local Bioequivalence Laboratories • Health Products Retailing and Supply Chain • The Role of Universal Health Coverage	Facilitated by Ms. Cecilia Oh UNDP
12:45-14:00	Lunch Break	
	Session 4 - The Role of Trade, Procurement and Investment Policies	
14:00-14:15	Investment, Industrial Policy and Local Production of Medicines - How Can Access be Encouraged?	Ms. Cecilia Oh UNDP
14:15-14:45	The Role of State-Owned Enterprises in Ensuring Access to Medicines	Dr Rachaneekorn Jevprasesphant GPO
14:45-15:15	Procurement, Tariffs and Subsidies - the Good, the Bad and the Ugly (International Examples of Coherence and Non-Coherence)	Ms. Corinna Heineke GIZ
15:15-15:30	Coffee Break	
15:30-16:00	Procurement Policies for Medicines in Thailand	Ms Paithip Luangruangrong BHA, MOPH

16:00-17:15	Facilitated Discussion on Trade, Investment and Procurement Policies	Facilitated by Ms. Corinna Heineke GIZ
	Session 5 - Making Market and Non-Market Dynamics Work for Greater Access	
19:30-20:00	Competition Law and the Pharmaceutical Industry - International Case Law (will include discussion of licensing)	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
20:00-20:30	Facilitated Discussion on Competition Law, State-Owned Enterprises, Government Shareholding and Privatization	Facilitated by Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
20:30-20:45	Distribution and Explanation of Team Drafting Assignment	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD Ms. Cecilia Oh UNDP Ms. Corinna Heineke GIZ
Wednesday, 9 September 2015		
	Session 6 - The Art of Coordination	
09:00-09:15	Policy Coordination for Access in Thailand - Current Practice	Ms Wannapa Krairojananan NHSO
09:15-09:30	Policy Coordination for Access in Vietnam - Current Practice	Mrs. Vu Thi Hiep Head of Legislation and International Integration Division, DAV, MOH
09:30-12:30	Thai Participants and Vietnamese Participants Meet to Discuss and Draft Recommendations/Suggestions to Improve Policy Coherence in Their Respective Countries (this exercise will require one breakout room)	
12:30-13:30	Lunch Break	
13:30-14:45	Presentation and Comments on Recommendations/Suggestions	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD
14:45-15:15	Closing Ceremony Presentation of Certificates Workshop Evaluation Forms	Mr. Christoph Spennemann UNCTAD Ms. Corinna Heineke GIZ Representatives of Thai and Vietnamese Delegations
Thursday, 10September 2015		
10:00	Departure of Bus for Nonthaburi and Bangkok Suvarnabhumi International Airport	

Annex II: List of Workshop Participants

Workshop on policy coherence for local pharmaceutical production and access to medicines: the experiences of Thailand and Vietnam
Anantara Hotel Resort and Spa, Hua Hin, Thailand
7-9 September 2015

Resource Persons

	Name	Agencies	E-mail
1.	Dr Suwit Wibulpolprasert Vice Chair	International Health Policy Foundation and Health Intervention and Technology Assessment Foundation	suwit@health.moph.go.th
2.	Mr. Christoph Spennemann Legal Officer and Officer-in-Charge	Intellectual Property Unit Division on Investment and Enterprise UNCTAD	Christoph.Spennemann@unctad.org
3.	Ms. Corinna Heineke Advisor	Sector Project on Trade Policy and Trade and Investment Promotion German International Cooperation (GIZ)	corinna.heineke@giz.de
4.	Ms. Cecilia Oh Programme Advisor	Access and Delivery Partnership HIV, Health and Development Group Bangkok Regional Hub UNDP	cecilia.oh@undp.org
5.	Dr. Nima Jirhandeh Asgari Public Health Administrator	WHO Country Office for Thailand	asgarin@who.int

Secretariat Team

	Name	Agencies	E-mail
1.	Ms. Boonyarak Chanprasobpol	International Health Policy Program	boonyarak@ihpp.thaigov.net
2.	Ms Prasinee Mahattanatawee	International Health Policy Program	prasinee@ihpp.thaigov.net
3.	Ms Hathaichanok Sumalee	International Health Policy Program	hathaichanok@ihpp.thaigov.net

Thailand

	Name	Agencies	E-mail
1.	Ms Worasuda Yoongthong Pharmacist, senior professional level	Bureau of Drug Control Food and Drug Administration, MOPH	worasuda302@gmail.com
2.	Mr Sombat Hirunsupachote Pharmacist, senior professional level	Bureau of Drug Control Food and Drug Administration, MOPH	somlen@yahoo.com
3.	Dr Ruchira Wangteeraprasert Pharmacist, professional level	Bureau of Drug Control Food and Drug Administration, MOPH	wruchira@hotmail.com
4.	Ms Sitanun Poonpolsub Pharmacist, professional level	Office of International Affairs Food and Drug Administration, MOPH	psitanan@gmail.com
5.	Dr Supattra Rungsimakan Pharmacist, practitioner level	Office of International Affairs Department of Thai Traditional and Complementary Medicine, MOPH	rsupattra@outlook.com
6.	Ms Paithip Luangruengrong Pharmacist, Senior professional level	Bureau of Health Administration Office of the Permanent Secretary, MOPH	paithip@gmail.com
7.	Dr Inthira Yamabhai Researcher	Health Intervention and Technology Assessment Program (HITAP), MOPH	inthira.y@hitap.net
8.	Ms Benjarin Santatiwongchai Research assistant	Health Intervention and Technology Assessment Program (HITAP), MOPH	benjarin.s@hitap.net
9.	Dr Chutima Akaleephan Pharmacist, professional level Senior researcher and Program manager	International Health Policy Program, MOPH	chutima@ihpp.thaigov.net
10.	Ms Pornpit Silkavute Deputy Director	Health Systems Research Institute	pornpit@health.moph.go.th
11.	Ms Wannapa Krairojananan Senior Officer	National Health Security Office	wannapa.k@nhso.go.th
12.	Ms Achara Eksaengsri Deputy Director	Government Pharmaceutical Organization (GPO)	aeksaengsri@yahoo.com

	Name	Agencies	E-mail
13.	Dr Rachaneekorn Jevprasesphant Senior Researcher	R&D Institute Government Pharmaceutical Organization (GPO)	rachaneekorn.j@gpo.or.th
14.	Ms Ratchwan Jindawat Trade officer	Department of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Commerce	ratchawan.j@ipthailand.go.th
15.	Ms Jittima Withayaanumas Director of Expert and Examination Unit 1	Trade Competition Bureau Department of Internal Trade, Ministry of Commerce	jittimaw@dit.go.th
16.	Ms Arissara Sinudom Plan and Policy Analyst, Practitioner level	Office of Industrial Economics, Ministry of Industry	sweetie.taw@gmail.com
17.	Dr Sunun Siriraksophon Senior Analyst	BIOTEC National Science and Technology Development Agency, Ministry of Science and Technology	sunun@biotech.or.th

Vietnam

	Name	Agencies	E-mail
1.	Ms. Le Thi Phuong Thuy Officer	General Department of Customs, Ministry of Finance	lelanphuongthuy@gmail.com
2.	Ms.Tran Thuy Hanh Deputy Director of Material Testing Department.	National Institute of Drugs and Cosmetics Quality Control, Ministry of Health	tranthuyhanh1974@yahoo.com
3.	Ms. Vu Thi Hiep Head of Legislation and International Integration Division	Drug Administration of Vietnam, Ministry of Health	hiepfk@yahoo.com
4.	Ms. Vo Thi Nhi Ha Deputy Head of Division of clinical trial management	Sciences, Technology and Training Administration, Ministry of Health	vonhiha@gmail.com
5.	Ms. Pham Thi Van Hanh Deputy Head of Drug Business Administration Division	Drug Administration of Vietnam, Ministry of Health	handqld@gmail.com
6.	Mr. Nguyen Duc Toan Officer, Quality Management Division	Drug Administration of Vietnam, Ministry of Health	ndtoanvkn@gmail.com
7.	Ms. Hoang Thanh Tam Officer	Ministry of Planning & Investment	hthanhtam@mpi.gov.vn
8.	Mr. Nguyen Viet Ha Officer	National Office of Intellectual Property, Ministry of Science and Technology	nvietha@noip.gov.vn
9.	Ms. Nguyen Son Tra Officer	Ministry of Industry & Trade	trans@moit.gov.vn
10.	Ms. Tran Phuong Nhung Officer	Ministry of Industry & Trade	nhungtp@moit.gov.vn
11.	Mr. Tran Duc Chinh Deputy Chairman	Vietnam Pharmacy Companies Ass.	chinhientd@yahoo.com.vn
12.	Mrs. Pham Thi Ngoc Lan Deputy Director	Pharbaco	ptngoclan@gmail.com

Annex III: The Evaluation Questionnaire

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

1. After the workshop, how well did you feel prepared concerning the topics/the content of the workshop?	
Very well prepared	**72%**
Sufficiently prepared	**28%**
Insufficiently prepared	
2. Do you think you have a clear idea about the topics of the workshop?	
Yes, very much so	**35%**
Yes, generally	**58%**
Not so much	**7%**
Not at all	
3. Did the workshop in general meet your expectations?	
Yes, very much so	**40%**
Yes, generally	**60%**
Not so much	
Not at all	
4. Do you think having participated in this workshop will be useful for your work?	
Yes	**65%**
Mostly yes	**35%**
Cannot say	
No	
5. How do you assess… a) … the workshop's methodology and efficiency?	
Excellent	**38%**
Good	**62%**
Fairly Good	
Could be improved-please explain.	
b) … the quality of workshop discussions and presentations?	
Excellent	**35%**
Good	**58%**
Fairly Good	**7%**
Could be improved-please explain.	
c) … the workshop's overall duration?	
Excellent	**35%**
Good	**61%**

Fairly Good	**4%**
Could be improved	
d) … the workshop facilitators' general expertise in their field?	
Excellent	**60%**
Good	**40%**
Fairly Good	
Could be improved	
e) … the cooperation and communication with the workshop facilitators?	
Excellent	**46%**
Good	**50%**
Fairly Good	**4%**
Could be improved-please explain.	
f) … the group's professional experience and skill levels?	
Excellent	**46%**
Good	**50%**
Fairly Good	**4%**
Could be improved	
g) … the exchange of information and experience at group level?	
Excellent	**42%**
Good	**54%**
Fairly Good	**4%**
Could be improved-please explain.	
h) … the working atmosphere within the group?	
Excellent	**58%**
Good	**42%**
Fairly Good	
Could be improved-please explain.	
i) IHPP's / UNCTAD's overall organisation of the event?	
Excellent	**54%**
Good	**42%**
Fairly Good	
Could be improved-please explain.	**4%** **"Logistical arrangements should be more flexible to make participants more enjoyable".**

6. What is your overall assessment of the workshop?	
Excellent	**46%**
Good	**54%**
Fairly Good	
Could be improved	
7. Would you recommend this workshop to others?	
Yes	**100%**
No	

8. Do you have any remarks/ suggestions?

Reproduction of all comments made in this section. Remarks by the workshop organizers are in brackets [].

1. " - I realize the importance of policy coherence in order to achieve the national goal promoting pharma manufacturing. More cooperation and dialogue bet. relevant agencies are needed in order to balance interests and establish coherent policy.
- The organisation is excellent. Thank you very much.
- Next workshop may focus on the role of competition law in promoting the access to medicines in developing countries. There should be introductory session on competition law/concept so that the participants would have the same background and can participate more in discussion on case studies.
- I would like to learn more about case studies or experience in other developing countries."

2. "Everything in this workshop is absolutely going very well and I am very happy to be here joining the workshop with everyone. Only one thing I think should be improved is dinner. I prefer an option eating at the hotel by an arrangement of the host."

3. "We should have the study of each country's health system before the workshop. So we can develop the model of collaboration together. We can further work efficiently."

4. "'Hit to the point' is 'the must' [in case presentation]. To make the workshop [?] constructive and productive."

5. "The organizer should give guideline for each presentation."

6. " - Lack of presentation print out or in electronic form." [Was provided in electronic form at the end of the workshop]

7. " - The name in the flight ticket must be exactly as in passport.
- The organizer should pay accommodation fee directly to the hotel."