

**IDRC at the 11th World Congress on Public Health/8th Brazilian
Congress on Collective Health, August 21st to 25th, Rio de
Janeiro, Brazil**

Evaluation Report

Report by Lucy Gray-Donald

October 9, 2006

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|---------|
| Background & Objectives..... | page 2 |
| Methodology..... | page 2 |
| Evaluation Results by Objective..... | page 3 |
| Objective I..... | page 4 |
| Objective II..... | page 5 |
| Objective III | page 7 |
| Objective IV..... | page 8 |
| Objective V..... | page 9 |
| Other Evaluation Results | page 10 |
| Content & Level of Interest..... | page 10 |
| Logistics..... | page 11 |
| Lessons Learned & Recommendations..... | page 11 |
| Final Remarks..... | page 13 |
| Annex 1 – Summary of Workshop Survey Results..... | page 14 |
| Annex 2 – Summary of General Evaluation Results..... | page 19 |
| Annex 3 – Post-Congress Interview Questions..... | page 25 |
| Annex 4 – Post-Congress Interview Notes..... | page 26 |

Background

From August 21st to August 25th 2006, nearly 10,000¹ people gathered at the Rio Centro congress centre in Barra de Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for the 11th World Congress on Public Health. IDRC had a strong presence at the event, supporting 8 congress panels in which 28 researchers and partners presented their work. IDRC was also present at the Congress exhibition where it hosted a booth, to distribute information and material to congress participants and where IDRC answered questions from the public.

In the days prior to the Congress, IDRC took advantage of the gathering by organizing a workshop on August 19th and 20th at the Intercontinental Hotel. The workshop entitled “Research to Policy in Public Health: Analytical Frameworks for Action” brought together 58 participants, from both the Ecosystems Approaches to Human Health (Ecohealth) and Governance, Equity and Health (GEH) program initiatives to discuss the linkages between research to policy in the field of health in Latin America and beyond. This workshop was a joint initiative with the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) and the Network for Health Systems and Services Research in the Southern Cone (REDE).+

In addition to the researchers and partners, nine IDRC delegates participated in the activities in Rio de Janeiro: Federico Burone, Chantal Schryer, Christina Zarwosky, Roberto Bazzani, Ana Boischio, María Urbina-Fausser, Andrea Puppo, Adriana Bordabehere & Jill Murphy.

In order to maximize learning from these two events, a monitoring and evaluation strategy was developed to compare the actual events against the objectives for IDRC’s participation.

Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of this evaluation were twofold:

- 1) to systematically monitor and collect data that will inform key outcomes of IDRC performance at the 11th World Congress on Public Health / 8th Brazilian Congress on Collective Health, ABRASCO
- 2) to help design more effective participation in similar events in the future by
 - a. Assessing workshop content and relevance
 - b. Studying the level of interest in panel presentations
 - c. Evaluating the logistics of activities

Methodology

The evaluation data was collected using 5 different tools:

- 1) workshop participant surveys
- 2) Panel audience surveys
- 3) Participants surveys
- 4) Post-event interviews
- 5) Panel monitoring fact sheets

¹ A total of 9180 participants attended the Congress, of which 755 were from outside of Brazil.

1) Workshop participant surveys. On the second day of the workshop, surveys were distributed among all 58 participants who were also explained the purpose of the evaluation forms. Upon termination of the workshop activities, the surveys were collected from the participants. A total of 37 completed evaluations forms were submitted. (A summary of these results is included in Annex 1.)

2) Panel audience surveys. Audience members in each of the 8 IDRC-sponsored panels at the Congress were given a 1-page evaluation form when they entered the room. These forms were collected as participants left during or at the end of the panel by IDRC staff waiting at the door. Two panels took place each day of the Congress (one in the morning and one in the afternoon) except for on August 25th when the 2 panels overlapped in the morning.

Over 630 people attended the IDRC-sponsored panels. An exact figure is difficult to estimate since the audience was quite mobile, with people entering the room at the beginning, during at and the end of the panel and leaving the panel when they desired as well. A total of 117 audience surveys were completed and collected in the panels.

3) Participant's surveys. IDRC partners invited to attend the activities in Rio de Janeiro were asked to complete a survey about their overall experience. These surveys were distributed to participants in the hotel before their departure from Rio de Janeiro, and 19 of the 37 participants completed and returned the form. (A summary of these results is included in Annex 2)

4) Post-event interviews. During the week of September 18th to 22nd, six post congress interviews were carried out with three participants from both the Ecohealth and GEH program initiatives. The questions for these interviews (included in Annex 3) were developed in collaboration by Alicia Iglesias², Roberto Bazzani³ and the project consultant Lucy Gray-Donald. Alicia Iglesias carried out these interviews, as it was decided that someone not directly involved in the organization of the event would be best suited to do so. (The notes from the interviews are included in Annex 4.)

5) Panel monitoring fact sheets. In each panel, an IDRC staff member, gathered information on the panel. This information included number in audience at the start and end of panel, number of questions asked, whether there were any technical difficulties, and if the event was on schedule.

Evaluation Results by Objective

The objectives of IDRC's participation in the 11th World Congress on Public Health were:

- I. To raise the ecological dimensions of human health and present the Ecohealth approach at the 11th World Congress on Public Health / 8th Brazilian Congress on Collective Health –ABRASCO- (Rio de Janeiro, August 21-25, 2006)

² Research Officer, Ecohealth and UPE program initiatives, LACRO

³ Senior Program Specialist, Ecohealth and GEH program initiatives, LACRO

- II. To raise the governance and equity dimensions of health systems and present the GEH approach at the 11th World Congress on Public Health / 8th Brazilian Congress on Collective Health –ABRASCO- (Rio de Janeiro, August 21-25, 2006)
- III. To bring together Ecohealth and GEH researchers to further exchange and partnerships with key national and international organizations to promote a fruitful interaction and build a joint perspective on participatory intersectoral approaches linking public health and sustainable development (Rio de Janeiro, August 19-20, 2006)
- IV. To increase awareness and consolidate collective thinking on policy influence issues.
- V. To strengthen the Ecohealth and GEH and research partners' capacities to influence policy, maximize the potential of knowledge utilization and discuss the main factors affecting knowledge utilization and policy influence in selected research projects.

The results of the evaluation tools will be presented by objective.

I. To raise the ecological dimensions of human health and present the Ecohealth approach at the 11th World Congress on Public Health / 8th Brazilian Congress on Collective Health –ABRASCO- (Rio de Janeiro, August 21-25, 2006)

This objective was pursued through the organization of 4 IDRC-sponsored Ecohealth panels, which presented research and results from a variety of Ecohealth projects in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and beyond. The titles of the Ecohealth panels are listed below.

- i) An Ecosystem Approach to Environmental Pollution and Public Health in Rural Areas. Research to Policy Linkages
- ii) An Ecohealth Approach: Globalization, Urban Challenges and Public Health. Research to Policy Linkages
- iii) Ecosystems Approaches to Communicable and Emerging Diseases
- iv) The Ecosystem Approach, a Heralded Complexity for Public Health

Over 300 people attended the Ecohealth panels. An exact figure is very difficult to calculate due to the fact that audience members were free to enter and leave the meeting room during the panel presentations.

The results from the surveys are presented below by panel, showing the top two answers respondents gave when asked about their level of interest in the event, the usefulness of the information for their work and the quality of the presentations.

| Name of panel | Attendance | # of completed surveys | Level of interest | Usefulness for my work | Quality of presentations |
|--|------------|------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| An Ecosystem Approach to Environmental Pollution and Public Health in Rural Areas. Research to Policy Linkages | 58+ | 19 | 65% very interesting 20% somewhat interesting | 36% very useful 31% somewhat useful | Excellent 33% Very good 33% |
| An Ecohealth Approach: Globalization, Urban Challenges and Public Health. Research to Policy Linkages | 100+ | 14 | 50% very interesting 36% somewhat interesting | 43% very useful 21% somewhat useful | 28% excellent 28% no answer |
| Ecosystems Approaches to Communicable and Emerging Diseases | 100+ | 26 | 69% very interesting 16% somewhat interesting | 58% very useful 27% somewhat interesting | 42% excellent 31% very good |
| The Ecosystem Approach, a Heralded Complexity for Public Health | 41+ | 13 | 54% very interesting 23% somewhat interesting | 46% no answer 38% very useful | 38% Excellent 31% no answer |

Audience members were also asked to comment on the key message they were taking away from the panel. Answers to this question included:

- The importance of participatory research
- The ecosystem approach
- Need to involve the entire community in the research process
- Relationship between health and environment
- Importance of intersectoral and transdisciplinary research
- It is possible to find low cost solutions to public health problems
- Link between ecosystems and well-being

It is also worth mentioning that in addition to raising the ecological dimensions of health, IDRC raised its profile among Congress delegates. **Only 23% of audience members in the Ecohealth panels had heard of IDRC before compares to 76% who had not.**

Considering the data presented above, it is possible to conclude that the ecological dimensions of human health were successfully raised and the Ecohealth approach was successfully presented at the 11th World Congress on Public Health.

II. To raise the governance and equity dimensions of health systems and present the GEH approach at the 11th World Congress on Public Health / 8th Brazilian Congress on Collective Health –ABRASCO- (Rio de Janeiro, August 21-25, 2006)

To meet this objective 4 panels of GEH partners were supported by IDRC. The titles of these panels are listed below:

- i) Use of Research Results in Policy Decision-Making, Formulation, Implementation in the Health Sector. Extension of Social Protection in Health
- ii) Extension of Social Protection in Health in Latin America and the Caribbean: 5 Case Studies
- iii) Extension of Social Protection in Health and Universal Access to Healthcare: Challenges for Policy-makers
- iv) Governance in Health. A Conceptual and Analytical Approach to Research in Health Policy

Over 330 people attended the GEH panels. Once again it is not possible to present an exact number since audience members were free to enter and leave the room as the panel took place. **Around half (52%) of the audience had heard of IDRC before the panel.**

The results from the surveys are presented below by panel, showing the top two answers respondents gave when asked about their level of interest in the event, the usefulness of the information for their work and the quality of the presentations.

| Name of panel | Attendance | # of completed surveys | Level of interest | Usefulness for my work | Quality of presentations |
|---|------------|------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Use of Research Results in Policy Decision-Making, Formulation, Implementation in the Health Sector. Extension of Social Protection in Health | 175+ | 16 | 50% very interesting 31% no answer | 44% Somewhat useful 31% no answer | 38% Good 31 % Very good |
| Extension of Social Protection in Health in Latin America and the Caribbean: 5 Case Studies | 70+ | 10 | 50% Very interesting 30% Somewhat interesting | 50% Somewhat useful 50% no answer | 40% Very good 40% no answer |
| Extension of Social Protection in Health and Universal Access to Healthcare: Challenges for Policy-makers | 40+ | 6 | 83% somewhat interesting 17% very interesting/ no answer | 67% somewhat useful 17% very useful | 33% Very good 33% Good |
| Governance in Health. A Conceptual and Analytical | 45+ | 13 | 62% very interesting 31% Somewhat | 54% Very useful 23% Somewhat useful/no | 46% Very good 31% no answer |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|--------|--|
| Approach to Research in Health Policy | | | interesting | answer | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------|--------|--|

Audience members were also asked to comment on the key message they were taking away from the panel. Answers to this question included:

- Governance is a useful concept for researching public policy
- Governability is not the same as governance
- Governance is not a linear concept
- More research on the methodological and theoretical aspects is needed
- Participatory management
- The challenges of social protection in the globalized world
- The role of the state in the regulation of the development of health policies
- The importance of discussing the role of government in the organization of social protection policy
- The importance of health-information transfer
- The validity and pertinence of theoretic-methodological instruments to analyze the relationship between science and decision-makers

Considering the survey results and key messages above, it is possible to conclude the governance and equity dimensions of health systems were successfully raised and the GEH approach was successfully presented at the Congress.

III. To bring together Ecohealth and GEH researchers to further exchange and partnerships with key national and international organizations to promote a fruitful interaction and build a joint perspective on participatory intersectoral approaches linking public health and sustainable development (Rio de Janeiro, August 19-20, 2006)

On August 19th and 20th, Ecohealth and GEH researchers were brought together for the workshop on “Research to Policy in Public Health: Analytical Frameworks for Action”. **Of the 63 invitees to the event, 58 participants attended, of which 23 can be considered Ecohealth partners and 25 can be considered GEH partners.**⁴

On the 37 completed surveys, the **interaction among researchers from different disciplines and the engagement of both Ecohealth and GEH researchers** received a score of **8.3 out of 10**.

Many survey respondents commented on the fact that the two groups were brought together.

“The workshop with the two groups is/was an excellent initiative and I hope it is the start of a fruitful dialogue.”

⁴ The remaining 10 participants include IDRC staff not affiliated with either program initiative and other guests.

One appreciated “the direct exchange with such diverse researchers and of such good levels” commenting “this cannot be replaced by any electronic network.” Others mentioned the sharing of ideas and problems and uniting forces. Two respondents said that most important thing that they would take home from the Workshop was “the creation/consolidation of a research agenda and long term work” and “the definition of new work agendas”. Another respondent commented on the need to better articulate the two fields/ approaches: Ecohealth and GEH”.

When asked what they most liked about the Workshop, eight respondents commented on the diverse participants and perspectives or networking. Meanwhile, 2 respondents commented specifically on the bringing together of the Ecohealth and GEH groups. However, 3 respondents expressed frustration that no “concrete actions” or “joint agenda” of “conceptual framework” between Ecohealth and GEH materialized during the event.

These issues were raised again in the post-congress interviews (see Annex 4 for full interview notes). Mitko Voutchkov, an Ecohealth partner from Jamaica commented that the workshop was the best activity in Rio. Ernesto Bascolo, a GEH partner from Argentina said that “the workshop on the 19th and 20th was very useful and one of the richest spaces for extending relationships and networks.” Walter Flores, a GEH partner from Guatemala commented on the importance of the participation of the decision-makers in the workshop in order to gain perspective on how to influence policy and understand why there are difficulties doing so. Marcelo Korc, an Ecohealth partner in Venezuela said that “it was a great idea to bring the GEH and Ecohealth focuses together in the workshop.” In the post-congress interviews, there was consensus on the usefulness of the exchange between partners in the workshop.

IV. To increase awareness and consolidate collective thinking on policy influence issues.

The topic of policy influence was addressed not only in the workshop but it also was an underlying theme in the 8 panels presented in the Congress. In the GEH panel on the *Use of Research Results in Policy Decision Making, Formulation, and Implementation in the Health Sector*, where policy influence issues were at the forefront of the panel discussion, audience members took away the following key messages:

- The relationship between research and development is crossed by complex relationships and social processes.
- We need to improve research for decision-making
- It is really possible to link academics and policy but it is a real challenge to do so
- The creation of interactive networks is a priority so that research to action can be considered a central component of research financed with public funds.

The most interesting aspect of the panel cited by some audience members includes:

- Push pull strategies
- The importance of how to translate knowledge to practice
- The mechanism to integrate research and implementation policy

- The construction of bridges between research and health policy is not linear

However, even in other panels where the issue of research to policy lay a little further below the surface, audience members commented on the fact that they learned about the importance of including the government in research processes, for example. A key message taken away from the panel on *An Ecosystem Approach to Environmental Pollution and Public health in Rural Areas* was “the need for a transdisciplinary approach to link research to policy”. At the most basic level, the discussion on policy influence offered hope to some people in the audience. One audience member in the panel on *An Ecohealth Approach: Globalization, Urban Challenges and Public Health* answered that the key message they were taking away from the panel was that it is “possible to undertake scientific research and formulate and implement policy in poor countries also.”

Workshop participants were asked to if their **participation in the workshop allowed them to become more familiar with the conceptual and strategic frameworks linking research to policy in the context of the Ecohealth and/or Governance, Equity and Health approaches**. The grand majority - **35 of 37- respondents said that it had** while only 2 respondents said that it had allowed them little familiarization.

When asked **if they received new information related to the importance and strategies for using research results in policy formulation from the discussion at the workshop**, only 14% (5 participants) said that they had received little new information while **86% of respondents said they had received new information**.

V. To strengthen the Ecohealth and GEH and research partners’ capacities to influence policy, maximize the potential of knowledge utilization and discuss the main factors affecting knowledge utilization and policy influence in selected research projects.

Meeting this objective is closely linked to the success of the two previously discussed objectives. However, a further aspect of strengthening research partner’s capacities to influence policy is related to helping researchers build and strengthen networks. When partner invitees were **asked if they benefited by making new contacts and networks, two-thirds responded that they had greatly benefited** with the remaining respondents said they had somewhat benefited.

When asked **how IDRC could improve networking possibilities in the future**, partners suggested **continuing with the focused workshop approach at future events, inviting researchers who are not part of the IDRC community, holding** more social events for participants and linking up with other networks at the Congress.

Another aspect of this objective is related to discussing the main factors affecting knowledge utilization and policy influence in selected projects. Not only were projects presented in the Congress panels on this issue (*"Push and Pull" Strategies for Research Use in the Canadian Healthcare System; Promoting The Use Of Research Results - The Experience of The Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research; Knowledge Translation - the Difficult Road from Theory to Policy and Practice in the Americas; Healthy Housing Initiative: Linking research to policy ; Policy challenges: the case of health*

and housing in Pietermaritzburg ; User fee for Preventive Care: Research to Policy in Public Health, etc.), but 3 case studies were presented and discussed in the workshop on work being done in Colombia, South Africa and through the World Health Organization's Health and Environmental Linkages program. Workshop participants were asked **if the case studies presented were illustrative of the Ecohealth and GEH approaches. Over 80% of respondents agreed that they were,** while the remainder found them only somewhat illustrative.

It is therefore possible to conclude that advances were also made with respect to this objective.

Other Evaluation Results – Content, Logistics, & Recommendations

In order to help design more effective participation in similar events in the future, it is important to assess workshop content and relevance, study the level of interest in panel presentations, and evaluate the logistics of the activities.

Content & Level of Interest

Workshop content was given a score of 8.2 out of 10, while the dynamics of the event received a score of 8. One participant commented that they found the case studies presented in the workshop only somewhat illustrative since they focused on the details of the studies and less on the topic at hand of research to policy, but as mentioned above the majority of respondents found them illustrative. The workshop received very positive comments. **Many partners commented on the importance of seeing what other researchers and doing and learning from the experiences of others.** One partner said what they liked most about the Congress was “meeting different researchers and exchanging experiences”, while many others echoed this sentiment.

The scores showing the level of interest in panel presentations were presented above in the tables, with most audience members finding the panels very interesting. Another possible measure of interest in the panel is audience numbers at the beginning and end of each panel. In the case of six of the panels, the audience grew throughout the one and a half hour period. In the case of two panels, the number of people in the audience was lower at the end of the panel than at the beginning. However, it is important to note that there are other possible explanations for this decline including competition from the 19 simultaneous panels some of which had high profile local experts, the fact that the two panels where the audience declined were held on the two last days of the congress when delegates may have been tired or over saturated with information, etc.

Besides the high competition with other simultaneous panels, one of the reasons for low attendance could be due to the marketing of the panel by IDRC. While IDRC promoted its panels through the website on its participation in the event (http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-99236-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html), and had a poster in the booth with the titles and times of the presentations, **the majority (81%) of the panel audience heard of the panel through Congress website (54%) or program (27%). Less than 1% of the audience heard of the panel through the IDRC website and only 5% at the IDRC booth.** These results suggest that more efforts need to be taken to market the IDRC activities at such large events,

through both pre-congress contact with key organizations and contacts, and the distribution of information on the IDRC activities in the format of a folder at the event itself.

Logistics

Although partners were not impressed with the logistics of the Congress itself due to the sheer magnitude of the event, IDRC received good scores on the logistical aspects under its responsibility. **The logistics of the workshop received a score of 9.2 out of 10** while **IDRC's coordination and logistical support received a 9.5 out of 10**. In the survey completed by partner invitees to Rio, IDRC's coordination and logistical support received a similar score of 9.37.

Lessons Learned & Recommendations

In order to improve on the effectiveness of IDRC's participation in similar events in the future, the following lessons are noted with corresponding recommendations. These lessons and recommendations were developed taking the results of all evaluation tools into account, especially the post-congress interviews with partners.

a) Lesson learned - the importance of a facilitator

Several workshop participants commented that more control was needed in the workshop to regulate presentation and discussion times. Likewise, some respondents commented on a lack of a reflection exercise among the group and poor working group dynamics.

Recommendation: *These issues could be addresses in the future through the use of a trained facilitator*

b) Lesson learned – need for more discussion time, less presentations...or a longer workshop

Although 18 workshop survey respondents said that what they liked most about the workshop was the exchange and discussion between participants, nine respondents also commented on the lack of discussion time or an overabundance of presentation time that restricted discussion time.

Recommendation: *In a future activity, a full 2-day workshop or 2.5-day workshop should be considered.*

c) Lesson learned - the importance of holding a satellite event

The overall sense from participants was that holding a workshop in combination with the organization of IDRC's partners' participation in the Congress was an invaluable part of the activities. Partners enjoyed the exchange between the two program areas (Ecohealth and GEH), the open dialogue format of the event, meeting other researchers from different countries and the networking opportunity.

Recommendation: *When participating in a large congress, organize a satellite event with participants before or after the Congress.*

c) Lesson Learned – piggybacking works up until a point

Several partners when asked about what they liked least about the workshop commented on “using up Saturday and Sunday” or “working on Sunday” or the “lack of leisure time.” There were seven such comments on the evaluation, which is roughly the number of researchers and decision makers who also attended a project meeting in the three days prior to the workshop and who were also staying on for the Congress. This meeting was scheduled before the Workshop and Congress to piggyback those events, however, participants involved in all three meetings found the back-to-back activities overwhelming.

Recommendation: *Limit the number of events that will be piggy-backed to future congresses or take special care to allow invitees some rest and leisure time between meetings.*

c) Lesson learned - study the benefits and drawbacks of large congresses

Many partners invited to the Congress commented on its colossal size and its logistic issues. Participants noted that the Congress sessions were not run on time, resulting in little or no discussion time. Other partners commented on the isolation of the location of the event (Rio Centro), which is the only venue in Rio de Janeiro big enough to hold a congress of this size. Still other partners complained of the lines at the Congress and simply the sheer number of people, and the difficulty of meeting up with other IDRC partners in the event. Large events are attractive for the size of the target audience and possible press coverage however, there is also the risk that the Centre’s message will be lost among the multitudes.

Recommendation: *If IDRC decides to participate in very large events, efforts should be made to compliment the Congress with more social activities for partners and smaller activities such as workshops and seminars before and/or during the congress.*

d) Lesson Learned - Panel size should allow time for discussion

Several IDRC panelists commented on the lack of discussion time in the Congress panels. In some cases this was caused by previous panels going over their scheduled time, in other cases by panelists going over their time.

Recommendation: *Adjust the number of panellists to the panel duration to ensure for discussion time. In the case of 90-minute panel such as these, include no more than 3 panellists for example.*

f) Lesson learned - Booth size does matter

The IDRC booth in the Congress Expo became the meeting place for IDRC staff and partners during the congress. Unfortunately the size of the booth did not allow for people to meet and sit in the area. At a congress of this size, having a focal point is important, therefore investing in a larger booth is important.

Recommendation: *Rent a space which allows IDRC staff and partners to interact comfortably at the Congress, understanding that the cost is worth the intangible benefits.*

g) Lesson Learned – Fierce competition for audience members

The size of the event and the fact that each IDRC panel competed with 19 simultaneous panels and lectures meant that at times the attendance in the panels was less than expected. The overwhelming options available to congress delegates made it difficult for participants to select which panel to attend.

Recommendation: *IDRC must make a greater effort to promote its panels to its target audiences leading up to and at the congress. This could be done beforehand by email to key contacts and organizations already identified as future delegates, and at the event through the distribution of fliers with the schedule of IDRC panels, drawing attention to the fact that these panels all had simultaneous translation – a service which was lacking in some of the other panels. Inviting a widely recognized panellist to participate on the panel would also increase audience numbers.*

h) Lesson learned – Evaluation of activities is a major, but very valuable task

What was considered a simple task before the Congress proved itself to be a major undertaking. The development of the evaluation strategy and forms, their distribution and collection, and their processing is a major task that should be considered as such.

Recommendation: *An IDRC staff member should be assigned to this task or a consultant should be hired to carry it out in full.*

Final Remarks

This monitoring and evaluation exercise proved useful for informing on key outcomes of IDRC's participation in the 11th World Congress on Public Health and identifying areas where IDRC can improve its performance at future events. Evaluation and monitoring of future events are a way for IDRC to keep improving its performance and participation at future congresses, and should form a central part of the work plan of future events.

Annex 1: Summary of Workshop Survey Results

37 forms completed by participants on August 20th

The most important thing I learned/ will take home from the Workshop is:

- The distance between the Governance and Ecohealth programs. Better links should be made.
- There is an emerging and very active group interested in linking ecohealth research to policy in Latin America.
- We learned more about how to keep community level results and policy makers on the same page.
- That complexity exists and that integrating the different aspects relating to health and policy is difficult but possible.
- Relevance of South American experiences for our African continent.
- Linkages between researchers and policy makers and decision makers and those who implement.
- The importance of opening spaces for exchange and debate and of confronting challenges and visions of researchers and public employees.
- The quality of the people invited for their dedication to the topics of environmental health as a life example.
- The similarity in the difficulties faced by different researchers using the Ecohealth approach.
- The conceptual approaches to research and policy/ experiences with projects with decision-makers.
- That the problems are common and it is possible to overcome them.
- The chance to hear different perspectives on possible links between research and policy.
- I got updated on the discussion around the use of research results in health.
- The complexity of the relationship between research and management and the importance of formulating strategies.
- Seeing how we researchers are seen by the decision-makers and vice versa.
- How the interests of various participants on critical development issues coincide.
- To explore all possible ways to make research results influence the policy making process.
- The vital necessity of joint work between researchers and decision-makers.
- The strong link between the political economy and research processes. The conceptual “enlargement” and new analytical tools.
- To share ideas and common space with other disciplines.
- That we shared problems and we could unite forces.
- The creation/consolidation of a research agenda and long term work.
- The broader understanding of what the link between research and policy is.
- The direct exchange with such diverse researchers and of such a good levels/ topics of my interest. This cannot be replaced by any electronic network.
- There are many different examples of research, some of which are not articulated

as such but are still closely linked to decision making processes.

- The need to better articulate the two fields/approaches: Ecohealth and GEH
- The possibility to share worries and interests in a new context.
- The more integrated approach to the relationship between research and policy.
- New alternatives and ideas for transferring research results to public policy or decision making at a local and national level.
- The importance of transdisciplinary approaches.
- The definition of new research agendas.
- Becoming more familiar with different conceptual frameworks.

The thing I liked most about the Workshop was?

- Networking.
- The very wide representations from various countries in Latin America.
- The outcome of the research should be included in political level or policy maker level.
- Quality and insights of the presentations as a whole. Some excellent contributions from the floor.
- Interaction among the participants.
- Coordinated with relevant topics of discussion
- Choice of participants.
- The selection of the groups and people participating.
- The thematic organization allowed the debate to open from the start.
- The freedom to discuss.
- The nice people and the food!
- The content.
- The time for debate and dialogue.
- The gathering of researchers and decision-makers from many countries.
- Reflection on effective practices.
- The gathering of different perspectives represented by the participants.
- What the decision makers do.
- The discussion of the prospective research agenda.
- To carry out an in-depth discussion about the two main themes of Ecohealth and GEH.
- The quality and the freedom of expression and thoughts.
- The participative manner in which different opinions are debated.
- Very well organized, not only in the logistics but also with respect to coherence of the topics, very complimentary.
- Search for meeting points and strategies to achieve better results and interaction between researchers and decision-makers.
- The discussion and diverse points of view.
- The systematic, critical approach of the research process/interaction.
- The openness of the participants, the feeling that everyone is learning.

- The exchange.
- The presentations by Celia Almeida and Eduardo Levcovitz.
- The debate around the future developments of this initiative.
- The organization of very adequate themes.
- Presentations and debates
- The connection /exchange of perspectives between the 2 groups (Ecohealth and GEH)
- That different actors have been brought together in the framework of a joint Ecohealth / GEH activity.
- The participation.
- The clarification of a new research agenda.
- The debate about social protection and the interaction of actors.
- The presence and participation of well-known experts.

1. The thing I liked least about the workshop was?

- Time-keeping
- Not many results and impacts were discussed except by a few projects.
- Language problem (*participant from Asia who needed to use earphones for duration of workshop*)
- Inability to cut off long, sometimes vague comments - but only a minor irritation.
- Not sticking to the agenda times.
- The lack of “experts” from social movements.
- No leisure time.
- Time pressure
- The little time to develop the workshop, there was always too little time for debate.
- The little time available for discussion
- The little time for debate and dialog
- I would leave more time for the participants to speak and less time for the presentations.
- That it was held on a weekend
- There should be more discussion of public policy itself.
- Limited spaces for independent gatherings of each of the initiatives (Ecohealth / GEH).
- Little time for Ecohealth
- Using up Saturday and Sunday.
- Too much listening time and not enough discussion time.
- Lack of the option and opportunity to have copies of the presentations and speaker documents.
- Little social life, location far from the centre of the city.
- Could have been more space for discussion and analysis.

- Better control of the presentation time and the discussion.
- The lack of a reflection exercise which would have permitted the group to better explore the links between the communities of practice.
- Time pressure.
- The times were too restricted for the exchange and disproportionate to the size of the group. Outdated analytical approaches which were presented as part of the researcher-decision maker interaction.
- Working on Sunday
- Concrete joint actions between Ecohealth and GEH did not materialize.
- The work day was too long.
- That Ecohealth and GEH did not achieve the creation of a joint agenda.
- Working on a Sunday morning.
- Isolation of the workshop site.
- The long presentations and the dynamic of the working group.
- No conceptual framework was established to integrate the analysis of Ecohealth and GEH.

Participation in the Workshop allowed me to become more familiar with the conceptual and strategic frameworks linking research to policy in the context of the Ecohealth and/or Governance, Equity and Health approaches?

95% said yes
 5% said only “little familiarization”

From the discussion at the workshop, did you receive new information related to the importance and strategies for using research results in policy formulation?

86% said yes
 14% said they had received little new information

Were the cases and examples discussed in the Workshop were illustrative of both the GEH and Ecohealth approached

80%⁵ said they were
 20% said they were only somewhat illustrative

ON a scale out of 10 (with 10 being the highest score), please rank the following aspects of the Workshop:

Dynamics: 8.03
Contents: 8.19
Location: 8.70
Allowed interaction among researchers of different disciplines, engaging both Ecohealth and GEH researchers: 8.30
Logistics: 9.19

⁵ Due to a translation error, the 7 people who filled in the survey in English were asked a slightly different question and their answers have been excluded from the sample.

Further Comments:

- Coming from the area of Ecohealth I have the impression that the concept of health systems and policy still is biased towards the area of services and not the integrated concept of health. A joint project could help break this barrier and introduce the concept of Ecohealth to health policy with greater force.
- I think that for future events you should consider giving people some free time. In general these are people dedicated to the IDRC, their projects and their country and who work a lot. I understand there is a concept of “economy of scale” in moving so many events together one after the other, but it should be remembered that people need to rest and change the activity in order to give the best of themselves.
- The workshop with the 2 groups is/was an excellent initiative and I hope it is the start of a fruitful dialogue.

Annex 2: Summary of General Evaluation Results

Results of the 19 evaluation forms received from participants

The most important thing I learned/will take home from the Congress is:

- “The importance of keeping informed about similar research and policy work to our project and the chance to reflect on our work with peers.”
- “I have a far more optimistic view of the progress and capacity in Brazil.”
- “The impressive way in which IDRC is contributing to health research for development in Latin America and the Caribbean.”
- “A new/ renewed vision for the collective/public health in a globalized world.”
- “Lots of technical public health messages”
- “That my work is well-oriented and that I should try not to copy but rather carefully analyze the work of others.”
- “Learning how the groups are dealing with success and creativity with research questions similar to mine regarding Ecohealth.”
- “Advances in the discussion of topics of interest to me.”
- “The panels on social determinants and discussions on social participation.”
- “For me it was important to learn about Ecohealth presentations on social determinants.”
- “The increase in research with an ecohealth focus from different disciplines.”
- “The interaction, meeting others and the probability of joint projects with other researchers.”
- “The need to disseminate research.”
- “The little that researchers in Latin America know about what is happening in other countries in the region.”
- “The exchange with the other IDRC projects and the possibility to spread the potential of Ecohealth”

The thing I liked most about the Congress was

- “Strong linkages made with relevant research groups”
- “The breadth of participants from across Brazil and Latin America and sessions in such spectacular surroundings.”
- “Opportunity for meeting colleagues/networking (including the bus rides)”
- “The opening with President Lula and Prof. Paulo Buss’ lecture, Canadian reception on Day 2.”
- “Management part”
- “The discussion on the future of social protection, equity in health and public health.”
- “The freedom of expression.”
- “How research could be linked to action and public policies. Several people have met to for a new network on agro-toxics. This group will participate in the Brazilian activities from COPEH.”

- “The possibility to share with other researchers interested in the same topics.”
- “The variety of themes and the diversity of approaches.”
- “The thematic richness and the quality of the presentations.”
- “The diversity and amplitude of the topics.”
- “The presentations of important experts, who are a reference for many researchers, such as Marrito, Laurel and Berlinger.”
- “The varied themes presented.”
- “That there are many researchers in Latin America who are aware of environmental problems and health.”
- “The space to share what is happening in Central America.”
- “The possibility to get up to date on public health topics and the use of research results.”
- “To meet different researchers and exchange experiences.”

The thing I liked least about the Congress

- “Inability to run sessions on time and allow for debate - a totally oversubscribed presentation forum.”
- “Too little discussion time available at most sessions. Very long days 8.30-18:30 when you add in a 30-40 minute shuttle each way and no breaks between sessions made it quite draining.”
- “Some sessions were not well disciplined (eg. no time for discussion). Scientific content not high.”
- “The location of the conference centre.”
- “The high prices in Rio de Janeiro”
- “A lot of people and long lines.”
- “Several sessions going on at the same time as ours on the same themes (Friday 9:30)
- “The impersonality of the physical location”
- “The physical space.”
- “The distance it was necessary to travel.”
- “The long lines to get everything.”
- “The brief presentation time and the scarce discussion in the panels.”
- “The internal logistics of the congress: far, lack of places to eat, long lines for everything.”
- “The organization by ABRASCO. Unnecessary lines.”
- “Little foreign participation, which resulted in little exchange between the north and the south.”
- “The disorganization and the unpunctuality. That the Congress was not a ‘world’ congress after all.”
- “The size of the congress.”

Regarding new networks/contacts:

I greatly benefited – 67%
I somewhat benefited – 33%
Did not benefit – 0%

To improve my networking possibilities at similar events in the future, IDRC could:

- “Continue with the focused workshop approach. Look at taking key themes that emerge at workshop and use these as a process, leading to the next congress/appropriate forum for disseminating IDRC work (e.g. strengthening the policy research process).”
- “Host a new gathering of partners and/or partners you would like to recruit. Increase numbers participating from the host region.”⁶
- “Do what you did this time – get profiles/put stuff on web, etc”
- “Organize in the South Asian Region”
- “Promote research through a new community of practice on ‘social protection, equity and health’.”
- “Hold a session of individual presentations with a similar topic or orientation”
- “COPEH-TLAC is already offering wonderful opportunities for establishing new contacts and network. Link the communities of practice from different parts of the world.”
- “Continue this type of support to attend congresses and promote exchange between sub-groups by regions, such as Central America.”
- “Support activities with researchers from other institutions and stimulate social spaces that increase the possibility for exchanges.”
- “Could generate some spaces that bring in other researchers (beyond IDRC researchers) to address big, relevant questions. For example, ‘how to contribute to equity through research?’ or ‘how to support the construction of public policies?’
- “Facilitate the context and communication on research options.”
- “Hold meetings with other networks to assess synergies.”
- “Promote an exchange and dissemination process through the web and email and workshops for meeting and debate.”
- “Know the agenda beforehand. Sign up in advance for work in networks where it would be possible to have the objectives and working guidelines in advance.”
- “Keep working along the same lines as you have been working.”
- “Keep supporting these initiatives in Central America for example and the Caribbean.”
- “Promote panels to exchange with similar networks within the congress.”
- “Organize more meetings between the participants.”

On a scale out of 10 (with 10 being the highest), please rank the following IDRC

⁶ This participant did not attend the Workshop on August 19th and 20th where a reception/dinner was held.

activities:

IDRC booth: 7.75

Workshop: 8.38

IDRC Panels: 8.18

IDRC's coordination and logistical support: 9.37

I would/would not want to participate in this type of event again. Why or why not?

- “WOULD. Excellent networking and evaluation of ones work. But there must be a strong move to have more facilitated discussion as well as presentations.”
- “WOULD. I have much to learn and I am very interested in extending my network in this field. This is a quick way to do both, on an introductory basis, although very Latin American focused.”
- “WOULD. To support IDRC's work”
- “WOULD. Provides international networking opportunities”
- “WOULD. To build human capacities and establish networks on themes of common interest.”
- “WOULD. It allowed me to see the problems faced by others.”
- “WOULD. Very important and useful for our community of practice.”
- “WOULD. Because I learned a lot and was able to make new contacts.”
- WOULD. For the possibility of having access to the technical collaboration and action related projects currently underway.”
- “WOULD. To maintain communication with projects & development alternatives.”
- “WOULD. Possibility to share with other researchers the advances on the approach and meet networks.”
- “WOULD. It is necessary to continue disseminating research results and through these types of meetings networks and communities are strengthened and developed.”
- “WOULD. It opens spaces for new knowledge.”
- “WOULD. For the exchange on what is being done in each region.”
- “WOULD. Because it opens the possibility for new projects and networks (COPEH) and institutions.”
- “WOULD. It forms part of the training of a researcher.”

If IDRC participates in this type of international event again, what element would be most important to repeat?

- “The workshop was the most successful.”
- “The use of one unifying theme through the various themes.
- “Use website effectively”
- “Careful preparation, website, reception”
- “Community participation with policy and decision making bodies”

- “The workshops prior to the Congress”
- “The debate but based on personal experiences.”
- “Parallel events like the workshop on research and public policies – linking different areas from IDRC activities.”
- “Organize panels around the projects and themes supported by IDRC.”
- “The opening workshop and meeting the researchers from different lines of research.”
- “The workshop and bringing together GEH and Ecohealth researchers – the possible union with other health related themes. I would do the panels again but improving their marketing, perhaps looking for more attractive, captivating titles.”
- “Exchange of experiences.”
- “The symposiums. The reflection meeting beforehand.”
- “The meeting of researchers from different projects and the organization of panels and integration workshops.”
- “The preparatory workshops which bring together people with a shared vision.”
- “The bringing together of researchers and policy makers.”
- “The workshop prior to the congress and the panels in the congress.”
- “Greater discussion on methodology and research results.”

What should IDRC do differently next time?

- It is critical to build on the outcomes from IDRC participation. Develop the next workshop, for example, based on getting formal networking of partners underway.
- “An early reception to greet all IDRC presenters would be helpful”⁷
- “I’d suggest a small reception (evening dinner) with just IDRC people (staff and consultants) at the beginning so we have a cleaner idea of who is on the IDRC team”⁸
- “Organize a meeting of panelists/presenters/ IDRC organizers prior to meeting.”⁹
- “Workshop on regional and IDRC-supported projects”
- “Promote general conferences as well as the panels.”
- “Time to get to know people.”
- “Check out that there are no sessions on the same themes at the same time (Friday 9:30 am) ecohealth /ecosystem degradation and health...”
- “Improve the presentation of the stand with interactive tools and media.”
- “Stimulate the participation of research institutions from Latin America in the 12th World Congress.”
- “Organize a central presentation.”
- “Keep supporting the positioning and development of the relationship between research and policy in order to more actively link it to decisions.”
- “Have more coordination in the panels.”

⁷ This person did not attend the Workshop on August 19th and 20th.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

- “In the IDRC panels take care that the participants focus more on the themes of the panel.”
- “Open more space for discussion in the presentations.”

On a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest), my overall experience of the Congress scores.....Why?

Average score: 8.7

Annex 3: Post-Congress Interview Questions for Selected IDRC Partners

- 1) What were your expectations in attending the Congress and offering your presentation?
- 2) TO what extent were you able to meet your expectations?
- 3) Did IDRC's support help you meet your expectations? How so?
- 4) To what extent did the Congress held you expand your professional network?
- 5) What are your goals following on from the Congress? If IDRC could help you meet these goals, what type of support would be most beneficial?
- 6) If you were to participate in an event like this Congress again, what would you want to see changed? What should stay the same?

Annex 4: Post-Congress Interview Notes

Interview with Mitko Vutchkov
Ecohealth Partner
University of the West Indies, Jamaica
September 19th, 2006

He is very pleased with the results of IDRC activities and the Congress.

In his view, the best activity was the Workshop on Research to Policy, which was held prior to the Congress. “It was very good to reinforce links among researchers, as well as good to meet new contacts.” He considers the workshop to have been an excellent learning experience.

The IDRC staff was very collaborative and friendly, which helped make the researchers feel comfortable. Considering the huge Congress, with 12,000 participants, some times we felt lost.

The panels worked well as focal points. He attended other IDRC partner presentations. The presentations were of very good quality and very professional.

In relation to the future, he would like IDRC to keep some level of organization that allows contact to continue among researchers and professionals working in the field. Since Jamaica is a small country and an island, they usually feel isolated.

He proposes to explore the possibility of organizing an event in Jamaica, considering that the Ecohealth Approach is easily applied in Jamaica.

Interview with Donna Mergler
Ecohealth Partner
University of Quebec at Montreal, Canada
September 22nd, 2006

What were your expectations in attending the Congress and offering your presentation?

Donna had 2 main expectations:

- 1) On the one hand, to learn more about what is going on in the field of Public Health in LAC.
- 2) To meet with COPEH (Community of Practice on Ecohealth) network members and with new people.
- 3) At the same time, COPEH expected to use the opportunity of the Congress to: meet new people; hold its own meetings; and to meet government and public health authorities from Brazil on issues related to COPEH; and to organize joint activities with them.

She said they met all their expectations, met new people, held COPEH meetings, met people from the Brazilian government, and enlarged their network. They could also organize two new activities to further outreach.

In relation to IDRC's support, she thinks it was critical. The COPEH budget was not sufficient to cover the trip of all members, therefore, IDRC funds made it possible for the whole COPEH team to be present.

During the workshop prior to the congress, they met a lot of people from the "health promotion" field (she refers to the GEH partners). She said the content was excellent and she learned a lot.

In relation to the question on their goals following the Congress, they were mostly related to COPEH activities in Brazil.

COPEH had a meeting with the Ministry of Health during Congress and proposed and prepared a meeting on agro-toxics, which took place during the week of the 18th-22nd of September in Brasília. COPEH's expertise on pesticides was presented in the meeting.

Another COPEH outcome from its participation in the Congress was the decision to participate in 2 upcoming activities:

- 1) Americas Conference on Occupational Environment and Health. Caracas, Venezuela . This activity is supported by US Universities.
- 2) ISEE (International Society for Environmental Epidemiology) international conference in Mexico.

Conclusions:

- ❑ One interesting observation from the Workshop is that it was possible to see that Ecohealth and GEH have shared goals.
- ❑ There is a need for more points of contact between Ecohealth researchers and GEH researchers - need to get together more often and carry out integrated projects
- ❑ Other activity is that COPEH decided to move the COPEH meeting from February to September 2007, to overlap with ISEE international conference in Mexico.

COPEH will propose that IDRC supports COPEH's meeting in Mexico, which will take place before the conference.

Finally, Donna suggests that IDRC needs to be more integrated within the mainstream of the congress program. This comment is in relation to the fact that in the panels, the audience was formed of mostly the network of partners that area already familiar with the approach. There is a need to organize activities within the mainstream activities of a given event (another Congress) so to get more visibility and outreach.

Interview with Ernesto Bascolo
Governance, Equity and Health Partner
Instituto de la Salud “Juan Lazarte”
September 18th, 2006

Expectations about attending the Congress:

- 1) attend the important academic presentations offered at the Congress
- 2) Participate and exchange experiences in more concrete activities on specific subjects related to governance

With regards to the first expectation, the presentations were not academically satisfactory, and there wasn't a really rich discussion in the Congress.

He was satisfied with his participation in the workshops and panels on the topic of governance. There was a better environment and the presentations were of better quality.

The workshop on the 19th and 20th was very useful and one of the richest spaces for extending relationships and networks.

An inconvenience was that the program was very long. This combined with the logistic difficulties of moving from one site to another made some activities very tiring. For example, the workshop organized by the Network for Health Systems and Services Research in the Southern Cone did not contribute much to his participation.

With regards to IDRC's support to reach his expectations, the panels on governance and the workshop were very good. These spaces provided the opportunity to increase his contact networks, even with other researchers from Argentina. One result of particular interest was learning about Community of Practice in Ecohealth (COPEH).

The organization of the governance panel was very good, since there was coherence in the design of the panel. There was a good level of debate.

How could IDRC improve its performance in similar events?

- better communication with IDRC and the selection of 2 or 3 key themes to centre the concentration of partners around
- to not go into so many themes, better selection of the subjects around which the event is organized
- the Congress was very big, so much so that the IDRC partners were dispersed and it was difficult to meet up with others
- promote a future discussion on the selection of themes that have been brought up in the Congress. This could be done through virtual discussion forums and other media.

Finally, he valued the role that IDRC played with respect to promoting the integration of networks and facilitating the exchange and personal knowledge between researchers that are working in these topics.

Interview with Walter Flores
Governance, Equity and Health Partner
Centro de Documentación e Investigación Maya (CEDIM), Guatemala
September 19th, 2006

The project in which Walter Flores is involved in just started 4 weeks ago.

His expectations about attending the Congress:

- 1) To attend the IDRC events. They included the participation of well-known experts from the region and made the agenda very attractive.
- 2) To establish new contacts and meet the IDRC program staff personally after meeting them by phone and email

His expectations were met, as he explained:

“The workshop was very good. It was good to have the participation of the decision makers, who discussed with researchers how to influence policy and why there are difficulties.”

He suggests that for future workshops, it would be a good idea to invite researchers from the field of political science, who could also have provided their research perspective, since in this workshop all of the researchers were from the health field and from disease control projects.

He pointed out that it was very important that decision makers were present to help bring some assumptions back down to Earth and to analyze other factors which influence the decision making process.

With regards to the Congress in general, it was an extremely large event. There was a great variety in the topics addressed, which made it difficult to attend all the activities of interest. However, this is linked to the nature of the event, since it was an international congress.

He thought that IDRC’s strategy of organizing panels with specific themes was very sensible.

With regards to the possibility of establishing new contacts and expanding networks, his participation in the Congress and panels was a great opportunity since he met other researchers from projects relating to governance.

Now they are preparing a proposal for IDRC for the generation of a space for direct exchange between GEH researchers in the region in order to deepen knowledge about conceptual frameworks.

He would like to see IDRC facilitate direct exchanges between researchers and projects in similar topics, not only in LAC but also at a global level between projects in other regions.

When organizing similar events in the future, he suggests holding an open consultation about which topics to discuss in the events (panels or something similar) organized by IDRC. He understands the importance of also consulting people from outside of IDRC projects, since it could be a source of important strategic topics to address in the event.

**Interview with Alvaro Cardona
Governance, Equity and Health Partner
Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia
September 20th, 2006**

Expectations about attending the Congress:

- 1) To be able to attend the events organized by IDRC and share his research findings with other researchers from the region.
- 2) Disseminate the results of his project.

Both expectations were reached because:

The Workshop was very good and useful. The topic of his project is new and has innovative elements. He understands that the experience could be useful in other countries. "How can social protection be provided to laid-off workers during their period of unemployment?"

With respect to the dissemination of the project, the achievements were good and positive.

However, he mentioned the low attendance in his panel where he presented the results of his project. He understands that the topic is very specific and did not expect multitudes of people. He understands that greater efforts need to be made in disseminating these lines of research.

What was the most useful part of his participation (activities organized, opportunities that arose) and what was the most inconvenient or least useful?

He found all the activities organized by IDRC very useful.

The Workshop permitted him to learn about the achievements of other more advanced projects. This experience allowed him to make some generalizations based on common experiences:

- it is difficult to drive policies for primary health care, in the current situation or the state of development of countries in the region
- it is very clear that the State must be a greater protagonist in generating equity

In the Workshop, he noticed that these topics were very common. It was also very important to discuss the conceptual frameworks and different research.

He drew attention to the role of IDRC in the coordination of agendas, from the point of view of logistics. The permanent stimuli and collaboration about what materials to take along, facilitated participation greatly.

He has established contact with researchers from other countries, which is very important.

In the future, he suggests continuing research in GEH topics and continuing to study the academic results obtained in depth.

With regards to IDRC's support, he suggests that the Centre helps maintain the link with other researchers through short events, and internships in the region.

Finally, he pointed out that the workshop and the specific panels were a good idea. He suggested that perhaps there should have been better diffusion of IDRC's program within the Congress.

He also suggests that IDRC direct some specific funding towards the participation of young researchers and students who participate in the project research teams. (Perhaps a scholarship program)

**Interview with Marcelo Korc
Ecohealth Partner
Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), Venezuela
September 22nd, 2006**

It was a great idea to bring the GEH and Ecohealth focuses together in the workshop.

It would have been good to organize some type of concrete, common product to work on together in the future. For example, a joint call for research proposals, a joint paper, or other some concrete sign of a future together.

The value of bringing together Ecohealth and GEH researchers in the same space was something that really stands out from the experience. The programs have two different conceptual focuses but they also have a lot in common.

In the case of OPS, the institution still functions (and is organized) very sectorally. He believes it would have been a good idea for the experts from each PAHO area to get out of their specific space and be exposed to other rationalities.

With regards to IDRC's other activities in the congress:

It was good to support the participation of researchers from other regions but it is necessary to keep the connection between the people who participated as panelists alive afterwards. The best way to maintain exchange between participants should be explored, either virtually through discussion groups or through joint work together.

It would have been beneficial for the Research to Policy Workshop to involve PAHO's Sustainable Development (Galvao) program in the event. Since the PAHO representative in the workshop was Eduardo Levcovitz, who is from the area of Policy and Health Systems, it would have been a good opportunity to support a more integrated vision within PAHO as well.

Thank you very much for the invitation.