



**10<sup>th</sup> ROLL BACK MALARIA PARTNERSHIP  
BOARD MEETING  
UNICEF – New York  
July 26 - 27, 2006**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Purpose:** This special interim meeting of the RBM Board was called to review progress made since the last Board meeting and make decisions that will determine the future of the Partnership.

**Voting Members Present:** WHO, World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Foundation, Exxon Mobil and Bayer (Private Sector), PATH (NGOs), MMV (Academia & Research), Italy, UK and USA (OECD donor countries), Benin, Cameroon, India, Nigeria and Tanzania (malaria endemic countries)

**Voting Members Absent:** Venezuela, Sudan, Southeast Asia & Western Pacific (vacant seat)

**Non-Voting Ex Officio Members Present:** Executive Secretary of the RBM Partnership, Global Fund for AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria

**Participant List:** Attached

NB: All PowerPoint presentations are attached unless otherwise noted.

**Call to Order**

Chair Lambo welcomed delegates, thanked UNICEF for hosting the 10<sup>th</sup> RBM Board meeting and set expectations for the meeting. He highlighted the need to find a balance between quick change and change deliberate enough to be lasting and meaningful.

Mr. Kul Gautum, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF, welcomed delegates, highlighting the need for partnership to defeat malaria, the breadth of the RBM Partnership, recent progress (with several countries approaching their ITN targets, for example), and the challenges ahead. He also called for a clear MoU between RBM and its host, and a document clearly laying out the functions of the RBM Secretariat. Board members and the Chair endorsed this call.

The Chair outlined the following objectives for the 10<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting

- To review progress on work streams identified at 9<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting (Geneva)
- Discuss and decide on issues which will determine the direction of the Partnership
- To build a Partnership that is owned by all institutions and constituencies represented

Two additional co-Chairs were identified for the meeting: Dr. Steven Phillips (Private Sector) current Chair of the Change Initiative Steering Committee, and Kevin Starace (Foundations) current Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee.

**Consent Calendar**

- Agenda for 10<sup>th</sup> RBM Board meeting adopted without objection
- Minutes of 9<sup>th</sup> RBM Board meeting to be adopted without objection

- Amendments to the RBM Partnership bylaws to establish the Executive Committee and the process for amending the bylaws approved without objection

The meeting agenda and revised RBM Partnership by-laws are attached.

### **Executive Secretary's Report to the Board**

The Executive Secretary's report described the current global malaria landscape, opportunities, and challenges and outlined the achievements of the Secretariat over the previous nine months and its work with Partners to address issues related to scaling up malaria control. The Report also described the resource constraints of the Secretariat, a vision for the Partnership, its structures and the sustainable support required to underwrite a fully functioning Secretariat.

Following the Secretary's presentation, Board members requested:

- the inclusion of "research" as integral to the vision of the RBM Partnership
- that the Partnership facilitate overall harmonization efforts - not just "donor" harmonization
- clarity on GFATM Round 6 funding progress

The Executive Secretary agreed, and the GFATM representative was asked to provide an update on Round 6, which he did later in the meeting, noting that up to \$900 million could be available.

### **Change Initiative**

#### *Presentation Summary*

This overview described the change initiative as a comprehensive and disciplined Partnership change effort. It highlighted that the decisions taken at this Board Meeting would be important milestones in the change process and would begin to determine how the Partnership will move forward. The process will require a high level of compromise, patience, and engagement.

Other key messages:

- The change initiative will lead to a collective definition of Partnership, its mission, vision, strategy and processes.
- The work streams initiated in May are being carried out with a high level of Partner involvement.
- Initial interviews with Partners and recent structured interviews with a selection of Partners were used to map the value placed on the Partnership (i.e., how the Partnership does or could help Partners fulfil their goals). The information gathered is being used to define the Partnership core functions and make the case for investing in the RBM.

The presentation included a timeline for the change initiative and current work streams. Board Members were reminded of their mandate to represent both their own institution and that of their constituency in the Partnership.

#### *Discussion Summary*

Presentations, pre-read preparation materials, and focused progress in the change process were welcomed and congratulated. Francophone delegates requested that French versions of the pre-reads be available earlier and that slide presentations also be available in French.

Board members requested:

- that value mapping place even more emphasis on country level values,
- that technical standards be added to Partner Value Mapping, and
- that increased effort be made to ensure inclusion of endemic countries in all work streams and consultations

### **Partnership at Country Level**

#### *Presentation Summary*

World Bank and WHO presented an overview of the Country Partnership work stream progress and decisions points. The group studied Mozambique as an example of effective country-led partner coordination. Key points included:

- Harmonization seeks to (1) help countries define their needs and strategies and track their progress and (2) help Partners coordinate their responses.
- Alignment around country plans is critical to ensuring gaps are identified and filled.
- Government ownership and M&E (including impact data) are needed to ensure that growing resources do not lead to project-driven activities but rather to coordinated national scale-up.
- Donor coordination (here, primarily WB/Booster, USAID/PMI, and GFATM) can be achieved.
- Joint missions (here, primarily by World Bank and USAID) were very useful.

#### *Discussion Summary*

- Harmonization is critical to scaling up for impact—an in-country consultative process is required.
- Country leadership is key.
- Gap assessment is a key part of harmonization and should be systematic, frequent and done well; there must also be a concerted effort to fill gaps once identified.
- “Gap” needs to be defined, and gaps should be identified from both donor and country perspectives.
- Gap analysis data from endemic countries should be aggregated at a global level to help global Partners identify needs and prioritize resources.
- Countries also need help with planning, implementation, and evaluation.
- A key RBM Partnership role is to help facilitate partnership at country level.
- A new harmonization working group is needed.

#### **Decisions Reached**

*Determined* that gap assessment is a priority for the global RBM Partnership:

- *Approved* RBM Harmonization paper as the aspiration for country-level Partner activity
- *Endorsed* national gap analysis as an essential input into country-led harmonization and alignment of donor response

*Endorsed* roles for the RBM Partnership in:

- Gap analysis, led by the endemic countries with support from Partners in each country
- Managing a repository of information on gaps, managed by the Secretariat
- Facilitating the exchange of learnings across countries
- Actively expanding funding sources to fill country-level gaps

*Identified* roles in executing next steps for RBM country-level partnership proposals

- *Delegated* definition of gaps and development of gap analysis tool to a new working group on harmonization
  - Should also develop a tool to assess 1) gaps and bottlenecks; 2) donor and government behavior; and 3) progress and results
  - Will also develop a country-level harmonization scorecard, as proposed in the Harmonization paper

*Approved* need for an approach for RBM Partners and Secretariat to engage at the country level

- Approach for harmonization at the country level to be defined for approval

#### **Sub-Regional Networks**

##### *Presentation Summary*

UNICEF and the NGO constituency presented an overview of the SRN work stream’s progress and decision points. The group examined the role of SRNs in scaling up for impact, EARN and WARN budgets and work plans, and plans for SARN and CARN. Key points included:

- SRN members are active in Partner coordination, including regional and country planning
- Having a focal point funded by and reporting to the Secretariat helps SRNs be effective
- SRNs help identify, disseminate, translate, and implement best practices
- SRN evaluation data is available upon request

#### *Discussion Summary*

- SRNs consist of Partner institutions, not individuals or consultants.
- SRNs help bring the needs of countries to the attention of Partners, who then provide support.
- Countries and other Partners appreciate the proximity of SRNs, their coordination role, minimization of transaction costs and neutrality of the focal point, but warned against adding layers of bureaucracy and additional set-up costs.
- SRNs help as needed, requested, and able with supply chain management issues.
- The Board should consider long-term financing of other cost effective networks.
- SRNs should be flexible, adaptable, small and in close relationship with countries.

#### ***Decisions Reached***

*Determined* that SRNs are core bodies of the Partnership that should be governed by the Board and funded through Partnership resources

- Acknowledged the need to work through SRNs
- Agreed to reevaluate the need for and role of SRNs in 3 years

*Endorsed* the role of SRNs and prioritization of their activities as outlined in budget framework

- Core functions will be reviewed
- Funded activities will be prioritized

*Confirmed* Board support for initiating SARN/CARN, and sub-regional networks outside of Africa as appropriate

### **Secretariat Hosting**

#### *Presentation Summary*

BMGF (Foundations) presented an overview of the work of the Hosting Subcommittee, which:

- Proposed criteria to be used to evaluate potential hosting options, the relative weighting of each criterion and an initial short list of potential hosting options.
- Proposed to present a shorter list of options (2-3) at the next RBM Board meeting.
- Proposed the development of an interim MoU with WHO to clarify the current Host-Secretariat relationship and serve as the foundation for an MOU once a decision is made about future hosting.

#### *Discussion Summary*

- Historical sources of tension have been whether Secretariat should be subject to the Host's rules and regulations, whether the Secretariat should be under GMP or exist as a separate entity, and perceived overlap of mission between the Secretariat, Partnership, and WHO.
- There will always be some overlap since WHO is a Partner; it is therefore critical to clearly define responsibilities in areas of overlap to avoid mission creep.
- WHO indicated that it is receptive to the Secretariat existing as a separate entity outside GMP as long as there are clear terms of reference and the work undertaken is not duplicative.
- World Bank indicated that it was not in a position to consider hosting the Secretariat, while UNDP indicated it could continue to be an option for consideration.
- The cost of moving out of WHO should be and is being taken into consideration.
- Assuming that WHO remains on the short list through the next Board meeting, the Subcommittee will present its final recommendation to the Board after appointment of a new WHO Director General.

### ***Decisions Reached***

*Approved* the criteria to be used in evaluating the hosting options

- Strategic fit
- Operational fit
- Financial Fit

*Approved* the current short-list of potential hosting options for further analysis and consideration

- IFRC
- UNDP
- WHO
- PATH
- UNICEF
- Un-hosted option

*Requested* development of an MOU with WHO based on the evaluation criteria and best practices

- To serve as a basis for an interim agreement to strengthen the relationship with WHO
- To serve as the foundation or proposed conditions of the final hosting agreement regardless of which host is selected

### **Governance**

#### *Presentation Summary*

UN Foundation presented an overview of work to date which has set the course for the governance work stream. Key points included:

- The internal workings of the RBM Partnership Board, the relationship between the Board and Secretariat, direction and oversight of SRNs and working groups, and Partnership financing are the key issues this work stream seeks to address.
- This work stream drives at least half of the desired outcomes of the change initiative: effective Partnership structures, processes, and mechanisms.
- This work stream still needs an owner.

#### *Discussion Summary*

- Definition of "Partner" and the privileges and responsibilities associated with being a Partner should be a governance issue, including whether Partners (excluding endemic countries) should be required to contribute financially to the Partnership or the possible development of two-tier membership, in which funding and non-funding Partners would have different privileges and responsibilities.
- The role of the RBM Partner Forum as a governing body should be clarified.
- Governance structure will depend on Partnership and Secretariat core functions
- The Governance work stream should look closely at establishing predictable financing for partnership structures, including the Secretariat.

### ***Decisions Reached***

*Approved* the set of governance issues to be addressed

- Internal workings of the RBM Board (e.g., decision making, committee structures and mandates)
- Relationship between the Board and Secretariat (e.g., performance assessment, Secretariat role in supporting Board)
- Direction setting and oversight of Sub-Regional Networks and Working Groups, differentiating between standing and short-term (e.g., budget, performance assessment)
- Definition and expectations of Partners, including funding obligations
- Role of the Partners' Forum as a governance mechanism

*Agreed* to split next steps into two work streams

- A funding work stream to develop a process for budgeting and funding the RBM Partnership
- A primary governance work stream for all other governance issues

*Designated* PATH to identify a member of the NGO delegation to participate in one of the work streams.

- *Requested* an individual Board member to own the governance analysis and proposals
  - Need 2-3 additional Board members to actively support this work
- *Requested* an individual Board member to own development of a process for funding the Secretariat, SRNs and/or Working Groups
  - Need 2-3 additional Board members to actively support this work

## **Call to Order, Day Two**

The Chair reviewed the decisions taken the previous day.

### **Secretariat Design**

#### *Presentation Summary*

BCG presented the work of the Secretariat Design work stream. Key points included:

- The RBM Partnership Secretariat plays an important role in bringing Partners together, providing coordination and serving as a neutral facilitator.
- Previously the Secretariat has filled technical assistance gaps and carried out ad hoc functions. This has led to stress, confusion, tension, unwanted overlap, and lack of predictable, planned activities and funding.
- A key goal of this work stream is to create a more formal link between the needs of the Partners and the work plan and budget of the Secretariat.
- BCG has recommended an approach to defining Secretariat core functions based largely on value mapping. Core functions would be grouped into four categories based on the level of coordination required to perform the function and the value of neutrality in performing the function—*unique functions* performed only by the Secretariat, *shared functions* performed by the Secretariat on behalf of the Partnership and by individual Partners on their own behalf, *acknowledged functions* that could be delegated to an individual Partner but are currently performed by the Secretariat, and *ad hoc* functions.
- The Secretariat could be organized into four units reporting to the Executive Secretary: Partnership Body Support, Communications and Advocacy, Supply, and Partnership Administrative Support.

#### *Discussion Summary*

- Hosting, Partnership core functions, and Secretariat design are closely linked.
- Secretariat design must increase clarity about appropriate roles of the Secretariat but also allow some flexibility to meet unanticipated Partner needs that can be prioritized and funded.
- The size and composition of the Secretariat should depend on core functions (many potential or proposed core functions were discussed).

### **Decisions Reached**

*Endorsed* the approach to defining the core functions, organization and budget for the RBM Partnership Secretariat

*Approved* the following features of the draft functions, organization, and budget as the basis for developing final proposal to the next Board meeting

- Functions divided into *unique functions*, *shared functions*, and *acknowledged functions*
- Secretariat will not perform *ad-hoc functions* without prioritization and funding
- Secretariat will be structured around four functional units (Partnership support, communication and advocacy, supply, and administrative support)
- Budget should allow Executive Secretary flexibility in allocating staff against specific functions within the mandate

*Agreed* that the Governance work stream will develop a process by which Secretariat functions can be changed by the Board or other Partnership body.

## **Supply Services**

### *Presentation Summary*

UNICEF presented the work undertaken by the Supply work stream. The group proposed a revised role for the Secretariat in supply services according to Partner needs. The Partnership:

- Should convene players, aggregate forecasts, distribute and publicize information, and coordinate communication across Partners, constituencies and the supply chain.
- Should not: create demand forecasts or procure commodities on behalf of donors or endemic countries.

The presentation also underscored need for increased Partner input and shared ownership of the forecasting function, proposing identification of an appropriate residence for the forecasting function and investigation of alternative procurement mechanisms.

### *Discussion Summary*

- Work stream should expand to cover the full range malaria control commodities, not just ACTs.
- Work stream should cover demand as well as supply.
- Private sector procurement was not in this work stream's purview.
- Supply, procurement and forecasting, as well as sustainable prices and funding, are among the most critical issues to countries and therefore should be addressed by the Partnership.
- Sharing of risks and benefits between the Private Sector and other Partners was discussed.

### *Decisions Reached*

- *Approved* expansion of effort across all current and future malaria commodities
- *Approved* reconfiguration of the Secretariat supply group to focus on coordination of information and partner efforts, rather than execution
- *Agreed* that the Partnership should seek a clearer understanding from all relevant stakeholders of what support functions are required, decide on the metrics for those functions, then identify an appropriate owner [*revised based on Private Sector email response*]
- *Agreed* to advocate for reform to commodity forecasting process and to coordinate Partner efforts to expand participation
- *Supported* exploration of alternative commodity and supply chain management processes
- *Agreed* to explore issues relating to risk management and benefits as part of analysis of barriers, bottlenecks and opportunities for aligning supply and demand
- *Approved* development of a concept paper for a Partnership initiative to facilitate countries' efforts to develop and sustain procurement and supply management infrastructure through Partner support

## **Outputs of Change Initiative**

### *Presentation Summary*

BCG provided a review of how the work streams, partner value mapping, and earlier work interact with each other and build toward a newly defined and more effective RBM Partnership.

The expected outcomes are:

- Clearly defined Partnership functions;
- Partnership structures that are optimally designed to execute the agreed-to functions;
- Mechanisms and processes that allow the Partnership to effectively perform its functions;
- A revitalized RBM Partnership mission, vision, and strategy based on what the Partners, especially countries, value and bring to the Partnership.

The work leading up to the current Board meeting, and the decisions taken here, move the Partnership into the next phase of the change initiative.

## **Other Business**

- A next step regarding adding planning to the Country-level Partnership work stream was requested.
- A quick decision on Secretariat work plan, budget and funding is requested because of the need to comply with WHO's 2007 budgeting cycle.
- The Secretariat would like to formally recognize malaria goodwill ambassadors. This issue will be taken up at the next board meeting.
- A World Bank Booster program event in Dakar (September 12-15) will be an opportunity to exchange views on the way forward in malaria control in the region, with a special focus on commodities and supply chain management.
- A letter from WHO to the World Bank was read.

## **Reflections on the Board Meeting and Change Initiative**

- Country involvement: Ensuring consistent country involvement in work streams has been challenging but needs to happen. Upcoming regional meetings are one way to more fully engage more endemic countries. In addition to the WB/Booster meeting in Dakar, other opportunities include the WHO/SAMC meeting in Harare in August, the AFRO Health Ministers' meeting August 27 – September 2 in Addis Ababa, upcoming EARN and WARN meetings, and sub-regional health meetings. WHO can provide funds to support country participation.
- Getting to the finish line: Secretariat design, including work plan and budget, should be prioritized to help ensure the change process continues and positive change is sustained.
- Sustained commitment and involvement required of the Board and Partners may require mobilization of additional Partner staff for work streams. It would be helpful to have calendar of meetings and videoconferences.
- The Partnership should evaluate its change effort and/or have an independent evaluation in 2-5 years. Metrics should include indicators useful for advocacy and communication.

## **Adjournment**

The Board Chair described the meeting as one of the most successful RBM Board meetings in which he had participated, thanked UNICEF for hosting the meeting, thanked WHO for bringing a positive message and a new hope to the RBM Partnership, thanked BCG and the RBM Secretariat for preparing the meeting, and thanked interpreters for facilitating translation. UNICEF thanked the Board chair and the meeting co-chairs for their efforts in leading the change initiative and the 10<sup>th</sup> RBM Board meeting.

## **Next Steps**

1. See attached "Recap of Decisions and Next Steps" for next steps for each of the work streams.
2. Upcoming regional meetings (including WHO/SAMC meeting) will be used to better engage endemic countries in the change process, ensuring their comprehensive input.
3. The 11<sup>th</sup> RBM Board Meeting will take place November 10-11 in Geneva, Switzerland.