



MINUTES

RBM/EXD/2009/MIN.
11 MAR 2009
Draft document

General distribution
English Only

15th RBM Partnership Board Meeting

WHO Regional Office for South East Asia in New Delhi, India on
November 11 – 12, 2008

Attendance

Chair

Malaria Endemic Countries: Ethiopia

Vice-Chair

NGOs: Northern - John Hopkins University Centre for Communications Programs

Voting Members

Foundations: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Malaria Endemic Countries: Brazil; Cambodia; Cameroon; India; Mali; Nigeria; Uganda; Zambia
(absent with regrets)

Multilateral Development Partners: UNDP; UNICEF; WHO; the World Bank

NGOs: Northern - Malaria Consortium

Southern - Society for Family Health-Nigeria

OECD Donor Countries: France; United Kingdom; United States of America

Private Sector: Sanofi-Aventis; Vestergaard-Frandsen

Research & Academia: Earth Institute (absent with regrets - represented by the Alternate member, MMV)

Non-Voting Ex Officio Members

Executive Director, The Global Fund to fight against AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Executive Director, RBM Partnership

Executive Secretary, UNITAID (absent with regrets)

Office of the UN Secretary General's Special Envoy for Malaria

Meeting Purpose

The November Board meeting served to review progress by the RBM Partnership in implementing its annual workplan and to address specific issues ensuring that the Partnership's 2008 targets will be met. In particular, the Board was to review its role in addressing barriers to scaling up and critical issues like financing the Harmonized Work Plan, M& E capacity, as well as GFATM /RBM MOU, Conflict of Interest Policy, revisions to the Operating Framework and the proposed External review and Evaluation of the Partnership.

Call to Order, Day One

The Chair called the 15th RBM Board meeting to order.

Welcome

WHO South-East Asia Regional Office (SEARO)

Speech Summary

The Regional Director, WHO SEARO in his opening remarks mentioned malaria as one of the major public health concerns impeding the pace of socio-economic progress. He underscored the huge burden of malaria in Asia, particularly in countries in South East Asia region. He also called attention to the sizeable high endemic areas as well as epicenters of drug resistant malaria in the region. Therefore, threat to the inhabitants and the travelers are real, which require concentrated efforts. Fortunately with effective tools and technologies, malaria can be controlled and even eliminated and the launch of the malaria action plan in 2008 is an important step towards achieving such goal. The RBM Partnership Board meeting is also yet another milestone in that direction.

He wished the meeting all success.

Government of India

Speech Summary

The Secretary, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India welcomed the RBM Partnership Board members and delegates to India and wished them a successful meeting. He stated that malaria was one of the biggest public health problems in India and several other countries in Asia, besides those in Africa. While some countries in this region have shown success in tackling malaria, countries like India, Indonesia, Timor Leste, record a more or less static situation that needs to be addressed in an efficient manner. He particularly noted the vulnerability of the region to possible adverse effects of climate change that could increase the threat of vector borne diseases. With increases in temperatures in higher altitudes, the spread of the threat could be extensive. He stressed the need to control malaria as soon as possible. In India, the malaria control programme started in 1953. Despite initial success, the disease showed resurgence in the 1970s and although the incidence has diminished since then, much of the remote, forested areas continue to be highly endemic. The Government of India are applying effective tools, i.e. rapid diagnostic tests for diagnosis, ACTs for treatment of uncomplicated malaria, insecticide treated nets for personal protection, etc. With donor support from the Global Fund, World Bank, these interventions are being scaled up in highly endemic areas. The more effective long lasting insecticide treated nets are currently being rolled out urgently as well. National Rural Health Mission, a pioneering initiative of the Government of India to improve access to quality health care in rural areas with innovation, flexi-financing is focusing on infrastructure strengthening, community led implementation. A female accredited social health activist is being identified in each village to deploy RDTs and medicines to deal with fever cases subsequent to intensive training. Thus, India is making every effort to ensure universal coverage and sustained control contributing to reduction of malaria and other disease burden. The Government of India is grateful to the RBM Partnership for leading a coordinated movement against malaria control and re-focusing on Asia.

Board Procedures

The Board Vice-Chair, Dr Matt Lynch, noted that the Board had a quorum and recalled Board operating and voting procedures as outlined in the by-laws.

Opening remarks

The Board Chair, Dr Tedros A. Ghebreyesus, reminded the Board of the malaria community's commitments to achieve 2010 targets and emphasized that the implementation of the recently launched Global Malaria Action Plan (GMAP) will support the achievement of those targets and much more besides. He noted particularly the success in resource mobilization and the recent US\$3.2 billion pledged in New York on September 25th as well as the unprecedented increase in finances from all partners. He indicated that the number of countries exhibiting progress is growing due to the growth in political commitment and new financing, and the Chair challenged the Partnership to grasp the "low hanging fruit", build on these successes and ensure the goal of Universal Coverage with malaria control interventions is not compromised.

The Chair identified operating principles for the meeting; to focus on resolving selected issues and not try to cover everything; and to be as open and candid as possible in the deliberations, ensuring important issues were given the attention they deserved.

The Chair welcomed new representatives from Brazil and India and reviewed the Board agenda before opening the floor for Board member introduction.

----- Group Photo -----

Consent Calendar

- Agenda for 15th RBM Board meeting adopted without objection
- Minutes of 14th RBM Board meeting adopted without objection.

Action Taken Report

Presentation Summary

The Executive Director reviewed the action taken on issues arising from the 14th Board meeting, developing special points where consensus is still being built and points not otherwise covered in the 15th Board Agenda:

- MIST - reminded Board of decision taken at 14th Board and that work is ongoing.
- RBM representation on Global Fund Board was not on the agenda of the November GFATM Board and will be taken up at a future GFATM Board Meeting.
- GMAP - delivered and launched with support from BCG, MAWG and Malaria No More and others with very high level of media coverage achieved

Executive Committee (EC) Report

Presentation Summary

The EC Chair, Dr Matt Lynch, reviewed the work of the EC since May 2008. Five Meetings of the EC were held since the 14th Board meeting. The main topics addressed were a review of Governance issues, specifically the membership, roles and responsibilities of the EC; the design and content of Secretariat financial reporting templates (work in progress); financial support to the Southern NGO Representative; the review of the Harmonized Workplan (HWP) and Partnership budget scenarios for 2009; and revision of the MoU with the Global Fund which, given the context of Round 8 successes, would enable smoother communication flows between GFATM and the RBM Board Partnership. In addition the development of the Conflict of Interest Policy and finally the preparation of the GMAP were also supported through the work of the EC.

The EC Chair stressed the fact that the process of developing the GMAP, the facilitation of the GMAP naming and branding was highly consultative and the quality of the GMAP reflects the level of commitment and hard work that went into it.

Decision Reached

The Board endorsed the EC Report.

Executive Director's Report

Presentation Summary

The Executive Director's Report addressed the following areas:

- Malaria Landscape – highlighted the GMAP as most up to date reference detailing where we are today, describing key progress in LLIN, IRS and ACT coverage as well as RDTs; noted that WMR 2008 identified coverage levels were good but not at the level required for SUFI; emphasized need for better data collection, increase in resources; welcomed new research initiative such as MalERA; and drew attention to documented resistance in Asia as a growing threat to key ingredient artemisinin;
- Harmonized Workplan 2008 - reviewed HWP and emphasized need to clarify the wording of the HWP Priorities; highlighted the low level of resources mobilized (38% of total) for Partnership mechanisms;
- Secretariat and SRNs Management Report;
- Hosting Report – *Postponed due to WHO Global System Management (GSM) introduction*
- Financial Report - described need to strengthen accountability, reporting, and planning and identified sources of support for 2008;
- Partnership Constituencies - first time Constituency Reports have been included in EXD's Report and hopes to have more comprehensive contributions in future Boards;
- Working Groups Report.

Discussion Summary

- Many expressions of support for the EXD report, the greater financial clarity it provided, thoroughness of content and inclusion of additional reports from Constituencies;
- Increased support to countries noted by many as key achievement in terms of increased resource flows / GF grants secured, as well as support for developing business plans;
- Resource Mobilization - Concerns expressed about low level of resources secured for the Partnership and large gap to be filled. In addition strong support for presenting all resource flows through all mechanisms and presenting an even clearer financial picture;
- Tracking Progress - many echoed the need for improved data collection and major investment in monitoring, evaluation and surveillance as well as implementation support;
- Stressed the need for a review of current Partnership architecture and whether optimal for achieving agreed priorities. Additional request for Board to play a more central role in performing its oversight functions, particularly in the preparation of a financial report. Call for a Financial and Audit Committee to be established;
- Unprecedented accumulation of advocacy over last year has resulted in more funding and higher profile of malaria.

Response Summary

The EXD thanked the Board for its support.

- The Secretariat agreed to capture all financial flows through SRNs, WGs, Secretariat and other mechanisms;
- RDT prequalification delays need to be overcome and Secretariat will work to have a list of new products as soon as possible;
- Further discussion will take place on how to support individual Partners with regard to funding as well as Partnership mechanisms;
- Country Programme Advisers - EXD clarified that requests were received to deploy 10 country programme advisers but no follow up took place due to lack of funds;
- Apologized for communication challenges with regard to NGO participation in EXD's report and requested NGO constituency to supply a contribution for the Constituency Report.

Decisions Reached

The Board acknowledged the Executive Director's Report.

Financiers Forum (FF)

Presentation Summary

Achieving the GMAP goals will require extra effort by donors and partners particularly with regard to procurement and supply chain management and overcoming implementation bottlenecks and barriers. The Financiers Forum proposes to bring partners together to identify and resolve policy issues among financiers such as harmonizing the procurement quality standards of commodities, and addressing bottlenecks particularly with regard to high priority interventions such as LLIN campaigns and ACT stock-outs. The FF proposes to be country focused, maintain good communications with host governments and country stakeholders and be inclusive of all major malaria financiers, with an evaluation after one year.

Discussion Summary

- General support for a pragmatic approach for resolving bottlenecks and impediments and serving countries in a more responsible way;
- There was an urgent need to have common procurement policies and harmonize financing. Current policies for procurement differ dramatically;
- It was proposed that more precision and focus is required in the overall objectives of the FF to differentiate it more clearly from the PSM WG. Changes in the language of the objectives were proposed to emphasize its focus on procurement and implementation, and to work with in-country partners;
- Emphasis was placed on greater inclusivity at global and local level;
- Welcomed the invitation to endemic countries to bring specific problems to the FF's attention

Decisions Reached

To revert to authors to make amendments and add precision to objectives proposed by Board members by end of Day One.

Scaling Up Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity

Presentation Summary

Tracking Country Progress is one of the 6 RBM Priorities and with increased levels of funding and the new GMAP, there is greater urgency to scale up M&E to track progress, particularly in Africa. Strengthening Sub Regional Networks M&E capacity and M&E support to countries as well as the development of an African based survey support unit was proposed in the near term to focus on 15-20 countries needing support over the next year to meet 2010 targets. In addition the establishment of an M&E coordinating and reporting unit within the RBM Partnership/and or Secretariat was proposed.

Timeline-2 years; Budget-US\$3 million per year. The Board was requested to approve description of the new mechanism.

Discussion Summary

- Many reiterated the importance of M&E for tracking purposes and advocacy and supported the underlying principle of the proposal but warned against major investment in new parallel mechanisms in current financial environment;
- Also suggested that country capacity in M&E could be strengthened with funds from Global Fund and that existing framework could be better used i.e. strengthen capacity of intercountry team, additional staff placed in agencies already engaged in M&E and greater support for routine monitoring and surveillance;
- Data collection, advocacy and country support cited as the three priorities for RBM;
- Attention was drawn to need for inclusion of the role of surveillance and clarity on whether this was indeed a parallel structure and what impact it would genuinely have on strengthening country capacity;
- Board requested to focus on the issue of whether new parallel structures should be created or whether existing structures should be strengthened;
- Request for more clarity as to the scope of this group, how it will focus short term efforts but also build up more permanent M&E strengthening, and how it will achieve greater capacity at country level.

Decisions Reached

Principle of additional strengthening of M&E was agreed. The Board Chair requested broader group discussion and directed the MERG WG and WHO to meet overnight to review the details of the proposal and come back with recommendations and amendments on Day Two for decision.

Keynote Address by Dr Anbumani Ramadoss, Hon. Minister for Health & Family Welfare, Government of India

Welcomed Board Members on behalf of the Prime Minister and emphasized that India's progress in malaria control has been disappointing. Also acknowledged that climate change was impacting on malaria and other mosquito borne diseases which have increased as a result. Described recent initiatives to strengthen health systems including National Health Mission, Village Health and Sanitation Committees and the presence of the village ASHA or community health worker as well as the delivery and support of various malaria control interventions: larvaciding, ITNs, ACTs. He highlighted the problem of human resources and plans to have a District Malaria Officer in all malaria endemic districts of India but also emphasized that the scale of the challenge with Indian states being the size of European countries and India representing one sixth of humanity. Reminded the members that India had 50,000 cases of malaria in 1960 and that complacency set in. Today malaria control in India needs serious reinforcement.

Thanked the Board Chair and delegation from India who will participate in discussions.

Reactivation of the RBM Partnership Case Management Working Group

Presentation Summary

A comprehensive and coherent approach to ensuring reliability of supply and distribution of ACTs is needed to achieve the timely scale up of effective treatments. In addition urgent issues such as addressing artemisinin tolerant *Plasmodium falciparum*, assuring better interaction between private sector and public sector access, ensuring sustained financing and extended case management beyond health facilities were all cited as key areas on which a reinvigorated Case Management Working Group could focus its attention. The history of the previous CMWG was described, its mandate and objectives, and the following requests made to the Board:

- Endorse the need to address key issues cited above through the CMWG;
- Support for the effective operation of the CMWG including establishment of a Secretariat for the CMWG;
- Invite WHO to convene 1st meeting in first quarter of 2009 based on transitional membership outlined in 2003 membership.

Discussion Summary

- Strong support for reactivation of CMWG and encouragement to consider strong links with country support and other types of case management of other diseases i.e. diarrhea but warned against setting up another new structure;
- Repeated requests made for full TORs and budget before decision is taken and clarification of role of CMWG as distinct from role of WHO GMP;
- Recommendation that WHO would be best "home" for secretariat of CMWG

Decision Reached

The Board endorses the urgent need to address the key issues cited above through an active Case Management Working Group. WHO is invited to convene a first consultation of the reconstituted Case Management Working Group, based on the existing Terms of Reference, within the next 6 months, with the mandate of addressing these key issues. And the partners were requested to support the reconstituted Case Management Working Group with allocated time for participation of experts, funding to establish a secretariat for the working group, and other support as required to ensure effective operation.

Financial implications: subject to prioritization and explicit funding.

Partnership Role in Addressing barriers to Scaling Up: Operational Research Proposal - to be further developed by stakeholders and resubmitted at the 16th Board in May 2009 - Originator (Earth Institute) absent with regrets from Board Meeting.

Memorandum of Understanding between GFATM and RBM - Revision of existing Global Fund MoU (2004)

Presentation Summary

The 2004 MoU between the Global Fund and the RBM Partnership has been modified in order to acknowledge the leadership of the Global Fund in providing malaria funding to countries and therefore the need for a closer, more collaborative relationship. Modifications include:

- Specific reference to strategic analysis, technical and implementation support, monitoring and evaluation;
- Intensified information exchange;
- Acknowledgement of RBM's role in support of Global Fund's grant making to countries;
- Board requested to approve updated MoU and move to immediate joint signature by EXDs of RBM and Global Fund.

Discussion Summary

- Strong support was expressed for the new MoU and the opportunity to build a stronger relationship with the Global Fund;
- Hosting Partner (WHO) expressed concerns about the MoU.

Decision Reached

The Board endorsed modified MoU and moved for immediate adoption and signing of the MoU by the EXD RBM in consultation with Executive Committee, together with the EXD of the Global Fund.

Call to Order - Day Two

Summary Day 1

Decision Points and Next Steps

- 15th Board Meeting Agenda Adopted
- 14th Board Minutes Adopted
- Report of EC acknowledged
- Report of EXD acknowledged

Outstanding Issues from Day One

Financiers Forum – Summary of Review discussion

Board Decision Point was withdrawn -agenda item became information point not a decision point. In accordance with the Paris Declaration, the RBM board endorses, in principle, the creation of a Financiers' Forum to address practical procurement and supply chain bottlenecks in implementing countries.

The RBM board acknowledges the need for such an area to discuss specific and concrete procurement and supply chain issues in order to find pragmatic and rapid solutions.

Initiated by the World Bank Booster Program, the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and the United States Government's President's Malaria Initiative this Financiers' forum is gathering financiers (the three previously mentioned, UNITAID, OECD donors, etc.) on a voluntary basis, to deal with procurement and supply chain issues that can occur when implementing programs in a country. Appropriate partners at the global and national level (technical and in country stakeholders) may be invited to join the forum.

- The forum needs to articulate the strengthening of country capacity, forward and backward reporting and utilization of mechanisms;
- Stressed need to avoid duplication and emphasized that the focus is policy rather than implementation and there should be no overlap with other mechanisms such as the PSM WG.

Next steps

- Members to clarify the scope of the FF and produce concept paper to delineate clearly all aspects and functions and report back to the board.

Monitoring & Evaluation -- Summary of Review Discussion

Revised Decision point was presented

In the context of understanding existing work in malaria M&E by RBM, MERG and Partners will:

- Support "One M&E System at country level" with appropriate consistency between countries;
- Support the M&E Tool Kit (led by the Global Fund and supported by partners);
- Work with partners to standardize key indicators to track country progress.

The Board agrees on the principles of prioritizing the scaling up of malaria monitoring and evaluation and calls on RBM partners to support these actions - including :

- Building on existing mechanisms, strengthening malaria M&E functions, including surveillance, routine health facility reporting and survey capacity at all appropriate levels;
- Strengthening the systems for reporting of information to all levels;
- Mandating RBM MERG to work with partners to define the scope and terms of work, locations and mechanisms for implementing this enhanced M&E – including detailed budgets and timelines;
- Requesting RBM MERG to engage partners to help support this work with staffing or financial assistance.

In developing the details, the RBM MERG will be attentive to comments presented by RBM Board members including, but not limited to:

- Building on existing systems;
- Strengthening country and regional capacity;
- Clarifying the scope of RBM Partnership supported work in M&E including the requirements of information at various levels RBM Partnership, sub-Region, country, and local levels; the scope of information from inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, impact, surveillance, routine health information systems, and special studies such as insecticide and drug resistance and pharmacovigilance; emphasis on data for decision making; will cover all countries and regions outside of Africa; time frame for near-term and longer-term tracking of information and progress

Next steps

- MERG to meet at end January 2009 and report back to EC on budget and timeline.

Harmonized Partnership Workplan – HWP 2009

Presentation Summary

The HWP positions Partners to meet the increased demand from countries to attain the 2010 targets. 2009 is a crucial penultimate year in which those activities not carried out in 2008 must be implemented. In July 2008 six priority objectives were validated to which operational research was added. The overall budget for the Partnership HWP for 2009 presented as US\$ 36.6 million includes activities not carried out in 2008. Two budget scenarios were presented for the Secretariat and SRNs – an optimal budget of US\$ 11.5 million, and a core budget of US\$ 6 million. The former (US\$11.5 million) represents a realistic appraisal of the funds needed to carry out fully the unique functions identified by the change process. The latter (US\$6 million) is based on what was pledged and deemed currently available for 2009. To enable more consultative planning and budgeting, the Secretariat proposed that a new biennial cycle to be adopted and the Partnership workplan and budget to be presented at the May 2009 Board Meeting.

The Board was requested to endorse this workplan and costs, subject to review by the EC and the Board, and specifically approve the Secretariat component (US\$11.5million) based on what is realistic to support the core functions of the Secretariat, the SRN component (US\$5.9million) and to adopt a new biannual work-planning cycle.

Discussion Summary

- The HWP was appreciated however, an evaluation of HWP was proposed including scrutiny of resources, budget and overlap of stakeholder commitments as it was difficult to make an informed decision based on available information. Specifically it was noted that no targets had been included for 2009 and while some 2008 targets were still relevant, others would need to be revised.

Next steps proposed:

- Priorities, targets and budget narrative to be submitted to EC by 8th December then to Board for approval by 19th December 2008;
- Proposed two year workplan, with targets, outputs and budget for 2010-2011 to be presented at the 16th Board;
- The Board requested a drafting committee to be established to revised proposed decision points for the 2009 HWP and to report back by end of Day 2.
- Members generally agreed with this suggested approach and reinforced need to prioritize activities, retain a strong focus on the implementation of the GMAP and provide a workplan based on available resources while also giving the EXD authority to fund raise for additional activities not yet funded;

- Concern was expressed that by approving an aspirational budget the Board was abdicating its responsibility and placing the Secretariat under undue emotional pressure to raise funds for its own activities;
- The two year work planning process was generally approved, however to facilitate that process a call was made to have, in the near term, a Board retreat to review activities and budget as well as the role and responsibilities of the Secretariat, other Partnership structures and also the role and responsibility of Partners. This would contribute to determining a two year plan;
- This idea was reinforced with a suggestion to review the Partnership architecture proposed by the change project and determine which mechanisms need to be supported;
- Members were reminded that in order for the GMAP to be implemented, it was the Partners who will be held accountable not the Secretariat. Members were urged to move away from the idea that Secretariat is responsible for getting the work done;
- Strongly recommended that the Board not postpone or delay budget approval.

Decisions Reached

The Board Chair proposed that a small group develop a revised proposal and next steps for budget approval by end of Day Two. And it was requested that recommendations made during the discussion be taken into account and proposal be based on available funding and what may become available later.

RBM Partnership Operating Framework

Presentation Summary

Changes to the Operating Framework and By-Laws included clarification of the EC mandate (non-decision making) and EC Membership, the definition of Board quorum, triggers for voting during a Board Meeting; updates included numbers of Board-members, targets and strategies aligned with GMAP; additional processes included electronic voting, WG chair elections were also presented.

Budget implications USD 15,000 (Southern NGO travel to attend Board meetings)

Board was requested to adopt updated and revised Operating Framework and By-Laws.

Discussion Summary

- Clarification sought on a core function of Secretariat described as “provision of expert advice”;
- Clarity sought on the meaning of “SRNs possess no decision rights”;
- Board members recommended that Working Group (WG) TORs should not be prescriptive but be the decision of the WG itself; members also challenged the proposal that the WHO should be indicated as “de facto” Vice Chair of all WGs and suggested other institutions may have the comparative advantage and therefore be more appropriate candidates;
- Additional queries on the evolving function and name of Working Groups led to lengthy discussion on the way in which WGs are currently hosted and supported :
 - Chair proposed a formal hosting arrangement for WGs whereby individual Partners are empowered to host and support WGs, produce deliverables and be held accountable. Currently this was being undertaken informally by UNICEF with regard to the HWG;
 - Chair asserted that it was necessary to devolve power from the centre and build on the model provided by UNICEF who is the lead partner currently hosting and financing the HWG. The basic principle of giving power away and requesting the Board to share out the WGs to individual Partners was recommended to ensure Partners would take greater responsibility for WGs;
 - The issue of PSC contributions (considered excessive at 13%) to host Partnership mechanisms was cited as a reason for Partners not wanting to fund the Secretariat;
 - Members agreed with the principle of a reasonable degree of decentralization – but cautioned against secession and eroding the viability of the Secretariat and also cautioned that the concept of a lead partner taking responsibility for individual WGs could lead to conflicts of interest;
 - Stressed the need for a harmonized approach and requested clarification on the value added of proposing a more formal hosting arrangement by a lead partner for WGs; also concerned about the perceived lack of neutrality such a move could cause;

- The hosting of a WG is an opportunity to build capacity for that institution and therefore WGs should be hosted in institutions in malaria endemic countries to help develop that capacity;
- If the Board agrees to formalize the lead partner concept then it must be clear that the lead partner is working on behalf of the collective and reports and is accountable to the RBM Board;
- Members expressed concern that the recommendations being proposed were major structural changes and not simply a discussion of Operating Framework amendments and as such had not been tabled appropriately on the meeting agenda to facilitate a fully informed discussion and necessary reflection.
- Members further recommended that the discussion be postponed until the evaluation and a full Pre-read be developed on the issue in the context of an overall Partnership architectural review which would take into account what needs to be enhanced to achieve results.

Response Summary

- WGs issues should be presented in full and included as part of the retreat or the evaluation;
- 13% PSC by WHO should be tabled for review as part of workplan follow-up;
- Expert advice – this term comes from the Change Process and was the value added attributable to the Secretariat - that secretariat staff should possess expert knowledge;
- SRNs – facilitate networks and do not tell partners / countries what to do.

Decisions Reached

Specific amendments and updates in the Operating Framework to be reviewed and modified by small group taking into consideration comments from the meeting including:

- Clarification of Secretariat Functions:
 - Facilitation of Partnership mechanisms to identify problems and facilitate response;
 - Interfacing among Partnership mechanisms (Secretariat, Working Groups, SRNs);
 - Advocacy to ensure malaria remains high on the agenda;
 - Management support to partnership mechanisms;
 - Progress tracking;
 - Topic areas in which the Secretariat will “provide expert advice” need to be clearly identified to avoid duplication and overlap with Partner roles;
 - Language modified to read as "Secretariat will have expert knowledge in order to facilitate effective interfacing/knowledge management and facilitation" of the points above;
- WG Proposed Amendment with regard to prescriptive TORs and designation of WG Vice Chair:
 - Avoid specific provisions or language to be included in WG Terms of Reference;
 - Provide table of contents to ensure key issues are addressed in each Terms of Reference (for example the scope of work of the WG, selection process for chairs, performance criteria for WG leadership, procedures for change or removal of leadership, etc.);
 - WGs must submit TORs to Board for review and approval and can operate on those TORs for a maximum 3 year cycle or more frequently as appropriate
- To amend:
 - "RBM consensus working groups (CMWG, Communication, MERG, MIP, Resources, WIN) on best-practices are always co-chaired by WHO. The WG will elect a second co-chair who is not member of the multilateral constituency. WHO is free to renounce its ex-officio co-chair function by informing the Secretariat in writing";
 - Working Group Architecture & Funding to be reviewed through the External Evaluation and discussed at Board Retreat to be held in first part of 2009;
- Endorsed Board Member participation in EC meetings (removed on a non-voting basis);
- Board Retreat and Evaluation should consider Change Initiative and discussions that have gone on before.
- Financial implications – conditional upon external evaluation. Funds must also be found for Board Retreat (\$200,000);

Next Steps

- Make all modifications requested by the Board in the Operating Framework
- Final Working Group architecture to be determined following external evaluation and proposed Board Retreat in the first part of 2009

External Review & Evaluation

Presentation Summary

An evaluation is required by the World Bank as part of its grant conditions. Estimated costs US\$400,000. Terms of reference have been drafted. Currently limited funds are available to cover the costs of the evaluation. The Secretariat proposes two options to facilitate the evaluation as follows:

- 1 - Funding provided through the Secretariat- selection process and call for tenders according to WHO financial rules;
- 2 - Funding provided through partners - open competitive bidding

Requests Board to approve TORs for independent evaluation and mandate Performance Subcommittee to oversee implementation of evaluation.

Discussion Summary

- Whilst members requested an independent evaluation, following an open tender process to avoid conflict of interest, they were reminded of the time sensitive nature of the evaluation which should have been carried out in 2008;
- Clarification was sought as to period of time during which the evaluation should take place and whether Secretariat would lose funds for 2009 if delivery date exceeded;
- Suggested that tendering process take place outside of UN to speed up the process;
- Members recommended that a forward looking credible comprehensive and quality evaluation be undertaken to serve the entire Partnership which could then be used to secure new funding. Such a process would surpass World Bank deadline.

Decisions Reached

Board approved the first option: An open, competitive tender for a comprehensive, quality evaluation report that serves the whole Partnership and provides both a retrospective and forward-looking analysis of the Partnership and its activities and a request to extend the time period by which it must be completed from the Bank

Financial Implication: Minimum of USD 400,000 to conduct the External Evaluation, including country level case studies

Next Steps

- Terms of References are finalized with support of the Performance Subcommittee;
- Open tender and call for bids announced by the Secretariat no later than January 2009;
- Financiers of the external evaluation to be identified by the Executive Director

Conflict of Interest Policy

Presentation Summary

A MoU was signed with WHO in 2006 which refers to a Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy to provide guidance to the Partnership mechanisms and its Partners. Support for the drafting of the COI was drawn from pro-bono support and WHO legal with additional support from Private Sector Partners. The policy would be applied to all Partners and would concern financial, personal, professional and organizational advancement or gain.

Board requested to endorse the Conflict of Interest Policy & Procedures

Discussion Summary

- Clarification sought on whether the COI applied to individual, institution or constituency;
- COI welcomed and recommended to be applied consistently throughout the Partnership. Its contribution to ensuring greater transparency and accountability was emphasized;
- Members urged not to reinvent the wheel but learn from other partnerships to ensure an appropriate and workable document that can be applied across the Partnership.

Decision Reached

Board approved proposal by Private Sector to postpone the adoption of the Conflict of Interest Policy & Procedures and finalize process by May 2009 Board Meeting to allow for further review and revision of proposed policy and procedures.

Global Fund - Update on Round 8 - AMFm

Presentation Summary & Key Decision Points (see slides annexed)

Described the increase in malaria proposals and in successful malaria proposals submitted and approved by Global Fund especially in Round 8. Emphasized need to improve performance rating for malaria in countries. Outlined the AMFm framework and phased approach being proposed. Call for the RBM Partnership to be member of the AMFm Ad Hoc committee of the Global Fund Board.

Discussion Summary

AMFm

- The Board thanked the Global Fund for accepting to become the manager of the AMFm;
- Work to be carried out to sensitize countries prior to launch of AMFm should not be underestimated. In addition necessary forecasting and implementing services which will support countries will be a substantial undertaking;
- Need to address the issue of local manufacturers in order for AMFm to succeed such as guidance and technical assistance to help them attain prequalification;
- Requested that clear criteria are given for eligibility of countries for 1st and 2nd phases of AMFm;
- Emphasized and applauded role of RBM in nurturing AMFm.

Round 8

- Everyone was congratulated for a successful Round 8 – three times the size of previous rounds;
- Many countries did not qualify for Round 8 and greater support needs to be mobilized to support those countries;
- Emphasized need to respond to UNSG call for universal coverage which will include improved proposals to GF, advancing countries to signature of grants, and greatly accelerate efforts by all partners.

Decisions Reached

The RBM Board welcomes the decision by the 18th Board meeting of the Global Fund to host and manage the Phase 1 of AMFm and accepts the invitation from the Global Fund Board addressed to the RBM Partnership to cooperate actively with the Global Fund and UNITAID for a successful launch and implementation of the AMFm Phase 1 and to become a full member of the AMFm Ad Hoc Committee that will oversee the pre-launch phase of AMFm until the next Global Fund Board. Therefore the Executive Director (or his/her named alternate) has been requested to represent the RBM Partnership in this Committee.

The Board approves that the requested support to the launch and implementation of the AMFm be provided through the jointly coordinated expert streams as indicated by the Global Fund AMFm Policy Framework and relying upon existing RBM mechanisms as recommended by the AMFm Taskforce.

The Board expresses its gratitude to the AMFm Taskforce and the numerous Partners who contributed for their effective work in resolving AMFm implementation challenges and recommends the dissolution of the AMFm Taskforce with immediate effect.

The later decision has been adopted.

Miscellaneous - RBM Forum 2011

Presentation Summary

Members were reminded of the purpose of the Forum and end of 2011 was identified as appropriate opportunity for review of impact and targets achieved. Proposed moving forward to convene a Task Force and to develop terms of reference and rationale for holding a RBM Forum at end of 2011.

Suggested the following actions:

- Each constituency is called to nominate one Task Force representative by email;
- Task Force convenes in first part of 2009 to develop direction, rationale, TORs and reports to 16th Board Meeting in May 2009.

Discussion Summary

- Concerns shared regarding financial viability of Forum and date of Forum (end of 2010 considered more appropriate);
- Board members invited to share any concerns they have regarding Forum with EC.

Decision Reached

The Board approved a Task Force to be convened within one week and tasked to gauge the enthusiasm and interest of Partners to determine how to mobilize resources and how best to decide on date and location.

Next Steps

Task Force to receive inputs from all partners to develop a concept note for submission to the 16th Board responding to the questions:

Miscellaneous - 16th RBM Board

- The venue and date for the 16th RBM Partnership Board was discussed and scheduled tentatively for 13 -14-15 May 2009 in Geneva.

Outstanding Issues from Day Two

Harmonized Work- Plan (HWP 2009)

Decision Points Revised

Board congratulated the Partnership particularly the Secretariat and its Executive Director for mobilizing US\$16.15 million towards 2009 HWP and approves in principle the budget based on available commitments and pledges: US\$5.9million for the Secretariat, US\$4.1 million for the SRNs, and US\$6.15 million for the HWG and MERG. (Note - The other working groups do not yet have or have not yet declared committed funds or pledges).

This approval is subject to the Secretariat facilitating a process involving the Partnership Mechanisms to provide clear targets for each against the defined priorities for 2009. These targets will be used to measure progress and to reallocate the budget, if necessary.

Next steps

The final core and optimal budget and targets should be sent to the EC for review by 1 December 2008. The Secretariat's proposal will be reviewed by the EC and then submitted to the Board for an electronic vote by 12 December 2008 in order to reach agreement to have an approved budget for the start of 2009.

The Board encourages resource mobilization by the Partnership, including the Executive Director, up to the optimal budget and corresponding targets and work plans.

The Board requests the Secretariat to develop a 2-year plan to present to the 16th Partnership Board meeting. The budget should draw on the guidance contained in the GMAP and its priorities and should clearly articulate the targets and outputs and hence budgets for 2010-2011. The plan will be reviewed at the second Board meeting of each year. The Secretariat is encouraged to draw on the expertise of the Board throughout this process and to have sufficient time for review by the Executive Committee in preparation for the Board.

The Board will establish a Finance and Audit Committee of the Board.

The Board asks the EC to consider and put forward a recommendation on the concept of holding a strategic retreat, informed by the findings of the evaluation, in 2009 to review the Partnership's framework, architectural relationships, and relative contributions of Partnership Mechanisms towards the GMAP's priorities.

Discussion Summary

- Partnership Evaluation is now not linked to evaluation of the Partnership architecture which was referred to in the discussion of the WGs;
- The External Evaluation should inform the March Retreat;
- The Finance and Audit Committee is an excellent proposal but clarity is required regarding terms of reference and functions to be reviewed by the EC.

Decisions Points & Next Steps

The Board Chair reviewed all decisions points and next steps for the 2-day meeting.

Adjournment - The Board Chair adjourned the meeting.

RBM Partnership

Annex

Decision Points and Next Steps from the 15th RBM Board meeting.