

RBM Executive Committee Conference Call Minutes

August 5, 2009

Participants: Alan Court (Special Envoy's office), Hiro Nakatani (WHO), Uzo Gilpin (NGO), Kate Taylor (Private Sector), Awa Coll-Seck (RBM Secretariat), David Brandling-Bennett (Foundations), Renee Vandeweerd (UNICEF), Mickey Chopra (UNICEF), Robert Newman, (WHO/GMP), John Paul Clark (World Bank), Maryse Pierre-Louis (World Bank); Rick Steketee (MERG), Tom Achoki (Private Sector), Kapembwa Simbao (RBM Chair).

Hiro Nakatani of WHO introduced Robert Newman, the new Director of the Global Malaria Programme. Renee Van de Weerd introduced Mickey Chopra, who is replacing Peter Salama as chief of Health at UNICEF headquarters. Matt Lynch introduced Rick Steketee of MACEPA and Co-Chair of the MERG who served as a resource for the discussion of the Oversight Committee agenda item. Matt Lynch also reported that Tim Ziemer and Bernard Nahlen were unable to make this call due to a rescheduled urgent meeting and travel, respectively.

Adoption of EC Teleconference Agenda: The Agenda was adopted with an addition to the agenda item on the Board Retreat. The discussion item will include participants for the retreat.

Adoption of July 1 EC Teleconference Minutes: one issue was raised on the July 1 minutes. The Private Sector delegation is concerned that the role of WHO be emphasized along with the RBM Working Groups mentioned, the WIN and Case Management Working Groups, in the "resistance strategy" discussion process and that the strategy developed should be a comprehensive one. With that addition noted, the Minutes were approved.

Communication/Coordination Strategy for Global Partnerships' Global Fund Board Seat: The EC expressed its appreciation of the work of the Secretariat in preparing the pre-read presentation and emphasized the importance of this issue for the RBM Partnership.

Three key issues were discussed: (1) the burden of managing the communication necessary; (2) coordination within the RBM partnership at both Board meeting level and, even more challenging, at the Committee discussion level, and (3) coordination between the three partnerships sharing the joint seat.

Burden of Coordination: David Brandling-Bennett mentioned two concerns to consider: some members of EC and RBM board are also on Global Fund board—we will need consistent views from those institutions, so there will need to be communication within Partner institutions to coordinate positions. Second, Global Fund timeframes are generally quite short for reviewing documentation and providing feedback. He expressed concern that the proposed process may not be very feasible within that timeframe, particularly for committee issues.

This concern was reinforced by Hiro Nakatani, who stated that Global Fund documents are often coming at last minute, bombarding WHO with a lot of work. WHO has a full-time person just to manage the Global Fund Board task. WHO shares communications, documents and summaries with RBM Secretariat and Stop TB, and Dr. Nakatani offered to continue to do so in the future.

Kate Taylor expressed the Private Sector delegation's opinion that the EC is the right body to be involved in strategy for the joint seat. There are many overlapping circles in partners' memberships of the two boards. Because of the need for internal Partner consistency and this large overlap, in fact there should be relatively few instances where RBM will have to actively establish consensus, this should be a process which can be steered with a relatively light touch. However, the Private Sector feels the Board needs to know from the Secretariat the budgetary and staff implications to manage this communication and coordination task. She also pointed out that there are significant opportunity costs of taking on the burden of the Global Fund Board participation without adding additional capacity to the Secretariat staff.

Awa Coll-Seck reported that the cost of a mid-level staff person qualified to manage this function would likely cost \$130,000 per year, based in Geneva. This cost is not currently included in either the core or any other Secretariat budget.

Board level coordination issues: Matt Lynch is concerned that there are few channels for malaria-specific input into Global Fund Board discussions, giving as an example the Northern NGO delegation which is entirely made up of HIV activists. Thus, even though there are overlapping Board seats by RBM Partners, the emphasis is often on HIV issues, not malaria. This reinforces the importance of the joint Partnerships seat and RBM's input into that joint position.

Uzo Gilpin reported that the Civil Society Board members on various boards (RBM, GFATM, UNITAID and Stop TB) are meeting in late August/early September to discuss more effective representation and coordination of positions. We anticipate this will be a useful process for strengthening RBM's voice within these Boards.

Allen Court expressed thanks to WHO for the offered help in sharing documents and summaries, and suggested that the Executive Committee agenda include a session on Global Fund issues in one call close before Global Fund Board meetings. He suggested the pre-reads for that call include a summary at high level with specific information.

Committee Coordination issues: The Global Fund Board is preceded by the PSC meeting, which is also very important. The Harmonization Working Group has proposed to take the RBM Partnership lead on the Program Implementation Committee, and thus will also need to

develop and implement a similar coordination system to ensure appropriate consensus in their communications to that committee.

The challenges to coordinating positions for committee level discussions are many, including short time frames, multiple partners on committees, and complex issues. Several members supported a suggestion that designating individuals with specific interests to serve as subcommittees for coordinating responses to specific issue areas, such as commodities, AMFm, etc could be helpful. [Note: Tim Ziemer in email communications has flagged communication issues around the AMFm Ad Hoc committee as a particular area of concern which the EC should address as part of this discussion, including how Secretariat focal persons represent RBM Partnership positions. Since Tim is not available for this call, this should be placed on the agenda for the next call.]

Joint Board Seat Coordination issues (between 3 Partnerships): Similar challenges exist in negotiating a common position with our joint seat-holders. Awa Coll-Seck pointed out that the discussions with the other Partnerships so far have designated lead roles for specific partners on the Board and for specific committees. She agreed with David and others that the time constraints are difficult, with little time to discuss. If we don't have time to respond, maybe if EC can decide if it is issue of commodities, ask someone, and get a response within 24 hrs.

Hiro Nakatani requested more information on how discussion and negotiation will be addressed when two of the partnerships respond differently.

Matt Lynch pointed out that the options shown on slide #2 are not mutually exclusive, and the optimal process may include combination of options, stratified by the different levels (Board, Committee). Sub-groups could be organized with specific interests and delegated responsibility to speed response. It would be helpful to do a mapping exercise, map out overlap of constituencies on RBM board and Global Fund board—to find gaps where malaria may not be represented (as in the Northern NGO delegation). He suggested stratifying mechanisms for responses to help clarify structures. Our strategy needs to be in place by early September at latest, given PSC meeting on September 23-25 in Geneva.

Decisions/Next Steps: Matt Lynch will write up a rough draft of a stratified approach and circulate a revised document for one round of electronic consultation from the EC.

The Secretariat will prepare a table or chart mapping the overlapping memberships of RBM Partners with the Global Fund Board.

The EC will recommend to the Board that the Secretariat be requested to allocate staff and budget to the GF Board seat coordination function, as part of its package of recommendations regarding the Global Fund Board seat.

The EC will have a final discussion on this issue at the next EC call.

Oversight Committee

Matt Lynch opened this discussion by briefly reviewing the phone call held with members of the Oversight Committee. The purpose and vision for the oversight committee is that it is intended to guide a process of communication and collaboration between partners through a series of reports leading up to some high-level events in 2011 which will officially announce the results of the Partnership's efforts to reach the 2010 targets. This process has been extensively discussed by both the MERG and the MAWG working groups, which will be more intensively involved directly with partners in organizing details of the reports and events; the oversight committee is meant to ensure the process flows smoothly. Role of oversight committee is meant to be "light-touch", not involved in details.

Rick Steketee gave a brief summary of the MERG discussion at their June meeting in which UNICEF was designated the lead partner for the data and analysis to feed into the report process, and at which a number of reports were identified for coordination efforts. These reports include partner reports such as the annual WHO World Malaria Report, and some being proposed as new reports, such as a quarterly summary of progress proposed by the Special Envoy's office and data needed for statements or press releases around key events such as World Malaria Day 2010 and 2011.

The pre-read document for this agenda item was somewhat confusing to some, who found the addition of the information from the MERG meeting made it hard to differentiate between what was being handled by the working groups and what would be the responsibility of the Oversight Committee.

In addition, Maryse Pierre-Louis pointed out that the TORs should be revised to include specific terms of reference for the chairs of the committee, including the anticipated level of effort required, prior to their nomination/election.

Hiro Nakatani stated that although WHO had not responded to the email, WHO is very interested in this work and would be engaged in the work of the Committee. He suggested that the work of the Oversight Committee be added to the RBM Board Retreat agenda.

Awa Coll-Seck pointed out that the Endemic Countries constituency also was not on the call and from her conversations with Ministers at a meeting in West Africa, there was strong interest from them, in particular from the Minister of Health of Nigeria, in participating.

David Brandling-Bennett asked about the timing for the report, as September 2011 seems quite late to be reporting on targets for December 31, 2010. There will be expectations that results should be announced on World Malaria Day 2011. Matt Lynch said that this issue had been discussed at the MERG meeting, and that while all agreed that it would be ideal to have results by April, there was a question of data management and analytical capacity to process the 2010 survey data and have results available that quickly. If partners could contribute towards adding a person or persons to the UNICEF M&E team, that might speed the process along significantly. This is particularly important given the nature of both working groups, in that they are composed of volunteers with full-time “day jobs”, and not a lot of free time.

Rick Steketee pointed out that it would be ideal to have a common format, including style, color etc for the reports being issued over the next two years so that readers are aware that this is an ongoing process. There was quite strong interest at the MERG meeting in providing quality work. The table produced still needs to be more detailed on budget required. All agreed on the absolute need for communication so that all partners are comfortable with direction process is headed and quality of work. The Oversight Committee will need to stay attentive to critical communication issues.

Maryse Pierre-Louis stated that she had heard reports that there would be an event organized by the Special Envoy’s office at the Sept 2009 UN assembly and asked what the role of that event was vis-à-vis the reporting process under the Oversight Committee.

Alan Court responded saying that African heads of state are working on that, and plan to announce an alliance against malaria. The September 2009 event does not deal with announcing results. The Results High-level Event being discussed under the Oversight Committee is planned for UN General Assembly meeting in 2011.

Decision/Next Steps:

Matt Lynch will draft an email to be sent to the Board, including WHO and the Endemic Country constituency, extending the deadline for nominations for the chairs of the Oversight Committee, and including the TORs presented for the Committee, but also including draft TORs for the chairs, including the level of effort expected.

The Secretariat is also preparing a communication on the process, which will be coordinated with Matt’s email by the Secretariat.

Dates for the 17th Board meeting:

Thomas Teuscher informed the EC that the Board in an electronic vote has approved the 3-5th of December for the next Board meeting. The meeting will be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The only schedule conflict was that France's ambassador will not be able to make those dates, but we expect France will have someone there to represent them.

Kate Taylor expressed the Private Sector's concern that December is very late date vis-à-vis the RBM budget. This will not leave a lot of time for budget planning. She expressed the Private Sector's hope that the Secretariat can manage their budget planning so that it's ready in time, as there will not be time for Board feedback.

Awa Coll-Seck responded, proposing we have an electronic Board vote to agree to budget beforehand, or at least have it almost completed.

Board Retreat Planning:

Awa Coll-Seck presented the proposed objectives for the retreat:

- 1) Review of the findings of the External Independent Evaluation;
- 2) Identify implications for the 2010-2011 RBM Partnership Workplan and budgets;
- 3) Agree on the final recommendations by External Independent Evaluation for use in World Bank evaluation report.

External Evaluation review: John Paul Clark noted that the wording for objective 3 needs to be changed, to remove any implication that the RBM Board is agreeing to, or approving the recommendations of the External Independent Evaluation, as that would imply limiting its independence, and defeat the point of the evaluation from the World Bank's point of view. The EC after brief discussion agreed that the purpose of that objective is to allow the RBM Board to provide feedback to the external evaluators on their observations and recommendations, but not to approve or disapprove their recommendations.

Priority topics: The EC discussion also highlighted that the top priority for the retreat needed to be ensuring that the External Independent Evaluation report be submitted on time to the World Bank. Second priority is discussing how the recommendations will impact the 2010-2011 Partnership workplan, budget and structures. If time allows, discussion of the Oversight Committee and reporting/high level event coordination process would be very useful, but this

could also be done via the Oversight Committee and electronic communication, as there is still a fair amount of time between now and 2011.

Participants and Budget: A number of members expressed concern that 50 participants was a lot, and would make it difficult to have substantive discussion. The suggestion was made to try and reduce the number. After some discussion, it was agreed that the first day should be limited to Board members only, for discussion and feedback to the External Evaluation team. The second day would be opened to Working Group chairs and SRN focal points to ensure the discussion of implications for the workplan, budget and structures was inclusive of those mechanisms.

Awa Coll-Seck presented the Secretariat's suggestion that a professional facilitator be hired for the retreat, as with the large group it will be quite complex to ensure adequate discussion. Alan Court asked about the budget for the retreat, expressing the concern that the cost of the retreat should not reduce the Secretariat's cash flow situation and thus inhibit key activities in the third Quarter. Awa stated that the funds were sufficient for a facilitator. Hiro Nakatani suggested that it may be possible to find a skilled facilitator among the UN agency partners, at lower cost.

In addition, Alan Court suggested that a draft of the 2010-2011 workplan, in whatever form it is available at that point, be circulated prior to the retreat to facilitate informed discussion.

Decisions/Next Steps:

Secretariat will re-word the 3rd Objective for the retreat

Secretariat will circulate the best available draft of the 2010-2011 Workplan and Budget to all Board members prior to the retreat.

Secretariat will circulate a full copy of the External Independent Evaluation report to all Board members as a pre-read for the retreat

Draft Board Agenda for 17th Board Meeting:

This agenda item was postponed due to lack of time, the EC requested an email be circulated asking for input into the agenda prior to the next EC call.

Decision/Next Steps: The Secretariat is requested to circulate an email to all EC members requesting feedback on agenda items for the 17th Board meeting prior to the August 26 EC teleconference.

Conflict of Interest Policy update:

The EC was pleased that a major step forward had been made in the negotiations with WHO on the Conflict of Interest policy. The revised document from WHO has essentially removed the section g which was a major sticking point. Kate Taylor expressed the private Sector delegations pleasure at that advance, but noted continuing concern about a sentence in pg. 2 paragraph 4 :

The Partnership is not a separate legal entity, for which WHO provides such status. WHO hosts the RBM Partnership Secretariat and administrative and fiduciary support for the Partnership. The hosting arrangement enables the Partnership to make optimal use of its resources to fulfill its mission; it provides an accountability framework which ensures safeguards and due diligence in the management of the partnership resources and activities. In line herewith, the activities of the partnership must be in accordance with the WHO Constitution and WHO Rules.

The wording of the final sentence appears to give WHO carte-blanche with respect to making changes in rules and regulations. The Private Sector feels this reflects a confusion between the Secretariat, which is housed within WHO, and the RBM Partnership which is quite different. The Private Sector Delegation suggests that this sentence should be stricken out.

Decision/Next Steps: The EC requests Julian Fleet on his return to raise the issue of the sentence in question with the appropriate person at WHO to see if it can be struck out or modified.

Finance committee report:

Alan Court presented the report of the Finance Committee for the second quarter. He presented three recommendations:

Quarterly estimates of expenditures need to be more precise, it is not sufficient to equally divide the annual budget by four.

The Secretariat should monitor the variance between the shadow system data and the GSM closing data and report that variance back to the Finance Committee regularly.

The shortfall between expected income and actual income in Quarter 2 is alarming, and the Board members representing the constituencies involved are requested to follow up with their

delegations and report back to the Secretariat via the EC Chair on confirmation of those contributions and their expected transfer dates.

In addition, the Finance committee shared its pleasure with the progress made by the Secretariat in terms of financial reporting, including the development of a cash-flow template which we hope to see in operation for the next quarterly report.

Kate Taylor asked about the rescheduling of contributions from Quarter 2 to Quarter 3, and those are shown in the table on the first page of the pre-read titled "Note to the Financial Report Q2. Chair Simbao requested clarification on the apparent lack of spending, particularly for activities by the Secretariat. Alan Court explained that the implications of the delayed contributions for the Secretariat cash flow are severe, and account for some of the underspending which appears in the financial report.

David Brandling-Bennett explained that the Gates Foundation can only disperse money once they receive annual report, and requested that he receive a copy once the Secretariat sends it in so that he can follow up on the process.

Alan Court also mentioned that the slow roll-out of the WO GSM system means that the monthly books are very slow to close and this will continue for another 2 years. Thus the Secretariat needs to continue to run a shadow system to be able to compare monthly and annual figures and track variance.

Decisions/Next Steps:

Matt Lynch will follow up with the OECD Board member on the status of contributions from USAID and France.

David Brandling-Bennett requested the Secretariat to send their annual report to him, so that he can follow up on the Gates Foundation funding. He will also contact UN Foundation regarding their contribution.

The EC approved the Financial Report and recommendations to be forwarded to the Board

Any Other Business: Awa Coll-Seck will circulate a document regarding a recent project which uses SMS to report drug stockouts, in collaboration with Novartis and Vodafone. The EC welcomed the information.

Next EC Teleconference Date: the next EC teleconference will be held on August 26th. The EC agreed that the proposed Sept 9th call be canceled.

Matt Lynch committed to having the EC call minutes circulated by Friday.