APMEN
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES
End-year Teleconference

Date: 14 December 2011 (13 December 2011 for USA)

Apologies:
Prof Graham Brown, APMEN Partner Institution: Nossal Institute for Global Health, University of Melbourne
Dr Eva Maria Christophel, WHO WPRO

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Country/City</th>
<th>Advisory Board Member Voting</th>
<th>Advisory Board Member Observer/Non Voting</th>
<th>APMEN Secretariat Observer/Non Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Australia, Brisbane    |                               |                                          | Prof Maxine Whittaker (University of Queensland – UQ)  
|                        |                               |                                          | Arna Chancellor* (UQ)  
|                        |                               |                                          | Amanda Lee* (UQ)  
|                        |                               |                                          | Dr Roly Gosling (University of California, San Francisco – UCSF)  
|                        |                               |                                          | Cara Smith-Gueye* (UCSF) |
| Australia, Canberra    |                               | Mika Kontiainen (AusAID)                 |                                       |
|                        |                               | Kate Snowball (AusAID)                   |                                       |
| Australia, Melbourne   | Prof Graham Brown (APMEN Partner Institution: Nossal Institute for Global Health, University of Melbourne) | |                                        |
| Philippines, Manila    | Dr Mario Baquilod (APMEN Country Partner: Infectious Disease Office, National Center for Disease Prevention & Control, Department of Health, Philippines) | |                                        |
| Indonesia, Jakarta     | Dr Rita Kusriastuti (APMEN Country Partner: Office of Communicable Disease and Environmental Health, Ministry of Health, Republic of Indonesia) | |                                        |
|                        | Dr Siti Nadia Tarmizi (APMEN Country Partner: National Malaria Program Manager, Vector borne Disease control Directorate, Republic of Indonesia) | |                                        |
| Yangon, Myanmar        |                               | Dr Leonard Ortega (WHO SEARO)            |                                        |
| USA, New Jersey        | Prof Dennis Shanks (APMEN Partner Institution: Australian Army Malaria Institute) | |                                        |

*Not APMEN Advisory Board member
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Identify Meeting Chair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Introduction of participants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Meeting logistics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Confirmation of previous meeting minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from meeting held 12th May, 2011</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Business arising from the previous minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from meeting held 12th May, 2011</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Matters for consideration</td>
<td>1) Draft APMEN 2011 Annual Report</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Draft APMEN Vivax Working Group Coordinating Team (Menzies) Annual Report 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) 2011 projected yearend financial statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Draft Annual Report including projected yearend financial</td>
<td>1) Draft 2012 APMEN work plan</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statement and Menzies report</td>
<td>2) 2011 work plan update and 2012 phase I work plan consultation with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network (presented to Country Partner representatives in August and November, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Development of 2012 work plan</td>
<td>1) Terms of Reference</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Report (to be finalised)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Governance issues</td>
<td>Review of the APMEN Governance Procedures</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Findings from AusAID midterm review of the APMEN Establishment</td>
<td>1) Terms of Reference</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>2) Report (to be finalised)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Evaluation of Network</td>
<td>Website links for further reference</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 APMEN IV Themes and planned meeting structure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 Managing expressions of interest to attend APMEN meeting from the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Industry sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>New Country Partner and Partner Institution applications</td>
<td>Application from:</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cambodia (Country Partner)</td>
<td>1) Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sarawak Malaria Centre (Partner Institution)</td>
<td>2) Sarawak Malaria Research Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mahidol Malaria Research Centre (Partner Institution)</td>
<td>3) Mahidol Vivax Research Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Deed of Amendment to Head Contract – costed extension from January to</td>
<td>Deed of Amendment</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>UQ/Menzies contract for renewal December 2011</td>
<td>Agents Agreement (to be finalised)</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>General business (Board raised issues)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Matters for noting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting opened at 12PM AEST

IDENTIFY MEETING CHAIR
The Advisory Board meeting members unanimously voted for Maxine Whittaker to temporarily fill the role of Chair for the meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

MEETING LOGISTICS
As Mika Kontainen needed to leave the meeting early the participants of the meeting agreed to moving items 3.4 and 3.5 to the beginning of the meeting. The meeting was also informed that Kate Snowball would join the meeting when Mika was required to leave and that she would follow up on any queries asked of AusAID if required. The meeting participants were also in agreement that the meeting was to be recorded for the purpose of minute taking and that the recording would be destroyed following the agreement of the final meeting minutes.

APOLOGIES
Apologies were received from Prof Graham Brown, APMEN Advisory Board Member Dr Eva Maria Christophel, APMEN Advisory Board Member

AGENDA ITEM 1.0: CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

The minutes of the 12 May 2011 Advisory Board meeting, were distributed and agreed to by the Advisory Board in January/February 2011.

Recommendation:
That the Advisory Board acknowledges the minutes have been previously agreed to via an email process in June, 2011.

AGENDA ITEM 2.0: BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Recommendation from Agenda Item 3.2.3 (Renewal of APMEN Advisory Board Members) of the previous meeting minutes, requested the APMEN Secretariat to draft and distribute to the Advisory Board the suggestions discussed and proposed for the renewal of the Advisory Board members. This document was to be pre-circulated, reviewed and voted on as part of the Country Partner meeting which was initially planned to occur in December, 2011.

Two factors impacted on the Secretariat not following through on this recommendation. Firstly, the Country Partner meeting proposed for December was instead conducted in August and November, which did not allow the Secretariat enough time to prepare the draft document. Secondly, issues relating to governance procedures arose shortly after the meeting, including the resignation of the Advisory Board Chair, which had a significant impact on these renewal processes. As a result, a decision was made to delay any further action on these matters until further advice was source from the Advisory Board.

These issues have been included for further discussion in Agenda Item 3.3.

Recommendation from Agenda Item 3.3 (Planned AusAID Review of the APMEN Establishment Program) of the previous meeting minutes requested that the Secretariat update the Advisory Board and Network in regards to the planning and processes, including dates and terms of reference, around the AusAID mid-term review.
Recommendation:

AGENDA ITEM 3.0: MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

3.4: FINDINGS FROM THE AUSAID MIDTERM REVIEW OF THE APMEN ESTABLISHMENT PROGRAM

Mika Konttainen, representing AusAID at the meeting, was introduced as the new Director of AusAID’s HIV/AIDS and Disease Prevention and Control. He is also has the policy lead for malaria. The AusAID independent progress review was conducted in October and November by independent consultant, Debra Stevenson. The objective of the review was to assess UQ’s performance and function as Secretariat within APMEN and if the existing funding arrangements were still suitable. The review did not examine the Network activities and technical issues. It is not intended to alterAusAID’s original commitment to funding UQ for APMEN activities for the duration of the present funding agreement – that is up to 2013.

A final draft of the report had just been released to AusAID prior to the meeting which outlined a list of key issues and recommendations for further consideration for the future of the program. The review found that UQ performed very well in the Secretariat and that positive feedback was received from various stakeholders. The significant workload of the Secretariat was also acknowledged. Areas of improvement included ensuring financial sustainability for the Network and development a monitoring and evaluation framework. The report recommended that APMEN as a Network should undertake a review of its own performance and effectiveness, to demonstrate the impact of the Network’s activities on partner governments, policies and programs, which would in turn be useful for gaining future funding support.

As the current funding arrangements between AusAID and UQ has been extended until the 30 June, 2012, there will be a need to negotiate a further funding agreement up to the end of 2013, taking into consideration the review’s recommendations.

The final version of the report will be made available to the Advisory Board and Country Partners from AusAID via the Secretariat in January, 2012.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat develop a discussion paper around the financial sustainability of the Network for pre circulation to the network for discussion as an agenda item at the Business meeting at APMEN IV

3.5: EVALUATION OF NETWORK

Following the recent AusAID review of the UQ Secretariat’s function within APMEN, the need for a broader evaluation of the Network became apparent to examine the Network’s impact within Country Partners and regionally, as well as to assess its ability to reach its activity objectives. AusAID emphasized support for APMEN conducting a broader review of its activities as this may be beneficial in the pursuit of identifying and securing future funding and financial sustainability.

Board members highlighted the importance of the methodology to be utilized for the evaluation to ensure maximum Country Partner engagement in the discussions. Board members also emphasized the strengths of a number of potential approaches to the evaluation, including an independent external review as well as an internal review process, and also proposed the use of a hybrid approach.

Recommendation

That the Secretariat prepare a paper detailing potential approaches to a Network evaluation and circulate to the Country Partner prior to May, for further discussion during the Business Meeting at APMEN IV.
3.1: DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT, INCLUDING PROJECTED YEAREND FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND MENZIES REPORT

The draft APMEN 2011 Annual Report was presented to the Board. It was explained that the report document presented was the contractual reporting requirement from AusAID and provided a narrative summary to APMEN’s 2011 activities and outputs. An extended version of the annual report (in matrix format), detailing all of APMEN’s activities and outputs in 2011 will also be forwarded to Country Partners in a draft document with the annual report.

A number of Advisory Board members requested additional time to review the report and supporting papers and that the documents should be circulated to the meeting participants in more advanced time. It was agreed that the Advisory Board members could continue to review the papers in the following week and forward any additional feedback or comments to the Secretariat by Thursday, 22 December.

A query from the Board arose around the separate Vivax Working Group report provided and the absence of individual reports from other APMEN Working Groups and Committees. The Secretariat explained that a separate Vivax Working Group annual report was provided as it was a contractual requirement with Menzies School of Health Research. Feedback and comments from consultations with other working groups and committees were integrated into the APMEN annual report in addition to highlights from the Vivax Working Group report.

A board member requested further clarification around the issue of increased interest in the Network. It was agreed that a more detailed explanation on what the challenges of increased interest in APMEN were and the impacts of this upon the Network’s operations, would be included in a revised draft of the annual report presented to the Network.

Recommendations
That the Advisory Board members raise any concerns or feedback from the Draft APMEN Annual Report presented to the Secretariat by Thursday, 22 December. The Secretariat to then integrate any edits received to the report for circulation to the Country Partners in early January, 2012 for review and endorsement.

That the Secretariat provides a more detailed explanation in the annual report on the benefits and challenges of increased interest in APMEN and the impacts of this upon the Network’s operations in 2011.

3.2: DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2012 WORK PLAN

The 2012 work plan was developed from a combination of APMEN Country Partner consultation meetings which took place in August and November 2011 and with additional feedback and comments from the Working Groups and the various workshops and forums which occurred within the Network since APMEN III (including GIS training course, Vivax Working Group planning meeting, Vector Control Working Group sub-committee meeting, Community Engagement Workshop).

There was a query from the Board over the identification on some collaborating partners in the Vivax section while other partnerships were not recognized. It was agreed that the list should not appear limited and specific and that other appropriate collaborating partners should be made more explicit. The Secretariat agreed to raise these issues with the Vivax Working Group Coordinating Team.

At this point, Dr Rita Kusriastuti departed the meeting due to other commitments and Dr Siti Nadia Tarmizi joined as replacement.

A Board member queried the research activities. It was clarified that the outlined research activities in the
work plan was not a final list and just represented ones that had already been identified. Additional research activities in 2012 may arise from the topics submitted in the Research Grant round or from the Vivax Working Group meeting in May, 2012.

One Board member raised the greater need to share success stories between countries in the region at a political level.

The Secretariat agreed to the advice given by the Board to develop an advocacy plan incorporating the issues discussed during the meeting to circulate to Country Partners prior to May for further discussion at APMEN IV.

A discussion on the planned advocacy activity of facilitating a high level meeting in May 2012 was seen as a very worthwhile initiative but one with many challenges. There is a potential opportunity for APMEN to advocate with WHO and Ministries of Health during /coinciding with the (South East Asian) Regional Committee Meeting in September/October (TBC) in Indonesia, 2012. The Secretariat agreed to continue discussions on developing this further with APMEN WHO representatives.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat adopts the changes and edits proposed during the Advisory Board meeting and then circulate to the Country Partners for review, comment and endorsement in early January, 2012.

3.3: GOVERNANCE ISSUES

3.3.1 The first governance issue raised and discussed was the identification of the Country Partner representatives within APMEN. As a number of founding Country Partner representatives have moved on from their previous positions, it became apparent that the existing governance document did not specify the process to correctly identify the current National Malaria Control Program manager and second representative.

All Advisory Board meeting members agreed that a formal letter from the APMEN Secretariat to the Ministries of Health seeking nomination/clarification on the representatives in each Country would be the most appropriate method. As this process would be a sensitive one, another suggestion proposed was to identify if countries have a country coordination mechanism in place to also select representatives, however not all APMEN countries are eligible for Global Fund funding (in the past or since the December 2011 changes), and so this may not be appropriate.

3.3.2 Voting process for the next round of Board members: It was noted that the new Board needed to be constituted in 2012. Issues that arise in this process are:

- Making clear the process of electing a Chair
- Naming of the country partner representatives for the voting process for the Board Members (as per the Partner Institutions representatives, and not, as was the process in the first voting round, country name only);

Due to the complexity and importance of some aspects of the governance issues raised and the poor phone connections with many of the Advisory Board meeting participants at this point, it was agreed that individual phone contact would be made shortly following the meeting with available meeting participants, to follow up and discuss these issues, including others not yet reviewed, further in more detail. Feedback from these individual consultations would then be incorporated into the proposed governance document changes and re-circulated to the Advisory Board for final review prior to circulation to the Country Partners for review and endorsement.

(At the time of circulation of these minutes not all Board members had been available for discussion).
3.3.2 The second governance issue reviewed was the membership process of the APMEN Working Groups. It was highlighted that there is currently different membership rules for each of the Vivax and Vector Working Groups. The different rules of membership for each working group posed the potential for confusion around funding for attendance to meetings as well as a lack of clarity on membership processes, such as when an individual changes jobs and organisations. All Board members agreed that the appropriate technical person (e.g. Case management for the Vivax and vector control for the vector working groups, and not necessarily the APMEN country representative are the appropriate nominees, and that it does not need to be the same for each working group.

**Recommendation**

That the Secretariat sends a letter to the relevant Ministries of Health of each country partner to identify the Country Partner representatives.

That Maxine Whittaker contact each Board member personally by telephone as soon as possible to discuss the Governance issues (noted above) about country representatives and Board membership.

**3.6: APMEN IV THEMES AND PLANNED MEETING STRUCTURE**

There was discussion around the possible themes for APMEN IV. All Advisory Board meeting participants agreed that Country Partner updates were still useful and important to the agenda. There was a suggestion for the Business meeting to be moved earlier in the agenda, rather than as on the last day, to allow consultations and discussions on APMEN Business items to occur throughout the meeting. Board members also agreed that an agenda item allowing a more challenging discussion or debate may be beneficial to stimulate ideas and actions. Other suggestions for themes and agenda items included:

- surveillance and mobile populations,
- chemotherapy
- micro stratification and
- APMEN Partner Institution updates.

**Recommendation**

That the Secretariat develop a draft APMEN IV program and a summary paper and circulate to the Country Partners, Advisory Board and APMEN participants in early 2012 for further discussion and agreement.

**3.7: MANAGING EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST TO ATTEND APMEN MEETING FROM THE PRIVATE/INDUSTRY SECTOR**

Due to the poor phone connections with many of the Advisory Board meeting participants and complexity of the agenda item, it was agreed that individual phone contact would be made by the Secretariat shortly following the meeting with available meeting participants, to follow up and discuss agenda item 3.7 further in more detail. (for details of the topic, see the pre-circulated materials)

At the time of circulation of these minutes not all Board members had been available for discussion

**Recommendation**

Maxine Whittaker to continue to seek advice from the Board on the aforementioned item.
3.8: NEW COUNTRY PARTNER AND PARTNER INSTITUTION APPLICATIONS

During the first half of 2011, an application to become an APMEN Country Partner was received by the APMEN Secretariat from Cambodia. In addition applications from the Sarawak Malaria Centre, Malaysia and Mahidol Vivax Research Centre, Thailand to become APMEN Partner Institutions were received. In line with the APMEN Governance processes, the APMEN Secretariat prepared an analysis of the implications for each of the three applications to the APMEN work plan, budget and other resources. Following consultation with the Advisory Board, the APMEN Secretariat will present the applications to the Country Partners for voting in 2012, which pending the outcome of the vote, may allow the new participants to fully participate in APMEN IV and the 2012 APMEN work plan.

Discussion occurred around the situation when a department or sub-group of a larger organisation applies to participate in APMEN and the consequences if its encompassing organisation also requests to join. It was proposed that if a department of a broader organisation applies, then participation may be conditional and subject to change if the parent organisation wishes to directly participate in APMEN.

Recommendation
That prior to APMEN IV, the Secretariat presents the APMEN Country Partner application from Cambodia to the Country Partners for an email out-of-session vote; and the APMEN Partner Institution applications from the Sarawak Malaria Centre and Mahidol Vivax Research Centre to both the Country Partners and Partner Institutions for an email out-of-session vote, with the aforementioned caveat.

3.9: DEED OF AMENDMENT TO HEAD CONTRACT – COSTED EXTENSION FROM JANUARY TO JUNE, 2012

The current APMEN head contract with AusAID was due for completion in June 2011. A midterm program review was to be conducted before continuation of the committed AusAID funds occur. As this impacted on the network’s activities and as the review format and timeframes had not been secured a no cost extension was granted from June to December, 2011. This was approved following an analysis of the financial implications determined that Network activities could be completed within the remaining funds. An additional costed extension was secured in November 2011 for the period January to June, 2012.

Recommendation
That the Deed of Amendment to the AusAID Head Contract be circulated by the Secretariat to Country Partners in early 2012.

3.10: UQ/Menzies Contract for Renewal December 2011

On the first December 2010 an agreement was finally signed between UQ and Menzies Institute of Health Research Darwin as a subcontracting arrangement for services related to the Vivax working group and research program. A new extension was signed in 2011 for the duration of the no cost extension of the APMEN AusAID contract. This contract termination will occur in December 2011.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat aligns the Agents Agreement UQ Menzies with the costed extension for the APMEN Establishment program and extend the contract until June 2012.

GENERAL BUSINESS (BOARD RAISED ISSUES)

MATTERS FOR NOTING
Due to the very poor quality of phone connectivity with many of the meeting participants, the Secretariat
will undertake a more comprehensive costing for a face-to-face meeting for the next End-Year Advisory Board meeting in 2012, considering a strategic and appropriate timing and location to meet.

NEXT MEETING
APMEN IV, Seoul, Republic of Korea.