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<th>Advisory Board Member Voting</th>
<th>Advisory Board Member Observer/Non Voting</th>
<th>APMEN Secretariat Observer/Non Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Dr Krongthong Thimasarn representing Dr Leonard Ortega (WHO SEARO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mika Kontiainen (AusAID)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Maxine Whittaker (University of Queensland – UQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Roly Gosling (University of California, San Francisco – UCSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arna Chancellor* (UQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda Lee* (UQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cara Smith Gueye* (UCSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not APMEN Advisory Board member*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Documentation Presented</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 and Welcome 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 previous APMEN Advisory Board meeting held 14th December, 2011</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Business Arising from the Previous Minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from previous APMEN Advisory Board meeting held 14th December, 2011</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Matters for Consideration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Findings of AusAID Review of the APMEN Establishment Program</td>
<td>AusAID Review Terms of reference</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AusAID Findings report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Framework</td>
<td>AusAID review findings report</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes from previous APMEN Advisory Board meeting held 14th December, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Advocacy Efforts of APMEN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Financing of the Network and Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Governance Issues</td>
<td>APMEN Governance survey 2012</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APMEN Governance document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Work Plan Changes from APMEN IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Review of Arrangements for APMEN Advisory Board Meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>New Country Partner Application</td>
<td>Application from Vietnam for the Asia Pacific Malaria Elimination Network (APMEN)</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Partner status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Development Process for the APMEN 2013 Work Plan, including Country Partner Engagement Opportunities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>For discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Deed of Amendment to Head Contract</td>
<td>Draft Deed of Amendment( if available)</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>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING CHAIR
At the commencement of the meeting, the APMEN Secretariat called for nominations for a Meeting Chair in the absence of an Advisory Board Chair. Prof Dennis Shanks was nominated by Graham Brown and seconded by Dr Rita Kusriaostuti and unanimously voted by the Board Members present to be the Chair of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 1.0: CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
The Advisory Board members confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting, held via teleconference on December 14, 2011.

AGENDA ITEM 2.0: BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES
Agenda Item 3.4 (Findings from the AusAID Midterm Review – Review of the APMEN Establishment Program) from the previous minutes was discussed further. It was noted that throughout discussions during APMEN IV, the Network recognised and acknowledged the need for the broadening of resources for APMEN. It was also noted that a direct call for further Network funding support was made by APMEN Co-Chair, Sir Richard Feachem, during the APMEN IV closing session, with potential funding sources identified.

The Board members agreed that increased acknowledgement of in-kind support to the Network was important to demonstrate current Network funding arrangements and contributions. Linkages and partnerships that arise from APMEN events and supported activities was also raised as an important area to document, in order to explore opportunities that the Network has either directly or indirectly supported to develop.

Country Partner members of the Advisory Board also advised that the suggestion was raised during the APMEN IV Country Partner Business dinner to identify governments of APMEN Country Partners as potential donors.

Recommendation:
The Board members noted the updates and progress on the Agenda Items which arose from the previous Advisory Board meeting as well as the completed business items.

AGENDA ITEM 3.0: MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

3.1 Findings of AusAID midterm review of the APMEN Establishment Program
It was reemphasized that the scope of the AusAID 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 Network activities and technical issues. The importance of an evaluation of the Network initiated
by the APMEN was discussed. AusAID expressed support to this concept and interest in the process and outcomes.

There was a query from the Board on the APMEN/Secretariat response to the review. The Secretariat explained that the Secretariat had had an opportunity to respond to the draft version of the review, which it did in November 2011. These comments were then considered by AusAID prior to the release of the final version of the review findings.

The arrangements and terms of the next AusAID – APMEN/UQ Contract are still being negotiated which will take into account the review findings.

Recommendation:
The Advisory Board noted the developments following the release of the final findings from the AusAID midterm review of the APMEN Establishment Program. The Secretariat will circulate the next Contract document from AusAID once it has been finalised.

3.2 Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

A brief overview of the draft monitoring and evaluation framework which was prepared by the Secretariat was presented and discussed at the APMEN IV meeting. Initial evaluation focus groups were also conducted with Country Partners and Partner Institutions during the APMEN IV meetings. It was noted that during the APMEN IV Business meeting the Network agreed to establish a small Monitoring and Evaluation Working Party, to assist and advise the Secretariat during the evaluation. It was clarified that over the next few months, other key participants such as WHO partners would be involved in this evaluation process.

It was emphasised that the evaluation were being conducted in a tight timeframe and it is anticipated that the evaluation would be completed by the end of 2012 with a report finalised in December. Part-evaluation results aim to be completed by September 2012.

The involvement of AusAID in the Network evaluations was raised. The Secretariat detailed that the draft framework and ideas had been discussed with AusAID as they have expertise in evaluation of aid effectiveness and are also interested in using the APMEN led evaluation for their internal contractual needs, rather than separate evaluations. Through the normal channels of communication with AusAID they would continue to be kept updated on the progress and developments of the Network evaluation progress.

Recommendation:
That the Secretariat prepares an overview of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan including input from all consultations and circulates to the Network for discussion. The Secretariat will also establish a time limited (for duration of the evaluation) APMEN Monitoring and Evaluation Working Party.

3.3 Advocacy efforts of APMEN

Due to the poor telephone connections experienced during the previous Advisory Board meeting which was held via teleconference, the issue of private sector engagement in APMEN was revisited to confirm discussions on managing expressions of interest from private companies to be involved in the Network.
The Secretariat explained that current engagement with the private sector occurs through networks that already have established linkages with the private sector such as Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV). There was general agreement that further engagement with the private sector is worth considering in an effort to identify alternative funding sources for APMEN. The Roll Back Malaria model was raised as a successful example of private sector engagement and also highlighted the importance of developing a clear code of conduct and conflict of interest policy to avoid the risk of the agenda being dictated by private companies. It was suggested that Private Sector participation in APMEN extend so far as having ‘Observer’ status only.

It was pointed out that APMEN currently offers a unique forum in the malaria world where Country Programs and their representatives are not ‘accessed’ by private industry representatives. Other potential issues identified around private sector engagement included how APMEN would review and screen requests from interested private companies and the subsequent resourcing and workload implications in managing this interest.

The Board recognised that Country Partner perspectives and experiences with the private sector could be varied, with some having positive experiences and others being more reluctant to engage.

It was agreed that managing the process of working with the private sector would require a unified approach from the Network and that APMEN would need to ensure that it did not clash with any of its Country Partner’s existing engagement efforts.

The Advisory Board recognised that identifying alternative funding sources for APMEN was a priority area for the second half of 2012 and that engaging the private sector could play an important role in this.

Recommendation:
That the Secretariat investigates potential private sector companies to engage with in an effort to diversify funding arrangements for the Network. That clear guidelines are drafted by the Secretariat prior to any formal engagement with private companies.

3.4 Financing the Network and Activities

Two potential funding streams were recognised, Government agencies and non-Government/private companies, including commercial industry businesses (such as those from pharmaceutical and the mining sector) as well as Philanthropists and Foundations. There was strong support amongst the Board towards the consideration of the governments of APMEN Country Partners, in particular those with stronger economies.

The Board advised that it was important to examine the current funding priority areas and to look at aligning APMEN activities to these.

Discussion occurred on how to raise the profile on elimination and APMEN on the ASEAN agenda. The opening up of economic development corridors (such as Myanmar and other border areas) may assist with increasing interest from ASEAN.
Board members considered what the role could be for APMEN to assist in the ‘trickle-up’ process within Countries, through supporting National Malaria Programs to influence the Ministerial level. It was thought that APMEN could play an important role in assisting with advocacy at the ministerial level, in co-coordinating (multiple) country responses.

Antimalarial drug resistance was identified as an emerging priority in region. It was noted that the ASEAN Health Ministers meeting to be held in July, 2012 in Cambodia is expected to consider this issue. It was also noted that increased political awareness and commitment to responding to malaria and the threat of drug resistance is achievable if the issue could be elevated to, for example, the East-Asia Summit, a meeting of Heads of State/Government which will next occur at the end of November, 2012.

In these discussions there was strong emphasis that the elimination agenda and message should not be lost in the rising issue of drug resistance and that communication strategies should be positive and direct with a focus on achievements and successes with the Network and APMEN Countries. Advisory Board members noted that the importance of working closely with the World Health Organization.

There was a suggestion to develop 2-page business case which notes that the region has being doing well in terms of elimination agenda but that resistance will be a major issue in sustaining the gains made.

Recommendation:
Secretariat to develop by the end of June 2012 draft advocacy tools using clear and simple language and adopting key messages which arose from the APMEN IV meeting. This advocacy tool is to be a two page document for Country Partners to use. Circulate quickly to Advisory Board Country Partner members (Dr Mario Baquilod and Dr Rita Kusriastuti) for prompt feedback and then circulate more broadly for review and comment.

3.5 Governance issues

The Secretariat noted that resolution had been achieved for the presented governance items at the APMEN IV meeting and direction was provided by the Network on how to proceed with these issues.

The process and timeframe for electing the new Advisory Board members was discussed. The timing impact of the proposed change to the composition of the Advisory Board was noted. The recommendation raised at the APMEN Business meeting, to increase the number of Country Partner representatives on the APMEN Advisory Board from 3 to 5, is to be reviewed and endorsed by the Network in early June. Depending on the feedback time for this Governance process change, the call for nominations for the new Advisory Board members is likely to occur by the end of June or early July.

The Board members acknowledged the value and effectiveness of face-to-face meetings. In light of the telecommunication difficulties experienced in the previous two Board teleconference meetings, it was recommended that the next Board meeting, scheduled to occur in approx 6 months time towards the end of 2012, should be face-to-face. It was recommended that this meeting should attempt to coincide with another regional meeting, where some/all Board members will be in attendance to minimize disruption to work schedules and commitments.
A query was raised as to whether any member of the Advisory Board could be eligible to be the Chair of the Board. This was not detailed in the original governance document and could be included in a change to the Standing Orders.

It was noted that the APMEN Business meeting did not support the proposed Past-Chair position, however there was strong support amongst Advisory Board members to establish a Vice-Chair position in the Board.

Discussion ensued regarding how the ex- Network participants and representatives could continue to be involved and share their expertise in elimination within the Network. It was noted that there was no guidance from the Governance document on this. Discussion acknowledged that the experience and knowledge that these participants bring to the APMEN could continue to be highly valuable. It was agreed that in its current form, the Network could not offer financial support to access APMEN activities for past-representatives, unless for example they were invited to an APMEN meeting as a guest speaker or another similar capacity. It was agreed that further discussion and refinement of a past position, or ‘Honorary Member’ was required.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat actions the abovementioned governance changes within the timeframe discussed.

### 3.6 Work Plan Changes from APMEN IV

The Advisory Board noted the changes to the 2012 Work Plan that were proposed and/or voted on during the APMEN IV Business meeting.

In addition to completing the activities that had already commenced for 2012, three priority areas were identified for the remainder of 2012 were Advocacy, Financing and Monitoring and Evaluation. The Secretariat was requested to provide a rough estimate of budget implications of these activities.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat analyse the implications of the changes proposed during the APMEN IV Business Meeting on the 2012 budget and provide these details to the Network for comment and approval by the end of June 2012.

### 3.7 Review of arrangements for APMEN Advisory Board meetings

The arrangements for the next APMEN Advisory Board meeting were discussed in Agenda Item 3.5.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat makes arrangements for the newly elected Advisory Board to meet face-to-face in the last 3-months of 2012 (preferably avoiding the month of December).
3.8 New Country Partner application

The Secretariat announced that it had received an application from Vietnam to become an APMEN Country Partner, just prior to the APMEN IV meeting.

It was re-iterated that the one of the primary criteria for a Country to join APMEN was that it needed a commitment or immediate aspiration to declare elimination on a national or sub-national agenda.

The application from Vietnam was viewed very positively by a number of Board members. It was noted that it was a significant country from a regional and geographical perspective and also important to have Vietnam’s engagement over the critical drug resistance issue. At this early stage in the process, the Board did not foresee any issues Vietnam becoming an APMEN Country Partner.

Discussion then arose around the engagement of current Country Partners in APMEN as it was noted that two countries had been absent from this year’s APMEN meeting. The Secretariat provided further clarification on communications that had been exchanged between these Countries and the timing of invitation circulation was acknowledged as important, to allow for enough processing time for approvals to be gained. The Board expressed support to continuing to reach out to Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

The Secretariat acknowledged the interest expressed by Nepal and India in joining APMEN as new Country Partners as well as the Pasteur Institute in Cambodia on becoming a Partner Institution and will follow up with each Country/Institution in the following months.

The Advisory Board requested that the timing of the Secretariat’s circulation of new membership and Governance issues to the Board and Network be considered as it was preferred that the multiple issues requiring action be combined into one email communication.

Recommendation

That the application from Vietnam to become an APMEN Country Partner be presented to the identified APMEN groups as stated in the governance document for approval to become full APMEN participants in an out-of-session in June, 2012.

3.9 Development Process for the APMEN 2013 Work Plan, including Country Partner Engagement Opportunities

Discussion highlighted that Evaluation process being undertaken in the second half of 2012 will most likely influence the workplan of 2013. A draft workplan will be developed and discussed with Country Partners and the broader Network in the later months of 2012. Potential consultation opportunities will also be identified in the following months.
3.10 Deed of Amendment to Head Contract

The Advisory Board noted that a new contract, from July 1, 2012 – December 31, 2013, is presently in negotiation between UQ and AusAID.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat circulate the new contract document once it has been finalised, to the Advisory Board and Country Partners for noting.

AGENDA ITEM 4.0: GENERAL BUSINESS (BOARD RAISED ISSUES)

4.1 Composition of the Advisory Board

Country Partner members of the Advisory Board noted that a pre-briefing prior to the Business meeting was useful. Further discussion occurred around the proposed increase from 3 to 5 Country Partner representatives to the APMEN Advisory Board which raised in the APMEN Business Meeting. The Board emphasised that Country Partner Advisory Board members need to represent all Country Partners. Distribution of the Country Partner representation was questioned between Countries from the two APMEN-WHO regions and there was a suggestion was that there be 3 members from the WPRO region and 2 from the SEARO region to equally reflect the current representation number of APMEN Country Partners per region. It was also suggested that if membership changed significantly, that this proportion could be reviewed. Some members cautioned the use of mandatory quotas and another suggestion raised was just to have at least 2 representatives from each WHO region.

The Board agreed that no changes should be acted on until the new Advisory Board has been established and the issue could be revisited if raised on the Board agenda after this time.

4.2 Advisory Board members terms

The issue of the number of times an Advisory Board member could sit on the Board was also raised. All Board members agreed that it was beneficial to have some degree of continuity within the Advisory Board and that limiting members to one-term on the Advisory Board may not be as effective. It was decided that due to the new proposed composition of the new Advisory Board, the scenario of an entire new Board being elected would be unlikely and that it was recommended to not proceed further with making any further changes to member’s terms until after the new Board had been established. Following this, a review of the arrangements could be re-evaluated if necessary.

4.3 Working Group participation

Participation in the Vector Control and Vivax Working Groups and invitation process to the annual Working Group meetings was also raised, as there was confusion expressed by some Countries during the meeting over the process of becoming a member of the Working Groups.
Recommendation
That the Secretariat communicates with the Countries who had reportedly expressed concern over membership to the APMEN Working Groups and also follow up the WHO regional offices to seek any further clarification required on expertise areas in APMEN Countries.

AGENDA ITEM 5.0: MATTERS FOR NOTING

Brief discussion occurred on the roles and responsibilities of being an APMEN Advisory Board member. Emphasis was placed on the important need for the Board to continue to manage any risks and actively ask questions and seek clarification from the Secretariat on APMEN matters.

The Advisory Board thanked the Secretariat for their role in organising the meeting.