## APMEN IV

### Business Meeting Minutes

**JW Marriott, Seoul, Republic of Korea**  
**Thursday, May 10, 2012**

### AGENDA

**Thursday, May 10, 9:30AM – 11:45AM**  
**Session 16: APMEN BUSINESS MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>TIME AND SESSION</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.0 | Order of the meeting, process and outcomes | Dr Mario Baquilod  
Dr Rita Kusriastuti | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 2.0 | Minutes of the last meeting | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 3.0 | Business arising from last meeting  
Independent review | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 4.0 | Results of Survey on governance issues | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 5.0 | Evaluation of the network | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 6.0 | Review of Workplan | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 7.0 | Election of Co-chairs | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |
| 8.0 | Any other business:  
8.1 Location and themes for APMEN IV: 2013  
8.2 Increase to Country Partner representation on the APMEN Advisory Board  
8.3 Remaining Governance issues | | Professor Maxine Whittaker  
Dr Roly Gosling |

**Country Partners present (one vote per Country):** Bhutan, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Solomon Islands and Thailand.

**Apologies:** Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Vanuatu
### 1.0 Order of the meeting, process and outcomes

The APMEN Co-Coordinators explained that as per the current APMEN Governance process, all meeting attendees were welcome to be present for the APMEN Business meeting but that the voting process would need to follow the APMEN Governance procedures. It was further reiterated that the voting process was one vote per Country (or Institution, if applicable) and that each voting constituent would need to indicate agreement using the blue cards (Yes) and orange cards were to be used to indicate disagreement (No). Abstentions are possible and will also be counted and recorded.

Country Partners informed the Business Meeting that they had met last night to consider the agenda and had nominated a spokesperson from their group, Dr Gawrie Galappaththy. The meeting noted that discussion was still welcomed within this meeting by all Country representatives. There was a call for any other business items and no items were offered at this stage.

*No further comments or voting occurred.*

### 2.0 Minutes of the last meeting

It was noted that the previous minutes had been circulated and agreed to by the Network and were subsequently made available on the APMEN website following last year’s meeting.

*No further comments or voting occurred.*

### 3.0 Business arising from last meeting: AusAID Independent review

The final findings from the AusAID Independent review of APMEN, conducted in October/November 2011, was uploaded onto the APMEN website and copies were distributed and made available on each table of participants during the this meeting. It was clarified that the review was not of APMEN program activities but of the University of Queensland’s performance (management and operations) in providing Secretariat functions and the effectiveness of the existing funding mechanism. The report evaluation criteria included; Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability, Gender Equality, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Analysis and Learning. It was reported that overall the review was positive and it made note of key issues and recommendations to be addressed for future programs.

*No further comments or voting occurred.*

### 4.0 Results of survey on governance issues

The APMEN governance survey results were presented. The Survey was sent out to the 11 Country Partners (Cambodia not a Country Partner at this stage) using the online Survey Monkey tool as well as in an email attachment. Three Country Partners had not responded to date.

An overview of the proposals which were **passed by majority agreement** was presented namely:

a. That the APMEN Secretariat send a formal letter to the respective Ministries of Health seeking nomination/clarification on the 2 APMEN representatives from each Country Partner on an annual basis.

b. That the APMEN Secretariat sends a formal letter to the APMEN Partner Institution’s seeking nomination/clarification of their representative within APMEN on a yearly basis.
c. As APMEN funding is only guaranteed until the end of 2013, the APMEN Advisory Board positions will be voted on in March 2012 via an email vote and the incumbent Advisory Board members will serve until December 2013 instead of the normal 2 year term.

d. In order to increase transparency in the voting process for Advisory Board members, the names and positions of each Country Partner representative will be made available at the time of voting. It will then be the discretion of the respective National Malaria Country Program’s from the nominated countries as to the individual chosen to be the representative on the Advisory Board.

e. If a vacancy occurs on the Advisory Board then the relevant Country Program or Partner institution is to nominate an incumbent who will then formally assume the Board position until the next scheduled voting round.

f. In the event of the resignation of the Advisory Board member in the Chair position, the 4 remaining voting Advisory Board members, in addition to the new incumbent, will vote for a new Chair as per the agreed guidelines for the election of Chair.

g. That the Chair of the Advisory Board be elected by the Advisory Board members by email vote or at their first Board meeting (dependant on timing) as the first Agenda Item of that meeting. The voting process for the Advisory Board Chair are as follows:
   i. That all voting Advisory Board members are eligible to vote for the Chair position.
   ii. That the Chair is elected by majority vote.
   iii. That the incoming Chair (of the new Advisory Board) will remain in the position until end December 2013.

h. The APMEN Advisory Board Standing Orders were agreed to.

There were two proposed governance changes which had remained unresolved from the survey and which required further clarification and discussion.

The first proposal discussed was: “That there is no limit on the number of times a Country Partner representative who is a Board member can be voted as Chair”. This proposal was revised based on feedback received from the survey and subsequently replaced with a new following proposal at the Business Meeting: “There should be a limit of 2 terms (of 2 years each) or a maximum of 4 years. “

Further discussion ensued amongst the Country Partners and the proposal was further refined to a limit of 1 term (of 2 years) for a Country Partner representative on the Advisory Board, to be voted as Advisory Board Chair.

Revised Recommendation:  
That there should be a limit of 1 terms (of 2 years) that a Country Partner representative who is a Board member can be voted as Chair .

Passed unanimously.

The second proposal requiring further discussion was “That a new past chair position was created for APMEN Advisory Board”. Based on further feedback received from the survey, this proposal was amended.

Revised Recommendation:  
That the Advisory Board position of the Past Chair is created if the ‘past’ chair remains as a Country Partner representative within APMEN.
Recommendation not passed.

It was noted that the passed amendments will now be incorporated into revised governance documents.

5.0. Evaluation of the network

The Secretariat proposed to the Network at the meeting, that it was timely – at the mid-term, to evaluate ourselves. It was proposed that the goals of the evaluation will be quality improvement, and informing strategy and resource planning. The focus of the evaluation should be how APMEN is functioning as a Network and not examine the Network’s direct impact on malaria. It was proposed that the evaluation involve both qualitative and quantitative components. The proposed groups consulted should include Country Partners, Partner Institutions (as defined in the APMEN Governance documents) and other Partner Organisations (including the WHO who are defined as an Observer Institution)). It was suggested that there will be use of both internal and some external evaluators and that the evaluation results will aim to inform the Network as it transitions from an establishment to consolidation period over the next few years.

The Country Partners noted that they had discussed the evaluation during their evening meeting. They agreed that it would be appropriate to have a mixed group of evaluators and a combination of methodological approaches (including both qualitative and quantitative). It was also deemed important that there was a need to work at improving collaboration with APMEN Partner Institutions, observer’s organisations and other Network partners.

The APMEN Co-coordinators suggested the formation of an Evaluation Working Party that would be made up of a small group of Network participants (approx 3 people). It would be established for a fixed period of time with the specific task of assisting and guiding the Secretariat in this process. Nominations were called for, but the meeting decided they would like to respond out of conference. A call for nominations will be sent after the meeting.

Another focus raised was the need to evaluate the types of messaging required the Network and to evaluate the level of awareness of APMEN. It was emphasised that the Network’s planned communications messages need to be clear and concise

It was noted that focus groups discussions with Country Partners and Partner Institutions were being undertaken during this meeting. A survey and in-depth interviews will be held after the meeting with other Partner Institutions and observers, including the WHO. There will be other aspects to the evaluation in which all partners (country, institutions and observers organisations) will be invited to engage.

It was proposed that interim evaluation results of some aspects be made available by September 2012. It was also agreed that some funding should be available for this evaluation activity.

Recommendation
That the network agreed to commit funds for this activity.

That the Secretariat draft Terms of Reference for an Evaluation Working Party, which would detail roles, responsibilities and timeframes. A call for nominations will be held as soon as possible after the meeting

Passed unanimously.
6.0 Review of Work Plan

An overview of the 2012 Work Plan including the budgets of the main activities was presented. All country partners had had access to these document pre-meeting. This item is included in the Business Meeting to allow the Network to make any changes, additions and/or re-prioritisation of activities.

The APMEN advocacy agenda was further discussed and the Country Partners had agreed at their evening meeting that Advocacy at a national level was each country’s own individual responsibility. The Country Partner’s did however call for assistance at a regional level and discussed the importance of developing more effective ways to influence the agendas of high level meetings such as the ASEAN meeting. The Country Partners also requested that for advocacy on a global level, that the Secretariat to take a lead and agreed in principle to recruit a professional advocator.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat writes an advocacy plan with budget and circulates to Country Partners for agreement.

Passed unanimously.

The second issue that was raised was a request to increase funding available for each APMEN Fellowship, to allow the Fellowship’s to be up to 3 months in length, if required.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat makes the necessary changes to increase the funding available to each APMEN Fellowships recipient, up to an additional AUD $2,000 per individual, if required.

Passed unanimously.

7.0 Election of Co-chairs

The presenters outlined the need to re-elect APMEN Co-Chairs as detailed in the APMEN Governance document. It was recalled that the Network has 2 Co-Chairs, one being a representative from the Host Country of the next Annual Business and Technical Meeting, and the second being from an APMEN Partner Institution, who is elected by both Country Partners and Partner Institutions. To date, the Partner Institution Co-Chair position has been filled by Sir Richard Feachem from the Malaria Elimination Group. It was noted that following process, Sir Richard Feachem was not present for this part of the discussion.

A discussion on nominations amongst the meeting participants ensued. Nominations for Sir Richard Feachem and Dr Jim Tulloch were put forth. It was explained that as Dr Jim Tulloch was not a Partner Institution representative, he was not eligible to be nominated for the Co-Chair position.

Clarification was requested over the nomination process and if nominations were for the individual or the Partner Institution that the individual represents. It was suggested that the nomination should stand for the Partner Institution.

Following further discussion, meeting participants concluded that it had become apparent that a separate nomination process that allowed time for consideration of the issue prior to the meeting was required before voting. It was therefore agreed that there would be no voting during this meeting and that nominations would be called for by the Secretariat following the meeting after which voting would occur virtually.
Recommendation
That the Secretariat calls for nominations for the APMEN Co-Chair (Partner Institution) position via email and that a virtual voting process will occur following this. For the interim period, Sir Richard Feachem will remain as an APMEN Co-Chair.

Passed unanimously.

8.0 Other business

8.1 Location and themes for APMEN V: 2013
Following discussions during the Country Partner evening meeting held Wednesday 9 May 2012, the Network was advised by the Country Partners that the next annual Network meeting – APMEN V in 2013 will be hosted by Indonesia, with the proposed location of Bali. The meeting themes and Co-Chair will be confirmed at a later date following consultation with the Indonesian Government and the Network. A potential theme suggested was “Increasing and Sustaining Gains”. The Philippines also raised their interest in hosting the APMEN VI meeting in 2014, but this was not confirmed at this stage. The meeting participants expressed support and extended their thanks for the upcoming APMEN V meeting arrangements.

No further comments or voting occurred.

8.2 Increase to Country Partner representation on the APMEN Advisory Board
The Country Partners requested that the Business Meeting discuss and vote on a request that had been raised during the previous evening’s Country Partner meeting. The recommendation was that there should be an increase from 3 to 5 Country Partner representatives on the APMEN Advisory Board.

The Co-coordinators clarified the current composition of the Advisory Board, which includes representatives from 3 Country Partners, 2 Partner Institutions, and Observers from WPRO and SEARO (as per existing WHO request not to be voting members of APMEN’s Advisory board), AusAID and the Joint-Secretariat.

There was a call to clarify how Governance changes such as this are to be addressed within APMEN. The Co-coordinators clarified that changes to the Governance document procedures require a voting process by Country Partners.

Recommendation
That the Secretariat draft this proposed Governance change to the composition of the APMEN Advisory Board and present it to the Network via email for endorsement before the end of August, 2012. It was noted that this would need to be undertaken before the voting process for the new APMEN Board which is currently due.

Passed unanimously.

8.3 Remaining Governance issues
Due to time limitations the remaining outstanding governance issues were proposed to be dealt with via email:

- Removal of the Terms of Reference for the Vivax and Vector Control Working Groups.
- Removal of Individual names of representatives from the Governance document.
- Increased support to the Vivax and Vector Control Working Groups in the development of a new role of Deputy Chairs.
• Revision of duties of the Joint-Secretariat.
• APMEN Advisory Board Chair stand-in.

**Recommendation**
That the outstanding governance issues listed above will be presented via email to the Network with voting to occur virtually prior to the end of August.

*Passed unanimously.*