

# APMEN

## ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

### Mid-year Teleconference



**Date: 14 December 2010 (13 December 2010 for USA)**

#### Apologies:

Dr Krongthong Thimasarn, APMEN Advisory Board Member – Observer/Non Voting. (WHO SEARO); Praveena Gunaratnam, APMEN Advisory Board Member – Observer/Non Voting (AusAID).

#### Attendees:

Location Country/City/Time	Advisory Board Member Voting	Advisory Board Member Observer/Non Voting	APMEN Secretariat Observer/Non Voting
Australia, Brisbane: 12:00PM	Prof Dennis Shanks ( <i>APMEN Partner Institution: Australian Army Malaria Institute</i> )		Prof Maxine Whittaker ( <i>University of Queensland – UQ</i> ) Arna Chancellor* ( <i>UQ</i> ) Amanda Lee* ( <i>UQ</i> )
Australia, Canberra: 1:00PM		Beth Slatyer (AusAID) Andrew Sutton (AusAID)	
Australia, Melbourne: 1:00PM	Prof Graham Brown ( <i>APMEN Partner Institution: Nossal Institute for Global Health, University of Melbourne</i> )		
Indonesia, Bali: 10:00AM	Dr Rita Kusriastuti ( <i>APMEN Country Partner: Office of Communicable Disease and Environmental Health, Ministry of Health, Republic of Indonesia</i> )		
Philippines, Manila: 10:00AM	Dr Mario Baquilod ( <i>APMEN Country Partner: Infectious Disease Office, National Center for Disease Prevention &amp; Control, Department of Health, Philippines</i> )		
Philippines, Manila: 10:00AM		Dr Eva Maria Christophel (WHO WPRO)	
Sri Lanka, Colombo: 7:30AM	Dr Rabindra Abeyasinghe. <b>APMEN Advisory Board Chair</b> ( <i>APMEN Country Partner: Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka</i> )		
USA, San Francisco: 6:00PM			Michelle Hsiang ( <i>University of California, San Francisco – UCSF</i> ) Cara Smith Gueye* ( <i>UCSF</i> )

\*Not APMEN Advisory Board member

## AGENDA

NO.	ITEM	DOCUMENTATION	ACTION
-	Welcome by the APMEN Advisory Board Chair	-	-
	Introduction of participants	-	-
	Meeting logistics	-	-
	Apologies	-	-
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Confirmation of previous meeting minutes</b>	<b>Minutes from meeting held 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2010</b>	<b>For noting</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>	-	-
<b>2.1</b>	Changes to APMEN Governance document	Summary paper of feedback and suggested changes to APMEN Governance document	For discussion
<b>2.2</b>	Standing Orders for APMEN Advisory Board meetings	Draft Standing Orders for APMEN Advisory Board meetings	For discussion
<b>3.0</b>	<b>MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION</b>	-	-
<b>3.1</b>	APMEN 2010 Work Plan activities report, including financial statement	1) Draft APMEN 2010 Work Plan activities report 2) 2010 financial statement 3) Funding lessons learnt 4) Discussion points	For discussion
<b>3.2</b>	Vivax Coordinating team (Menzies) report	Draft APMEN Vivax Working Group Coordinating team annual report 2010	For noting
<b>3.3</b>	Proposed APMEN 2011 Work Plan	1) Draft 2011 APMEN work plan (log frame) 2) Discussion points	For discussion
<b>3.4</b>	New Country Partner and Partner Institution applications received: - Thailand - London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	Analysis of applications: 1)Thailand 2) LSHTM	For discussion
<b>3.5</b>	Deed of Amendment to head contract	Deed of Amendment	For noting
<b>3.6</b>	APMEN III themes	1) Draft program 2) APMEN III proposed themes and guest speakers	For discussion
<b>3.7</b>	Invitation to APMEN III to Brunei and Vietnam	-	For discussion
<b>3.8</b>	APMEN Advocacy – MMV	-	For noting
<b>3.9</b>	APMEN Partner Institution's role and eligibility status within the Network	-	For noting
<b>3.10</b>	Continuation of Secretariat arrangements	-	For discussion
<b>4.0</b>	<b>GENERAL BUSINESS (BOARD RAISED ISSUES)</b>	-	-
<b>5.0</b>	<b>MATTERS FOR NOTING</b>	-	-
<b>6.0</b>	<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	-	-
	<b>MEETING CLOSED</b>		

## Meeting opened at 12.00PM (Australian Eastern Standard Time – AEST)

### WELCOME

Dr Rabindra Abeyasinghe, the APMEN Advisory Board chair, welcomed all Advisory Board members.

### APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Dr Krongthong Thimasarn (WHO SEARO) and Praveena Gunaratnam (AusAID).

## **AGENDA ITEM 1.0: CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes were distributed and agreed to by the Advisory Board shortly following the previous meeting in Kandy, Sri Lanka in February, 2010.

An update was requested on agenda item 5.8.1 on the concerns from APMEN's Chinese participants on involvement in the APMEN Advisory Board and engagement in APMEN activities. The Advisory Board Chair, Dr Abeyasinghe, expressed that further engagement following APMEN II with the Chinese participants had been sought via numerous APMEN participants and no further concerns or issues had been raised by the Chinese delegation. Additional Advisory Board member feedback following direct communication with the Chinese participants further reinforced that the partners were satisfied with the processes and any issues had been resolved.

Dr Christophel advised at this point that one of the Chinese Country Partner representatives, Professor Lin-Hua Tang had recently changed positions. It was agreed that the APMEN Secretariat was to follow up with Prof Tang and the Chinese delegation to receive formal advice on the composition of the partners.

#### Recommendation:

That the APMEN Secretariat communicates with Prof Tang and the Chinese Country Partner partners to obtain formal advice on their representation arrangements within APMEN.

*Accepted unanimously.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 2.0: BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

### **2.1 CHANGES TO APMEN GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT**

During the finalization stages of the APMEN Governance document in mid-2010, feedback was received from AusAID which raised issues that had not been discussed or agreed to during the APMEN Governance consultation session during APMEN II. A summary paper of these comments and suggested changes to the Governance document was circulated to the Advisory Board members before this meeting.

AusAID provided clarification that the feedback was not intended to raise additional issues, but for further discussion and consideration by the APMEN Secretariat and Network. It was also clarified and noted that ownership of feedback of this nature should be conveyed as from AusAID, rather than the individual AusAID officer. The briefing paper will be modified to note this request.

The selection process for representation on the Advisory Board was queried – with particular concern on the number of malaria endemic countries represented on the Advisory Board. It was reiterated that the structure and format of the Advisory Board had been discussed and agreed upon at APMEN II, which was subsequent to the discussions that occurred at APMEN I.

The APMEN Secretariat affirmed that it was available to assist in re-sending governance and other relevant documentation as requested.

Based on these discussions around the Governance document, it was agreed that the Secretariat should seek any changes, additions and further discussion points around the document and processes when circulating draft APMEN III information and papers to the Network in early 2011. The Secretariat is then to collate feedback into one summary document for presentation at APMEN III and discussion amongst Country Partners.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat should seek any changes, additions and further discussion points around the document and processes when circulating draft APMEN III information and papers to the Network in early 2011. The Secretariat is then to collate feedback into one summary document for presentation at APMEN III and discussion amongst Country Partners.

*Accepted unanimously.*

## **2.2 STANDING ORDERS FOR APMEN ADVISORY BOARD MEETINGS**

The APMEN Secretariat developed draft Standing Orders for the Advisory Board as recommended in agenda item 5.8.2 from the previous Advisory Board meeting. The draft document was circulated by the Secretariat to Advisory Board prior to this meeting.

No objections or issues were raised in relation to the draft Standing Orders and it was agreed that if any concerns or issues became apparent following the meeting, then Advisory Board members were encouraged to submit their feedback or suggestions to the Secretariat via email.

Recommendation:

That any feedback or suggestions on the draft Standing Orders are submitted to the Secretariat via email by the end of January, 2011. Following this the Secretariat is to incorporate any advised changes and feedback and circulate the final draft to the Country Partners for review prior to APMEN III, for final agreement during the annual meeting.

*Accepted unanimously.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 3.0: MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **3.1 APMEN 2010 WORK PLAN ACTIVITIES REPORT, INCLUDING FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

The draft APMEN 2010 work plan activities report, including financial statement was pre-circulated by the Secretariat and the report was reviewed.

A suggestion was made for improvements on better matching the objectives and progress in the work plan to the budget, in order to more clearly distinguish the achievements and financial return on activities. The Secretariat

outlined that that the current structure of the reporting documenting documents were in line with the original contractual requirements and fulfilled these obligations.

It was agreed that discussion around reporting structure should be recommended to the Country Partners for further consideration at APMEN III.

Discussion occurred around the lack of momentum within the Vector Control Working Group in 2010, a result of there being no paid personnel committed to the group. Concern was also expressed over the general shortage of entomologists in the field. It was recommended that the VcWG should reallocate current available funds in order to support either a dedicated staff member or percentage of institutional lead or administrative support funds to increase VcWG productivity in 2011.

The background of the work plan documents format was discussed following queries around the wording within the documents and concerns that the priority areas and activities field duplicated some of the activities already being undertaken by the WHO and RBM. The Secretariat outlined that the priority areas and activities fields were mandated during the conception of APMEN and reflected what the Network anticipated it would be doing. In light of the concerns around the duplication of activities undertaken by the WHO and RBM, the yearly work activities and achievements sections which are updated on an annual basis, have been redrafted with careful consideration not to overlap with the WHO and RBM work.

The importance of the WHO and other Partner Institutions involvement in APMEN was emphasized as part of the process in identifying what activities are occurring within malaria elimination in order to identify how APMEN can best complement this work. The Advisory Board Chair acknowledged the WHO's leadership and reaffirmed APMEN's complementary and supporting role in augmenting and assisting efforts within the field of elimination and that extra effort was needed to prevent the Network as being seen as duplicating and repeating activities already being undertaken.

#### Recommendation:

That the Secretariat revise the 2011 work plan document taking into careful consideration the leadership role of the WHO and amend and rephrase activities to better reflect the Network's complementary role. Once the work plan has been revised, the Secretariat will then circulate for final review and sign off from the Country Partners.

That further discussions are conducted amongst the Country Partners at APMEN III about APMEN's complementary role in the malaria elimination community.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.2 VIVAX COORDINATING TEAM (MENZIES) REPORT**

The issue of engaging and coordinating efforts with countries not currently involved in APMEN, nor embarking on elimination, but where *Plasmodium vivax* is an issue was raised for discussion.

Ideas that were proposed included establishing and strengthening links with the Asian Vivax Group as well as increasing funds to provide for an extra VxWG meeting, in addition to the yearly meeting held in conjunction with the broader annual Network meeting. The purpose of an additional meeting would be to invite other regional and/or relevant participants or groups to further the sharing of information and knowledge exchange within Asia and the Pacific.

The WHO also requested to be included as a member of the Vivax Working Group.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat in consultation with the VxWG Coordinating Team at Menzies, incorporates the WHO into the list of collaborating partners/members of the VxWG. The Secretariat to also put forward to Menzies prior to APMEN III the proposed ideas discussed – including having an additional VxWG meeting and connecting with the Asian Vivax Group.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.3 PROPOSED APMEN 2011 WORK PLAN**

The draft APMEN 2011 work plan was pre-circulated by the Secretariat and the work plan was reviewed.

The issue of cross-border and imported malaria was highlighted as a particular concern and priority issue to many Advisory Board members.

An Advisory Board member emphasized the importance of considering the mechanism that elimination issues are brought to the attention of governments and heads of state and discussed at meetings. Some discussion occurred over how to elevate elimination issues into government's health agendas.

Discussion occurred again around the Vector Control Working Group and the need for momentum to advance the group's activities. It was suggested that the VcWG's annual meeting time be extended to one and a half days from its current one day allocation, or host a standalone meeting to coincide with another opportune regional meeting.

The logistics and arrangements for the mid-year virtual Advisory Board meetings was raised with concerns over the lack of engagement obtainable through the teleconference method as well as connectivity issues. A proposed idea to enhance participation was to replace the teleconference with a one day face to face meeting in an accessible regional location.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat propose the discussed suggestions to the Country Partners with the 2011 work plan in January 2011 further discussion and consideration, in collaboration with WPRO and SEARO.

That the Secretariat explore further mid-year meeting options available for the Advisory Board and calculate cost implications for a face-to-face meeting within the 2011 work plan and financials for presentation to the Country Partners to consider.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.4 NEW COUNTRY PARTNER AND PARTNER INSTITUTION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED:**

**-THAILAND**

**-LONDON SCHOOL OF HYGIENE & TROPICAL MEDICINE**

The new Country Partner application from Thailand and the new Partner Institution application from the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine were circulated by the Secretariat prior to the meeting.

No objections or issues in relation to the two applications were raised by any members.

Recommendation:

That the applications to become an APMEN Country Partner (Thailand) and an APMEN Partner Institution (London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine) be presented by the Secretariat to the identified APMEN groups as stated in the governance document for approval to become full APMEN participants in an out-of-vote session prior to APMEN III.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.5 DEED OF AMENDMENT TO HEAD CONTRACT**

A copy of the Deed of Amendment to the AusAID Head Contract was circulated by the Secretariat prior to the meeting.

The Advisory Board noted the amendment and acknowledged and thanked AusAID and the legal teams at the University of Queensland and Menzies for their enduring efforts in re-drafting the agreement.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat circulate the Deed of Amendment to the AusAID Head Contract to the Country Partners for noting.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.6 APMEN III THEMES**

A draft APMEN III program and summary paper for APMEN III proposed themes and guest speakers was circulated by the Secretariat prior to the meeting.

It was again noted that following consultation and agreement from the Secretariat with the members of the Vector Control Working Group, that the meeting time for the group be lengthened to one and a half days, prior to the Business and Technical meeting.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat forward the draft APMEN III program and a summary paper for the APMEN III proposed themes and guest speakers to the Country Partners, Advisory Board and APMEN participants by the middle of January, 2011 for further discussion and agreement.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.7 INVITATION TO APMEN III TO BRUNEI AND VIETNAM**

It was clarified that Brunei's interest in engaging with APMEN was as a Partner Institution rather than as a Country Partner, given its malaria-free status.

Recommendation:

That the Secretariat continues communication with Vietnam and Brunei regarding their involvement in the Network and APMEN.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.8 APMEN ADVOCACY – MMV**

Discussion occurred around the 2010 APMEN work plan identified endorsement of tafenoquine as an advocacy activity. AusAID outlined their principle regarding advocacy and that care needs to be taken when being seen to endorse any drug or product. The issues and concerns expressed included: the basis that the Network was providing the endorsement; how to determine and measure the assessment and the appraisal undertaken; when and where would it be appropriate to endorse developed, or the development of, single products; and what is the role and implications of the Network in recommending drugs and medicines.

The point was reinforced by board members that tafenoquine still remained the only anti-malarial currently being developed for the treatment of *P.vivax*.

The Advisory Board members agreed that it was, in principle, not appropriate for APMEN to endorse singular products at this time noting the concerns expressed by AusAID regarding the tafenoquine endorsement letter as well as the position of the WHO. The commercialization and conflict of interest issues which may arise were also noted.

### **3.9 APMEN PARTNER INSTITUTION ROLE AND ELIGIBILITY STATUS WITHIN THE NETWORK**

The question was raised over the implication of increasing the eligibility of Partner Institutions from non-APMEN Country Partner, resource-limited countries to opportunities within APMEN (such as the APMEN Fellowship Program) would have on current Country Partners. There was some concern that broadening the parameters of eligibility would restrict opportunities to Country Partners.

The Secretariat sought advice on how to address the range of concerns presented and it was agreed that a brief should be drafted to include more detailed information on the impact any modification in access to APMEN opportunities would have on the Network and Country Partners.

#### **Recommendation:**

That the Secretariat draft a document detailing further information including how many organisations this potentially included as well as the financial implications on the Network. Once drafted, this is then to be circulated to the Advisory Board in January for further feedback and advice. Following this, the Brief will then be circulated to Country Partners for discussion and consideration at APMEN III.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **3.10 CONTINUATION OF SECRETARIAT ARRANGEMENTS**

Discussion and advice occurred on the development of a process which could provide more structure and guidance to the positioning and continuing arrangement of the Secretariat. AusAID highlighted that in the agreement with the University of Queensland, that a provision was included for an independent progress review of the *APMEN Establishment Support Program*, however the timing of this has not been decided but will be in 2011.

The Advisory Board also discussed the requirement for Network to review the current Secretariat arrangements. The Chair indicated that this assessment would be for the Network to determine in the next 1-2 years.

The Secretariat indicated that as per the AusAID/UQ agreement, the initial UQ staff contracts were due to expire in June, 2011 which presented concerns in the proximity of this timing to APMEN III in May, 2011, which relies heavily on the administration and support from this staff. AusAID confirmed that there is a 2 year contract arrangement with a 5 year commitment.

Representatives from Global Health Group noted that they had secured Bill and Melinda Gates funding for 4 years from October, 2010.

Recommendation:

That AusAID communicate with the Advisory Board Chair on AusAID intentions for the independent review of the *APMEN Establishment Support Program* (UQ) and funding details, taking note of the timeframes outlined in the discussion. Following this communication, the Advisory Board Chair will discuss the presented information amongst the other Advisory Board members.

*Accepted unanimously.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 4.0: GENERAL BUSINESS (BOARD RAISED ISSUES)**

### **4.1 The Australian Government's Review of Aid Effectiveness**

Prof Graham Brown raised for discussion the independent review that the Australian Government has established to evaluate the future direction of Australia's aid program. The review aims to examine whether the current systems, policies and procedures for the aid program maximise effectiveness and efficiency and will be completed by April, 2011. Prof Brown put forward to the Board and AusAID the possibility of APMEN contributing to the review highlighting the Network's successes and international recognition.

AusAID informed that they would be presenting their own submission to the review committee which would include information on APMEN, and that they would need to seek advice on how APMEN could contribute to the review.

Recommendation:

That AusAID will provide the Secretariat with the website link for the independent review for circulation to Advisory Board and Network partners. The Advisory Board chair to consult with the Advisory Board and Secretariat in regards to any action or suggested contributions that APMEN could make towards the review.

*Accepted unanimously.*

### **4.2 Potential Partnership Opportunities with Roll Back Malaria (RBM)**

Prof Graham Brown stated that he had recently been appointed to the Board of Roll Back Malaria and raised discussion around the potential opportunities that close collaboration with RBM could offer. Such opportunities could include: increasing the channels available to explore future funding options, gaining more attention for the Network and increased representation in the region. Dr Abeyasinghe conveyed that he was currently a member of the RBM Vector Working Group. Possible methods of future engagement and linking options with RBM discussed included advocating for an Asia/Pacific location for an RBM meeting and establishing a partnership on

community participation and engagement, the latter of which produced positive feedback during earlier discussions with RBM at APMEN II.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5.0: MATTERS FOR NOTING**

No matters raised.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6.0: NEXT MEETING**

Dr Abeyasinghe thanked board members and participants for their attendance and contributions to the meeting in light of members' busy schedules. Dr Abeyasinghe acknowledged the difficulties that some Advisory Board members experienced with connectivity. Also thanked were the Secretariat for their preparation efforts, AusAID for their continued interest in APMEN and making the meeting possible as well as Eva Christophel representing the WHO.

The Board members and meeting participants thanked the Advisory Board Chair, Dr Abeyasinghe for his role.

[Meeting closed at 3.25PM AEST](#)