

APMEN III

Business Meeting Minutes



Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
 Tuesday May 10, 2011 and Thursday May 12, 2011

AGENDA			
No.	TIME AND SESSION	CHAIR	PRESENTER
Tuesday, May 10, 14:30 – 15:30 Session 5: APMEN BUSINESS MEETING		Dr Leonard Ortega	
1.0	AusAID Review		Dr. Rob Condon
2.0	Summary of 2010 Annual Report		Professor Maxine Whittaker
3.0	Review of 2011 Annual Work Plan		Dr. Michelle Hsiang
4.0	Discussion from Session 5: APMEN Business Meeting		
Wednesday, May 11, 19:30 – 21:00 COUNTRY PARTNER ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS MEETING WITH COUNTRY PARTNERS		Closed session (no minutes)	
Thursday, May 12, 11:00 – 12:00 Session 14: PRIORITIES FOR APMEN 2011 WORK PLAN AND 2012 MEETING		Professor Dennis Shanks	
5.0	Procedural Documents: Standing Orders for Advisory Board Meetings		Professor Maxine Whittaker and Dr. Michelle Hsiang
5.1	Contractual		
5.2	Breakout Sessions: Advocacy, Capacity Building and Fellowships, Cross Border Issues and Regional Collaboration, Emerging Themes		
5.3	Vivax Working Group		
5.4	Vector Control Working Group		
5.5	APMEN IV: 2012		

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

Apologies: Democratic People's Republic of Korea

1.0 AusAID Review

The Meeting participants welcome Dr Rob Condon, presenting on the behalf of AusAID, to the meeting.

Dr Rob Condon discussed the upcoming APMEN independent mid-term review. AusAID was still in the very early planning stages of the review and up for discussion with the Network was the structure and scope of review that would be most beneficial. Three options were proposed: a simple contractor performance review (examining the UQ Secretariat functions and governance supporting role), a comprehensive review and full assessment of the Network, or a hybrid approach to the review. A comprehensive or hybrid approach would require close involvement with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (which supports the GHG Secretariat). It was noted that a hybrid approach would be most likely which would require contact with Country Partners and Partner Institutions an opposed to a comprehensive review but that AusAID is still deliberating on these issues and approaches.

Several possible components and more detailed approaches of the review were outlined and factors such as the level and type of involvement with the Network and use of case studies for the review was discussed. Outcome indicators were also considered which included: progress of the activities in the annual work plan, reporting of achievements by the Secretariat and support provided by the Secretariat, practical value in assisting response to emerging issues, measuring value for money, and application of the OECD and Paris criteria.

Dr Condon emphasised the strong development and aid effectiveness focus which would underlie the review and the need for APMEN to demonstrate its links with its Country Partner's national agendas and the Network's ongoing support and collaboration with these agendas. It was reiterated that AusAID's financial support beyond the initial 5 year commitments was not guaranteed and that there was a need to diversify funding sources. The findings and outputs of the review were seen as a potential valuable tool for the Network to leverage with future funding providers.

2.0 Summary of 2010 Annual Report

Prof Maxine Whittaker provided a summary of the APMEN 2010 Annual Report which has finalised and submitted to AusAID in February and circulated to the Network via email and posted on the APMEN website.

It was re-iterated that the Working Group meetings, breakout groups, Country Partner and Advisory Board meetings occurring in association with APMEN III, were all also part of the Network's business processes.

The summary of the 2010 Annual report presented the activities completed and achieved against the Network's 6 work plan objectives:

Objective 1: Information sharing and consensus building

APMEN II: Annual Network meeting, APMEN II study tour, development and launch of APMEN website, translation of ROK strategic plan, matrix project, development of an APMEN newsletter

Objective 2: Building the evidence base for decision support

Vivax Working Group: annual meeting held in conjunction with APMEN II, coordinating team at Menzies established, Research Grant Program developed, 4 research priorities identified and Round One (vivax) opened, 14 full proposals-received and 11 Research Grants expected to be awarded.

Vector Control Working Group: annual meeting held in conjunction with APMEN II, slow to commence activities, needs assessment survey commenced.

Other activities: Sri Lanka case study, Bhutan case study, documentation of experience and lessons learnt from mass drug administration in Jiangsu province, China.

Objective 3: Technical guidance and capacity building

Fellowship Program: launched and from the 10 applications were received, 5 Fellowships awarded. Lessons learnt included: funding allocation inadequate to support placements longer than 4 weeks, need to broaden Host Institutions network, applicants required to provide more detail of their learning needs and identified potential for other donor interest in this activity area.

Objective 4: Leadership, knowledge management, advocacy.

Advocacy strategy and plan developed and key APMEN events promoted through internal and external media and communication channels, standardised power point presentations and promotional materials developed, contribution towards other global advances in support to malaria elimination and awareness of challenges in the region.

Objective 5: Facilitating of Emerging priorities.

Community participation and cross border: provided assistance to Bhutan for cross border and regional collaboration as requested, in collaboration with WHO SEARO and GHG, support to publication of literature review.

Objective 6: Secretariat Function

Establishment of Secretariat teams at UQ and GHG, finalising governance documents, the running of APMEN II and preparation of APMEN III, coordination and management of Advisory Board, coordination with other malaria partners, regular joint Secretariat meetings between UQ and GHG.

3.0 Review of 2011 Annual Work Plan

Dr Michelle Hsiang outlined the process involved in the development and endorsement of the 2011 work plan. The foundation of the work plan was designed from objectives set forth from the Country partners. A consultation process occurred where the Secretariat circulated and received feedback from participants on a proposed draft work plan over email and via telephonic discussions and opportunistic meetings. The Advisory Board also reviewed the work plan in the December 2010 and made some recommendations to the Secretariat. The APMEN work plan detailing proposed AusAID funding allocations was submitted to and endorsed by AusAID in January 2011.

Guiding principles for the 2011 work plan included a strong focus on Country Partner requested and led activities, action oriented, pragmatic and elimination focussed. The most significant changes to the APMEN budget in 2011 is the increase in funding allocated to the Fellowship Program and cross border work. All relevant APMEN participants have received a copy of the annual work plan and annual report.

A summary of the APMEN 2011 work plan activities proposed or underway, were presented against the Network's 6 work plan objectives:

Objective 1: Information sharing and consensus building

Annual Network meeting and study tour, Working Group meetings, website maintenance, intervention matrix, collection and publishing of case studies, key documents translated, continue collaboration with the WHO and continue to develop projects to share data, create accountability and track progress towards elimination, APMEN Atlas.

Objective 2: Building the evidence base for decision support

Vivax Working Group: Continue to conduct operational research, conduct reviews, leverage funds for operational research, and inform WHO guidelines.

Vector Working Group: Establish priorities and mechanisms to support activities, conduct reviews and operational research and inform WHO guidelines.

Case Studies: publish the Sri Lanka case study, complete at least one comprehensive or topic specific case study, and identify opportunities for other case studies.

Objective 3: Technical guidance and capacity building

Fellowship Program, Malaria Mapping program, Research Grants, collaborate and support other relevant training activities, gather experts and continue to support WHO as requested.

Objective 4: Leadership, knowledge management, advocacy.

Generate awareness and appreciation of elimination efforts in the region, liaise with leaders and partners to garner political, financial and research support, advocate at all levels, liaise with other regional efforts to generate awareness.

Objective 5: Facilitating of Emerging priorities.

Identify issues and develop activities – possible projects include cross border/regional collaborations, community participation, other.

Objective 6: Secretariat Function

Continue managing and supporting governance functions, plan annual meeting, coordinate work plan activities, manage finances and Network communications, and maintain Secretariat capacity.

4.0 Discussions from Session 5: APMEN Business

Queries from the Network were raised around the effect the mid-term review would have on the immediate future and funding of the Network. It was emphasised that the purpose of the review was to inform both AusAID and the Network on how things were going however there would be a focus on performance and value of the Network and the benefit of the Network the Country Partners would be examined. Funding was not considered to be at risk from the review.

It was restated that the foundation activity areas and Working Groups in the Network arose from discussions in 2009/10 and were identified by the Country Partners, based on their needs at the time. Any shifts in needs and proposed changes to activities could be raised during the meeting and in the breakout sessions. The discussions and decisions made at the annual meetings are also used to inform the annual work plans and priorities.

There was acknowledgement of the work APMEN has achieved in the areas of collaboration and regional advocacy as well as highlighting the need for further operational research. The Network was also recognised as filling a gap on linking regional elimination efforts. Caution was voiced in regards to the increasing up scaling of goals and deadlines by Country programs, which needed to be more carefully considered in relation to funding and capacity available and feasibility. Closing remarks to the discussion focussed on the timeframes of current tools being developed in elimination and treatment options and need for a better balance between vaccine and drug development.

Session 14: Priorities for APMEN 2011 Work plan and 2012 meeting

5.0. Procedural Documents: Standing Orders for Advisory Board Meetings

Standing orders for the APMEN Advisory Board have been developed and were reviewed by the Advisory Board in December 2010. The Board recommended that this addition to APMEN governance be voted on by Country Partners

Recommendation

That the APMEN Advisory Board Standing Orders be circulated by the Secretariat to all Country Partners for review, amendments, ratification by end of June.

Accepted unanimously.

5.1 Contractual

Three contractual issues were brought to the attention of attendees

- The Deed of amendment to the AusAID head contract which involved changes to Intellectual property issues necessitated by the APMEN Research Grant Program
- The no cost extension to APMEN July – Dec 2011 sought due to the midterm review timing.
- The current agent's agreement between UQ-Menzies for Vivax Coordination which will need to be extended to fall in line with the no cost extension until December 31 2011.

Recommendation

That these contractual changes are noted by the Network.

Accepted unanimously.

5.2 Break out sessions

The four breakout feedback sessions raised the following activities and issues for the networks consideration and agreement. Some of these are to be implemented in 2011 and the remaining is to be represented to the network for inclusion in the 2012 draft work plan.

Advocacy

The 5 activities below were suggested as key activities:

1. Develop strategic documents for advocacy
2. Evidence base: Case studies on resourcing to Hold the Line; Business case for elimination;
3. Target ASEAN, APEC, new donors and regional countries
4. Provide good case to existing donors to APMEN for continued/increased funding
5. Develop materials for World Malaria Day 2012

The following discussion noted that these additional work plan activities will most likely require:

- Increased funding and person hours / persons for case studies required
GHG – Noted that they will need to analyse implication for GHG commitment to APMEN and availability.
Other donors to do these
- Increased Secretariat person-hours for the development of advocacy materials.
- Plan for strategic visits – Funds appear adequate for 2011
- Materials
More funds required over present allocation
Would need to come from emerging issues \$85,000 budget
- Media screening tool for APMEN Website No budget implications anticipated

Prof Whittaker called upon the chair of the Advisory Board for further exploration of these implications for the work plan, financing and Secretariat roles and responsibilities.

Dr. Rabindra Abeyasinghe notes that there is broad agreement on the need to increase advocacy activities.

Capacity Building and Fellowships

The changes recommended to the APMEN capacity building activities included the following;

- Confirmed addition of GIS training course as per the 2011 work plan and funding allocation;
- That Fellowships need to continue to show how the Fellowship will contribute to Malaria Elimination in the APMEN Country partner program;
- That any remaining Fellowship funds are to be utilised to fund additional Fellowships;
- That all APMEN Country Partner countries are to encourage their Partner Institutions to join APMEN to facilitate increased opportunities for capacity building;
- That the Secretariat include in the APMEN Fellowship application form a list of partner institutions and their capacities or area of expertise from which the applicant may rate their preferences on;
- That the Secretariat reviews the Fellowship information on the APMEN website to ensure greater clarity of the program;
- That the Secretariat investigates the reasons for some APMEN Country Partners not applying for Fellowships in the last two rounds.

Specific changes to the APMEN 2012 fellowship guidelines are to reflect the following:

- That a second level of screening occurs by the Country Partners National Control Program managers prioritising applications from their countries
- One fellow per country to be awarded unless the number of suitable applicants has not been reached
- Priority to be given to countries that have not been awarded fellows in previous rounds
- Fellows can only re-apply for fellowship after 3 years.

Cross Border Issues and Regional Collaboration

A leader for this activity was called for. No one self identified and a call for post APMEN III meeting nominations was made. Lack of progress in this activity was seen by the group as possibly due to the political sensitivities of this issue. Country Partners called for a name change to the group in the future. An initial suggestion is "Populations movement and elimination implications".

Country partners called for the WHO and other partners to continue supporting this activity as it involves high level political negotiation. The meeting noted that information sharing in the form of National Strategic Plans has occurred. Case studies that focus on sharing of strategies and successful initiatives in cross border collaboration were requested. Discussion ensued around an inventory of challenging border areas in malaria elimination as way to identify key activities and a tool for advocacy.

Emerging themes

A workshop on *Community Participation* was called for with a budget of \$US50, 000 to be conducted in the later part of 2011. Proposed leads include Dr Jetsumon Prachumsri and GHG. Its objectives and outcomes were not discussed in detail and engagement with the network post APMEN III will be undertaken before any development occurs.

Suggestions made for *P knowlesi* work to be included in the APMEN emerging themes agenda. Activities discussed by the group included

- Sharing PCR technique (SOPs) for primary *P. knowlesi* surveillance in APMEN partner countries where *P. knowlesi* may be present
- Operational research to give scientific evidence to human/human transmission
- New techniques for diagnosis and surveillance (might be able to integrated into VxWG)

Advocacy on G6PD and ACT resistance was also seen as important to include in the emerging themes agenda.

Recommendation

That the above recommendations will be summarized including budgetary implications by the Secretariat and be sent to all Country Partners for review, amendments, ratification by end of June.

Accepted unanimously.

5.3 Vivax Working Group

The Vivax working group have decided to reduce the 5 themes for operational research down to 2 research themes. They plan to in 2012 allocate half the research grants funding to small research grants and the remaining half to multi-site research. No cost implications were identified for the 2011 budget –work plan and these changes need to be incorporated into the 2012 planning.

No voting occurred.

5.5 Vector Control Working Group

The Vector Control Working Group (VcWG) activities had no need for increased funding. The VcWG will review and customize if necessary the APMEN Research Grant process for the planned APMEN vector research. This research will focus on Vector control strategies (Palawan); Larviciding effectiveness with the possibility for multi-center studies later.

Funding for two case studies (Palawan: community engagement in vector control and mobile populations) were identified as new activities for 2011/2012.

A sub working group to address standardized entomological surveillance tools and databases has been formed

Capacity building activities were deemed crucial in the Vector Control Working Group. The group has planned to support to both ACTMalaria and the WHO in the following activities

- TOT Training for reorientation towards elimination vector control, maintenance
- Development of Training for supervision of IRS
- Tool and training for conducting impact assessments

No voting occurred.

5.6 APMEN IV: 2012

Following the Country Partner evening meeting the network is advised that the next APMEN meeting (2012) host country will be South Korea. The themes, location and Co chair will be confirmed at a later date following consultation with the Republic of Korea Government. The meeting expressed support and extended thanks for this arrangement.

No voting occurred.