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Day 1: 27 September 2016

Pre-Board Strategic Planning Workshop

Chair Dr Winnie Mpanju-Shumbusho and Vice Chair Kieran Daly welcomed participants and highlighted that the morning session would be outside of normal Board business, hearing perspectives from African Leaders Malaria Alliance (ALMA), Asia Pacific Leaders Malaria Alliance (APLMA), the Harmonization Working Group (HWG) and the End Malaria Council (EMC) that would facilitate discussion and create the opportunity for the Board to hear views and opinions on the challenges and opportunities that the Partnership presents.

1. Welcome & Introductions

1.1. The Chair Dr Winnie Mpanju-Shumbusho welcomed Board Members to the third face-to-face meeting of the Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board. She noted that some colleagues were unable to attend and she had received apologies from Mr As Sy and Mr Paolo Gomez.

1.2. Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho informed the Board that Mr As Sy had been granted an Observer to attend in his place, Mr Jason Peat from IFRC and that he had communicated his wish for Prof Awa Coll-Seck to hold his proxy vote.

2. Adoption of Agenda

2.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho welcomed Board Members back following the break for lunch and commented on how everyone was enthused after the highly informative morning session. She then noted the move into the formal part of the Board meeting with the first item being the adoption of the agenda.

2.2 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho clarified that the minutes of the last meeting had already been approved by the Board

2.3 The agenda was formally adopted.

RBM/PBM.03/2016/DP.1 – Agenda
The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board approves the agenda for the third Board Meeting of the Partnership Board.

3. Workshop Outcomes and Decisions

3.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho handed over to Mr Daly to open a session designed to provide the opportunity for the Board to reflect on the issues discussed in the morning Workshop in order to inform strategic thinking, decisions and any guidance it wishes to provide for the IST.

3.2 One key theme discussed was the Global Fund. The Board appreciated the outstanding work being done by the Harmonization Working Group under the leadership of co-chairs Dr Olumese and Dr Renshaw in supporting countries to access Global Fund Resources. They further noted the large volume of work coming up in this area to support concept note development in late 2016/early 2017 following the successful replenishment of the Fund earlier in the month.
3.3 The Board acknowledged with appreciation the significant additional work being undertaken by Dr Renshaw (HWG co-chair) in representing RBM in the Partners Constituency to the Global Fund Board during this interim period and the need to ensure there were adequate Board arrangements in place for communication and support to her in this role, especially until a CEO is recruited. It was agreed that Dr, Renshaw would report to the Board at its next meeting regarding progress at the Global Fund.

3.4 Given the importance of the upcoming November Global Fund Board meeting as an opportunity to engage key stakeholders it was requested that Board Chair Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho also attend.

3.5 Board Members also expressed their thanks for the morning presentations and welcomed the contribution the EMC could make to the global fight against malaria. Board Members further stressed the importance of country ownership of solutions and the coordination of the efforts of the EMC with bodies such as RBM as well as existing country and regional networks. Board Members further highlighted the importance of balancing short term and quick action and more strategic thinking.

4. **Bye-Laws**

4.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho stated that the delay in getting the Bye-Laws approved had set back linked RBM’s milestones and that in order to move forward they needed to be approved at this meeting. However, Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho stressed the importance of the discussion of those areas still outstanding and the importance of achieving a consensus wherever possible.

4.2 Mr Jonah Grunsell from the IST was called on to introduce a summary of the Bye-Laws as they stand and to highlight the key discussion areas.

4.3 Mr Grunsell acknowledged that the process of developing the Bye-Laws had been long and sometimes challenging, having been through a number of iterations. He thanked Board Members for their engagement and feedback, as well as the legal advice and support received from Ms Sylvie Fonteilles-Drabek (MMV) and Mr Issa Matta (WHO). Mr Grunsell also stated that the proposed version of the RBM Bye-Laws had been reviewed and approved by UNOPS as the target hosting organization.

4.4 Mr Grunsell stressed that the Board leadership had reviewed all suggestions and then presented four specific areas identified as requiring further discussion and decision: 2.1 Roles and responsibilities, 4.3 Partnership Board Membership, 7.3 (Partner Committee) Leadership, 9.2 (Working Groups) Criteria of Accreditation.

4.5 Mr Grunsell handed back to the Chair who asked the Board to put forward any other comments and suggestions relating to the four already highlighted or any other area of the proposed RBM Bye-Laws.

4.6 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho opened up discussion to the Board and asked if there were any other comments or suggestions in regard to the RBM Bye-Laws. A number of additional comments and suggestions were made and tabled by Board Members relating to a number of specific sections and wording of the RBM Bye-Laws. These were reviewed and discussed at length by the Board who considered each suggestion and recommended amendments.
4.7 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho provided a summary of the debate and thanked the Board for their efforts to reach consensus. Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho informed the Board that Mr Paulo Gomez had communicated that he wished her to hold his proxy vote as he was unable to attend.

4.8 After a short recess to ensure the latest suggested amendments could be incorporated and the RBM Bye-Laws considered fully, the Board moved to a vote. The Board unanimously subsequently approved the wording of the Bye-Laws.

RBM/PBM.03/2016/DP.2 – RBM Bye-Laws
The Roll Back Malaria (RBM) Partnership Board approves the new Partnership Bye-Laws and agrees that these will serve as the governing document of the Partnership with immediate effect.

5. RBM Partner Committee Governance

5.1 Mr Daly introduced the next agenda item, the discussion and approval of RBM Partner Committee Terms of Reference (TOR) and the process for their establishment. He stated that at this time the Partner Committee TORs were not formally part of the RBM Bye-Laws in order to allow some flexibility in the first year of operation and to enable the incoming RBM Partner Committee Co-Chairs to have input. Mr Daly then called on Mr Jonah Grunsell from the IST to provide some background and present proposals for consideration by the Board.

5.2 Mr Grunsell explained that the RBM Partner Committees were designed to formalize, consolidate and amplify the core Partnership functions. As agreed by the Board and set out in the RBM Bye-Laws, TORs had been drafted for three RBM Partner Committees: Advocacy & Resource Mobilization; Strategic Communications and Country/Regional Support.

5.3 Mr Grunsell stated that according to the RBM Bye-Laws the work of the RBM Partner Committees will be coordinated by the CEO and the RBM Partner Committees shall in all respects be accountable to the Partnership Board. The Board will also set and approve the RBM Partner Committee TORs and any changes to them.

5.4 Mr Grunsell then outlined the proposed process for establishing these new Partner Committees and for re-registering RBM Partners. He explained that the re-registration of Partners was required due to the lack of information and insight currently held by RBM about its partners. In relation to the excess of 5,000 Partner email addresses provided, only 5% had individual names listed and little or no information on sector, country of origin, interest or expressed commitment or willingness to remain a Partner. Mr Grunsell explained that the re-registration process currently underway would enable greater understanding of the Partnership including any gaps along with the targeting of messaging.

5.5 Mr Grunsell moved on to outlining the proposed process for establishing the new RBM Partner Committees. In order to ensure RBM Partner Committees are stood up and get to work as soon as possible that it was proposed that a request for RBM Partner Committee General Membership and the nominations / self-nominations of Co-Chairs be taken forward in parallel. Under this Fast Track selection process the board would approve selection of the inaugural Co-Chairs for each RBM Partner Committee for an initial term of one year. It was highlighted that this process represented a deviation from the RBM Partner Committee Co-
Chair Selection Process as set out in RBM Bye-Laws, but was necessitated by the unique circumstances around standing up these committees for the first time.

5.6 Mr Grunsell stated that under this proposed process, RBM would launch a simultaneous call for Committee membership and Co-Chair nominations w/c 10 October 2016, with the intention of being able to approve and announce Committee Co-Chairs in November 2016. Mr Grunsell further stated that the selection of RBM Partner Committee Co-Chairs needed to occur sensitively and in a manner that did not undermine the range of critical work currently underway by Partners and Partnership mechanisms such as the Harmonization Working Group (HWG).

5.7 Mr Daly thanked Mr Grunsell for his presentation and further stressed the importance of agreeing a process for the setting up of RBM Partner Committees as quickly as possible and establishing this critical mechanism of the new Partnership. Mr Daly opened up the discussion to the Board for any questions or comments.

5.8 The Board noted the importance of quickly setting up the RBM Partner Committees and that in these unique circumstances a deviation to process outlined in the RBM Bye-Laws was justified and appropriate. The Board also noted that limiting the terms of the inaugural RBM Partner Committee Co-Chairs to one year would provide sufficient safeguards and reassurance to the Partnership. It was further noted that it was vital that the call for nominations and self-nominations to the RBM Partner Committees and Co-Chair positions was circulated as widely as possible to ensure effective representation throughout the Partnership.

5.9 Board Members raised a specific questions regarding the size and structure of each RBM Partner Committee, Mr Grunsell informed the Board that the internal structures of each committee would be developed with the new co-chairs, including development of specific workstreams or steering committee as needed. Mr Grunsell further proposed that the overall size for General Membership for each RBM Partner Committee would not be restricted to ensure they operate as open and inclusive Partnership mechanisms available to all Partners willing to commit time, effort and resources to its work.

5.10 Mr Daly moved to a vote and the Board unanimously approved the RBM Partner Committee TORs and the process for their establishment.

---

**RBM/PBM.02/2016/DP.3 – Partner Committee Terms of Reference & Establishment**

The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board approves the Partner Committee Terms of Reference.

In order to facilitate the rapid establishment of these important new Partner Committees, the Board adopts a Fast Track selection process for the inaugural Co-Chairs for a term of one year. Under this process, it will launch a simultaneous call for Committee membership and Co-Chair nominations w/c 10 October 2016, with the intention of being able to approve and announce Committee Co-Chairs in November 2016.

Recognising that this deviation from the Committee Co-Chair Selection Process set out in Bye-Laws is necessitated by the unique circumstances around standing up these committees for the first time.
6. Close (Day 1)

6.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho spoke ardently about the excellent accomplishment that the Board had made for the day and confirmed the Decision Points, including the adoption of the agenda, the approval of the RBM Bye-Laws, the approval of the terms of reference and the decision to move forward with the establishment of RBM Partner Committees.

6.2 The first day of the meeting was then closed.

Day 2: 28 September 2016

7. Welcome & Reflections on Day 1

7.1 The Chair Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho welcomed everyone to Day 2 of the RBM Partnership Board meeting, stating that some very important decisions had been made on Day 1 but that there were still a number of important areas to discuss.

7.2 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho noted that Prof Yongyuth Yuthavong was unable to attend Day 2 and thanked him for his contribution to the discussions and decisions on Day 1. Chair Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho also welcomed representatives from UNOPS, in attendance for the first agenda item of Day 2 only, along with Paul Miller from the IST.

8. Management Team & Hosting Update

Hosting Update

8.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho asked Mr Grunsell from the IST to address the Board and provide an update on the establishment of the RBM Management Team and negotiations with UNOPS as the target hosting entity.

8.2 Mr Grunsell stated that since the decision of the Board to select UNOPS as the target hosting organisation, the IST have commenced detailed negotiations. The initial primary focus has been to agree a target hosting implementation plan and identify all key activities required to be delivered by the RBM Partnership, WHO and UNOPS in order to successfully transition to the new arrangements. Mr Grunsell further stated that IST have also worked with UNOPS to determine key budgetary requirements and planning considerations along with the CEO recruitment process.

8.3 Mr Grunsell noted that the first key dependent activity, as stipulated by both UNOPS and WHO, was the agreement of revised RBM Bye-Laws and hosting Terms of Reference. Once these were agreed the transfer of residual RBM Funds and relevant agreements can take place. The delay in finalizing the Bye-Laws has delayed progress of the agreed plan by approximately 7 weeks with negotiations now due to be finalized in December 2016 against the original target of October 2016.

8.4 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked Mr Grunsell for the update and invited Armen Chobanyan from UNOPS and Paul Miller (IST Ops) to join the Board to help answer questions on the hosting negotiations to date. Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho then invited questions from the Board.

8.5 The Board asked a range of questions in relation to the different UNOPS staffing contracts and employment condition for the RBM Management Team and the role of UNOPS on the
CEO Selection Committee. Mr Chobanyan provided further details regarding employment terms and contracting options available and confirmed that UNOPS would not have a role on the CEO Selection Committee, only to appoint the candidate recommended by the RBM Board in line with UNOPS policies and procedures.

8.6 The Board welcomed the progress made and the proactiveness of UNOPS in moving the process forward as quickly as possible, as well as their flexibility working with the Partnership during a period of significant change. Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked Mr Chobanyan and his team for their time, dedication and support.

8.7 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho then moved for the Board to consider and approve a decision point highlighting the RBM Partnership’s commitment to the establishment of a hosting relationship with UNOPS. The decision point was unanimously approved.

Management Team Update

8.8 Moving onto the recruitment of the CEO, Mr Grunsell stated that following approval of the draft CEO role description by the Board on 22 July 2016, the IST had been assessing search agency partners for the recruitment and assessed a number of candidate search firms following recommendations from Board Members, Partners and stakeholders.

8.9 Mr Grunsell stated that following a review by the Board Leadership and the consideration against a range of criteria including experience, understanding of the brief, responsiveness and cost it was recommended that Egon Zehnder be commissioned to take forward the search process.

8.10 In regard to the target timeline, Mr Grunsell stated that the IST had developed a target timeline for the next 3-4 months that was ambitious but achievable, with a view to holding final panel interviews and selection in December 2016. To guide and support this process, it was proposed that a RBM Board CEO Selection Committee be convened of up to five Board Members (including the Board Leadership) representative of the diversity of the board and with the capacity to undertake this role.

8.11 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked Mr Grunsell for his presentation and noted that outside the RBM Board CEO Selection Committee, all Board Members should engage in active outreach and potential candidate identification to identify the best possible candidate.

8.12 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho then moved to a vote to approve the search agency and members of the RBM Board CEO Selection Committee, which was approved unanimously.
The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board notes the work undertaken by the IST in assessing candidate search firms for the recruitment of the CEO and approves the appointment of Egon Zehnder to assist with the executive search process. The board notes and approves the IST allocation of the finances to support this decision. The Board further commits to providing support to ensure efficient and effective outreach and identification of suitable candidates.

The Board appoints the following Board Members to serve on an ad hoc CEO Selection Committee:
- Dr. Winnie Mpanju-Shumbusho (Committee Chair)
- Mr. Kieran Daly
- Prof. Awa Marie Coll-Seck
- Dr. David Reddy
- Prof. Dr. Yongyuth Yuthavong

9. Financing & Resourcing Update

9.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho invited Mr Paul Miller from the IST to present an update on finance and resources to the Board.

9.2 Mr Miller presented an updated summary of the resourcing currently in place to run the activities of the Partnership and an up-to-date estimate of the likely annual costs for the RBM Management Team. This included anticipated funding available to be transferred to UNOPS to support Establishment of RBM Permanent Structures, funds held by WHO remaining from the previous WHO hosted RBM activities, new US Government funding recently approved, budget and funds available for Interim Support Priorities and estimate of Funds required in 2017 to support RBM Partnership.

9.3 Mr Miller stated that a Working Capital Reserve (WCR) was established by the previous RBM Board and is currently held by WHO to provide for any remaining liabilities of the Partnership. The WCR is to be sufficient to cover all staff termination liabilities and other cessation costs. Mr Miller confirmed that the closure process of the RBM Secretariat at WHO was almost complete. There remain two staff termination indemnities to be resolved before the final balances are transferred to the RBM Management Team at UNOPS.

9.4 Mr Miller stated that as at the 15th September 2016 WHO was holding USD 1.32m in RBM funding. It is estimated that the balance available to be transferred to the RBM Management Team at UNOPS will be a minimum of USD 1.12m (excluding staff termination indemnities). It is anticipated that the balance of funds will be transferred to a designated account with the RBM Management Team at UNOPS in two tranches with the final balance by the end of December 2016.

9.5 Mr Miller advised the Board that the US Government has made USD 3.8m available for transfer to UNOPS to support two main areas of work; to support establishment of the permanent new RBM Management Team and structures and funding earmarked for continuation of HWG technical assistance coordination and country support activities. Once the new Partnership Country Regional Support Partner Committee (CRSPC) is operational, it is expected that current HWG activities will be coordinated through the CRSPC.

9.6 Mr Miller stated that the RBM Board at its second meeting in June 2016 agreed on a number of key priority areas of work to take forward the evolution of the partnership structures and
mechanism. The Board further established an Interim Support Team and requested it to secure resources necessary to take forward these priorities under the leadership of the Board Chair and Vice Chair. Following the Board’s request, resources have been secured from RBM/WHO Funds and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) to take forward these agreed IST priorities. These funds are held by Malaria No More UK and dispersed in line with Board approved plans and processes.

9.7 Mr Miller then presented an illustrative Management Team structure previously presented to the board in June 2016, that had been used to guide the development of the UNOPS resource planning estimates. It is designed to be scalable as funding grows and/or priorities change. Mr Miller stated that for the purposes of resource planning it has been assumed that the RBM Management Team will be based at UNOPS in Geneva with a sufficient travel budget to enable commitments to be met across the globe. Mr Miller noted that the timing and pace of recruitment of staff will impact the funding requirement for the RBM Management Team in its first year.

9.8 Turning to the financing of RBM Partner Committees, Mr Miller stated that was not possible at this stage to estimate the likely cost of the work of the new Partner Committees as these are still to be established and workplans developed. Once these workplans are approved we would expect that in-kind support / resource mobilization for the Partner Committee work can take place and the activity / resource plans and priorities modified to match the funding available. The outcomes of the proposed further Country / Regional Support consultation may recommend an infrastructure where the team are based in a location other than Geneva.

9.9 Mr Miller stated that the next phase of detailed financial planning and forecasting will require significant Board engagement. The Board will also need to determine the minimum resourcing requirements for the Management Team to operate effectively and compare with the funding available in order to finalize future resource planning. It was therefore proposed that a Board Finance Committee be established to take forward this important next phase of work.

9.10 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked Paul for his presentation and opened up the session to the Board for questions and comments.

9.11 The Board discussed the number of options available for the pace and sequencing of the recruitment of the Management Team and its implications for the funding gap that was required to be filled. The Board felt that it was critical to identify the core resources required and to move forward in an agile and flexible manner with a preference to incremental growth. The Board also felt that it was vital to ensure that the Management Team was as lean as possible, complementing the resourced and capacity of the Partnership. It was noted that this was an approach that would be welcomed by donors.

9.12 The Board stressed the importance of the finalization of a resourcing and recruitment plan as soon as possible in order for a budget for 2017 to be developed and agreed. It was also agreed that the Board should be seeking to mobilize resources for more than only one year of operation and in order to support countries, regions and programme planning.

9.13 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked the Board for their comments and questions and asked the Board to consider a Decision Point relating to RBM Financing and the establishment of the RBM Board Finance Committee.
9.14 Both Decision Points were unanimously passed by the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RBM/PBM.03/2016/DP.6 – RBM Financing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That all RBM liabilities are expected to be settled within this calendar year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The estimated total value of the remaining funds at WHO by 31 December 2016 will be USD 1.32m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board approves the transfer of the remaining balance of RBM Funds held by WHO to UNOPS, at the Board Chair’s written request, once the relevant final hosting terms are approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RBM/PBM.03/2016/DP.7 – RBM Partnership Board Finance Committee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Roll Back Malaria (RBM) Partnership Board agrees to establish a Finance Committee supported by the IST with the following inaugural membership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Mr Simon Bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Mr Paulo Gomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Mr Ray Nishimoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Mr David Reddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Finance Committee will develop proposals for its role and remit and recommend detailed TORs including determining membership and the involvement of any appropriate external advisors for consideration and approval by electronic vote by the Partnership Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Board Recruitment**

10.1 Mr Daly invited Mr Jonah Grunsell from the IST to provide an overview of the proposed process for the recruitment to the two remaining seats on the RBM Board.

10.2 Mr Grunsell noted that at its 2nd Board Meeting in June 2016, the RBM Board agreed to proceed with the selection of additional Board Members to fill the two vacant Board positions once the Bye-Laws were in place. Now these have been adopted, we are able to progress with the next round of Board Member recruitment.

10.3 Mr Grunsell then gave a presentation providing an overview of the eligibility criteria, key skills and proposed selection criteria for these vacancies, together with a proposed recruitment plan and timeline.

10.4 Mr Grunsell stated that at its last board meeting the RBM Board expressed a strong desire to increase gender balance (more female board members needed) and include malaria affected regional representation from the Americas in the filling of the vacant Board positions. The IST therefore recommended the following criteria for the selection of the two remaining RBM Partnership Board Members:

- At least one Board member to come from a malaria-affected country or region in the Americas, representing the geographical and economic diversity of the country / region, whether from government, civil society, multi-sectoral, private sector or international organizations.
Applications from female nominees who meet the eligibility and skills requirements will be prioritised, with the intention of recruiting more female members to the board.

10.5 Mr Grunsell stated that a Board Selection Committee (BSC) would need to be established comprising a minimum of three and a maximum of seven Partnership Board Members to review the nominations and select suitable candidate(s). The BSC will submit their recommended candidate(s) to fill the Partnership Board vacancies to the full Partnership Board for its approval at the next available Partnership Board Meeting.

10.6 Mr Grunsell noted that the process was noted to be consistent with the RBM Bye-Laws and with a timeline that would aim to identify two additional Board Members by December 2016.

10.7 Mr Daly thanked Mr Grunsell for his presentation and asked if Board Members had any questions or queries regarding the process. The Board agreed that the target timeline was ambitious, but agreed it was nevertheless another critical and urgent priority to move forward. The Board further noted that it was the responsibility of the entire Board to encourage as many high caliber individuals who matched the selected criteria to come forward and to proactively engage in outreach across their networks.

10.8 Mr Daly then asked the Board to approved a decision point on the selection of Board Members and for membership of the BSC.

10.9 The decision point was unanimously passed by the Board.

RBM/PBM.03/2016/DP.8 – RBM Partnership Board Selection
Recognising the need for greater gender balance and malaria affected regional representation from the Americas, The Roll Back Malaria Partnership Board approves the launch of a Board Member selection process seeking to appoint 1-2 new Board Members.

A Board Selection Committee was established to manage this process including:
- Dr. Winnie Mpanju-Shumbusho
- Dr. Pedro Alonso
- Dr. Altaf Lal

11. RBM Strategic Communications

11.1 Mr Daly asked Mr Grunsell to address the Board on the important area of strategic communication.

11.2 Mr Jonah Grunsell led the Board through a presentation and discussion on RBM strategic communications, including consideration of what sort of communications role was envisaged for the Partnership and Board moving forward; either as a platform to amplify the voice of Partners or a more proactive outward facing role to become “the voice of malaria”. It was noted that these options had an important bearing on messaging and tone as well as considerations such as resourcing, for the core Management Team and the Strategic Communications Partner Committee.
11.3 Mr Grunsell also outlined a potential approach to considering the branding and identity of RBM to ensure it was consistent with the revitalized Partnership following the period of significant change. It was stressed that any consideration of the brand should be done with appropriate consultation with Partners.

11.4 Mr Grunsell explained that the IST is developing an interim communications plan and it was requested the Board give guidance on core content and messaging, including any thoughts on the branding and identity review. It was noted that given the agreed timescales for establishing the RBM Partner Committees that the steers provided would also be a critical input for the Strategic Communications Partner Committee as they develop the medium to long term communications strategy and workplan.

11.5 Mr Daly opened up the session to questions from the Board. There was strong agreement amongst the Board that branding and identity was an important piece of work to progress whilst ensuring any proposed changes were careful, sensitive and consultative. The Board also stressed that the process needed to be guided professionally and therefore the time should be taken to do a branding assessment and to involve the Strategic Communications Partner Committee in reaching out to Partners in order to capture broad views.

11.6 The Board further stressed the importance of proactive messages coming out of RBM and using the best communication channels to get those messages out.

12. **Confirmation of Decision Points**

12.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho called on the Board to formally confirm the wording of all Decision Points and to confirm their commitment to them. The Board unanimously confirmed their approval of all Decision Points.

13. **Future Meetings**

13.1 Dates of the next Board meeting were discussed with proposed timings for mid December 2016, mid-March 2017 and mid-June 2017 put forward.

13.2 Specific dates in mid-December were proposed, with Board Members’ availability checked and dates agreed. It was felt that the timing of the meetings, especially the next one, should be made strategically so that the Board can make many of the big decisions that will be needed to be made in the near future such as the appointment of a CEO.

13.3 There was strong agreement that the next Board meeting should be held in Geneva again, for various reasons including the appointment of a CEO. However, it was also felt that it is important that at least one meeting next year should be held in a malaria-affected country as the impact RBM wants to make is in those countries. Board Members were encouraged to suggest malaria-affected countries and timings.

13.4 Budget for meetings was a consideration voiced by Mr Daly and the finance committee urged to make sure the Board is making the most of availability of resources. It was agreed that the finance committee would look at the proposed cost of future meetings and location before any decisions are made. It was proposed that although three meetings were needed in this first year of the Partnership, the agreed two Board meetings per year as outlined in the RBM Bye-Laws would be the aim moving forward.
14. Close (Day 2)

14.1 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho voiced a profound thank you to Board Members, commenting on their visionary approach and the very refreshing way that they work together. She said the progress of the Partnership was going well in a large part because of the way Board Members relate to each other and the approach that they have taken to the tasks related to the Partnership. She urged the Board to find ways to make sure they retain this spirit of cooperation and communication.

14.2 The Interim Support Team (IST) was thanked by the Chair, noting the dedication, hard work and passion that the IST has shown in supporting the Board throughout the progress of the recently-revitalized Partnership.

14.3 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho thanked her Vice-Chair Kieran Daly and the people who have been working on the Partnership on a daily and weekly basis, including those who support the leadership team. Advisors and donors were thanked, as were UNOPS and WHO for their transitional work.

14.4 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho said “when we see a ship sailing elegantly there is massive work going on underneath”, recognizing both the great progress that the Partnership is making, as well as the number of people contributing to make that progress possible.

14.5 She addressed all Board Members to say that they all have a responsibility to continue to fly the flag to let the world know the work that the Partnership is doing - to be ambassadors to promote and spread good messages about the Partnership because it is alive and well and doing good things.

14.6 Dr Mpanju-Shumbusho wished all Board Members well for the variety of projects they are working on and closed the meeting.

Close