



Executive Board Meeting

Paris, France

Tuesday, October 13, 2015

1:30pm - 6:30pm

MINUTES

Participants

Executive Board:

1. **Pekka Puska**, IANPHI President, Finland
2. **Jeffrey P. Koplan**, Immediate Past President, USA
3. **Mauricio Hernandez-Avila**, Secretary General
4. **Amha Kebede**, Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Ethiopia
5. **Gregory Taylor**, Public Health Agency, Canada
6. **Ilesh Jani**, National Institute of Health, Mozambique
7. **Naima El Mdaghri**, Institut Pasteur Du Maroc, Morocco
8. **Reinhard Burger**, Robert Koch Institute, Germany
9. **Wang Yu**, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, China

EB Members unable to attend:

1. **Mwele Ntuli Malecela**, Vice President, National Institute for Medical Research, Tanzania
2. **Fernando de la Hoz**, Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia
3. **Mahmudur Rahman**, IEDCR, Bangladesh
4. **Maris Jesse**, National Institute for Health Development, Estonia

IANPHI Secretariat:

1. **Courtenay Dusenbury**, Director, Secretariat US Office
2. **Ellen Whitney**, Programs Director Secretariat US Office
3. **Anne-Catherine Viso**, Deputy Director, Secretariat France Office
4. **Kelly Scoggins**, Senior Officer, Secretariat Mexico Office
5. **Katja Heikkiläinen**, Presidential Office and Foundation

Observers:

1. **S. Venkatesh**, India National Centre for Disease Control, India

Matters for Final voting:

1. 2015 Member Applicants

Chariman: Pekka Puska, President of IANPHI

1. Opening of meeting: Establish quorum and approval of meeting agenda:

1. Pekka Puska opened the meeting and established quorum for EB meeting
2. Pekka Puska confirmed that there were no additional matters to add to the Agenda, but mentioned the Future Earth Project could be discussed later with the US team to place on IANPHI website to determine member interest, but this was not elaborated on further by Pekka Puska.
3. Pekka Puska requested signatures of attendance for this EB meeting
4. Pekka Puska requested signatures on the February 17 and August 26 EB meeting minutes: **Annex 1**
5. Katja Heikkiläinen (KH) distributed a document on financial statement and explained that the legislation has changed and now require for all 5 members of the BoT Foundation.

2. New Executive Board members (informative):

1. Pekka Puska reminded the EB that the Member decision for 2015 based on 26 August EB meeting was for Ilesh Jani and Naima El Mdaghri to continue. Camilla Stoltenberg was proposed as a new EB member.
2. Pekka Puska requested that Jeff Koplan preside over the President and Vice President election in the GA.

3. IANPHI Secretariat 2015 Activity and financial reports: Annex 3 (1 – 11)

1. Pekka Puska thanked the Secretariat for their efforts in producing the EB document.
 - Activity and financial reports were presented accordingly:
 1. IANPHI President's Office Report (Pekka Puska): Described some of the advocacy meetings that he attended using **some** of the 5000 euros budget for the Presidential office (other travel expenses were funded by organizers), which included European meeting in Prague, the Global World of Public Health in Calcutta, and will attend in 2 week the Global Health Forum in Taiwan, meeting in WHO, and others if possible. PEKKA PUSKA has had a lump sum of 5000 EUR for President's Office expenses: not all was used and in some cases these travels were funded by the organizer. For correct activities/events, please refer to the PO's report presented in the EB meeting folder.



2. U.S. Office Report (Courtenay Dusenbury):

- The activity report is basically the same as that provided in the August 2015 EB meeting, but most important development has hiring Ellen Whitney to manage the CDC Cooperative Agreement, to lead the programs and the Gates funded project, and all work on CHAMPS project.
- Communication for 10 year anniversary of IANPHI and will send to the EB ideas on Advocacy strategies with global focus to be sure to present the importance of the IANPHI work and that of its members; US communication team created a website development project that has helped 5 public health institutes to develop websites and use social media tools with excellent success rate, which demonstrates that today's public health is more about communicating using social media tools in addition to so than MMWR type publications.
- Currently working on strategic planning for the EB and IANPHI on whole; developing working groups with InVS based on member interests.
- Successful evaluation at the Public Health of Belgium in Spring 2015. Reinhard Burger described the uniqueness and success in the combination of institutions participating to the peer-to-peer evaluation. Courtenay Dusenbury affirmed this is a good example of how can use the power of the network to help other institutes. This evaluation tool was developed by Anne-Catherine Viso and working group at InVS and tested in Belgium and have now been requested to use in RIVM in Netherlands, Saudi Arabia and PHE, and hope to charge for this service for HIC while for LMIC such evaluation could be embedded in projects. If resources would be collected they would go toward the Secretariat to support other activities. Katja Heikkiläinen stated that according to Finnish law, foundations cannot provide services for profit making purposes. Hence, all the activities IANPHI (Association) provides against payment need to be regarded as "donations" when paid. Thus, it would be technically the "cleanest" way that the Secretariat invoices the fees with wording as required by the paying organization, and the payments are made as "donations" – just like the member fees – in this way the Foundation does not act as the invoicing body (and does not violate the law) but only recipient of funds the Association (via the Secretariat action) directs to the Foundation account.



- Launched the NPHI Research Bureau, Christy Craig will research and reply questions of how countries differ and a graduate student will put together a data base of public health laws of institutes around the world.
 - USCDC will fund 2016 meeting for Leadership Development Activity; 2014 had seminar in Tanzania.
 - Working a lot on advocacy and partnership strategies to bring new resources to the Secretariat, and this included bringing IANPHI members in projects to have institute-to-institute approach; have engaged a list of NPHIs this year for discussion, including China.
 - Looking into how funding received can benefit the network, for example with the CDC Cooperative agreement and CHAMPS were able to secure \$40,000 USD to support the Paris meeting for low resource countries.
 - Funded 53 projects and helped in the creation of 9 public health institutes.
 - Ellen Whitney elaborated on project information as requested by Greg Taylor, specifically year 1 cooperative agreement: CDC emergency funding for Ebola to Guinea Bissau, Guinea Cameroon and Ivory Coast affected by Ebola for training, purchase of PPE; year 2 cooperative agreement: proposing to fund Guatemala, Mozambique, Zambia, Sierra Leone in projects largely for PHI development, training and consultation; Gates funded support for PHI and the Gates funded CDC projects to develop NPHIs in Botswana, Rwanda, Uganda, Ethiopia, Ghana and others to be identified.
 - Mauricio Hernandez-Avila comment on how these projects with larger NPHIs illustrates how these missions can strengthen IANPHI and our capacity to help other countries. We are signing a MoU with PHE and hope this will also be a very good model of lessons learned for other large NPHIs.
3. France Office Report (Anne-Catherine Viso)
- Anne-Catherine Viso reported that the main activity of InVS is the Annual Meeting and the Evaluation Tool with the US office.
 - InVS has a limited participation with core activities of the IANPHI Secretariat, but is very active with development projects and the NPHI evaluation tool, among others projects.
 - Hosted CDC-IANPHI meeting to convene the IANPHI consultative group (January 2015) on the evaluation tool developed by the CDC in order to determine impact in other countries. The consultative group was set up to get feedback from other IANPHI



members, the progress made by the CDC with the Staged development tool as it is named now will be presented in a concurrent session of the annual meeting.

4. Mexico Office Report (Mauricio Hernandez-Avila & Kelly Scoggins)

- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila reported that due to the budget reduction of 50%, activities have been reduced primarily to core operations only, but have contacted PAHO with the US office, as well as the Bloomberg Foundation / Union with Adam Karpati, but have not been able obtain funding; also submitted a proposal to the UCLA to participate in the World Health Policy Analysis Program and are waiting to hear results. Offer to conduct webinars on Global Health policy.
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila explained that as secretary general and director of an NPHI requesting grants create confusion for the donors on whether he acts on behalf of the Institute or of IANPHI. The lack of legal status for IANPHI is problematic, the foundation being nothing more than a bank account nowadays.
- Working to create paper from the Ebola session on the lessons learned.
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila reported to sign a MoU between the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health ASPPH and IANPHI for training activities MOOCs; Harrison Spencer is attending the Paris and hope to sign later this year.
- Kelly Scoggins reported on Core activities same as reported in August; current balance of fees paid \$213,263.00 USD and will examine later the analysis of the member payments; member contact and communication; printed member directory updated for 2015; EB support according to the constitution; support provided for the Annual Meeting; new member applicant evaluation for EB recommendation; the budget for 2015 was reported to the EB
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila explained that Peru has made a formal request for support and referred to the US office for update from their contact with Peru; Dusenbury reported that funding from CDC to support Peru was approved.
- Pekka Puska commented on importance of NPHI becoming sustainable institutes for tobacco control.
- Jeff Koplan inquired about where / how funds for NPHIs has been allotted as usually grants are awarded more often to NGOs. Mauricio Hernandez-Avila commented that funding is very diverse, but in Mexico for example mostly focused on the MoH and

NGOs; Pekka Puska, Jeff Koplan and Mauricio Hernandez-Avila agreed that there is a top-down trend in funding.

5. IANPHI Foundation report (Pekka Puska and Katja Heikkiläinen)

- Katja Heikkiläinen reported on the projection of the Foundation's finances in section 4 and reported that the current balance is 264,751.97 euros; have received fees but slightly under expected for this time of year; BoT met too times (virtually) this year and will meet again later in 2015 to decide on the budget for 2016; all activities have been within the budget.
- Pekka Puska inquired Anne-Catherine Viso about the budget for the 2015 Annual Meeting; for the time being it is not possible to give the amount of the expenses for the meeting. Anne-Catherine Viso commented on the different collective funding for the meeting needed to sponsor the IANPHI LMIC members and to pay for services needed, stressing the importance of membership dues. Without them it would not be possible to host the annual meeting.
- Katja Heikkiläinen explained that anyone considering directing funds to the Foundation account should consult KH and PEKKA PUSKA prior to the action to ensure the legal and accountability requirements are met.

4. Member dues 2016 and evaluation of inactive members (discussion):

1. Evaluation of inactive members **Annex 4- 1**

- Kelly Scoggins reported on the History of membership participation 2013 – 2015 to demonstrate the different scenarios of how members are paying, waivers and not replying for group discussion.

2. Discussion on Member Fees Committee **Annex 4- 2**

- Pekka Puska opened this discussion on the current policy for non-payment and raised the question of the non-paying/non-replying members and how the Constitution should reflect and deal with this; after GA discussion, a Committee should be set up to deal with this situation.
- Reinhard Burger and Jeff Koplan inquired about the controls and methods used by the Secretariat to ensure that when there is no reply for fees or contact mails, that the correct person is being sought; KS gave detailed explanation of the different measures for verifying and attempting to contact the Directors.



- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila commented on the rotation of Directors and how it is difficult to re-engage IANPHI with the new DGs as predecessors don't always inform incumbent Directors about IANPHI and the membership activity and dues payment.
- Reinhard Burger inquired about Secretariat reaction to unauthorized reduced fees such as Japan; KS replied that these cases are contacted directly to inquire about their situation and appreciation for their contribution as such is always extended from the Secretariat.
- Gregory Taylor commented that it seems there are two issues at play: 1) is membership and the connections with IANPHI and 2) is the amount of the membership payment support. Gregory Taylor considers that perhaps these should be kept separate it may be approaching the membership independently should be independent from the dues request. The mechanism of payment is often very complicated administratively to make the payment, which is the case with Canada and complications may cause non-reply and/or non-payment issues, but this should not reflect on membership itself. If a Committee for membership evaluation is to be established, there should be 2 separate committees to deal with membership participation and another for dues payments.
- Ilesh Jani agreed with Gregory Taylor that some of the members are unable to pay, and suggested that someone from the Secretariat contact the non-paying members attending the Paris meeting, but the Secretariat could contact the non-paying and non-engaging members and those EB members who know directly the Directors who are not replying to reach out to them on a more informal level.
- Jeff Koplan suggests sending a letter to engage contact separating the issues of payment with value of membership. Alternative to setting up a Committee is for the EB to come up with some steps to be taken circulated among members of the EB for comment- constructed by the 3 offices of the Secretariat. Gregory Taylor agreed that this could be a good solution.
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila suggested the possibility to link grants with membership payment; could determine individual cases with particular problems in making payments. Reflects on some members do not feel like they are receiving any service from IANPHI and so fees are not important to them. Jeff Koplan commented that when members receive newsletters or other
- Naima El Mdaghri confirmed that her institute has paid but that they had legal difficulties doing so and suggest creating some standard legal process (to facilitate membership payments.)



- Wang Yu (WY) we need to think out of the box and consider removing those members that do not respond at all and should attach the grants to the membership payment, and not just reply on the contributions.
 - KH reminded all that it was established in 2014 to create a draft for guidelines for membership payment.
2. Fee amounts for 2016 to remain the same based on 26 August EB meeting (to present to GA)
- EB Approved 2016 Fee Amounts***
- Low income or low middle income countries: 500 \$
 - Upper middle income countries: 3000 \$
 - High income countries: 9000 \$
- KH suggested that the fees be presented in USD but that the exchange rate to euros will be applied on the date the invoice is sent to members to avoid losses in currency exchanges.
 - Pekka Puska confirmed the wording to present to the GA and the fee amounts do not change.
3. Re-assign CARPHA as Upper Middle Income (currently classified as LIC)
- KS explained the confusion that occurred with the EB's 2014 misclassification
 - All agree and the Secretariat will notify CARPHA of the change.

5. 2016 IANPHI Work Plan and Budget (discussion):

1. Report on September Secretariat meeting in Atlanta
 - Courtenay Dusenbury reported on the meeting in Atlanta September 2015 with PP, Jeff Koplan, MHA, ACV, Courtenay Dusenbury, and US group: strengthening regional groups and services such as NPHI evaluation and training program, new registration website for the annual meetings to be offered by the US office/server, increase policy work such as journal articles on case studies, policy groups and evaluations, MoU with WHO for advocacy issues, Courtenay Dusenbury and Jeff Koplan will be working on a strategy to advocate with the US Congress, will continue with public health development, will expand with support toward the US CDC (ex. Ebola) and other activities to expand IANPHI's scope. Strategic planning session is needed. Bellagio Meeting to address key issues and the issues of strategic planning and the European fund raising strategy was mentioned.



2. Presentation of 2016 Secretariat Work Plan (to present to GA) **Annex 5**
3. EB guidance on IANPHI discussion
 - Mission and vision – this was not discussed
 - Advocacy and fundraising:
 - Courtenay Dusenbury spoke on fundraising and mentioned that for the 1st 8 years, IANPHI had funding from Gates to support efforts and the membership dues, and membership dues payments wasn't initiated until 3 years ago as a necessity. In 5 years there won't be any funds from the CDC cooperative initiative, as such they are attempting to integrate IANPHI into the CHAMPS funding; Jeff Koplan is looking into this with Emory to help sustain some activities for the future. Need to development strategies for research, funding, technical assistance, and as the membership increases the costs of the Annual Meeting increases; requested EB members to give the Secretariat feedback as invited EB members to be ambassadors for the Secretariat to determine what the individual members require from IANPHI.
 - Anne-Catherine Viso added to the request for support from the EB help define collective activities that would add value.
 - Gregory Taylor commented on how in Canada that if funding is withdrawn and the agency activities continue then the agency is functioning, so the question is if IANPHI is viable without Gates funding. The funding relation with Gates/CDC seems somewhat confusing but that it is apparent that IANPHI is definitely in a leadership position. Canada has a similar organization, which is the Community of Practice for technical advice without politics. Where global public health leaders are meeting, it is a unique situation, but what the added value for the members needs to be defined.
 - PEKKA PUSKA responded to Gregory Taylor on the importance of his comment and having the Directors
 - Reinhard Burger commented on the importance of being able to contact easily other DGs directly to be able to request feedback and activities, which is very good.



- Strategic planning
 - Mauricio Hernandez-Avila stressed the importance of adding value to membership, and hope that in Bellagio Meeting will have a full discussion of the direction of the new phase of IANPHI for the next 10 years.
 - Ilesh Jani suggested taking into consideration what needs to be done is to engage and determine the needs of the members, and cannot make a strong strategic plan until we have identified the needs and interests of the members, especially those who are not attending the annual meetings.

- 4. 2016 Secretariat office budget proposal **Annex 6 (1 – 4)**
 - PEKKA PUSKA opened the session discussing the IANPHI Foundation financial scenarios and mentioned the Secretariat budget for \$56,000.00 USD dollars for 2016, and questioned if KH could receive financing for her support.
 - Anne-Catherine Viso confirmed that the cost for the annual meeting is always between \$100 000 and \$120 000 US dollars.
 - Gregory Taylor inquired how finances are allotted and Dusenbury explained that US office is not included in the budget presented as it does not go through the Foundation. Does the association want to continue to chip in to its contingency funds, and it is not easy to approve any budget with inaccurate numbers. The founding capita of \$25,000 euros is the minimum balance that remains in the account and is not an expense.
 - There was a great deal of confusion on whether the figures? presented from the Foundation were all in Euro or USD or both.
 - Anne-Catherine Viso explained that InVS cannot receive money unless the costs of the salary is paid 100% and receives support for travel to annual meetings
 - Gregory Taylor and Ilesh Jani asked PEKKA PUSKA is the Foundation 2016 requested increase of \$27,000 USD was for salaries. Ilesh Jani suggested that the Foundation expenses should not be increased.
 - PEKKA PUSKA suggested that some of the Mexico office activities could be done in Helsinki, such as the EB agenda, some other activities to support the overall network. Requested what is the estimated budget for the Annual Meeting.
 - Jeff Koplan asked PEKKA PUSKA what would be the % of time for the salary increase of \$27,000 for the Foundation.



- Courtenay Dusenbury and Jeff Koplan confirmed that the estimation for the Annual meeting is \$100,000 from membership fees and the US office compensates as needed. KS confirmed that the final cost for the 2014 meeting was \$94,000 USD (\$65,00 from IANPHI fees and \$30,000USD from Gates/CDC funding) and was decided in the EB 2014 to generally budget the annual meeting at \$100,000 USD)
- PEKKA PUSKA photocopied an updated version in euros of the increase requested for the Foundation: presenting the list of proposed expenses and explained that KH invests a great deal of time to the Foundation and Presidential office and is requested compensation for this time and effort.
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila questioned if PP's proposal to move some of the Mexico activities to Finland, would decrease the funds to Mexico and reduce activities further or if funds would stay the same for Mexico but enabling technical activities that Mexico has not been able to pursue due to the 2015 budget cut. PEKKA PUSKA declared that the budget Mexico receives is very low but KH is doing a lot of pro bono work and we just need to determine if the EB agenda should be prepared in Helsinki.
- Jeff Koplan commented that the amount is a lot of money and given what IANPHI's funds are vs. the task described (being the EB agenda) doesn't add up; Gregory Taylor agreed and added that this proposal is a substantial increase to approve and needs to be clarified.
- Ilesh Jani pointed out that it seems like are having 2 Secretariats and the geographical separation but that apart from the increase for salary, the President's office receives 5000 euros for travel.
- Courtenay Dusenbury and Anne-Catherine Viso commented as well that it would be untimely to shift activities from the Mexico office to Finland.
- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila pointed out that one of the reasons that the Secretariat is located in Mexico is the lower cost of salaries. Also, the revenues for administrative activities are limited and suggest determine what percentage of the membership dues should be allotted for core operations and collecting dues.
- Its was agreed that there is not enough information to vote on the budget at that time, but could provisionally approve the \$100,000 USD for the annual meeting, and will not spend more than receive, and this will be how to report to the GA on the pending 2016 budget approval.

6. New member Applicants: Annex 7

1. Descriptive overview of the applicants for IANPHI Membership 2015 was presented by MHA.

- Anne-Catherine Viso informed that the Burkina MoH applied but KS explained that according to the Constitution their application was received too late and will have to be postponed for 2016.
- Established the need for the application forms to be updated to make it obligatory to fill out the survey for both national and associate applicants to be able to submit online.
- Jeff Koplan suggested to structure text in application for (ie Cameroon) to provide the required information in the survey in order to determine their qualification and type of membership.
- KS suggested that in the application there should be mention of the Constitutional responsibilities of membership including the annual membership dues and travel grants.
- Naima El Mdaghri suggested the benefit of linking better the International Pasteur Institutes Network with IANPHI. Anne-Catherine Viso answered that in the past RIIP attended the IANPHI meetings but not any longer. This could be reactivated.
- Discussion exchanged on the applicants and voted on resulting in the following:

Country	WHO Regional Classification	World Bank Classification	NPHI	Affiliation Requested	EB Decision
Cameroon	Africa	Lower middle income	Centre Pasteur du Cameroun	Associate	EB RECCOMENDATION FOR GA IS PENDING FURTHER INFORMATION
Pakistan	EMRO	Lower middle income	Pakistan's National Institute of Health	National	APPROVED
Madagascar	AFRO	Lower middle income	Direction De La Veille Sanitaire Et De La Surveillance Epidemiologique	Associate	APPROVED
Zambia	AFRO	Lower middle income	Zambia National Public Health Institute	Associate	APPROVED



7. Bellagio Meeting, (informative): Annex 8 (1 – 2)

- Mauricio Hernandez-Avila suggested that we hear from outside of the network to provide added value and develop a US Office-type business model for IANPHI.
- Open discussion exchanged on the future role of IANPHI, its potential partners
- Jeff Koplan added that IANPHI seems to some partners as a representation of government institutions, and suggests concrete proposals for sustainable long-term intervention projects with potential funding partners focusing on the uniqueness of IANPHI. Suggested that the EB members make a list of participants to evaluate.
- Ilesh Jani supports inviting external partners to the meeting: ratio of 60-40 or 70-30, to get a different perspective.
- Courtenay Dusenbury informed of facilitator pro-bono support from Anne Berg from the Norwegian Institute.

8. 2016 Host for Annual Meeting:

- Wang Yu presented the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, China as the host of the 2016 Annual Meeting
- EB approved for GA recommendation.

9. Next EB meetings:

- The 2nd Paris EB meeting Oct 15th was cancelled
- Confirmed the need for an EB meeting via WebEx at some date during November to discuss the 2016 budget

10. General Assembly proposed agenda discussion: Annex 9

1. General Assembly Agenda Draft

- Quorum with national members will be established
- Executive Board recommendation for new EB members using box with secret ballot with volunteer counter from the floor
- Re-election of President and Vice President to be presided by Jeff Koplan and using box with secret ballot
 - S. Venkatesh inquired if still accepting nominations for the Presidency and VP; PEKKA PUSKA confirmed that nominations can be made from the floor for the Presidency, VP and EB positions with 2 seconds to go to vote.
 - Kelly Scoggins presented the form for the voting ballots for voting.



- IANPHI Secretariat 2015 Activity and financial report
- EB Recommended Membership Fee amounts for 2016
- IANPHI 2016 Work Plan, budget and financial projections will not be defined with numbers
- EB Recommendation for new member applicants
- 2016 Host for Annual Meeting

11. Confirmed 2nd EB Meeting was not needed the BoT members for 2016: Annex 10

- (however this did take place as decided in the GA after the unforeseen election of Mauricio Hernandez-Avila as President of IANPHI)

12. BoT election added during the EB meeting by PP. Approved that the same members to continue on the BoT for 2016.

Support Material:

1. **Annex 1:** February 17 and August 26 EB meeting minutes
2. **Annex 2:** EB Rotation Chart 2006 – 2015
3. **Annex 3 (1 - 11):** 2015 Secretariat activity report
 - Mexico, U.S., President, Office reports
 - MoU ASPPH
 - MoU PHE
 - MoU WHO
4. **Annex 4 - 1:** History of membership fee participation 2013 – 2015
5. **Annex 4 - 2:** Reference document for Fees and waiver committee
6. **Annex 5:** 2016 Secretariat Work Plan
7. **Annex 6 (1 - 4):** 2016 Secretariat office budget proposal
8. **Annex 7:** New member Applicants
 - Descriptive overview of the applicants for IANPHI Membership 2015
9. **Annex 8 (1 - 2):** Bellagio Meeting
 - Application Update
 - Participant list proposal
 - Agenda proposal
10. **Annex 9:** General Assembly Agenda Draft
11. **Annex 10:** 2nd EB Meeting Agenda Draft