The Partnership's Executive Committee (EC) Teleconference
Tuesday, 17 February 2016

07:30 Washing DC, 12:30 London, 13:30 CET, 14:30 Johannesburg, 18:00 New Delhi

DRAFT Note for the Record

Attendees

Katie Taylor, USAID (Chair); John Borrazzo, USAID; Betsy McCallon, White Ribbon Alliance; Flavia Bustreo, WHO; Ted Chaiban, UNICEF; Stefan Germann, World Vision International; Núria Casamitjana, IS Global; Jan-Willem Scheijgrond, Philips.

Speakers & Observers: Jo-Ann Purcell, DFATD, Ann Starrs, Guttmacher Institute.

Secretariat & Consultants: Robin Gorna, Abir Shady, Ryan Weeks.

Apologies: C.K. Mishra, Government of India; C.N. Purandare, FIGO, Yemurai Nyoni, Adolescents & Youth constituency.

Objectives

The meeting convened members of the Partnership's Executive Committee (EC) to:

- *Review* and *approve* the notes for the record of previous EC calls (27 January & 2 February 2016).
- *Review* and *comment on* the revised draft Business Plan.
- *Agree* for the draft to be revised based on feedback from the EC and be sent to the Board for a no-objection approval by end of February 2016.
- *Review* and *agree* the SO Partner Co-Lead TOR
- *Review* and *comment on* the draft Resource Mobilization Strategy

Recommendations and decisions (see details in Annex 1)

- *EC members* approved the Business Plan, with comments to be incorporated and then to be sent to the Board for a no-objection approval
- *EC members* to submit any further comments on the Draft Business Plan to the Secretariat by 12:00 CET 18th February 2016
- *Secretariat* to revise the Business Plan in line with these comments, and submit to the Board for a no-objection approval on 19 February 2016
- *EC members* to submit further comments on the Draft Strategic Objective (SO) Partner Co-Lead ToRs to the Secretariat
- *Secretariat* to amend Draft ToRs before issuing a call for Partner Co-Lead nominations
- *EC members* to submit comments on the Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy to the Secretariat
- *Secretariat* to incorporate comments into the Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy and present the next iteration at a future EC meeting

Annex 1: Summary of discussions

1. Approval of the notes for the record of the EC calls on 27 January and 2 February 2016

The EC approved the notes for the record from its previous two calls on the 27th January and 2nd February 2016.

2. Draft Business Plan (including the Results Framework)

Background

The EC was asked for its comments on the second draft of the Partnership's Business Plan so that the Plan could be revised and submitted for Board approval on a no-objection basis by the end of February 2016. The EC was informed that its previous feedback had been incorporated in the current draft, especially with regard to the guiding principles for country selection and consistency with the budget ceiling approved at the extraordinary virtual Board meeting on the 7th December 2015.

The EC was also asked for its comment on a Draft Terms of Reference for the role of Strategic Objective (SO) Partner Co-Leads, which the EC had requested during its previous meeting. It was noted that the ToRs specified a maximum of eight Co-Leads per Strategic Objective. The EC was informed that the Secretariat would issue a call for nominations once the ToRs had been agreed.

Discussion

The EC expressed general support for the Business Plan and thanks to the Secretariat team that had produced it. Although the group had a number of comments (summarised below), it felt that some of these could be addressed at the work-planning stage and should not prevent a revised version being submitted for Board approval.

- **SO1 focus countries**. The EC felt that the Business Plan's proposal that country engagement be prioritised in "four to eight countries annually" was unclear. The Draft should identify whether this means four to eight at any one time, or successively. The EC also recommended that the Draft should consider how Partnership focus countries would relate to GFF country platforms. It was noted that the operational issues around country working were yet to be decided, and that the upcoming Board Retreat, Johannesburg, 1-2 March 2016, might provide a good opportunity for further discussion and articulation of the detailed selection criteria.
- **Budget consistency**. The EC reiterated the importance of consistency between the Business Plan and the ceiling agreed by the Board during its virtual Board meeting, 7 December 2015.
- **Accountability and ownership**. The EC felt that, given that the Business Plan was expected to be approved on a no-objection basis, some effort would be required to build ownership among Partners. Without ownership, the EC advised that Partners would not feel accountable towards results defined in the Business Plan. It was suggested that the upcoming Board Retreat might provide a good opportunity to build Partner ownership. The EC also recommended further clarity on the separate accountability arrangements for the Secretariat and the Partnership as a whole.
- **Prioritisation**. Some members felt that the Business Plan's Results Framework was too broad, and risked over-promising and under-achieving: suggesting that further prioritisation was needed. Other members proposed that the Business Plan should retain its high ambition and breadth of targets, but that it should be treated as a "trigger document" to guide natural

prioritisation. Prioritisation will take place during the annual work planning process. Under this approach, the funding required to achieve individual results identified in the Results Framework would be "unlocked" by the EC in response to stakeholder interest and feasibility. The group felt that, although prioritisation would be important, the Business Plan should not reduce its level of ambition.

- **Results Framework**. Some members felt that the results were defined too broadly, and others recommended refining some of the process-level measures of success where, for example, the current indicator is a report.
- **Innovation**. It was noted that the Business Plan made two references to innovation, which may be insufficient given the importance of innovation described in the Partnership's Strategic Plan.

The Draft Partner Co-Lead ToRs were also broadly well received, with discussion covering the following points:

- **Term length**. Co-Leads should serve 2 years terms rather than the 1-year terms currently proposed, with staggered replacement times.
- **Decision-making authority**. The EC sought clarification on whether Co-Leads would have any decision-making powers. The Secretariat explained that SO leadership groups were currently expected to be advisory rather than decision-making groups, but that this could be changed at the EC's direction.
- **SO leadership group size and representation**. The EC agreed that having eight Co-Leads per SO would be excessive, so this should be a maximum, and the Secretariat should not feel obliged to seek more than two or three Co-Leads per SO. It was also clarified that Co-Leads would not be expected to represent the views of the constituency.

Decisions and recommendations

- EC members approved the Business Plan, with comments incorporated, to be sent to the Board for a no-objection approval
- EC members to submit any further comments on the Draft Business Plan to the Secretariat by 1200 CET 18th February 2016.
- Secretariat to revise the Business Plan in line with the EC's comments, and submit to the Board for a no-objections approval on 19 February 2016.
- EC members to submit further comments on the Draft Strategic Objective (SO) Partner Co-Lead ToRs to the Secretariat.
- Secretariat to amend Draft ToRs before issuing a call for Partner Co-Lead nominations.

3. Draft Resource Mobilization Strategy

Background

The EC was asked to review the Partnership's Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy, which provides a summary of resources that have been secured to-date, resources that are under review and the potential resources that need to be followed up.

Discussion

Owing to time constraints, discussion of the Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy was postponed until a later call, though written comments on the current draft were requested.

Decisions and recommendations

- EC members to submit comments on the Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy to the Secretariat.
- Secretariat to incorporate comments into the Draft Resource Mobilisation Strategy and present the next iteration at a future EC meeting.

4. AOB

- The Independent Accountability Panel (IAP) members have now been named.
- The Ad-Hoc Strategy Group (ASG) met via teleconference on the 8th February, and has appointed Jo-Ann Purcell as Chair, and Ann Starrs as governance focal point. The ASG will consider three decision sets concerning Board role and mandate, membership, and processes over the coming months before submitting its recommendations to the Board, via the EC, during the 18th Board meeting, Copenhagen, 18-19 May 2016.