IAPB EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
DATE 4th June 2013
Tele-Conference

MINUTES

Date - Tuesday, 4th June 2013
Time - 14:00-15:30 London time
Venue - Tele-Conference
Attending -
Chair: Bob McMullan
Member(s): Johannes Trimmel; Adrian Poffley; Kathy Spahn;
Apologies: Abdulaziz AlRahji; Serge Resnikoff
In attendance: Peter Ackland; Alessandro Di Capua

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes from previous meeting
   The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

2. Matters arising
   There were no matters arising which were not covered in the agenda.

3. Strategic Plan
   BM referred to the latest version of the strategy, which had been drafted by the consultant following the discussions at the board meeting in Bangkok.

   PA highlighted the main changes as follows:
   - References to VISION 2020: The Right to Sight had been moved from the vision/mission section to the body of the strategy;
   - The target had been qualified as proxy indicator for universal access to eye health and footnote added to highlight the challenges in measuring impact on the most marginalised communities;
   - There had been other minor word changes, without much alteration of the substance.

   All agreed that the new draft reflected the discussions in Bangkok and was now in a form ready to be presented to the Council of Members in Brighton.

   It was also suggested that a first set of rolling priorities should also be presented at the Council meeting, together with the strategy.

4. Membership/governance review process
   BM informed the committee about discussions that had taken place with Richard Bennett, the consultant for the strategy, about contracting him also with regards to the upcoming membership/governance review.
The committee was favourable to the idea as it was noted that, following the work on the strategy and the positive feedback from the board, Richard Bennett had the trust of the board and he also happened to be an expert in membership/peak bodies.

It was decided that clear terms of reference about what exactly the review should cover would be submitted to the Board meeting in Brighton for approval.

**ACTION:** PA to submit initial draft ToRs for the governance review at the next Executive Committee meeting.

5. **WHO support update**

PA updated the committee on latest developments following discussions in Bangkok, in particular that a meeting had been scheduled for the 28 June in Geneva between Nick Banatvala, Ivo Kocur and Silvio Mariotti for WHO and Caroline Harper, Serge Resnikoff and himself for IAPB. The meeting would serve to clarify the priority areas where international partners could with support WHO in rolling out the new action plan and to start building a medium term framework for collaboration.

6. **IAPB/VISION 2020 lock-up logo review**

BM referred to the attached paper informing the committee of the changes in the layout of the IAPB/VISION 2020 lock up logo. It was clarified that no changes had been made to the individual logos, neither to the way members could use the individual VISION 2020 logo in their material.

The changes simply affected the lock up logo (featuring both logos together) to better explain the relationship between the organisation (IAPB) and the initiative (VISION 2020). Members could use this or the individual VISION 2020 logo at their own discretion.

A new IAPB Member button was also introduced, but again this was simply another option for members to use and was by no means replacing the VISION 2020 logo.

The changes were noted.

7. **Process to review IAPB policies**

BM referred to the issue raised by the Audit Committee in Bangkok about whose responsibility it was among IAPB governing bodies (in particular Audit and Executive Committee) to review policies prior to their submission to the board for approval.

To inform the discussion, AP noted that the practice at the World Bank was for the Audit Committee to be responsible for determining the adequacy and effectiveness of policies rather than to receive and review them (with the only exception of accounting policy). This was due to safeguard its independent role.

In principle all agreed that it seemed appropriate for the Executive Committee to be the body responsible to receive policies from the executive team and review them, with the Audit Committee maintaining its independent oversight role assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of the policies and identifying any possible gaps. The board was in any case the only body responsible for ultimate approval.
It was however suggested that, given that in practice both the Executive and the Audit committee had been taking on this policy review role, a final decision ought to be taken only following a joint discussion between the two bodies. All agreed.

**ACTION**: To set up a joint meeting in Brighton by overlapping the end of the Executive with the start of the Audit Committee. BM to flag up this issue with the Chair of the Audit Committee.

8. **Management accounts**
AP referred the attached papers. He drew attention in particular to:
- The healthy level of reserves;
- The thorough control mechanisms for cash management introduced, i.e. short term investments of Seeing in Believing grants, and ongoing practices for minimising currency exchange exposure.

He noted the committee should be reassured of the current state and ongoing management of IAPB finances and praised for this the work of Blandine Labry and her team.

9. **Membership applications**
The following membership applications were submitted, accompanied by the relevant endorsements from the regional chairs.
   a. Ophthalmology Dept., Severance Hospital, Yonsei University
   b. Restoring Vision

The applications were unanimously approved.

10. **OEU Seeing is Believing grant**
BM referred to the attached paper which followed up the concerns raised in Bangkok about the bad debt IAPB incurred due to OEU’s financial problems and the possible financial and reputational repercussions for IAPB in relation to the approval of OEU’s Seeing is Believing (SiB) grant.

With regards to the latter, PA reported on the work done to reassure ourselves that OEU was indeed in a position to raise the match funding required as part of the SiB grant, and that IAPB was not in any way responsible under its MOU with Standard Chartered to come up with the matching funds should an implementing partner default. Based on the review of the agreements, the reassurances obtained by OEU and the adoption of more stringent financial reporting requirements from OEU in relation to the grant, his recommendation was to proceed with the SiB phase V grant award.

Based on the evidence provided and reassurances from the Treasurer that exposure was minimal, all agreed with the proposal.

In relation to the former issue, OEU’s debt to IAPB, BM noted that, as per the attached letter from OEU, the debt had now been acknowledged a proposal had been put forward to provide a repayment schedule by 1st January 2015.
All agreed that, with the acknowledgment of debt and commitment to come up with a repayment schedule, the relationship had been put back on a principled level, regardless to the actual recovery of money which ultimately depended on the success of OEU’s recovery strategy.

It was noted that, as the issue had initially been raised by the Audit Committee, information of the above developments should be sent to The Audit Committee.

**ACTION:** AP to inform Audit Committee of developments on the above matter.

**11. HR issue**

The issue of a possible relocation of a member of staff was discussed and it was agreed that PA should explore the various options and their financial implications.

**ACTION:** PA to circulate options paper to the Committee, including financial implications.

**12. Next meetings**

a. Council of Members, Brighton 2013
   All noted schedule and BM highlighted possible clash with another commitment, but hoped to be able to attend.

b. Board of Trustees, March/April 2014 – dates
   Given A. AlRahji’s absence from the meeting and the fact that location was in his region, it was agreed not to discuss possible dates but to circulate options after the meeting.

   **ACTION:** PA/BM to circulate date options to the committee via email.

c. Next Executive Committee meeting
   It was agreed to hold the next Executive Committee meeting via teleconference on 5th September, with the particular aim to discuss the ToR for the Governance review (see agenda item 4 above).

**13. AOB**

As there was no other business the meeting was declared closed.