



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid

June 04, 2008 Meeting Report

USAID/A/AID
Room 6.9-073 RRB
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523-7600
Tel. 202-712-4002 Fax 202-712-0077



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid

Public Meeting Agenda

**Promoting Peace, Prosperity and Partnerships:
Atlanta's Contribution to Global Development**

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

The Commerce Club
34 Broad Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30302
Ph.# 404-525-1661

9:00 am **Welcome, Overview of the Forum and Introductions**
The Lane Room, 16th Floor

Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, and Executive Director, Center for International Private Enterprise

9:05 am **Welcome Message**

Henrietta H. Fore, Administrator, USAID, and Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, U.S. Department of State

9:10 am **Atlanta's Cross-Cutting Partnerships**

Moderator: Helene Gayle, President and CEO, CARE, and ACVFA Member

Discussants:

Dr. Julie Gerberding, Director, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Ron Jarvis, Home Depot, Senior Vice President, Pro, Tool Rental, Environmental

Dr. Roy Bahl, Professor and Founding Dean, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University

Michael Nyenhuis, President and CEO, MAP International and ACVFA Member



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

10:15 am Discussion and Questions from the ACVFA Members, Followed by the General Public

11:10 am Coffee Break

11:25 am Update on USAID's Development Grants Program

Introduction:

Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, and Executive Director, Center for International Private Enterprise

Presentation:

Terri Hasdorff, Director, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, USAID

11:40 am Keynote:

Introduction:

Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, and Executive Director, Center for International Private Enterprise

Presentation:

James R. Kunder, Acting Deputy Administrator, USAID

Discussion and Questions from the ACVFA Members, Followed by the General Public (Ms. Hasdorff will also be available for questions)

12:30 pm Working Lunch

Building an American Understanding of U.S. Foreign Assistance and Partnerships – Small Groups Facilitated by ACVFA Members



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

2:00 pm Working Groups Report Back

Facilitator:

William Reese, ACVFA Member and President and CEO, International Youth Foundation

3:00 pm Adjournment of Public Meeting

Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, and Executive Director, Center for International Private Enterprise

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

**Public Meeting
June 4, 2008**

Table of Contents

Opening Remarks	1
<i>Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chair and Executive Director of the Center for International Private Enterprise</i>	
Welcome Message	1
<i>Henrietta H. Fore, Administrator, USAID, and Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, U.S. Department of State</i>	
Atlanta’s Cross-Cutting Partnerships	2
<i>Moderator: Dr. Helene Gayle, ACVFA Member and President and CEO, CARE</i>	
<i>Dr. Roy Bahl, Professor and Founding Dean, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University</i>	
<i>Dr. Julie Gerberding, Director, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)</i>	
<i>Corey Griffin, ACVFA Member and Director, International Development Aid, Microsoft Corp.</i>	
<i>Michael Nyenhuis, ACVFA Member and President and CEO, MAP International</i>	
Discussion	6
Update on USAID’s Development Grants Program	12
<i>Terri Hasdorff, Director, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, USAID</i>	
Keynote Address	13
<i>James Kunder, Acting Deputy Administrator, USAID</i>	
Questions and Answers	16

Building an American Understanding of U.S. Foreign Assistance 18

Facilitator: William Reese, ACVFA Member and President and CEO of the International Youth Foundation

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, welcomed attendees, thanked Jocelyn Rowe for organizing the meeting in Atlanta, and introduced a new member of the Committee: Deborah Bensen, Vice President of Media and Government Relations for Operation Blessing. He also introduced the new members of the ACVFA Public Outreach Subcommittee: Paul Clark, Subcommittee Chairman and Principal, Paul Clark Communications; Deborah Bensen; Craig Charney, President of Charney Research; Mike Kiernan, Senior Director of Communications and Media for Save the Children; Robert Tappan, President of Weber Merritt Public Affairs; and Ellen Yount, Chief Information Officer for Management Systems International. Three members of the Subcommittee could not attend: Mike McCurry, Principal at Public Strategies Washington, Inc.; Johanna Schneider, Executive Director–External Relations for the Business Roundtable; and Sig Rogich, President of The Rogich Communications Group. He also thanked Janice Rhys and Kari Hackett of the Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, John Hicks of Georgia State University, and the staff of the Commerce Club.

WELCOME MESSAGE

Henrietta H. Fore, *Administrator, USAID, and Director of U.S. Foreign Assistance, U.S. Department of State*

In a recorded message, Administrator Fore welcomed the attendees and sent her regrets for not attending, but said she was sure this would be a productive meeting. Atlanta is a dynamic center for economic progress and social justice, the qualities to which international development should aspire. She thanked Dr. Helene Gayle and Michael Nyenhuis in particular for bringing the event to Atlanta.

The panel discussion, she noted, was slated to focus on international development partnerships in the Atlanta area. These partnerships are essential to USAID's work. Two weeks before, the Administrator said, she had traveled with the first airlift of USAID relief commodities from Thailand to Rangoon, Burma, to assist those devastated by Cyclone Argus. Since then USAID has coordinated 70 humanitarian flights with the Department of Defense (DOD). Beginning with that first flight, the American people have provided \$2 million in relief commodities including mosquito nets, water bottles, hygiene kits, and plastic sheeting. As a result of their generosity, USAID's efforts will provide lifesaving assistance to more than 470,000 people. More than 280,000 will benefit from the commodities and nearly 100,000 will benefit from emergency programs in shelter, food, water, sanitation, and hygiene.

Expanding the use of public-private partnerships is a top priority in American foreign assistance. Administrator Fore said she had challenged the staff of USAID to triple the resources attracted through such partnerships during this year and the next. Public-

private partnerships provide more resources, cutting-edge technologies, and good business practices. USAID welcomes the participation of all private-sector partners: businesses, faith-based organizations, universities, not-for-profit organizations, and volunteer groups.

USAID is close to launching a public-private partnership with leading CEOs for reconstruction efforts in response to the earthquake in China. This partnership will help to ensure that the humanitarian relief effort transitions smoothly into reconstruction. American know-how and business relationships in China, combined with USAID's expertise in reconstruction, will help the Chinese swiftly rebuild the villages and cities devastated in Sichuan province.

ACVFA has a special role in facilitating dialogue with USAID's leadership. The February forum on democratic governance and economic growth has led to a series of case studies reflecting the importance of integrating these two goals. One of the forthcoming case studies will examine a successful entrepreneurship program in Montenegro, a nation shedding its Soviet past and engaging its future in economic growth. The Administrator thanked ACVFA for its coming deliberations on partnerships, and its help in raising awareness of U.S. foreign assistance.

ATLANTA'S CROSS-CUTTING PARTNERSHIPS

Moderator: Dr. Helene Gayle, *ACVFA Member and President and CEO, CARE*

Dr. Gayle thanked Administrator Fore for taking the committee so seriously. She said she and Michael Nyenhuis were very pleased to bring ACVFA to Atlanta, the first time in a while that the group has met outside of Washington, D.C.

Dr. Roy Bahl, *Professor and Founding Dean, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University*

The Andrew Young School is the smallest and newest of the six colleges at Georgia State University. Founded twelve years ago to influence global policy, it now teaches 4,000 students each term. The school offers BAs, MAs, and PhDs in two departments—economics and public administration—and has moved more swiftly into national rankings at a level higher than it had even hoped.

One of the school's goals has been to attract strong faculty in public budgeting and finance. The school has aimed to offer technical assistance to any agencies that were interested, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), USAID, and the World Bank. This, in turn, led to a strong relationship with USAID, and partnerships with USAID in several developing countries.

One of these is in Indonesia, a country undergoing the most dramatic government decentralization the world has ever seen. As government power devolves to the local

level, there is a great need for local government training. The Andrew Young School approached USAID with a proposal to conduct that training in public budgeting and finance. USAID funded an education program, and now there are fifty-five MAs and nine PhDs from the Andrew Young School working in Indonesia's poorest areas.

The Andrew Young School also set out to build a strong Africa program in public budgeting and public administration. One of its first opportunities to do so came through South Africa's Mandela Economic Scholars Program, which sends students to America for MAs in economics. The Andrew Young School has hosted eight of these Scholars, seven of whom were women. All returned to South Africa and to positions of responsibility.

The school has invested in students some of the money it received from technical assistance projects for USAID. In cooperation with Morehouse College, it created a study abroad program in South Africa, now in its eighth year. It also won one of the Ron Brown Scholar Programs on entrepreneurship in southern Africa.

The Andrew Young School's focus on Africa has attracted many international students interested in good governance and economics. Today, the School has PhD students from Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gambia, Mozambique, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, South Africa, and Zimbabwe, along with several from the Caribbean. Abdul Mwangi from Uganda wrote a dissertation on agricultural development. Upon leaving the Andrew Young School he was accepted to the highly competitive World Bank Young Professionals program. Christine Moloi attended the Andrew Young School and then returned to the central bank of her native Botswana. Leslie Fisher, one of the Mandela Fellows, now directs the Department of Local Government in South Africa's Ministry of Finance.

The Andrew Young School worked with USAID to develop comprehensive tax reforms in Russia and Jamaica. In both cases this meant designing and helping to implement a flat tax. The school has done curriculum development work with the University of Nablus in the West Bank and is working with Egypt on technical assistance for local governance. USAID's own economists come to the Andrew Young School one week a year for a training program.

Today Georgia State University has over 3,000 international students from 145 countries. The Andrew Young School alone has 360 international students at the graduate level, many of whom are funded at least indirectly by USAID, and most of whom will return home when they finish their education.

Dr. Julie Gerberding, *Director, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)*

The world faces big problems, including climate change, poverty, and severe conflicts. Those problems bring health burdens along with economic and social-ethical burdens, and the CDC has begun to try to address these. At the same time, the CDC continues its work on epidemics such as SARS, monkey pox, and seasonal influenza.

In a world with so many problems, it would be arrogant to think that one government agency or even one government could make much of a difference. We must form partnerships. Fortunately, we are seeing these network partnerships emerge.

There are three keys to an effective partnership:

- *Commitment to a defined goal.* A good example would be the U.S. government's commitment through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), which has brought together other international agencies and host governments to work toward clearly measurable objectives.
- *Connectivity.* Partnership requires a special brand of leadership, what the CDC refers to as "meta leadership" or the ability to lead horizontally, among equals.
- *Capacity.* Not only must the amount of money invested be commensurate with the scale and scope of the problem, but the people and the resources to keep the program going must be effectively developed.

One of USAID's strengths is that it launches programs with the goal of sustainability. The CDC's unique strength is its scientific expertise, its ability to interpret evidence. USAID's strength is in sustainability, in the difference between "we're doing it for you" and "you're doing it and we're just filling in the gaps."

In summary, partnerships are very important in terms of mobilizing the vast network of people necessary to solve major problems. We all must recognize the importance of training and building infrastructure, with the ultimate aim of sustainability and an exit strategy. One of the best examples is the CDC-USAID partnership in Kazakhstan. The CDC's unique strength is its scientific expertise, and USAID's strength is the important component of sustainability—the ability to transition from "we're doing it with you" or "we're doing it on your behalf" to "you're doing it." USAID is working on its transition and exit strategy as the program moves into sustainability and CDC is watching because it must learn to do that too.

Corey Griffin, *ACVFA Member and Director, International Development Aid, Microsoft Corp.*

Today information technology is used by one billion people. A year ago Microsoft launched a campaign for the "next five billion" people on the planet. Under the umbrella of that strategy, Microsoft is working in three main areas: transforming education, creating jobs and opportunity, and fostering local innovation. The effort is guided by the principles of access, affordability, and relevance of technology.

This is a business proposition for Microsoft. Corporations cannot sustain giving without a view toward creating business in the future. Bill Gates has named this new paradigm "creative capitalism," and called for corporations to invest in development with a long-term perspective. The return on investment may not be immediate sales but intangibles such as employee satisfaction or long-term exposure.

Partnership is a relationship between individuals or groups characterized by mutual cooperation and responsibility for the achievement of a specified goal. The International Development Aid team was formed five years ago to work on partnerships with organizations in the developing world. Microsoft now has twenty such agreements in place. One of the most recent is with USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and PEPFAR. It took eight months of negotiations to finalize that arrangement, and it represents the first of its kind, where the three U.S. government agencies have signed a partnership agreement with a private-sector firm. Microsoft is currently reviewing some twenty specific partnership opportunities with USAID, PEPFAR, and the MCC, many with the Africa Education Initiative. Microsoft will contribute such things as its Partners in Learning program, a \$500 million commitment the company made several years ago to train teachers to teach the use and application of technology. The partnership agreement also discusses opportunities for the three government units to work collectively with Microsoft in countries where all four entities are present.

Public-private partnerships give Microsoft a chance to work with well-equipped agencies. If the company has plans to invest \$3 million in a community and USAID is in that country, it behooves Microsoft to work with USAID to create the strongest possible program. Partnerships help Microsoft build relationships locally. They allow Microsoft to showcase its technologies, explore business opportunities, and are simply the right thing to do. Consequently, Microsoft aims to increase these partnerships from twenty to thirty over the next year.

A successful public-private partnership engagement must be designed to address the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It should be relevant to the partners' strategies and operating philosophies, and integrated with their overall program priorities. A partnership should deliver an improvement relative to indicators. It should be implemented at the headquarters level and locally, and receive vocal support from senior management. For Microsoft, the partnership must be mutually beneficial, be an integral part of the company's business strategy, be integrated with its wider citizenship initiatives, build awareness with the company's customers, have clear goals, and generate excitement internally and externally.

There are some pitfalls to partnerships. Microsoft can spend a lot of time and effort in some cases without accomplishing anything. This happens when:

- The right expectations are not set from the beginning. Partners must articulate what each brings to the table and what they are willing to do.
- There is not a natural common interest. Too often partnerships are formed for their own sake.
- Partners are not under equitable obligations.
- Partners' business models are not compatible.
- One partner—often a government agency—is too risk-averse.
- There is a lack of trust.
- Negotiations drag on too long.

Michael Nyenhuis, *ACVFA Member and President and CEO, MAP International*

MAP (Medical Assistance Program) International is an international nongovernmental organization (NGO) based in Georgia. It has one office in Atlanta and others in Savannah and Brunswick.

MAP has engaged in three different kinds of partnerships. For a midsized organization like MAP to participate in all three of these kinds of partnerships requires flexibility, humility, and a diverse team.

Directed partnership

These partnerships occur under a straightforward transactional or contract model. For example, MAP manages USAID's stockpile of avian influenza protective gear, disinfectants, and other equipment used by first responders around the world. Directed partnerships have clear expectations and evaluation points, but it can be difficult for MAP to offer its own ideas when it sees better ways to approach a problem. To work best within this kind of partnership, MAP works to understand USAID's directions and needs.

Asymmetrical partnership

These are partnerships MAP forms with organizations extremely different from itself. For example, MAP has a 50-year partnership with many branded and generic U.S. pharmaceutical manufacturers, which provide drugs and medical supplies for projects around the world. These massive corporations have very different mindsets and goals from MAP. When they make donations for certain countries, they are also thinking about opening markets. To better understand these companies and their aims, MAP has joined with them in an association called the Partnership for Quality Medical Donations (PQMD), which meets to discuss how to work together better.

Symmetrical partnership

These are partnerships MAP forms with agencies like itself. For example, the organization has joined with five other midsized NGOs involved in international humanitarian relief work to form the Global Relief Alliance. Each organization has a different field of expertise, and together the groups can accomplish more holistic relief efforts. Negotiations with like organizations are comparatively easy, because they have similar cultures and goals. But difficulties can arise around issues of authority and direction among equals. In Kenya, MAP has a long-time presence and so took the lead in relief efforts following the political crisis there. A different organization had a long-time presence in Burma, so that group has led relief efforts following Cyclone Argus.

Discussion

Dr. Gayle noted that money is central to partnerships. Often what are called partnerships are actually arrangements between funders and those that receive funds. She asked how such arrangements distort partnership.

Dr. Gerberding said that for a long time the CDC defined “partners” as organizations to which it gave money or those who lobbied on its behalf with Congress. These are actually the weakest forms of partnership. Stronger forms are those that are mutually beneficial.

Dr. Bahl said that the best partnerships were those in which each partner recognized its comparative advantage. USAID missions tend to have staff strong in management skills, with general knowledge of economics. So the Agency purchases technical assistance from the Andrew Young School. USAID staff lays out the problem and provides the entrée to important national government offices (e.g., that of a finance minister). The “indirect costs” included in those contracts end up invested in the Andrew Young School’s students.

Mr. Griffin said that to mitigate the risks of those kinds of relationships, Microsoft gathers NGOs in the area it wishes to work. Microsoft provides software, technology, cash, or technical assistance to the NGO, and then USAID can support the same organization. Problems can arise, however, when projects cost more than Microsoft is ready to give. If Microsoft is ready to give \$100,000 worth of technology and software but the project has a scope of \$150,000, the NGO then must buy the remaining \$50,000 in technology. Unfortunately, such roadblocks tend to arise deep into negotiations.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that money can help build partnerships as well. Though MAP does not typically grant money, it determined that the best way for it to provide relief in Burma was to give money to its partner in the Global Relief Alliance with an established relationship there.

Dr. Gayle noted that both asymmetrical and symmetrical partnerships came with inherent tensions. In asymmetrical relationships the organizations have different goals, which could lead to conflict. More similar organizations, however, can also be competitors. She asked how the tensions in each kind of partnership could be resolved.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that MAP’s pharmaceutical company partners have received a great deal of criticism for their unwillingness to release patents on drugs needed to save lives in Africa and Asia. In some forums, particularly those in Europe, MAP has been taken to task for its partnership with these corporations. MAP does not like everything the pharmaceutical companies do, and they don’t approve of all of MAP’s activities either. The key is to find common ground. The PQMD group offers an opportunity to work through some of those tensions, and MAP believes it also has an opportunity to influence those corporations.

On the other hand, many of the organizations in the Global Relief Alliance do rely on the same donors. The organizations share a great deal of information but then each goes to ask for money separately. The arrangement works mainly because staff members in these organizations know each other well and trust each other.

Dr. Gayle noted that those in international development aim for long-term, sustainable changes in communities. To accomplish that requires partnerships with local NGOs and constituents. She asked how panelists—especially those from commonly mistrusted sectors like government and big corporations—have created such partnerships.

Dr. Gerberding said that the CDC has built trust by working apart from the rest of the U.S. government. The CDC tends not to work through embassies or under the U.S. flag; it works through local health ministries and alongside local NGOs. It prefers to invest in local NGOs and aims to hire local people. Some parts of the U.S. government preferentially invest in large, U.S.-based or developed-country-based NGOs. The CDC goes through a much more tedious process of investing in hundreds of small, local NGOs. Such organizations do not always succeed, but they are much more likely to be sustainable in the long term. For example, the CDC has hired and trained 2,000 local people through PEPFAR—perhaps the greatest contribution the program will make. Nearly all of the health ministers in Southeast Asia have been through the CDC Field Epidemiology Training program in Bangkok.

The CDC has traditionally occupied a unique niche, highly technical and evidence-based. Today, though, the CDC has had to dramatically transform itself as it becomes involved in care and treatment, broadening its workforce and capabilities.

Mr. Griffin said that Microsoft believed in working with local partners. The company has 30,000 Technology Learning Centers around the globe, all operated by local NGOs. As a secondary approach Microsoft works with organizations like the International Youth Foundation, which has infrastructure and relationships in the field already. In all, Microsoft has some 700,000 partners worldwide.

Dr. Bahl said that the Andrew Young School's goal is to promote sensible government policy, but host country governments are sometimes mistrustful if the school appears to represent the U.S. government. The first step is for the U.S. government to get out of the way, allowing for a direct relationship between a host minister and those providing services.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that most of MAP's development work aims to build up the program design, management, and finance of local NGOs, community-development organizations, and faith-based organizations.

Judith Hermanson, ACVFA Member, asked what mechanisms panelists had used to ensure mutual accountability in their partnerships.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that MAP is a subgrantee on a project in Kenya funded by PEPFAR through a coalition of NGOs. These different NGOs all have their own reporting systems. In order to fit well into that partnership, MAP adopted one of the other NGOs' reporting tools. One answer, then, is to share evaluation tools.

Dr. Gerberding said that mutual accountability was one of the requirements of horizontal leadership. The CDC still doesn't do it very well, but it does it better than in the past. One important step is to define the shared goal and objectives. Take, for example, the need to invest in auditing to check corrupt governments. That need often isn't covered by the resources the CDC receives. There is so much pressure to put all resources into programs that management needs can be shortchanged. The CDC employs Country Operating Plans wherein the country, each agency, and each NGO involved knows its responsibilities.

International investments are different from domestic ones. Some failure is to be expected with international investments: if 100 percent pay off, one is probably not taking enough risk. It is hard to take risks with taxpayer dollars, but it is also necessary. One must expect a certain amount of failure.

Dr. Gayle agreed, but noted that diversifying partners made risk easier to bear, and that the foundation world had an easier time assuming risk. Sometimes those in international development translate "accountability" as "take no risk," which minimizes the opportunity for innovation. Mutual accountability is also an interesting concept because those in development don't have good systems for communities to hold aid agencies accountable. There is a power imbalance between those in USAID and major international NGOs on the one hand, and small indigenous NGOs and other community groups on the other.

Aaron Williams, ACVFA Member, said that partnerships are forged by leaders, but must have internal champions to be effective and sustainable. He asked how panelists fostered a collegial, respectful, productive, and engaged culture of partnership—especially given that all staff members have their own daily jobs to attend to.

Dr. Gayle said that she has told her staff not to talk about other NGOs as competitors. It is a reality that CARE competes with them for funding, but if they are seen as competitors then CARE cannot maximize opportunities for cooperation.

Dr. Bahl pointed out that USAID makes heavy use of cooperative agreements and consortiums of responders. The Agency will award a grant to a consortium based on the comparative advantages of all its members, but then one group becomes a prime grantee and others become subgrantees. That creates a competitive environment, and USAID rarely holds the prime grantee's feet to the fire and asks what the cooperating organizations got from the partnership.

Dr. Gerberding said that sustainability depended in part on bringing back stories to the United States. Sometimes the CDC brings back people who have benefited from its work, sometimes the people who are working in the field. In Uganda the CDC has been working for a long time on hemorrhagic fever outbreaks, and the health minister has established such trust with CDC scientists that the country is actually funding the CDC, building a Center of Excellence for the study of hemorrhagic fever viruses.

Mr. Griffin said that sustainability had to be a “scorecard” issue. He said that as frequently as he discusses Microsoft’s work externally, he has to make the same pitch internally just as often, telling the story to company executives and getting their support for additional partnership and investment.

Dr. Gayle said that organizations must honestly believe that they are better off as a result of partnerships. Too often lip service is given to partnership because it is the “right thing” to do. But the evidence is clear: partnership makes organizations more effective. Funders have a big role to play in enabling partnerships, by decreasing the insecurity over resources that leads to competition. The Gates Foundation, for example, has provided resources in a way that decreases competition and increases partnership.

Mr. Griffin added that USAID must regard partnerships as an important part of the Agency’s strategy. It appears that Administrator Fore does so. She often discusses using a \$2 billion USAID investment to attract \$6 billion in private-sector engagement. Corporations can play a part, as long as they are comfortable saying that they are doing development work for business reasons.

Nancy Aossey, ACVFA Member, asked panelists how they resolved branding issues when they arose. Branding affects NGOs’ fundraising and the goodwill reaped by corporations and governments.

Dr. Gerberding said that she had recently traveled in Africa and seen many posters up at various health agencies with undecipherable logos. One of the best things about the USAID logo is the tag line “From the American People.” The use of a brand depends on whom one is trying to influence. People receiving services don’t care who is providing them. They want to know whether a clinic is open and whether they can get their medicine. But branding does matter to host governments. The CDC is actually often much better off if it is not directly associated with the U.S. government—it prefers that the CDC brand stand alone, or not be shown at all.

Dr. Gayle said that sometimes branding matters because people have a positive association with the CDC and not another part of the U.S. government. For CARE, branding matters because it has implications for fundraising. It also matters because CARE has credibility in the places it has worked for a long time. Branding becomes problematic when it is used to exclude others. The NGO community also hasn’t addressed to the same extent as the corporate world the question of how to make its various brands distinct.

Dr. Bahl agreed that sometimes it was necessary to be seen as independent of the U.S. government. The Andrew Young School was asked to work with the government of Jamaica on reforming its tax system to be friendlier to investment. The main problem there was to win the Jamaican government’s confidence, which would not have been possible as a representative of the U.S. government. The school needed to present itself as an independent expert in the science of taxation.

Mr. Griffin said that often the development community will ask Microsoft to work with some other company on a project, which can result in a brand fight. Microsoft has walked away from partnership opportunities because it felt that its contributions needed to be branded. Other times corporations are able to share branding rights.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that the organizations in the Global Relief Alliance discussed whether they should put that collective brand on the work they do together, and decided against it so as not to lose their individual identities. In communication with donors, each organization simply claims the work of the Alliance as its own. On the ground the situation is different. In Kenya, where MAP led relief efforts, MAP put its banners on all eight of the clinics it set up. That was important because MAP had a long-term relationship with the government and wanted to show its presence. In Burma, where MAP is giving funds to another organization, its brand won't appear anywhere.

John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, commented that some on Capitol Hill have criticized Global Development Alliances (GDAs) as projects that would have happened anyway, for which USAID is simply positioning itself to take credit. He asked whether panelists felt that their work would have happened anyway, or whether there was real value to working with USAID.

Mr. Griffin said that Microsoft's partnership with USAID provided a necessary new dimension to what the company would have done anyway. Microsoft will offer programs and provide community learning centers, but the presence of a strong partner like USAID strengthens the company's presence.

Herschelle Challenor, a former ACVFA member, defended USAID's insistence on branding as a necessary antidote to past cases in which private voluntary organizations (PVOs) operating under USAID contracts tried to act as if they were independent. It was important to show that most of these PVOs were working under USAID policies. With respect to training, she said that one of the main governance problems she saw in Guinea was an inability to manage. It is clear that changing the culture of an agency requires training a critical mass of people. She asked to what extent the Andrew Young School had considered in-country training of as many as 30 people in a single agency. She also asked what was being done about francophone Africa, whose culture is so distinct and whose needs are so great.

Dr. Bahl said that for certain kinds of technical education, in-country training makes a great deal of sense. But for leadership training, it makes sense to bring people to the United States, where they can rub elbows with people from around the world and rethink their assumptions. Francophone Africa is very difficult because it is so different from the system Americans know.

Dr. Gerberding said that cultural exchange worked both ways: it is very valuable for CDC people to work abroad to understand the problems of other countries as well.

Bijan Fazlollahi of the College of Business, Georgia State University, commented that his school has conducted training in other countries and the United States, and that both are necessary. The College of Business has established a sustainable program overseas that now teaches 2,000 people. But it is necessary for people to see and experience the United States. They return home with a completely different mindset, and then can train others. He noted that while USAID works with large corporations like Microsoft and Intel through GDAs, there are no local mechanisms for an organization like the College of Business to work with local companies and USAID. Unsolicited, it is very difficult to get an audience with USAID. The College of Business has only originated one program with USAID in fifteen years, and that took three years to launch. The school has established programs in partnership with USAID on women and entrepreneurship, but the impetus for those came from USAID. There are no mechanisms for a smaller organization to submit a project to USAID for consideration.

Wayne White observed that several panelists had discussed issues of comparative power among partners, which to him raised the issue of power in relation to developing countries. Such power dynamics arise in connection with the decision to export grain as opposed to buying local sources, for example, or the donation of drugs from major pharmaceutical companies, or the choice of who gets training for a coming generation of leadership. He asked whether the partnerships being discussed allowed sufficient space for a country-specific voice and country knowledge.

Dr. Gerberding said that these questions were central to the emerging field of international development ethics. The CDC is just beginning to grapple with such dilemmas. It can be very difficult to truly set aside one's U.S. perspective and allow those from a host country to lead.

Mr. Nyenhuis said that one of the ways MAP dealt with the issue was to staff all of its country offices locally. MAP does not send American expatriates to lead its offices anymore. Its own staff therefore offers a local voice, and MAP simply needs to make sure that that voice is heard within the organization. The next step is to make sure that MAP's partners have the same respect for the local voice.

Dr. Gayle said that this was the case in most organizations operating overseas today: employees are hired locally. That requires a greater tolerance for risk. Directing large amounts of money while trying to foster local accountability means accepting some risk of failure. In order to listen to local voices an organization must take the time to develop managerial capabilities, and along the way there may be some bumps in the road. But without accepting that risk, one can never have true local representation.

UPDATE ON USAID'S DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROGRAM

Terri Hasdorff, *Director, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, USAID*

The President created the Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives (FBCI) in 2002. This followed Congress's action on welfare reform in 1996, which allowed faith-based organizations to compete for government grants on an equal footing with others.

The Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives at USAID serves as the primary FBCI center for international development. It is geared toward NGOs of all faiths and sizes, and brings together groups that had previously worked separately. Ms. Hasdorff suggested that attendees who belong to large organizations consider how they can be mentors for smaller ones. Small, grassroots NGOs are always hungry for opportunities to learn.

The FBCI Center has been convening meetings to discuss specific issues. A meeting coming up in a month will focus on water issues; faith-based and community-based organizations interested in learning more about working together and hearing from water experts at USAID should attend the meeting. (The FBCI Center will issue an announcement. The Center also puts out a newsletter; groups can sign up to receive it at www.usaid.gov/our_work/global_partnerships/fbci.)

The Development Grants Program was established by Congress as part of the FY2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act. Congress intended the program to address the problems small NGOs have had in competing for grants as USAID's operating funds and staff have declined while programmatic funds have risen. The Development Grants Program dovetails with USAID's recommitment to embracing the broad community of committed development organizations.

Specifically, the program will offer small grants to active U.S. and indigenous NGOs that have had limited prior direct grant funding opportunities with USAID. The FY2008-funded awards will cover a three-year project period. Grants will be provided in coordination with USAID missions in a number of countries whose sector priorities match the funds available. Interested applicants will have the opportunity to comment on a draft request for applications (RFA) later in June, to be posted on www.grants.gov. USAID will issue the actual RFAs in a few months. Nondevelopment grant programs in the health sector will incorporate outreach to new partners for small grants in Child Survival and Health, the Malaria Initiative, and the New Partners Initiative. Grants will range from several thousand dollars up to a maximum of \$2 million for a more competitive organization; total funding will be about \$50 million. Likely sectors to be included are microenterprise, water, and women's empowerment. Other sectors may be added as funds become available. The Development Grants Program will be coordinated by the PVO/NGO Division of the Office of Development Partners.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

James Kunder, *Acting Deputy Administrator, USAID*

Mr. Kunder thanked John Hicks of Georgia State University and Janice Rice and Carrie Hackett of the Metropolitan Atlanta Chamber of Commerce for helping to bring the ACVFA meeting to Atlanta. He also thanked ACVFA members for their commitment to the advisory process. The Administrator and all other senior managers at USAID appreciate it. He welcomed Deborah Benson of Operation Blessing to ACVFA, and all of the new members of the Subcommittee on Public Outreach Subcommittee: Paul Clark, Deborah Bensen, Craig Charney, Mike Kiernan, Robert Tappan, William Reese, and Ellen Yount, along with Johanna Schneider, Mike McCurry, and Sig Rogich, who could not attend.

There is much good work in the development arena, and yet those doing it have not yet explained it to the public. Polls have asked the public what percentage of the federal budget goes to foreign aid: the median answer is 38 percent. As all present know, the true answer is under 1 percent—and if one only counts nonmilitary, nonsecurity assistance, it is *far* under 1 percent.

This is one of the most exciting times possible to be involved in international development. Never since the Cold War has a broader swath of the American public understood that what happens in the developing world is directly relevant to the United States. There are a number of reasons why people are aware of that truth, including counterterrorism, jobs, trade, and reconstruction after disasters. The challenge for those in international development is to translate that awareness into concrete action and resources.

Those who are political appointees of this administration won't be with USAID for the next chapter of this story. But the essential elements of that next chapter will likely include public-private partnerships, humanitarian intervention, the role of information technology (including the Global Development Commons, or GDC), and possible changes in U.S. government structure.

Public-private partnerships

Anyone who believes that human development requires more resources must attend to public-private partnerships. Thirty years ago, capital flows to the developing world consisted of 70 percent government money. Today the overall flows are much greater, and 70 percent comes from foreign direct investment. The challenge is to push that investment in developmentally sound directions.

USAID is making progress in this regard in a few ways. One good example comes from the Agency's partnership with Home Depot on the Responsible Asia Forestry and Trade Program, which promotes sustainable management of forests in Asia. USAID has done projects with Home Depot in the past in Indonesia, Malaysia, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Now, however, USAID is working with the company in China, Japan, Singapore, and Malaysia—places where the policy and business decisions are made that affect the forests in Vietnam, rural Indonesia, and Cambodia. USAID is opening its first office in China, not because China needs foreign aid but because if the Agency cares about sustainable forestry management in East Asia, it must engage in a development

dialogue with Beijing. This is part of the next generation of development: not just to engage the action in the field, but also to be a part of the business and policy decisions that affect that action.

Another good example comes from USAID's work with Coca-Cola on water and watershed issues. This partnership represents a new corporate model that reduces transaction costs: rather than individually designing public-private partnerships in each of several African or Asian nations, USAID and Coca-Cola are establishing a global framework for partnership in the water and watershed sector.

Humanitarian assistance

A number of Atlanta firms have made significant contributions to the relief efforts in both Burma and China in recent weeks, notably UPS and AT&T. In many ways, USAID is still confronting the problem of access. The Agency has managed to wedge open some humanitarian space in Burma, but it has not been nearly enough or nearly fast enough. Too many of the initial victims have not received any assistance. USAID has received only one visa, and the staff member who holds that visa has tried to get into the Irrawaddy delta as much as possible, but it is a tightly controlled area. The U.S. military is waiting offshore, ready to help if allowed. USAID has been creative in using the openings negotiated by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and other regional bilateral donors—India, Bangladesh, and Thailand—trying to help them and the NGO community wherever possible. That will be a continuing challenge: how to open up humanitarian space in places like Burma?

Information technology

An American teenager can download music to an iPod at low cost, but it is not yet possible for poor children to download good educational opportunities and health messages. Technological progress provides untold new opportunities that the development community has not yet exploited. Today, if some Ugandan farmers encounter a pest, maybe the word reaches the country's government, and maybe USAID finds an expert in that blight six months later, and maybe the information gets to the farmers in a year, by which time two years' crops will have been lost. Why can't the Ugandan farmers get that information immediately, by communicating with an expert at Iowa State University directly? There are institutional barriers, yes, but technology can facilitate the communication. That is in part the purpose of the GDC.

There is also potential for exciting breakthroughs in other areas. USAID has a group now examining the potential of cooperation with the International Standards Organization (ISO). The ISO originally promulgated primarily technical, mechanical, and industrial standards intended to promote compatibility in the global marketplace. But ISO has broadened its purview to include environmental and workplace safety standards. This is a system that the development community does not have to drive—the world industrial community is driving ISO standards. Might it be possible to insert developmental standards into the global ISO system, so rather than trying to force a change that benefits human progress, those in international development capture it in the broadest systems of the global economy?

U.S. government restructuring

According to an article in *Congressional Quarterly*, a new provision just inserted into the House's version of the Defense Authorization Bill records Congress's desire for the next administration to "establish a new standing advisory panel to improve cooperation among the three arms of the federal government responsible for defense, diplomacy, and international development, the latest effort to improve coordination among bureaucracies whose overseas missions are expected to be increasingly intertwined, as they are in Iraq and Afghanistan."

The mechanisms within the U.S. government for the delivery of foreign assistance have become much more diffuse, diverse, and complex over the last thirty years. Twenty years ago, all health programs overseas were USAID programs. Today, though, the CDC has health programs in Africa. The Environmental Protection Agency has partnerships with environment ministries around the world. The DOD has become an increasingly important actor. It remains to be seen how all these efforts can be coordinated with the private sector.

In addition, USAID has recently launched a new Development Leadership Initiative. An attendee commented earlier on how difficult it can be for small organizations to get USAID's attention; in part that is because there are far fewer staff members to talk to than there once were. Thirty years ago USAID had 4,700 foreign-service officers. Today it has 1,180. (This is in addition to about 1,000 civil servants, 500 foreign-service contractors, and 5,100 foreign national employees hired in-country.) On the one hand the Development Grants Program is a worthy initiative; on the other, it is embarrassing that Congress has had to direct USAID to work with small NGOs. There aren't enough people in the Agency to engage all the opportunities in the private sector. The Development Leadership Initiative aims to combat this problem by doubling the number of USAID's foreign-service officers within the next three years. Congress appears to be supportive.

Questions and Answers

Dr. Helene Gayle, ACVFA Member, asked what USAID needed to do differently in its next stages.

Mr. Kunder said that first, the Agency needs more staff. Second, it has been considering how best to use that staff. In the past USAID could train people in difficult languages, improving their ability to work in the field. The Agency cannot do that now because everyone must serve as a contract administrator, but when more people are hired perhaps it could begin to do it again. USAID also wants to continue to have most of its staff in the field. Above all, the Agency is considering changing the job description of the standard foreign-service professional to classify him or her primarily as a catalyst of other development efforts in a country. An officer arriving in Malawi should be able to assess development priorities and then assess all other entities working on them. The

Agency is also considering creating a second backstop capability for all staff members, so that all education officers, for example, are also trained in public-private partnerships.

Terri Hasdorff, Director, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, USAID, added that USAID does not tell its story well enough, and does not receive as much communication from the field as it would like. Better contact is needed between mission offices and NGOs overseas.

Judith Hermanson, ACVFA Member, noted that the new Foreign Assistance Framework, new business and policy decisions, and new staffing capabilities all seem to contemplate the intertwining of at least two of the D's—diplomacy and development. She asked how those two should operate together.

Mr. Kunder said that the institutional framework devised in the post–World War II era—consisting of the National Security Council, the State Department, the DOD, and so on—was groundbreaking at the time, but fails to reflect the dynamics of today's world. There is a growing consensus that additional coordination is necessary to take into account PEPFAR, the MCC, the many State Department offices running foreign-aid programs, the CDC, the DOD, and much more. He said that he frequently received complaints from ambassadors wanting to know, for example, why USAID had sent an energy team to their countries without consulting them, and when he checked he discovered that the team was in fact from the Department of Energy. So it is clear that something must be done. While there are many great ideas, however, that “something” is still in its nascent stages. Among other proposals are ones to create a Department of International Development and to merge USAID into the State Development. A dozen different commissions and committees are considering various options. The next administration will have to confront the questions of what if any structural changes should take place.

John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, read a question from an attendee asking where on the USAID Web site one could find names, titles, positions, and e-mail contacts of personnel in country offices.

Mr. Kunder said that decisions about what information of that kind is put on the Web site are made by the diplomatic security office at the State Department. For security reasons much of it is not made available. He recommended calling the desk officer in USAID's Washington office and asking how to get in contact with the relevant person in a given country.

Mr. Sullivan read two related questions from attendees. The first noted that Americans lack understanding about foreign aid and its role globally, and asked how USAID could educate the American people. The second asked how USAID was planning to manage the length of grants to deal with the fact that development programs typically take years.

Mr. Kunder said that USAID has been trying hard to publicize its work. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report recently praised USAID's creation of Development

Outreach Coordinators, contractors at each mission hired to explain the Agency's work to the local populace. There are two limitations: a lack of resources and statutory provisions that prohibit "selling" foreign aid within the United States, though USAID is permitted to explain its work. The first is the bigger problem. The Agency doesn't have enough people to expend any personnel on congressional liaison or other promotion.

As to long-term development horizons, Mr. Kunder said that the Agency understands that it takes long-term sustained funding to foster long-term sustained change. But Congress will never give up its annual appropriations bill. In fact, in USAID's 2008 appropriation, 104 percent of the funds were earmarked to a specific program or country. There were so many earmarks that some of the funds had to be counted twice. Those in the nonprofit and corporate sectors will have to help USAID lobby on the Hill for greater flexibility.

Mr. Sullivan read a question from an attendee asking how the requirement for a joint State-USAID strategic plan has limited USAID's flexibility to work with other U.S. government departments. There seem to be many strategic plans for international aid. Are these coordinated?

Mr. Kunder said that the good news was that the administration recognizes the need for multiyear strategic plans that reach beyond annual funding cycles. The development-assistance reforms were meant specifically to link foreign aid to U.S. foreign policy. Not everyone agrees with that approach, and perhaps the new administration will change direction. The reforms also fulfilled an additional purpose: to make it possible to describe how much money is going to a given country. Along the way to answering that question, USAID has driven itself to link aid to foreign-policy priorities. That has limited flexibility, but USAID has not been limited in its ability to work with other agencies.

Mr. Sullivan asked what Mr. Kunder meant by "human progress." With the global environmental crisis upon us, he asked whether USAID would facilitate more sustainable development.

Mr. Kunder said that one of the main problems in international development was that that goal "human progress" was so vague. If USAID and the private-sector development community decided that their singular goal should be to eradicate illiteracy by 2020, they could undoubtedly accomplish that. The problem is that there is no such unifying goal. All those in development are making progress in their own paradigms, but there has been no good overall definition of the goal.

BUILDING AN AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING OF U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Facilitator: William Reese, ACVFA Member and President and CEO of the International Youth Foundation

Over lunch, attendees discussed two sets of questions in small groups. First, each group was asked:

From your experiences (PVO, private sector, university, volunteer organization, etc.), what is a real “learning” you’ve gained from private-public partnerships you have tried? What is a hurdle you have had, and what did you learn from it, that you would share with the ACVFA? Have you had a serious problem that you were unable to solve that USAID’s Global Development Alliance might try to help you with? Are there types of services that you’d like to see the GDA try to provide to PVOs/NGOs?

Groups reported back to the full group on their discussions. Recommendations and comments included:

- USAID should provide more information on the benefits of partnerships to various sorts of entities. How do corporations benefit from their partnerships, for example? How does the DOD benefit from its partnerships?
- More missions need the discretionary funds to participate in partnerships when they are available.
- To bring more accountability to the grant process, USAID should include a three-year benchmark evaluation procedure in the RFA of every grant. The goal would be to encourage local projects built with local governments and organizations, and to provide an opportunity for local people to tell their stories about what they thought of a project. This could be done over the Internet at relatively low cost.
- New partnerships could be created by organizing networks in various cities consisting of the broadest possible array of businesses, NGOs, and other groups with interest in international development, including community groups indigenous to other countries. Such partnerships would provide new direction to foreign-aid policy. To develop such partnerships, USAID should provide a longer notification period, perhaps six to nine months between the presolicitation notice and the RFA, to give new groups an opportunity to develop.
- Many organizations have difficulty communicating information about their international work to their constituencies. Group forums could improve that communication, perhaps on the model of the Rotary Club’s Polio Plus Partnership.
- USAID should assume more of a leadership role in addressing any given country’s problems, fitting NGO programs into the Agency’s overall goals.
- USAID should continue to encourage partnerships in its contracting and granting processes, especially partnerships between universities and NGOs, which happen too infrequently.

- USAID should also encourage more partnerships between universities and corporations.
- USAID should share best practices on how to conduct partnerships.
- USAID should facilitate a two-way dialogue during the RFA and contracting periods, so that all participants' needs are better met. In particular, because partners can incur legal obligations in working with USAID, the Agency should consider providing legal assistance to smaller NGOs.
- Very small PVOs trying to do business with USAID face particular challenges. To help them, USAID should offer greater clarity and more information, and be careful not to raise unreasonable expectations.
- PVO/corporate partnerships need to be more than transactional; they must be long-term arrangements in which PVO and corporation see themselves as equals. PVOs and corporations alike must work to foster a three-way dialogue that includes from the outset the beneficiaries of programs.
- Americans lack knowledge about field situations, and how development work can affect indigenous structures. Church groups and other small organizations have sometimes inadvertently contributed to that culture of dependence, or otherwise disrupted communities' political, cultural, or social structures in the name of "good works." USAID should provide more guidance on how to address entire cultural milieus, not just the specific problem at hand, serving as a mentor to help organizations create smaller projects that fit into larger solutions. NGOs must empower local populations to provide for themselves. USAID can facilitate NGOs' and PVOs' progress toward that goal of sustainable economic development by encouraging vocational training, employment, and income-generation projects.
- Partnerships depend on patience and personal relationships. They must allow time for groups' different agendas and different directions to become aligned toward the pursuit of certain outcomes. They must also be based on common principles and values.
- Local partnerships with NGOs are significantly more productive and sustainable than partnerships with host governments. NGOs are more innovative, have more expertise, cost less, and are less likely to be corrupt.
- The stronger the partnerships within countries, the stronger relations will be with the United States. This is important for trade.

Second, each group was asked:

How do you think the average American views U.S. foreign assistance? What is the benefit of a U.S. foreign-assistance policy to Americans? What is the most effective way to increase the American people's awareness of the U.S. foreign-assistance program? What is the perception of U.S. foreign assistance in the field/mission? What may be done to improve the perception of programs and also increase awareness?

Recommendations and comments included:

- Americans have a limited view of foreign aid and what it has accomplished. In most cases they have a negative view or think tremendous amounts are being wasted. Rectifying this problem may call for a Kennedy-type visionary, a celebrity like Bono, or a movie like *An Inconvenient Truth*.
- Much research has already been done into the various segments of the American public that are in need of accurate information about foreign aid. Those in the international development community must use that research to develop toolkits explaining why foreign aid is beneficial and what it accomplishes worldwide.
- All of the groups USAID works with—the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, YMCAs, and many more—must do what they can to influence opinion leaders.
- USAID could better describe the impact of its public-private partnerships by telling a story that includes all the funds involved: USAID's own funds, those of other foreign-assistance programs, and those of private-sector partners.
- USAID should make better use of social media like Facebook to tell its story.
- USAID does a good job of gathering the stories of people affected by its work, and must continue to do so. These stories should focus on the self-help nature of development. But storytelling should always be linked to statistics, to avoid the perception that foreign aid represents a “drop in the bucket.”
- USAID should establish a network of its alumni to act as domestic ambassadors.
- Immigrants in the United States with knowledge of USAID's development work in their countries could help amplify the Agency's message.
- USAID should provide bullet points on its work to schools of public policy.
- GDAs have already done quite a bit to change American notions about development assistance. Once corporations got involved, foreign assistance became less risk-averse. Americans have also been more receptive to the concept of foreign assistance since September 11.

- USAID has an excellent Web site, but most people don't even know the name of the bilateral foreign-assistance agency in this country and thus will never find it.
- USAID should encourage the Council on Foreign Relations and similar groups to spread messages about the importance of foreign assistance.
- The elections provide a good opportunity to raise awareness about foreign assistance, but so far none of the presidential debates has included a single question on the subject.
- USAID should work with universities to inject international development into their curricula.
- In its messages, USAID should stress the importance of health and development programs as stabilizing factors in the countries where they are active.
- International development needs to become galvanized around a single goal that engages all stakeholders, like the One Campaign launched a few years ago to eradicate homelessness. That campaign used celebrity advocates; brought together different political perspectives; injected poverty into political debate; and successfully engaged the grassroots.
- CARE's "I am Powerful" campaign, aimed at women between the ages of 35 and 54, made its pitch in language that resonated with them. That campaign included a feature-length film screened at the Tribeca Film Festival.
- Messengers need to develop their own media. No one watches the nightly news and no one reads press releases.
- If USAID did foster city or regional international development councils of the sort recommended above, those could become excellent venues to share stories and raise public awareness.
- Currently, the face of foreign aid is a soldier's. USAID must work to demilitarize the image of foreign aid.
- To increase the public's understanding of the benefits of foreign aid, what is needed above all is strong leadership.
- A growing number of Americans have visited developing countries and seen foreign aid firsthand, but no one has yet tried to maintain a network of those with such experiences. Doing so would be a valuable exercise.
- A government entity needs to walk a fine line in marketing itself. The DOD has gotten in trouble, for example, for placing propagandists on the nightly news to

market the Iraq War. One thing that USAID could do is humanize the issue of foreign aid, using fewer statistics and more case studies.

- Many countries do not have a high level of goodwill toward the United States at the moment. USAID should work to bring stories from those countries into ours and send Americans to those communities.
- Communicating in the world today is very different from even ten years ago. USAID can use technology to communicate far more cheaply than in the past.
- USAID should focus on the next generation—kids—through new media.
- There is strong evidence that the American public views foreign assistance positively, as shown by the strong support private foreign-assistance NGOs receive from the American public. On the other hand, Americans appear to be skeptical about official government aid, in part because they are skeptical about the capabilities of other governments. USAID should consider a promotional effort that taps this wellspring of support for NGO projects to help people in poor communities. Conversely, there is a danger that “inspiring” people to support foreign assistance means inspiring them to do “good works,” or make direct interventions through their churches, which can be problematic, as discussed above. Messages should be crafted not only to evoke sympathy and draw charity but to inspire respect.
- There may be some credibility issues with government-provided information. Faith-based, community, and refugee groups could be a credible and effective intermediary, but their messages and campaigns should be linked with USAID or its spokespeople to avoid promoting possibly harmful independent action.
- Americans should hear the message that they benefit from foreign assistance because trade creates more jobs along with greater security and stability, and poverty, by contrast, has destabilizing effects. The United States has a responsibility to the entire world; our actions affect everyone.
- It is difficult to tell stories in isolation, but the media gives no context to understand development stories. Media outlets also prefer to tell stories of immediate effects, which is difficult because development is a long-term process. In part that is because media organizations are overstretched themselves.
- CNN has launched a show called *Impact Your World* to discuss development and humanitarian aid.
- USAID could consider reaching out to AARP and its culture of volunteerism.
- USAID should use effective Ad Council commercials as models.

- USAID should focus on comparatively affordable radio outreach, with celebrities that the audience knows.
- Accountability is the key. Right now, everything is for sale, including U.S. foreign assistance. The American people must hear messages about quality of assistance, and effectiveness, not about what's good for U.S. businesses like Coca-Cola.
- Whatever messages are issued should recognize that foreign assistance may be a tough sell when there are significant economic problems here at home.

Mr. Reese said that this rich public discussion showed the depth of wisdom present outside of Washington. He said he hoped the Atlantans present had also made new connections among themselves.

John Sullivan, ACVFA Chairman, thanked all those who attended, and said that the results of today's discussion would be included in future ACVFA reports. On June 12 and 13, USAID's Democratic Governance Officers will be meeting in Washington. ACVFA's Democracy and Governance and Economic Growth Subcommittees have been assembling success stories, which they will share at those meetings and then post on the ACVFA Web site (http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/acvfa). Much has been said lately about the power of viral communication. If those connected to ACVFA could take these success stories and begin to spread them virally—i.e., through e-mail chains—that would be one small step in the right direction.