

United States Agency for
International Development

Advisory Committee on
Voluntary Foreign Aid

Wednesday October 19, 2016

Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

Transcript By
National Capitol Contracting
200 N. Glebe Road, Arlington, VA 22203

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

B

Beckmann, David.....14, 15, 37
Bourgault, Jeanne.....17, 18, 35, 36

C

Carray, Mariah.....29
Coates, Linday.....54
Coonrod, John.....29

G

Goddard, Anne.....19, 34, 37

H

Henderson, Laura.....54

K

Kayser, Laura.....53

L

Leslie, Jack.....3

M

McCray, Chris.....28
Miles, Carolyn.....46, 51, 53, 58, 60

R

Ray, David.....21, 33

S

Shear, David.....30
Smith, Gayle...6, 14, 17, 18, 21, 24,
26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36,
39
Stone, Carla.....52

W

Warren, Wade...42, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58
Watson, Jim.....24, 26, 32

[video playing]

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: What a powerful reminder of the wonderful work of this agency and all of you. I'm Jack Leslie. I'm chairman of ACVFA. I regret to announce that this is our last meeting of this presidential term, but I know all of you have been -- I look across this crowd. So many of you have been involved in this mission for a long time, and I know you'll be here, and we'll have -- whatever happens in a few weeks' time, we'll have continuity.

It is a great time, I think, to reflect on our achievements, and I want to talk a little bit about that, but first, really, I think it is appropriate to thank a number of people. First, the staff of USAID. If I could have the staff except for Gayle, who can't do this right now because of her crutches. But stand up for a moment. I just want to give all of you a round of applause for remarkable work.

[applause]

Many of them in the back are already standing. And especially to Gayle. Gayle Smith has been such, as you all know, a powerful, passionate, committed voice in before this administration, throughout this administration, and I'm sure she will be well into the future. She's positioned this agency and its work to continue, and I think without her great leadership we wouldn't have the opportunity we're going to talk about today of so many programs that we all hope will continue and be strengthened in the future.

I'd also like to thank all of my fellow board members, many of whom are here and a number of whom you're going to hear from during the panel. I've been very fortunate to have been able to serve with them. We've had, as many of you know, a whole series of working groups that I think have really marked the work of ACVFA over these years and I think hopefully have made a real difference in helping to advise the agency on the programs we are going to talk about.

We just had an interesting conversation in our meeting upstairs that I thought I'd relate, and it's about a mission that we've had for some time but that we're frankly not succeeding on, and that's doing a better job, like that video did, of reminding the American people about what important progress we're making. And if we're going to have these programs sustained into a new administration, that mission becomes even more important. I was struck by research that I saw recently. It asked Americans the question, "Has extreme poverty been cut in half, has it been doubled, or has it remained the same over the last 30 years?" Only 5 percent of the American people got the number right, which is, of course, that it's been halved. The Economist, in this story that I saw in The Economist, it said that a chimpanzee making a random choice would have a better shot at getting the question right than the American people. So it really shows that we still have a lot of work to do, and the core group are those of you who are in this room. So I hope that all of us can join together in spreading that word.

So we've got a great program today. Gayle is going to moderate

a conversation among a number of folks and reflect on progress made and next steps. Joining her will be David Beckmann, who is president of Bread for the World; Jeanne Bourgault, who's the president and CEO of Internews; Anne Goddard, president and CEO of ChildFund International; David Ray, the Vice President for Policy and Advocacy at CARE; and Jim Watson, the managing director of Presidio Partners.

As is our norm, after the panel, we'll open up the floor for your questions and for your feedback, so look for the mics that will be wandering about. And then after that, we want to make sure we make time for Wade Warren and Carolyn Miles, who are going to -- you're going to all want to stick around for this -- provide an overview of all of the items, or not maybe all of the items, but many of the items that are related to the upcoming Presidential transition. So thank you all, again, for making the time to be here, and I will turn this over to Gayle.

GAYLE SMITH: Now, I think I'm going to go, if you don't mind, sit up here. As I said, I was playing touch football. I lost.

[laughter]

I'm getting faster. Am I going to take this one? Okay. It's a real sign of my trust in the staff of the agency, I let them take my crutches and leave me up here.

[laughter]

Well, let me say good afternoon to everybody, and let me say special thanks to Jack. Jack Leslie is a man of quite some reputation and skill. He's got a lot of demands on his time, and he's put real meaningful time into this, and at a professional level, at a committed level in bringing your expertise and your passion to bear. So let me thank you. And let me thank everybody involved with ACVFA.

I mean, there's a really interesting stat. If you look at serving as the link between the U.S. government and public and private organizations active in foreign assistance since 1946, this may be a final meeting that we just had, but there is real continuity here, and I think that ACVFA and all of you are

really important players in that continuity that I think is so important. And we'll discuss some of this in the panel, but if I may, and I'm a little bit given to reflection for some reason. People keep doing the "how many more days?" thing. I mean, we were just doing "we have two more years." Now we're doing "we have how many days?" And I have to say that when I look back at where, eight years ago almost exactly, when as the transition team for what we called the Foreign Assistance Agencies, we walked into USAID, where we were then and where we are now, I'm pretty proud of where we've come but also pretty determined that we lock in those gains and enable a new administration to build upon them.

Now, part of that, to get to something Jack said, is breaking down some myths. And one of the myths is that -- and one of the phrases that has caused me to lose my temper often is that of Washington bureaucrat. Because I will tell you that when we walked in eight years ago, USAID was not at its strongest. It certainly was not at its most respected or elevated, but it was populated by extremely talented men and women who drive the work and the success of the agency, and that's still true. So the

first thing that I am proud of and I think we've got to keep doing is to build on and invest in the men and women that, despite the politicals among us that come and go and think we've got all the brilliancy in the world, and thank goodness we're here to rescue you from yourselves. And we've got to keep investing in the men and women who serve this agency, who serve administration to administration without reference to party or anything else. So I think they deserve a huge shout-out. I echo what Jack said. But that's been the constant.

Now, when I look at AID today and AID eight years ago, what do I see? I see an agency that has been elevated in stature but has earned, I think, it's new position of prominence. When I say "elevated," what do I mean? I was in government before. I can't say that USAID was as well-known across the interagency then as it might have been or should have been, nor was its mission. AID is well-known. I was recently in a high-level meeting where almost everybody at the table said they were working with the USAID team on the question at hand. Almost every other agency at the table. USAID is at the table, and it's the big table. We have been able to position AID to

represent the development equities in our policy deliberations. So that means that AID isn't just there as the ATM, although other agencies are very interested in the fact that AID has a budget. But AID is there to bring a perspective on how societies and countries change, whether on a positive or a negative trajectory, and what we know about what can be done to affect that. AID is leading in the interagency, and I think very wisely, whether it's on Power Africa where we have 12 U.S. government agencies, and USAID plays the coordinating role, quite frankly not by bigfooting any of our partners, but by being the coordinator for everyone. Similarly, USAID is leading in food security, and that is also multiple agencies.

The other thing that I see is AID that is delivering results, and don't get me wrong, it's not like AID wasn't delivering results before. But, like, AID is delivering more and better results, delivering those on the basis of more and better data and evidence, and making public and clear what those results are and then building upon them. I refer you to the recent results, for example, on Feed the Future, the progress report that was just released. And if you look at the year by year progress,

the impact on incomes, on reductions in extreme poverty, on reductions in stunting, it's real. It's measurable. So I see that.

So I see an agency that is confident, capable, and a player, and our determination is to position the agency and the work that we've done so that it can be built upon by a future administration. We're aided in that, I think, by something else that's quite remarkable. I'm looking out at a few people with whom I served at AID many, many years ago, and the notion that there would be strong bipartisan consensus around foreign assistance and development was not a common thought. You look today, and the President has signed into law on the basis of strong bipartisan support from both the House and the Senate the Foreign Assistance Transparency Act, electrifying Africa which codifies Power Africa; the Global Food Security Act; and additional new legislation on global health. It's pretty ironic that it's in this field that I think we have built one of the strongest coalitions of consensus on Capitol Hill and support for the work that not only USAID does but we do with all our partners across the government. So I look back, and I say,

"Wow, not bad for eight years." We had a vision when we came in, and I'd like to believe that we've delivered on it, but I also think, "Okay, what else do we need to think about, and what are the challenges out there?" And I hope we can engage the panel on this, because none of this would have happened, quite frankly, if it were not for the people on the panel and all of you that they represent. If we didn't have a constituency out there as diverse and strong and passionate and determined as you are, I don't think we'd be where we are today.

But I do think we've got huge challenges. One of the biggest is, a few years ago, AID used to measure that if there was on average one and a half DART teams, Disaster Assistance Response Teams -- those are these, like, amazing -- when I grow up I just want to be a DART -- these amazing teams that are deployed in emergencies. If there was the equivalent of one and a half in the field at a time, that meant a lot was going on. We right now have five, and we will probably very soon have six. At the height of Ebola, before the West Africa DARTs were merged, we had seven. That's the norm. If you look at the biggest increase in our budget expenditure, it's been on the

humanitarian assistance side. A lot of that driven by the Middle East, South Sudan. A lot of that driven by Ebola, but nonetheless, we are facing more and more complex and dangerous chronic crises than ever before.

The good news about that is the agency continues to iterate and bring new tools to the table and get better and better at responding with NGO partners from across this country and U.N. agencies all the time. The challenging news is that we are still investing more in responding to crises than we are in preventing them. And turning that around over time means driving home the point that things like Feed the Future or work that's done in health is working and is foundational. So that's one.

The second is the institution, and I'll just share with you that about a month after I was sworn in, I was meeting with some members of Congress, and one of them said, "What will be your advice for your successor?" And I thought that was kind of rude. It's like, I just got here. But I said, "Spend as much time on the inside as you do on the outside." And this is a

great job, and it's really tempting -- I would have a great time if I could spend all my time talking about what this amazing DART team is doing in response to Hurricane Matthew or the Feed the Future results or work on girls' education. Whatever it might be, I could be traveling all over the world all the time. I spend about half my time, I think, on the inside and on the strength of the institution, because the work we do is only as good and strong as the institution is. So there's some things we have done and are doing that we also hope will be lasting, and that in the same way that maybe we've started a culture of passing from one administration to the next development successes that can be built upon and that are not partisan but are good for the United States and good for the rest of the world. We can pass on some of the things we've done internally, whether it is improvements for staff, whether it is overhauling -- like, I still don't know all the acronyms for all the hiring mechanisms at USAID. Seriously, it's amazing. But we've got a long-term plan to transform that system, and that will serve -- I mean, it's great. President Obama should get credit for his administration getting this started. That will serve the United States for generations to come, so I think that's another big

challenge we have before us. How do we continue to enable USAID to be as flexible and nimble as it needs to be and to gain the support it needs from the American public and people?

I think there are other challenges out there, but you don't just need to listen to me on this. My suggestion would be, I think what we'd like to do now is if I can ask the other members of the panel to come up and join me. And I think what we're going to do is have a little bit of a conversation on this, not that any of these people has an opinion on anything. And let me just, again, before we kick off the panel, end where I began with thanks to Jack, to ACVFA, to everybody in this room, to everybody at USAID. Where I sit today is the privilege of a lifetime, and I'm just a little bit proud that we've been able to do what we've been able to do, but I mean it when I say "we," because none of it would have happened without all of you. So with that, thank you, and I'm going to turn to these people.

Ready?

DAVID BECKMANN: Ready.

GAYLE SMITH: David Beckmann, you don't have any views about anything. What do you think about poverty?

DAVID BECKMANN: [laughs]

GAYLE SMITH: Okay, I think you know this team. I think it would be useful to focus this discussion -- we will have time for questions and answers -- for a straight-up conversation about where have we come over the last few years and where do we need to go? Because I'm really proud of where we've come, but I am neither naïve nor arrogant, and I believe that there are a lot of things that are yet to be improved and built upon. So maybe if I were just to go down really quickly and say top line, like we're doing a quickfire challenge, where have we come that we really need to lock things in, but what are the biggest challenges you see? And we'll go straight down.

DAVID BECKMANN: Well, I think we've come a long way, not just AID, but the whole international development effort. I think it's the biggest success story in the world right now, that the World Bank just put out new numbers, so the number of extremely

poor people in the world, I think, is now 776 million, down from 2 billion in 1990. It's just -- and it's all of the indicators of development, child nutrition, you know, these dramatic reductions in child stunting. Thirty-five percent in Ghana in seven years. I think 50 percent in Peru, 40 percent in Cambodia. Child stunting.

So I just think we've got the -- this is the biggest success story in the world. It's a lot bigger than what AID or the U.S. government or all of us are doing. I mean, I'm a preacher. I think this is God. This is like the exodus. This is a big thing that's happening in the world with lots of things coming together, and really, I think it is -- the best thing to do is to say "Thank God" and then get to work. And it's like, you know, where we have to come is, I mean, let's all preach. I think God is inviting all of us to get with the program and to be part of this big exodus, because a big, powerful, rich country like ours could very easily play the role of Pharaoh, and that is not the role we want to be in. We want to help make it happen.

So, moving forward, I'm optimistic. I think we have a good chance in 2017 to move the priorities of our nation so that if those new priorities and on a -- it has to be a bipartisan agreement, but that we could set our nation and the world on track to end poverty and extreme poverty and hunger by 2030. I think that's really doable. So the immediate challenge is to, once we get through the election, to do our darnedest together. In this room, we need to get the new President and Congress to together commit to start moving in a direction of the 2030 goals. And I think what that means is especially money.

So it's going to be tough because both Presidential candidates have promised lots of things. Probably there's going to be a big budget negotiation, fight/negotiation, with the new President trying to get those priorities funded, whether it's tax cuts or tax increases. And in that, Trump has said that he would cut development and humanitarian assistance. I think President Hillary Clinton would probably want to increase it, but she hasn't said that. You know, she's campaigned and she's talking about a lot of other things she wants to spend money on. So it's going to be up to us to get the new President to

propose, I think we should be pushing in 2017 for a substantial increase in humanitarian and development assistance, and then to get the Congress to approve that. The conflict states are a good reason for that, because it really is -- there are security reasons for dealing with doing a better job in the fragile states, including the Central American countries that are so violent. It's also just a humanitarian imperative. So the fragile states, and then the hope that in a 13-year period we could virtually end hunger and extreme poverty in the world? Cripe! We got to get it done.

GAYLE SMITH: Okay.

DAVID BECKMANN: [laughs]

GAYLE SMITH: So, in essence, the good challenge and what's doable based on the progress that's been made is basically meeting the SDGs. The challenge is getting the commitments to the resources and the other things that are necessary to do that.

JEANNE BOURGAULT: I would also add that I represent the community of democracy groups, and I've sort of said where we've stumbled in the last decade is in the sector that I work in, and I think that the -- as we look at conflict around the world and see what's happening, it's because of a failure of institutions and a failure of political process. I think this good story is undermined by the fact of what you see on the screens is about this story, about the bad story.

GAYLE SMITH: Right.

JEANNE BOURGAULT: And so I do -- at the board meeting we had this amazing presentation at Feed the Future. I was so blown away by what's accomplished with that whole of government approach and some real commitment to an initiative, and it just pained me with the thought of, "What if we did this for democratic reform and progress? What if we did that same approach?" And I will advocate to the next administration that that should be the priority, because it's going to undermine everything else if we don't get that right. We're running so far ahead and doing so well, and yet these crippling things are

pulling us back, and so that would be my biggest piece of advice, is we've got to deal with the fundamentals or we won't be able to sustain this progress. And so it's time to deal with the fundamentals.

GAYLE SMITH: That's an extremely valuable point, and you said that keyword "institutions." And I think -- I mean, I've often thought about -- we don't have third terms, so I just thought about it on a very short basis, but if one were to do another big initiative, in looking at Feed the Future and Power Africa, if you looked at, say, ministries of justice or something that was really looking at institutions, I think there's probably big, big, big successes that could be had. I think it's a really valuable point.

ANNE GODDARD: I'll go to health. Since 1990, most of you know, we've cut the number of children dying in half. More children now reach their birthday. Infants and children. An amazing, amazing accomplishment. I was a child survival project manager in the early 1990s in Southeast Asia, you know, so I was living the beginning of that. And I reflect now to where we've come in

the last eight years, right, and I've been privileged to be on the board and be on the committee that's working on this issue of ending preventable mother and child deaths. And first of all, I have to say in 2012 AID did an amazing thing which said, "We can do that. We can end this." Right? I read -- I heard the other day one of the speeches President Obama gave, and he said something about institutions inherently have inertia in them. And it's people that push the change that make the difference, and that's what's happened here. Ariel and his team really got behind that issue and really pushed it and put really good thought into it, right? And the ACEs study, when I first realized what was going on, that AID was looking at really, what are the things that make a difference, and how can we use the same amount of money but do it better and rearrange our grant, which is hard to do, right? We can save 500,000 more children by 2015. I was like, "Wow. Sign me up," right? And that was accomplished, right?

So since 2000 -- 1990, huge accomplishments. In the last eight years, great accomplishments. Again, great leadership to make that happen. I think that, you know, we were working with

Ariel, who really leads it, and we just cheer him on because he's done such a great job. You know, what are the things going forward? And it's things like increasing, you know, working on sharpening the focus, getting the money right, you know, getting the message right. All that, if you ask me, going forward, yes, we have to do that.

But I would add one thing more. I would say that we've -- if we don't also look at another issue, we will potentially lose that advancement in saving children's lives, and it's the issue of violence, right? AID, U.S. government works on a lot of those issues of violence that impacts kids' lives in lots of ways. Violence in the home, early child marriage, then early child mothers, right, to violence in emergency settings, lots of issues. But it's all kind of scattered, right? And, again, to your point of a whole-of-government approach. The U.S. government has a plan for children in adversity. It is a whole-of-government approach. If we were to put the same kind of emphasis behind that and layer that on top of our health initiatives, then we don't risk losing what we could potentially from violence. Even our own communities here, I mean, the U.S.

The issue of violence is huge for kids in the U.S. Now, we work here in Mississippi in violence in schools, but in the countries we work in, it's really a critical issue. So if you ask me what would be the next thing in addition to keeping the job done, getting, you know, continuing to keep our foot to the pedal here, because there's still things to do, I would say really look at that. AID has signed up to inspire this new package of what we can do. How do we really put that whole-of-government approach behind that and make children not only live longer but live safer lives?

GAYLE SMITH: Thank you.

DAVID RAY: Well, I'll focus a little bit on the question of country ownership and local solutions. It's been an issue highlighted by this administration, and I think there's been a considerable amount of progress on that front. But first, I'll just say that I think you are justifiably proud about some of the changes made during the administration, and certainly I think there's no denying that the agency is both more dynamic and more focused than before, and I'd say on Capitol Hill more

well-respected, and that is in large part because of the efforts that you and Raj and Chuck his team and many others throughout the agency have made to develop those relationships on the Hill. So I would just call that out as one thing that I think needs to be continued as we move into a new administration. The investment and the time to build those relationships has been really critical, I think, to the success of the changes that you've tried to make in the agency.

In terms of USAID Forward, it's something we were talking about at the board meeting upstairs a bit. Obviously a very broad, comprehensive approach to try to bring some big changes to the organization, but I would like to focus just on one part of that, around local capacity building and country ownership. There's definitely been real progress in that area, but I'd highlight maybe two areas where I think there's still more work to be done. One of those is about getting the balance right between compliance and accessibility. I think both the agency as well as many of us as NGOs implementing partners struggle still with how we adapt the systems that we all have to live with, around how we pass funding along, whether it's through

contracts or grants, and the kind of accounting, either programmatic or financial accounting mechanisms that go along with those, and many of those are still very much out of reach for especially small, grassroots, community-based organizations. We still have work to do. We must, obviously, continue to be accountable, but we also have work to do to adapt to those systems in ways that enable us to engage in real, true partnership and enable local organizations to really take ownership of their own development.

The other area that I would highlight is in terms of removing the kind of constraints that exist on budgets. Again, we talked about this a little bit upstairs earlier, but there are, as you all know painfully well, there are a number of constraints that are imposed by earmarks or Congressional initiatives or Presidential initiatives that make it difficult for particularly agency staff at the country level to align the kind of country development programs that have been put together with local input with the kind of spending directives that come from D.C. And in order to make real progress around the area of country ownership, that is going to have to be addressed, and that's a

job that many of us in this room will need to take up along with your successors to try to see if we can create some chains around that with Congress.

GAYLE SMITH: Thank you.

JIM WATSON: Well, first of all, because you're going to find this out very quickly, I'm totally unqualified to be on this panel.

[laughter]

But my world is Silicon Valley, and I have been fortunate to be on the U.S. Development Lab Advisory Group for the last two to three years, and so my comments will be about the Development Lab a little bit and the relationship with USAID that we've been able to witness. And I also say that because I have absolutely never been in government service, and I've never even lived in Washington, D.C. So you can see I'm a true outsider here.

But bringing my experience to this lab has been fascinating,

where the job is about bringing innovation to development and allowing to wall off a group of people that are, and I agree with Gayle, incredibly dedicated. I was so amazed with my first meetings at the dedication and talent that was here. But how do you bring innovation to development and to the developing world, which means in my language, faster, better, cheaper? And to me, that's the challenge. How do we change how it's always been delivered? Because as much as I'd like to see the budget doubled, I'm not going to believe that that's going to happen. So how do we power Africa at half the price? How do we do it faster? How do we bring health care in a world that consists mostly of mobile devices? So those are the challenges, and they're really big challenges. The way we solve challenges is with great talent.

Okay, so, I see the U.S. Development Lab as a way to really entice people to come into public service, to allow people to come in and say, "These are really cool challenges. I would like to work on them," and come in and give even a year or two of their talent and, if you will, their free thinking into helping create a culture that says innovation is possible even

in a government agency. All right?

So the challenge is, though, how do you create a risk-taking culture within an entity within USAID, and how can people be rewarded for taking risk and failing fast? Or failing at all? And I think that's quite a challenge that we have tried to take on and allow people to feel free, allow outsiders to come in and not tell them how to think, and to come up with truly innovative business models and technology to help deliver development in a faster, better, cheaper environment. And I will say, we had one big win when it came time to help recruit a director for the U.S. Development Lab. We were so fortunate to get a woman out of Google who -- Ann Mei Chang, who said, "I'm not afraid. I'm going to come in and work hard. I'm going to think differently." And she, for us, kind of represented that first step towards an innovative culture that brought talent in from academia, from Silicon Valley, from other businesses to say, "Let's find a better way to deliver development."

GAYLE SMITH: So I'd like to say that you are fully qualified to be on this panel.

[laughter]

No, no, and I think it's -- I mean, it's quite a deliberate, I think, desire on our part and to our benefit to have somebody who doesn't live in Washington and brings the kind of insights that you bring. So you're stuck on the panel.

JIM WATSON: [laughs]

GAYLE SMITH: And we're delighted to have you. Let me -- we want to bring in some of your questions and comments, so let me just say a couple things by summary, and then we've got microphones wandering around, because I think there's some good points.

I think we're hearing that we've got the evidence that progress is possible, and we've got to resource it, but part of it is resourcing it with money. Part of it is resourcing it with innovation and diversifying the tools and the ways that we think about getting to scale. It's not just a linear investment of

dollars. We've got to do more, I think, on the changing how we do business. Your point on local ownership, I think we've made great progress, but I don't think you'd find anybody in USAID or elsewhere that doesn't think we need to go further on that. It's the best two-fer in the world in that people should own their own development, but if we're building capacity for people, to drive it all the better.

I think that a really important point that both of you made is also protecting the gains, whether it is by investing in the institution's processes, rule of law, strong civil society, all of the things that are the backbone of ensuring that those gains are sustainable, or addressing things like violence that can, you know, very quickly and overnight cut in half the gains we've made. So diversify how we resource things, keep changing the way we do business, and protect the gains.

Let's open it up. We have a microphone here and a microphone, I think, over here. I guess I'm going to call on people. Let me start over here. Yes, sir. And feel free to throw out questions or comments. If they're questions, if it would be

alright with you all, I think we're going to wait and take a few at a time so that we can get to as many as possible. Please, go ahead.

CHRIS MCCRAY: Chris McCray [spelled phonetically]. I'd like to pick up particularly on David's comments, which is as you're going forward in this sort of mobile world, what I'm wondering is, how do we get the sort of press cases that are coming out of USAID but sort of as they're happening, more in the sort of educational sort of format. Because one of my favorite organizations in the world is BRAC, and BRAC publishes everything, whether it works or it doesn't work. And in a mobile world, there's a link between education and jobs in development, and that's sort of organically happening, rather than waiting for four years deciding a program is brilliant and then only publishing the case afterwards, if you see what I mean.

GAYLE SMITH: Okay. Yeah.

JOHN COONROD: Thanks. I'm John Coonrod with The Hunger

Project, and I want to follow up on Jeanne's comment about integrating democratic governance more. One of the things I think I really appreciate about these last eight years has been more of a focus on integrated solutions, how health and WASH and Feed the Future all come together at the community level for resilience. And USAID does a lot of really great things in governance, but how, Jeanne, do you see that those could be more integrated into the main, big-time programs of USAID?

GAYLE SMITH: Okay, other questions or comments? Yes, you in the back?

MARIAH CARRAY: Thank you. Mariah Carray [spelled phonetically] with the World Food Program. As we see continually climate effects, political instability affecting our world, how do we integrate and reevaluate the link between development and humanitarian and emergency assistance?

GAYLE SMITH: Okay, I think we'll take -- yes, sir.

DAVID SHEAR: Thank you. David Shear, former USAID mission

director and office director. First of all, congratulations to you, Administrator Smith, for bringing about innovation and sustaining what has already been accomplished over the last seven years of the prior administration. But as we look at how one initiates innovation which is lasting, I would urge all the members of ACVFA and of all NGOs as well as the U.S., to really focus on building a capacity of local organizations. Local organizations have the capacity both at the community level, the village level, and the institution level. National NGOs within the countries in which we work have a huge capacity which can be expanded and made more efficient, but at the same time making them more efficient, we make them more sustainable. That's sustainability for innovation over time. I think it's hugely important, so they can absorb both new innovation and utilize what innovation that we can pass to them. Thanks.

GAYLE SMITH: Thank you. Okay, let me look across the room, and then we'll turn to folks. Okay. Don't see anybody else. Oh, one more in the back. We'll take that one, and then we'll turn to the panel.

MALE SPEAKER: We've heard a lot about what we should be doing more of. I wonder if each of the panelists could also bring up one thing that they think that USAID should be doing a lot less of.

[laughter]

GAYLE SMITH: No, no, that's a really good question. That's been one of my -- okay. So we've got a few questions, and maybe we'll come back down this way, and not everybody has to answer everything. I'll try at the end if there's anything left over that y'all just kick down to me, I'll see if I can handle it. But we got a question about educating, publishing more in real time rather than kind of waiting for the evaluations after the fact. A couple questions on integration, both how do we better integrate some of the things, Jeanne, that you talked about, that have to do with democratic institutions, processes into other programs, but similarly, when you think about things like climate change where you can't really look at humanitarian emergency response here and development over there. How do we bring those together? With respect to local organizations and

building their capacity, how do we sustain that, but how do we also sustain innovation? Which I think is a good question, because as with any new thing, there are a lot of projects. How do you really build it into the bloodstream? And then finally, everybody needs to name one thing that USAID should do less of. All right. Can we start at the end of the panel?

JIM WATSON: Sure.

GAYLE SMITH: Do you want to comment on it? Please.

JIM WATSON: Well, it seems to me the opportunity of watching USAID to be an amazing convener. So sharing of information, and I was fortunate enough to actually go out and visit one of the missions, and it struck me that what works in Colombia possibly can work in Ghana or other places around the developing world. So finding ways, with our modern communication network, which is primarily mobile and very social, how do we share what not to do? And that was one of the questions. What do we do less of? It seems to me if we can create this culture of try it, fail fast, figure out what works, share it, move it around the entire

USAID organization. Do more of what works, less of what doesn't work. So that fast, mobile communication can be a great benefit to the people that are out there in the world trying to execute on all the grand plans that everybody has. So that would be number one. Communicate, communicate, communicate. Figure out what kind of networks work in that environment. Do less of what doesn't work, which means you've got to create milestones that are very measurable and fast. So an example I can give you, when we build companies, we do quarterly milestones. If a company's not meeting those milestones, we stop the funding, okay. So you've got to have that discipline and that culture that says, "We live and die with the milestones. We'll communicate it. It'll be transparent. Do less and more based on that."

GAYLE SMITH: Thank you.

DAVID RAY: I'll just speak briefly to the question around humanitarian development and climate, and to say that I'm actually encouraged by the new global food security strategy, which by lifting up resilience as one of the three main pillars

is, I think, building a real bridge across those three traditional areas of work. And also say that we need to address again some of the kind of funding barriers that make it difficult to work in practical terms on the ground across particularly the humanitarian and the development spectrum. The other thing, in terms of what should AID do less of, I'd say perhaps less IQCs to a smaller number of big organizations like my own, and perhaps more smaller, more flexible funding mechanisms that are accessible to the kind of local organizations that the gentleman in the audience was talking about a moment ago.

ANNE GODDARD: I'll take on the -- I'll speak to the question about local capacity building. Totally agree with your point. Again, when I look back, you know, the growth of local NGOs, national NGOs in the countries we work in has been tremendous over the last 15 years, incredible. I think back with some countries when I was there, it was hard to find one. Really. Partly because the government controlled who could register as an NGO, and that's still a concern in some places. AID obviously has moved a long way in terms of local ownership and

prioritizing that. I think international NGOs, it's on us, and I think we're taking that challenge up about how to do that as well, right, how to build that capacity and utilize that capacity and empower that capacity locally. I think this is where innovation, I think, is tied to that. I think we have to bring, how do we support people in new ways through technology that will allow more independence of, sometimes of local organizations but also allow better oversight and milestone meeting and that kind of thing? The transparent data. I think that would help us all. On stopping, that's a hard one. I'll have to think about that one some more. Maybe making reports a little bit smaller.

[laughter]

And requiring us to put in a little bit smaller. Thanks, it is a joke. But it's truth. As we all know, paper sometimes is overwhelming to us all.

JEANNE BOURGAULT: I'll directly address the integration issue, and I think the only way it really works is if you were very,

very explicit about it. I can't imagine a development program that shouldn't have a major component about citizen engagement, civil society, empowerment to achieve your agriculture goal, your Feed the Future goals, your health goals, and an accountability piece. And that's what democracy is about, and we've seen over and over again, my organization is one of these organizations that does do integrated work. Not we have democracy funding, but we have lots and lots of health and humanitarian response funding, and until we are there doing it, no one believes we need to be there. And as soon as we're there, everyone's really happy, like, "This is amazing. You are doing something really special that is actually enhancing everything else we're doing." But the only way to get there is to be very, very explicit. Not with the democracy side. We got it. With the health side, with the environment side, with the climate change side. Make sure there's citizen engagement, make sure there's accountability, and you will get a lot more democracy in addition to these other things. We just need to be very, very explicit.

I mean, going back to what we shouldn't do, and I'm sort of

building on some of the things that other people have said. As much as we are talking about being nimble and innovative and using technology to do different things, there are still a lot of remnants of slow, old, and bureaucratic, and I mean that -- I know no one here wants to design that, like, but it still remains, and there's --

GAYLE SMITH: We live to slow things down.

[laughter]

JEANNE BOURGAULT: And it drives -- when I was in the organization, which I was, it drove me crazy, and it continues to drive me crazy. But it is -- I think there is reporting, there's approvals, there's all sorts of things that still happen that don't allow the feedback loops and the nimble stuff that we've all been talking about that's so exciting happen as effectively, or even the partnerships with local partners as effectively as it could. And so there's somehow to look at reporting, approvals, things like that, and really doing overhaul of those systems, I think we can get a lot more nimble

as a community.

ANNE GODDARD: I want to add one thing to my comment after that about local capacity building. I was on a panel once about a year or two ago. I forget who was on the panel with me. And I was talking to the need for local capacity building. And my colleague on the panel, who shall remain nameless because I can't remember their name, said, "Oh, you NGOs, you've been talking about that forever." So I think the other issue is, we need patience on this issue, right? Organizations don't grow up even in a decade, right. My organization is almost 80 years old, right? We built a lot of capacity over 80 years, right, and our local organizations are not that. So I think we need to give more patience and space to capacity building.

DAVID BECKMANN: I want to pick up on the World Food Program question and your first two comments. I think maybe around the year 2000 there was a new consensus that the place to spend development assistance money, serious money, was in low-income countries that had their act together, had pretty good governments, because they were spending their own money well.

You could put money there, and you could make a lot of progress. And that strategy has been outrageously successful. But it means that in countries that were badly governed or in humanitarian situations or in violent situations, we -- the development community, the international development community sort of did that on the cheap. So in humanitarian situations, you know, we give them some food to keep them alive, and if there are real opportunities for peacemaking or even development in those situations, we haven't done that because we were using our resources in the Ghana's and Mozambique's where we could get a lot done.

So it just seems to me we've come to -- well, the success we've had with that coupled with the growing share of hunger and poverty that is now in situations of violence and bad governance really argues for spending more of our effort and money there, maybe where the returns will be less dramatic, you know, where it's going to be tougher. And in the case of humanitarian and development assistance, when Pope Francis spoke at the World Food Program this summer, and the main thing he said, he said, "Governments, give the World Food Program money for development,

not just for humanitarian assistance, but in those places where they're providing humanitarian assistance, also to help people get on their feet and take care of themselves, even in those places where it's hard to imagine dramatic success."

GAYLE SMITH: All right. My goal -- I'm going to keep this on time. Okay, we got three minutes. Let me really quickly say thank you to all of you, and just a couple comments. I think on this, what should USAID do less of, I don't know that -- I mean, there are a number of things I can think of. I'm looking at Wade. I'm sure you got a list. I'm sure everybody does. But I think what's more important is to have a process or a system or a culture, similar to your point about innovation, where there's a regularized culture of taking stock of what we're doing and being prepared to stop doing those things that are not working well and take to scale those things that are working well and make some hard choices. I don't think it happens absent the permission to fail and the permission to stop. But also having a deliberate process. And so we've tried to be much more deliberate about this, and I think the culture has changed somewhat. I think we've got a ways to go.

We similarly just put something in place, to get to your point about integration on kind of humanitarian and development, to do a deliberate look at a crisis in the range of one year out to ask whether it's going to be a sustained crisis, and do we therefore need to be doing things differently rather than remain in emergency mode. But I think it's got to be the culture and the deliberate process of stopping and taking a look. I think this gets to something that's also been, I think, hugely important for AID, and I think everybody in AID would say we've done a great job of it, but there's much more that can be done, and that's evaluation. And evaluation, I think, is a process, but it's also a culture, and I look at internally one of the greatest changes I've seen is a much greater reliance on data and evidence and analysis, and much greater willingness to say, "This is great, but you know what? This isn't working." And whether that's a program or that's some of our internal processes. We got long processes too, and there's a constant iterative effort to kind of trim those down. But it's that culture of evaluation, to be willing to look at what we do and confident enough to say, "This is succeeding and this is

failing.”

The great lesson of this that I take, and I go back to the fact that AID's success or development's success for the United States has a whole lot to do with not just the executive branch but the legislative branch. What gives me a great deal of hope is I have found with the Hill, the more we rely on evidence and analysis and can say, “You know what? This didn't work so well, and here's what we're going to do about it.” And when we are transparent and talk about how we're going to fix it, the more confidence we buy. So I think having those deliberate systems and evaluation.

Now, I also think one thing that may be on your minds, if you haven't heard, it's October, and then in November there's going to be an election. And one of the things that that means -- it means many things, but one of the things that that means is that we are focused as USAID, as are all other government agencies, on preparing for a transition. Now, I will qualify that by saying we also intend to go full bore ahead, full steam, no slowing down till January 20th at 11:59 a.m. But we do also

want to see an effective transition that enables a new administration to take up the baton, avoid lag time, build on the successes, and so on and so forth.

So with your permission and if you would please join me in thanking the panel.

[applause]

Thank you, panel. Don't leave. We are now -- I think we're now going to move to a presentation on the transition process and be able to address some of your questions. So we'll invite you up. Thank you. I can stand up. No, I just wait till they -- otherwise they leave me stranded. You know the other thing I've learned about crutches?

[laughter]

That was cute, David.

WADE WARREN: All right. Well, good afternoon, everybody. My

name is Wade Warren, and in my day job I'm the head of USAID's Policy, Planning, and Learning Bureau, but Gayle asked me if in my spare time I could help get the agency ready for the transition, and I gladly took that chore on because, recognizing how important it is. And we wanted to spend some time this afternoon talking about what our plans have been and then hearing from you. And I wanted at the outset to thank you, Carolyn and Jack and everybody in ACVFA, for making this forum available to us. We've gotten a lot of requests from groups outside the agency who wanted to come in and meet with us, and we just don't have the time or the way to meet with every group individually, and so providing a forum like this for us where we can hear from the public and answer questions and receive comments is really very nice for us and important. So thank you for that.

So let me just talk a little bit about what we're doing in the agency. In August we created a working group, Transition Support Team, we call ourselves, to get ready for the change in administration. I'm really pleased to be the head of a very strong team. We intentionally selected people from across the

agency at all grade levels, foreign service officers, civil service, senior executive service. We've had some foreign service nationals who have been in Washington from the field who have been working with us on the team. So it's a great team, and we're all dedicated, increasingly on a full-time basis, to getting ready for the transition. I want to acknowledge a few of them who are here now. Daniel Corle is the Deputy Chief Operating Officer of the agency, Deputy Chief of Staff. Melissa Williams is with the Bureau for Education, Environment, and Economic Growth, and Colleen Allen is with the Management Bureau. So those are three people that I think are here today who are working with us on the transition team.

What we're doing, basically, is getting ready for a group of people who we believe will arrive here in the week after the election, so sometime the week of November the 14th. This group of people is called the landing team, or in some cases they've been called the agency review team. We expect there to be five to 10 to 12 people who will come to the agency and work with us through November and December to learn more about what the agency does and begin to think about directions that they want

to take the agency in. So my primary task is leading the agency through getting ready for that landing team to arrive here. We're basically doing two things. We're preparing a set of briefing papers that we will provide to this landing team, and then we're getting staff ready for in-person briefings. And I have to say there is this amazing pent-up desire in the agency to write briefing papers for this landing team. I've said a couple of times that hardly a day has gone by since I took this assignment that someone hasn't come up to me and said, "Have I got a briefing paper for you." So people, the passion is great, and everybody wants to get their issues in front of the landing team. Our task has been to try to make these papers concise and to try to figure out what the highest priority ones are for the team.

We've also consulted widely with members of past landing teams from past transitions, and they have told us that while the briefing papers are useful and they serve as important background documents, where they've really gotten most of their information has been from in-person briefings with the staff once they arrived here. So we're trying to put the briefing

papers behind us in the next week or so, and we're going to spend the rest of the time before the landing team gets here getting people ready for these in-person briefings. So that's what we're about.

I wanted to say just a couple of other things before turning it over to Carolyn. One is that Gayle has emphasized for us, and I think it's an important point, that she wants this transition to be as transparent and as inclusive as it can be. A time of transition like this can be a time of anxiety for staff, and so we're doing everything we can to keep everyone informed. We have points of contact in every bureau in the agency. We meet with them every week to tell them what we're doing and what the latest plans are. We're doing a weekly newsletter related to the transition, and we're also putting lots of information on our internal website about the transition. So an effort to keep everyone informed.

And I think the last thing that I'll mention is, we are also consulting carefully with our corresponding transition support teams in the interagency. So we've met with the State

Department a couple of times, with the NSC, with OPIC, with EXIM Bank, with Treasury, HHS, MCC, to make sure that we know what each other is planning to say and how we're approaching different issues. Not necessarily because we want to always be lockstep with other agencies in every single issue. We recognize that sometimes we may have different perspectives on issues, but we want to know what each other is planning to say and be very transparent with one another about what we're doing.

So I'll close just with one final thought, and I think it's an important one for me to emphasize. It's that we've heard several times from the White House that President Obama appreciated very much the smooth transition between the Bush administration and his own, and he wants us to ensure that there's an equally smooth transition to the next President, whoever it may be. So he has asked all agencies to dedicate themselves to ensuring as smooth a transition as possible, and so that's our primary goal. So, Carolyn.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. Well, thank you to Wade. We were talking upstairs before this panel, and he was joking about this

20 percent. Somebody comes and asks you to do something 20 percent of your time. You know how that works out. So I think we all owe him a great deal of debt, because he's really spending -- I don't think it's 20 percent of his time on this.

So I sit on three different boards, USGLC, EMFAM, and InterAction, and all of those organizations -- and I see many of my colleagues here -- have been busy writing transition books, transition memos, transition briefs, all of these papers. So I tried to actually kind of look at those and put them together and come up with six points that I think are important. And I'm sure I won't get them right, and the community that works on these things is here, so you guys can chime in afterwards. And we heard a lot about it before.

The first point is around cementing in what is working and what we want to continue. And that's going to be very important, I think, in any transition. We want to make sure that things like -- so it's both the what and the how. So the what are obviously global food security and the legislation and what that's going to take forward, but it's also things like ending preventable

deaths of children. It's Power Africa. It's those content pieces that we think have been working, and we now have a lot of data around those things that are working. We want to keep those going. But we also want to keep going the how, and so a lot of work that a lot of us in the room are doing, and it was mentioned before, accountability and transparency, data, which is so important to keep that how that's based on data going. Make sure, again, we heard a lot about driving to local capacity and building local capacity, so we want that to continue.

The second point I would bring up is that we, along this idea of continuing what's out there, we have a framework now called the STGs. It's been agreed by 193 countries. Many, many of us are working very hard to push that agenda, and I think we need to make sure that we're working in partnership with the U.S. government to drive that agenda, to be a role model on that agenda. I think we might have some work to do actually in this country on that agenda, but we really need to drive the STG piece and make sure that we're looking at our development work in that framework, because it's there and 193 countries have signed on. So along with this idea of taking what works and how

it works is taking that STG agenda forward.

But there are some differences, some different things that we have to do. And, again, these have been brought up, I think, in the conversation. The first is to recognize the chaos that's going on in the world. So right now, the vast majority of our funding is associated around -- and our work is associated around conflict and crisis. It isn't around development, and we have to recognize that that is not likely to change, so -- in the near future, certainly, and probably not in this next administration. So, you know, if you look at 50 fragile countries, that's where 43 percent of people living in extreme poverty are actually living, and if we are going the way things are going, it'll be 62 percent by 2030. So we really do have to change the way we're doing humanitarian work. I would call for an opportunity for a new humanitarian system working with many, many different actors. You know, we have a new head of the U.N. now that was running UNHCR. There's probably some good traction that we might get in the U.N. system to change. We need to focus on capacity of local responders, prioritizing conflict prevention, not just response, and new innovations or maybe not

so new, like cash programming and things that are very, very effective. So I think the U.S. government is the largest humanitarian donor in the world. There is a huge amount of power to drive change in the system, and we've got to be doing that and focusing on that.

A couple other points. We talked about new partners, and we talked about innovation. So recognizing that, again, ODA as a percentage of what's out there to drive change and resources is a smaller and smaller percentage, so how do we get the private sector engaged, and how do we really work in partnership with local governments? I would say we need to call for a pushing down responsibility and decision-making to the place that is closest to the people that we're trying to serve, and that probably doesn't mean here in Washington, right? So that drive, and if we kept that in mind and we said, "How do we develop everything? How do we drive everything we're doing with that in mind?" we would probably make some different decision.

Two more points. One about financing. So we're going to need the money, obviously, to drive this, but I think we need to

think about USAID and the work that we all do with USAID as that catalytic funding, and we have to think of it against match funding almost. So whether that's domestic resource mobilization, whether that's private sector financing, but something different again than what we're doing today, and recognizing it's catalytic. It's not all there is. It's got to be driving other resources to come to the table.

There's a bunch of new ideas out there. One of them is about a new development bank, what maybe we need to put OPIC and TDA and some other things together and develop a new development bank. Focus on domestic resource mobilization, driving small and medium enterprises at the country level, and then I think we do need to step back and look at public-private partnerships and say what really worked and have the guts to say, "You know what? Some of these don't work, and some of these really work, and what is it that distinguishes the ones that work and the ones that don't?"

And then final point is, and it goes back to the STGs, focusing on equality, and we will never achieve our development goals,

any of them, whether we're talking about ending extreme hunger or ending child deaths or ending extreme poverty, we'll never get there if we don't start with the people who are at the last -- who are last in the line. So whether that's girls or women or ethnic minorities, we really need to lift up this issue of equality.

So those are my six points, and I'm sure I missed some, but.

WADE WARREN: Thank you. I'm fighting the impulse to want to respond to all of those points.

CAROLYN MILES: [laughs]

WADE WARREN: I think those are great points that we could have a whole conversation just between ourselves about that.

CAROLYN MILES: We could, but we're going to open it.

WADE WARREN: But that's not what we're going to do. So I think we have about 15 to 18 minutes, something like that, where we

wanted to spend some time seeing what's on your mind. If you have questions for us about how the transition is working inside the agency, I'm happy to answer those to the extent that I can. If you have thoughts that you think are important for us to understand as we enter into this time of change, we'd like to hear them, so just open the floor and let you ask your questions or offer your comments. Yes.

CARLA STONE: My name's Carla Stone. I'm with the World Trade Center in Delaware, and one of my concerns is on procurement. It seems like this is going to be a very, very good opportunity to change procurement processes because they don't always match the actual resources out there in the private sector, which isn't always looked at, particularly small and medium. And I'm thinking about the emphasis on credentialing and points systems and things like that. Very often in terms of delivering expertise, you're looking at, well, in the I.T. sector, it seems that half the geniuses in the I.T. sector never even seem to finish high school these days, let alone gotten Master's degrees. But, you know, in many sectors, the people who are the best teachers and trainers and doers and planners might be the

actual operators, a senior plant operator or a wastewater operator, rather than someone with a string of degrees or someone who comes out of a long association with the overseas development. So I'm wondering -- it seems that this would be a good time to address those kinds of procurement issues.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay, so we have other ones.

WADE WARREN: Yeah, why don't we take a couple more, and then we can try to respond.

CAROLYN MILES: Yeah.

LAURA KAYSER: Hi. Laura Kayser, FHI 360. So in May, Wade, you spoke to a group of us through a SID breakfast, and you mentioned that you were looking, you and the team were looking at what initiatives might be sufficiently institutionalized that they could go on, you know, on their own, and which others might need to be repackaged for review by the new administration, and I was wondering if you had been able to -- or if you can share with us your thinking on that. Some of the ones you mentioned

were local ownership, you talked about research and evaluation, several others, and I was just wondering if you could comment on your thinking on that.

WADE WARREN: Okay.

LAURA HENDERSON: Hi. I'm Laura Henderson with CARE, and at the AFTA NGO consultation that was just yesterday, the AFTA -- some of the AFTA leaders shared that AFTA will be working much more closely with Food for Peace and also will be doing more multi-year planning, and there's the aspiration to do more multi-year funding around humanitarian emergencies, and I'm just wondering if that multi-year funding aspiration is something that, you know, is being talked about of how to realize that, because we know there are a lot of barriers for that multi-year funding, yet the humanitarian community has, you know, been very much pushing for it for a long time. So it's exciting to see that it's progressing, and just be interested in hearing more about that conversation.

WADE WARREN: Okay. Maybe one more. Lindsay?

LINDSAY COATES: Lindsay Coates from InterAction. Thank you, Wade, for all you're doing. Big thank you. I want to build on a point Carolyn made about humanitarian response. You alluded to the fact that you're having interagency conversation with peers about what you're actually doing. This is less a question and more a plug, and building on earlier remarks. The crisis we're facing in this context is so enormous, so the extent to which you all can look at this in a whole-of-government way, and maybe you'll publicly commit to that for all of us on behalf of whoever's elected right now. But just sort of underlining the importance of that issue and giving us any advice about how we can push for that real big systemic change that's really called for right now.

WADE WARREN: Okay. I see a few other hands, but maybe we'll stop a second and respond to some of these. I think, because I am mindful that we're here to talk about the transition maybe more than specific reform initiatives, but I want to assure you, I think, by talking about the big, overarching issues that we're planning to bring to the attention of the landing team, that we

do have these points in mind.

So I probably should have said in my opening remarks, we've envisioned kind of two levels of briefing papers and in-person briefings for the landing team when they get here. One is kind of by the bureau level, where bureaus will talk about individual country issues or individual sector challenges and issues. But we're also, we intend to start out with some corporate, overarching kinds of concerns and challenges and issues that we have identified, and most of them -- most of what we've already thought of will cover the things that you have mentioned. So, for instance, we're going to have an overarching briefing about development programming more generally and how what we do works with the STGs and how we work with the interagency in ways that we did not in years gone by. I think we'll touch on procurement reform as part of that, because no matter how dedicated we are to working more with local actors and doing things in a smaller way with local partners, there's still this large amount of money that has to be programmed, and there are, I think for the time being, always going to be big Washington-based procurements, and so how to manage those in a better way and be

more reform-minded is something that we'll want to bring to the attention of the landing team.

We are certainly going to be talking to them about both Presidential initiatives and Congressional earmarks and directives and the sort of hydraulic effect that they have on our funding. I think it's important for us to relay to the new team when they get here that some of their discretion is going to be constrained by the realities of the Congressional appropriations process and also some of the Presidential initiatives that will no doubt be continued in one form or another. Specifically to the question about Presidential initiatives, I think some of them, as Gayle mentioned, have been enshrined recently in legislation. So the Power Africa, the Feed the Future, parts of the Global Health Initiative. We hope before the end of this Congress we'll have authorizing legislation for the Global Development Lab. So many of the important things that we've been working on over the last eight years will have the power of legislation behind them when the new team gets here, so that's something that we'll have to bring to their attention.

We're also going to be talking about the structure of the agency and are we best fit for purpose, and I think questions about Food for Peace and AFTA and how they relate to one another will inevitably come up in those discussions. And then we are certainly going to be making the point that we've all made several times already this afternoon. The crises that we're seeing around the world are driving much of the work that we do now and that we have to be mindful of that and more, I think, discerning about how we program our money in crisis situations so that we're setting those countries up for development when they get to the point that they're able to take advantage of those kinds of programs.

And, Lindsay, I can guarantee you that we'll present to the landing team the importance of working in a whole-of-government way. And I think the -- you see it in the malaria initiative, the Power Africa initiative, the Feed the Future initiative. These initiatives are strong because they're interagency, and we will need to be honest that they're also complicated to manage because they're interagency. But the fact that they are

whole-of-government efforts I think is what makes them strong, and so that'll be part of our message.

CAROLYN MILES: So I told Wade I thought all the questions were going to be for him. I was right. But I would just add one thing on the OFDA Food for Peace question. I do think this idea that we need to better reflect the reality of the kind of crises that we're in, that are not these natural disasters, that are these long-term, fragile state kind of, in and out of crisis, and tying that to the way we do the funding is a big piece of what we need to talk about.

WADE WARREN: Right.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay. Other questions?

WADE WARREN: Okay.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay.

WADE WARREN: Don't be shy. Okay. All right. Well, we will

not keep you here till the bell rings. I at this point was supposed to turn back to Gayle, but she had to get on her crutches and get on out of here, so I'm going to bring us to a close with just a few comments.

One, I think Gayle made this herself on the previous screen. It's important to note that ACVFA has been a part of our world and a part of the foreign assistance community since 1946. So this administration is coming to an end. ACVFA will not come to an end. We in the agency intend to continue working with this community right on into the future. So look to announcements that will be coming to your mailboxes about the 2017 calendar of events.

And I wanted to remind you, if you have comments for us on anything we discussed today and in particular speaking with my transition hat on. If you have thoughts about the transition, if you have papers that you want us to see, if you have anything that you want to send to us, please feel free to do so at acvfa@usaid.gov. That's the email that we have established for this forum. We will be happy to take a look at anything you

send our way. So otherwise I would just like to thank everybody for coming. Thank you, Carolyn, for being my panel mate here, and I will see you all next time.

CAROLYN MILES: Thank you.

[applause]

[end of transcript]