

United States Agency for
International Development

Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid

Wednesday January 7, 2015

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

Transcript By

National Capitol Contracting

200 N. Glebe Road, Arlington, VA 22203

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

JACK LESLIE: All right, the administrator has joined us. I didn't want to have to say goodbye to him without him being here --

[laughter]

--so we needed to wait, but welcome all of you. I'm Jack Leslie. I'm chairman of ACVFA, and thank you all for joining us this afternoon. As we begin a new year, we certainly face a whole set of new challenges and opportunities in our mission to end extreme poverty and promote development of resilient democratic societies. And in many respects, I think this is a year that promises to be a year of transition and transformation. We will solidify the post-2015 agenda and agree on new goals for international development, and we'll explore those issues in two sessions this afternoon.

First, you'll hear from experts on the upcoming financing for development conference that will take place in Addis later this summer. And then, we'll have a broader discussion on the post-2015 agenda lead by David Beckmann of Bread for the World. Of course, it's also going to be a transition year here at USAID as Raj Shah has announced that he'll be stepping down as Administrator shortly. So before we started the meeting, I just wanted to take a few moments to thank my friend Raj for his five

years of service.

Speaking of transformation, I don't think we have had a more transformative Administrator since this Agency was founded. He came into the Agency when things were pretty bleak, and within just a couple of weeks, you may recall, he found himself immersed in the Haitian earthquake crisis. It was an agency that needed leadership with vision, a leader who had the courage and the insight to bring about sweeping reform, and indeed, I think that's Raj's enduring legacy. In many ways, I think Raj also arrived here at an inflection point for international development.

When USAID was founded in the 1960s, official development assistance represented 70 percent of all of the capital flows to developing countries. Today, foreign aid makes up just 13 percent. What's made the difference, of course, is primarily private investment and a much more active NGO community. And so, our foreign assistance strategy needed to be changed, and Raj set about reforming the Agency with USAID Forward. He brought in thousands of new people and set them in a direction with a much greater clarity of purpose and mission.

And he and his extraordinary staff have recognized that this new era of foreign assistance required partnership and innovation.

Partnerships like Feed the Future, Power Africa, and harnessing innovation through the new U.S. Global Development Lab. It's really these that are his extraordinary legacies of achievements. But beyond the institutional changes, I know Raj most wants to be remembered for the impact on people. Whether it's the 6 million children who saw their fifth birthdays who otherwise wouldn't have, or the millions of small holder farmers who have seen their yields transform, or those in Africa whose lives have been changed because of access to 60 million new electricity connections. These are the people that we serve, and their lives have been transformed because of the tireless efforts of Raj Shah and all of these he leads here at USAID.

We were talking about this a little earlier and I think a number of us mentioned the point that the test of real leadership is how you leave the institution behind. And we are blessed, I think, with an extraordinarily talented leadership team at USAID. It's a strong team and I know it's a team that's going to take these challenges ahead and deal with them in a very forceful way. I've known Raj since his days at the Gates Foundation, and I knew from the first day I met him that he was destined for great things. And it's been wonderful watching him bring his vision to reality, and as he brings this next chapter to a close, it'll also be fun to watch him tackle the next challenge. So please join me in thanking Raj for his

exceptional service and welcome him to the stage.

[applause]

RAJIV SHAH: Thank you, Jack. Twice today now I'm speechless following you. And so I'm very grateful for your kind remarks. I'm very grateful for all of you for being here and supporting the ACVFA Board and the USAID team, Jayne, and then the whole group that depends so much on this Board for leadership, support, accountability, insight, and sometimes just a little boost when things are tough.

I wanted to let you know that one of the things that has surprised me about public service and being in government is just how important these external boards are to our ability to perform, and I told the group this in a private session earlier today. I honestly don't believe that had it not been for Jack and his leadership, and had it not been for the outstanding members of this group that come together of their own free will and their own free time, and volunteer for subcommittees, and take on tasks and responsibilities, and come talk to the leadership and staff of the Agency at retreats and sessions, and do work for us on the Hill, all for no compensation other than a relatively low-cost lunch every now and then. We simply would not have been able to make the decisions and the reforms and the

progress, and build the political support we have been able to build to revitalize this Agency and our development mission. And so, I'd like to take a moment, I know this is perhaps a little lengthy, but I just want to mention the names of the members of the Board because they really do deserve our broadest thanks and recognition.

First, Jack Leslie, who is an extraordinary friend and colleague who I asked to chair this personally and asked to extend his chairmanship personally, and will continue to ask him to stay committed because he does an extraordinary job and adds tremendous value to our country's mission. David Beckmann, whom you all know as just a special leader who brings a lot of heart and passion and capacity to this work. Jim Boomgard, who leads DAI and does outstanding work in that capacity. Nancy Boswell, who has pushed us from time to time to be more focused on transparency and governance issues appropriately. The team at USGLC lead by Liz Schrayner, but also Ashley Chang and others who have stepped in at times, have been instrumental and essential to helping broaden our perspective about how to build support for our work.

Ralph Cicerone, who is not here but who has helped mobilize scientific communities on behalf of our efforts. Sam Worthington, whom we all believe is on holiday somewhere

thinking great thoughts. But he and his team, Lindsay Coates and others, have made a big difference for us. Helene Gayle at CARE, Ann Goddard at Child Fund. So many others. Charles Lyons -- is Chip still here? Who is just an extraordinary thinker and spent his whole life committed to these types of issues as the head of the Pediatric Aids Foundation. We generally benefit from the insights of some of our team members from abroad by phone, but NdidiNuweneli is one who has always been there in Africa and here. Will Warshauer, who we welcome to the Board, congratulations on your appointment at TechnoServe and thank you for committing yourself to this outstanding group and excellent endeavor. Ken Wollack, who needs no real introduction, but is our conscience and our guide on so many issues. Carolyn Woo, thank you for your leadership and being so creative in engaging on such a broad range of issues.

And there are so many folks who are not here but who have really put in a lot of time and effort that I do want to mention.

Patrick Awuah, the outstanding president of a university called Ashesi in Ghana. Maria Eitel who leads the Nike Foundation. Anwar Khan and his colleagues at Islamic Relief. Asim Khwaja, a brilliant economist at the Kennedy School. Rick Klausner who is one of the country's leading immunotherapy thinkers, who also helps us on a range of issues. Paul Meyer at Voxiva. Sunil Sanghvi from McKinsey and Company, and the list goes

on. So while it took a little while to mention all of our board members, I do want to note that it is really a special group, and the group has put so much time and effort into helping USAID be successful that we ought to give them a big round of applause. Thank you Jack, and thank you to the board members.

[applause]

I also want to note as we start this new year that our theme is just how important 2015 is for the cause of development. Far more than any single individual, this year will tax and give the leadership of our government's development team an opportunity to make some tremendous changes and impacts around the world when it comes to shaping the global agenda, coming up with plans and vision for financing, a global agenda that's defined by ending extreme poverty by 2030. Continuing to focus on a more results oriented approach to development, and continuing to do the creative things that have allowed us to leverage the private investment that Jack was talking about that has been such a powerful force for partnership and achieve the goals that we try to achieve together.

In particular, we look forward to the negotiations on the post-2015 framework and the Financing for Development conference this year, and I know you're going to hear more about that, as I will

as well, as we hear from our panelists. And in particular, we know that President Obama has now twice stood before the State of the Union, and I expect will a third time, and reminded us that it is our job and responsibility to bring the world together around a vision and a plan for ending extreme poverty by 2030, and to do it in a way that lifts up those who are most vulnerable by giving them opportunity, not just relief when times are tough. We're seeing that path from relief to opportunity take hold right now in the way our government is leading an effort to fight Ebola at its source in West Africa. And I want to thank everyone and all of our partners who I see around the room who have been deeply, deeply engaged in that effort, even through the holidays. And I know your teams are taking real risks every day, and we thank you for those efforts.

I'll just close by saying that I, you know, I wasn't actually -- when I started in this role -- when I started thinking about joining the Obama administration, I wasn't actually planning on leaving Seattle where I was living as I was working at the Gates Foundation when Jack and I started working together. My daughter was born on the same day that President Obama gave his acceptance speech in Denver, accepting the nomination, which was also Martin Luther King's 50th, the anniversary of his speech.

And it was a powerful reminder, when we were sitting in the

hospital room holding a new baby, that public service is a special calling and a special opportunity. And so, I am very grateful to have had the chance to serve and to serve with you. I'm grateful to Jack and to the ACVFA Board for helping us do our work in a way that reminds me that we can continue to be successful going forward. And I'm really firm in the belief that this is a critically important year and that public service done well with the support of all of our outside friends and partners can be transformational. So with that, I look forward to hearing from the panel, and thank you again, Jack.

[applause]

ALEX THEIR: Well, thanks everybody. My name is Alex Their, and I am the Assistant to the Administrator for Policy Planning and Learning here at USAID. And we have a terrific, but relatively brief panel, so we're going to keep it brief so we can get to you guys. But let me just very quickly say who you're about to hear from, and then we'll get started. First, Will Warshauer, who is the new President and CEO of TechnoServe. Welcome Will. Next is Daniella Ballou-Aares, who we work with every day, and she is the Senior Advisor for Development to Secretary Kerry. And finally, we have Cordelia Lonsdale, who is the Engagement Advisor for Development Initiatives.

Let me just start off by focusing on one thing that both Jack and Raj focused on, and that is the fact that it's 2015. It's actually 2015. It's January of 2015, and the reason I've said that now three times is because many of you in this room, many of us have been focusing on what a big deal 2015 is. And 2015 is a big deal actually because it's worth remembering the last sort of big bang moment that happened about 15 years ago when the world got together and set the Millennium Development Goals. And then, once those goals were set, the world realized that not only were they in retrospect something of a more important accomplishment I think than many had understood at the time, but we also had to think really seriously about how we were going to finance these goals. How were we actually going to get these incredible aspirations done?

And that led to the Monterrey Conference, and then the Monterrey Conference launched a series of conferences that both focused on financing for development, but also focused on something equally critical, which has been such an essential part of Raj's tenure here, which is about development effectiveness. How do we actually utilize our resources not to just pay for things for people in need, but to actually transform the landscapes in developing countries so that they are ultimately the owners of their own destiny? So that they can decide on their priorities, they can fund them, they can build the social and economic and

political institutions that they need to enjoy the type of success that we've had. That's the big goal, and that's what Monterrey and the subsequent conferences set out.

At the same time, as Jack said, the world had fundamentally changed in that period of time and even before it. The relevance and role of what we call official development assistance, taxpayer money, is a much smaller piece of the pie than it used to be and that is a wonderful thing. Because what is coming in to build a much bigger pool of resources is from the private sector, foreign direct investment coming from all over the world into development countries. It's private philanthropy that has not only grown tremendously in the United States and Europe, but in many of the developing countries. And most importantly of all, it is from domestic resources. It is countries and their population raising their own resources, and then figuring out how to budget and use them effectively to propel their own development.

And so when we look today at the opportunity of financing for development, what we see is a need to ask ourselves, how can we be the best that we can be in order to unlock those other resources in order to catalyze the real resources, and the real people who are ultimately going to make these transformative changes that we're all hoping for. And it's a powerful moment

and idea, and so what we want to talk through quickly are some of the ways in which we're trying to do that. The United States, of course, is trying to play a key leadership role, but this is an international dialog and an international debate that's going to unfold over the next year. It's also a civil society debate. It's one that needs to happen here and in civil society around the world. And so, engaging all of you in that discussion is a critical part of what we need to be doing as well.

So with that introduction, let me turn first to you, Will.

TechnoServe is a fascinating organization that really as one of its core things focuses on how to harness local and build local entrepreneurship, how to get people doing things for themselves. So talk to us a little bit about how both the international private sector and the local private sector and entrepreneurship are going to be a critical part of this debate about how we generate the resources that are really needed to achieve the development goals that we're setting out for ourselves this year.

WILL WARSHAUER: That's a simple question and Alex has asked me if I can trim my remarks from about five minutes to two and a half, so I'll try to address that quickly. We wanted to leave a lot of time for Q&A. But yes, as you mentioned,

TechnoServe's mission is to work with enterprising men and women in developing countries to help them build successful businesses, farms, and industries. And so we do that in partnership with public agencies like USAID, but increasingly directly with businesses.

And so I thought in my two and a half minutes of remarks I would be both highly conventional and a little heretical in thinking about the agenda for the Addis meeting and beyond. The conventional being to repeat what a couple of you have already mentioned, which is simply now what is accepted wisdom, but which was quite a controversial idea 47 years ago when TechnoServe was born, which is that business will play a key role in international development. And direct foreign investment is increasingly one of the most important flows to support that, and it's growing as you mentioned, very strongly.

I think that the Doha meeting as a follow up to Monterrey got it exactly right when it talked about this. It talked about countries needing to achieve a stable and predictable investment climate where contracts could be enforced, where land rights and property rights can be enforced. And it talked about how ODA can and should play a catalytic role to help support that, and I think the smart development agencies, like AID, have been onto that for quite some time, and Power Africa is one of many

examples where I think there's a high leverage factor of the investment of ODA to help crowd in that foreign investment.

Doha also pointed out that many developing countries are not seeing the rise in direct foreign investment, and so, obviously, those are many of the places where development is lagging where it's most needed. And we would argue that even in some of those environments where it may not be obvious, post conflict states, smaller landlocked places, there are opportunities for business to play a role. We're in an interesting partnership with Nespresso, the World Bank, and the IFC right now to begin the first commercial exports of coffee out of South Sudan, and I think it's a very powerful parallel narrative and hopeful for that country as so much of it is going through such a turbulent time.

So I would say that the best that we can hope for in Addis is essentially to reinforce some of these widely accepted points that were made in Doha. And to encourage the execution of these things because they're easy to say, but hard to do, this fostering of an enabling environment. And my heretical comment is that I think that the growth in direct foreign investment won't be driven by Addis. It is essentially an unstoppable force at this point. It's driven by the economic growth and opportunity that businesses are seeing in these regions. The

region that everyone is beginning to invest so much in, Africa, is not out of a great social conscience, but because they see it as the fastest growth market for their products and services.

And I think what's driving some of the more enlightened foreign investment is the change in international social norms. I've been doing corporate partnerships for two decades, and I must say I am so encouraged to see how they have changed, and to see now that I think corporations are feeling pressure from their shareholders, investors, from their customers and, indeed, from their own employees, and they are really seeing the business case for the kind of investment that fuels sustainable and equitable growth.

I'll just end with a very quick anecdote, and I can tell six more of them. I was just down in Atlanta with a series of meetings with Coca-Cola, and they have reorganized and taken what was an isolated vertical in their company called a sustainability group, and they have spread it out, putting most of it inside their procurement group, which is one of their most important and powerful groups, controlling most of the resources of that company. Eighty-five percent of what they buy are agricultural products. And so there are a bunch of people inside that group now, helping make decisions where they're

going to invest, who are thinking about doing that in a proper way and how to do that to benefit small farmers. So I think that's indicative of some of the dynamics of we're seeing. But let me stop there so we have a lot of time for questions.

ALEX THEIR: Thanks. It's a great example, and we talk a lot here about what we call the new model for development, which is about things like Power Africa, things like the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition where we've gone from this model of corporate social responsibility, which is some business and then charity on the side, to actually figuring out how do we do shared value with companies so that their bottom line is also a double bottom line that enhances development.

Let me use that as a segue way to you, Cordelia, because I think one of the interesting things that you guys have been doing is trying to dig out some of the data about what's really going on here, and looking at where the flows are and also trying to understand how data is going to help us drive the next generation of how we successfully do development. So can you talk a little bit about that in the context of the goals that are going to be set in Addis?

CORDELIA LONSDALE: Sure, first of all, just thanks so much for inviting me to be here. It's a real privilege. So I work for

Development Initiatives. We're an organization focused on the role of information in ending poverty. We do a lot of analysis of development finance, and also of how much it's responding to needs globally.

I'll try and keep this brief so we've got time for questions, but I was asked to talk a little bit about where the resources might come from in order to end poverty and help us meet the goals, and also provide a bit of an evidence base. It's always quite embarrassing because collectively, I think, the kind of research community around this, we are finding out how little we know. There's not, at this point, a sort of price tag that we can put on the list of SDGs and say, "Well, it's going to cost us this much." First of all because obviously the SDGs need to be met by national governments who will need to make a national development plan, and they'll have different resources they can attract. The U.S. will also be trying to meet the SDGs, these are universal goals. They'll be using different types of resources than Malawi will. And so that's the first thing that makes it kind of impossible to come up with any big figure.

But a good kind of line cost that is useful to bear in mind is UNCTAD did some good work looking at how much their key SDG sectors might require in annual investment on top of what the gap is in developing countries. They came up with 1.4 trillion

as a kind of indicative figure that shows us first of all that ODA definitely isn't enough. So we can see that we really need to mobilize a wider range of resources towards meeting these SDGs. We really need to look at how different kinds of resources can address each of those needs and where different types of flows, like ODA or private investment, might be the best kind of fit.

In the spirit of providing a little bit more evidence, we do know that developing countries are attracting a lot more international resource flows than they were in 2000. So in 2012, they've got something like 2.1 trillion in some kind of international private resources; so things like FDI, private loans, and remittances. ODA is around about \$138 billion annually, and that also includes some private philanthropic flows as well that get reported as ODA.

And domestic resources have grown massively across all developing countries as a group, though obviously in some much, much more than others. The total of developing countries domestic resources stand at about \$6.4 trillion right now. But we actually have quite poor data on a lot of these flows, so we really don't know if that's the whole picture. Again, this is just an idea of what there is.

In terms of looking at what we might want to see in Addis and what we could realistically hope to see, we haven't got this big number that we can come and ask for. A lot of developing countries still don't really know exactly what they should be asking for to meet the national development needs, let alone what the global figure might look like. We at DI are starting from the poverty goal, and we're trying to look at what that might cost and where you might mobilize finance from to meet that particular goal.

There's a few reasons for this. The first reason is that we know that ending poverty -- extreme poverty -- by 2030 is possible, it's achievable. There's enough finance in the world to do it. We can see from the data that that is possible. Secondly, obviously, it's important. We feel it's a moral imperative and a lot of developing country governments are quite keen to sign up to such a goal. In New York, we hear a lot of talk about that being the first priority goal. And the third reason we're focusing on that is that is that we really need some sort of concerted action right now to actually meet that goal, it won't just happen by itself.

Unfortunately, economic growth projections show that even with the most optimistic scenarios that we have, you still have four hundred million people living in poverty in 2030, and a lot of

those people will probably be in Sub-Saharan Africa. Domestic resource growth won't be enough to finance the end of poverty in quite a lot of the least developed countries, again, even with the most optimistic projection, there won't be enough resource to finance the kind of extreme needs that we have in a lot of the LDCs. And the last point is on fragile states, I think you raised this as well. Fragile states have really specific financing needs that we need to take into account. Ninety-six percent of the extreme poor today live in states that are either politically fragile or environmentally vulnerable or both. And if I had my slides, I would have had an amazing diagram, but you're just going to have to picture that. And if anyone's interested in all of this data, by the way, I can give it to you afterwards.

So in terms of what we might want to see in Addis, for us, even though the data is so poor on a lot of these things, so the first thing we think we could legitimately ask for is a commitment from all governments that they will direct investments at the poorest people worldwide. And we're thinking about the poorest 20 percent as a potential measure. The reason this is important is that there isn't actually any official public flow of money that is dedicated to poverty eradication currently. And you might think it's ODA, but it's not. The purpose of ODA is economic development and welfare. So we're thinking in this day

and age when we have a vast array of other resources to dedicate to economic development and welfare, we might want to have a flow that's focused on poverty eradication. And we also need domestic governments to really be focused on investing in that goal as well.

Secondly, we think we need a shared understanding of how we measure impact on poor people. Again, we just don't have that at the international level. We've got no metric that governments or private finance providers or philanthropists can use to really understand: what is the impact of their financial intervention on the poorest people? And the third one very quickly is about transparency and better data. We need much, much more transparent data and information on all the financial flows. Legitimately, we could ask for all providers of development finance to report their spending to IATI, the International Aid Transparency Initiative. That would be a pretty quick and easy win actually, and it's totally possible. And it would give us a lot more data on where all these flows are going, and they could be geocoded to subnational level. And we need much better data on where poor people are, and what their needs are as well. I might stop there.

ALEX THEIR: Great, thank you. Daniella, the United States is obviously going to be critical both as the largest provider of

overseas [sic] development assistance, as the largest economy, and I think as one of the most innovator providers of assistance, whether it's through USAID or MCC and OPIC, and all of the organizations that bring something to bear. Can you tell us a little bit about the U.S. priorities that are emerging for financing for development, and how we're going to be able to match the ambition of the moment?

DANIELLA BALLOU-AARES: Absolutely. And not to sound like a broken record, but 2015 is indeed a really big year. Not only because we're going to be setting these development agreements, as well as a climate agreement in December, but because it's really a test of the ability of the international community to come together, not only on common principles, but actually on really measurable goals that provide real, data-driven kinds of benchmarks for progress. That's the best case scenario.

You know, there's work to do to get those goals as strong as they need to be, but it's a really significant opportunity and one that will just really hinge on being able to say, how can the resources be mobilized globally in a different way to achieve sustainable development in the next 15 years? So it's exciting, but it's challenging. And I think as we work through and across the government, across USAID, State Department, MCC, OPIC, other agencies around, how can you really bring a

meaningful set of policy priorities to this agenda.

A couple of principles we've been focusing on. One is really starting with what's the outcome, and that's inclusive and sustainable economic growth. Financing for developing needs to be about really achieving that long-term goal, as well as ending extreme poverty. That needs to be at the core of what the purpose of financing for development is.

The second is really recognizing, I mean, echoing what's been said before is that this is going to take investments from all actors; public, private, domestic, international. You know, Monterrey and Doha are a really strong basis for this actually, but I think still wanting to make sure we are beyond old north-south divides and things that have made this exclusively, at least in the international agreements, historically focus on only assistance, for instance, and instead really looking at what do we do to get this broader set of flows on the table.

Third is really working to ensure this agreement reflects what we've learned over the past six years about what effective partnerships look like. For instance, Power Africa has been mentioned. How do we catalyze others, bring them to the table, build those partnerships for accountability and transparency, and really use data as a foundational way to open up information

and make ourselves and others accountable for results.

So I think those kinds of underlying principles are central to how we're thinking about the agreement, and then there are some specific areas where there's really strong opportunity and interest from ourselves and from developing countries in strengthening, and going even further, on what was in Monterrey and Doha. One of those areas is domestic resource mobilization. Obviously, it will be key. I think if you were able to show your really nice charts, domestic resources have grown dramatically relative to other flows and having those spent effectively and targeting poverty and sustainable development will be critical. And how can our assistance really support domestic resource mobilization, whether it's through improved tax collection, tackling illicit financial flows, improving financial inclusion to broaden the tax base, for instance.

So if you look at other venues like the G20, there's been recognition of female workforce participation, for instance, as really critical to building domestic resources. So there are a whole set of things that can be done to strengthen the domestic resource base and where our assistance and our policy engagement can be catalytic in enabling that.

A second area here is around private investment, building a

strong enabling environment for private investment. Providing the tools, whether it's risk management tools, guarantees, debt that will enable private investment to flow effectively, particularly in infrastructure where there's clearly a huge need that can't be fulfilled by anyone sector and where there's, I think, a strong interest and gap in terms of what currently exists. The third area is certainly effective catalytic targeted assistance across domestic resource mobilization, and infrastructure, and also really looking at the financing gap for fragile states and lower income countries, which face different challenges in their financing gap. But both, I think, have challenges.

So the last point, and I think we can open up the discussion, is to reinforce the role of data, both in terms of informing how finances are invested and in terms of measuring the resource flows better so we really know what assistance flows look like, what foreign direct investment flows look like, et cetera. There is a lot of work to do here to get those cleared. But this will be critical.

So, finally I'll say, I think the intention for this year, 2015, is clearly growing. This group in this room is clearly the set of people who are watching this closely, or watching post 2015, but really success is if every citizen globally knows that these

are goals our governments have signed up to. And that their own governments and international actors and U.S. government are working to make this real for young people today by 2030 to have a different world.

ALEX THEIR: That's a great, great conclusion. So before we start getting the hook, your pithy questions will keep the man with the hook at bay. So if you have questions or comments, please stand up, identify yourself and ask a short question or comment.

JOHN COONROD: Thanks, I'm John Coonrod with the Hunger Project, and I really appreciate your focus on domestic resource mobilization. I was really inspired once at an MCC presentation on how some of their transition grants had enormously increased local tax collection. I'm just wondering, are there some examples of building that kind of domestic resource mobilization into initial interactions with fragile states in post-conflict situations?

ALEX THEIR: Great question. Does anybody want to take that?

DANIELLA BALLOU-AARES: I think it's a key question. I have to say, I don't have an immediate response in terms of a specific country where we've seen that very successfully. But we've

certainly seen it in transitional countries and I think the overall question of fragile states is one of how do we get their resources right. And with, I think admittedly a very mixed if not great track record internationally in doing that, it means that this is going to have to be a really strong focus.

ALEX THEIR: Let me give you just one example of this that was actually created with the new President of Afghanistan, who at the time was not the president, and that is in Afghanistan. We did something that was kind of unique where we setup a trust fund through the World Bank to fund certain agreed upon development activities with the government, but we also created an incentive fund for domestic resource mobilization that paid into the Afghan budget for them if they met certain revenue generation targets.

And the amazing thing is that over about an eight-year period, their revenue, which admittedly was starting from a very low point, increased a thousand fold. And that is money that was coming into the Afghan coffers that was not there and had never been there before, and that they were able to use. And it caused all kinds of reforms, which also got at corruption because one of the ways they started getting more of the money was by cutting down on customs corruption. So there's a real virtuous cycle. And, I think the important part of your

question that it highlights is that you can do this and we must actually do this, everywhere. This cannot just be something that works for well-functioning countries, but not for the tough places. If we're going to do what we're talking about up there, it's going to have to work in some of the most challenging environments. And that's why we need creativity to figure out how to do this.

LAURA HENDERSON: Laura Henderson with CARE. Thanks so much for all your very thoughtful presentations. I just wanted to ask a question about the data revolution that we've all heard a lot of conversation about. Maybe you could share some of the thinking within the U.S. Government and beyond about what the U.S. Government can do, as well as what the NGO community can do, to contribute in really tangible ways. Because we can talk a great deal about this data revolution, but I think unless we figure out practically how to build the capacity in resource poor countries, to build data, we're going to be talking about it another 15 years from now. So I think we really have to think very creatively, and I'd just love to hear your thoughts on this point.

ALEX THEIR: Thanks, why don't we start with you Cordelia?

CORDELIA LONSDALE: Sure. We have actually produced a sort of

12 steps to a data revolution manifesto, but I can't remember all 12 steps right now. It was a great question. Thank you so much for asking about it. I love hearing about the data revolution. I think the thing is for us is that we have a lot of colleagues working in East Africa really right on the ground in terms of the cold face of the data revolution, if you like, trying to actually gather data from communities about what kind of resources are being spent and what the impacts are. It's pretty clear that there's a lot of big data at one end of this conversation and there's a real lack of absolutely core data at the other, which is what you're talking about.

In terms of what international NGOs can do to start with, first of all, it is to publish data about what you're spending to IATI because that really helps. The IATI standard is about decision-makers in developing countries actually being able to see what kind of resource flows are coming in, and that is absolutely critical for the data revolution. It's actually just about having decisions about development being based on better information than what we've got.

So if you're spending money, if you can publish data about that money, that will help. And I guess the second thing is, as you say, focus on what you can do to build up the national systems that are already in place rather than trying to create parallel

reporting structures if you like. I can give you a whole lot more information about this if you're interested, but I'll probably stop there.

ALEX THEIR: Did you want to add to that?

DANIELLA BALLOU-AARES: Yeah. I mean, in terms of making it real, which I appreciate very much; I think there are a couple of things. Some things we've already been doing and some things can be done in the future. One is just making sure that we release our data very well. So we've had a commitment to report to IATI standards and really continuously improve across our agencies. There is still work to do, but I think that's a strong commitment to continue to try and strengthen our own reporting. You know, historically we've had long-term supportive things like the demographic health surveys and other kinds of local statistical capacity, so I think doing more on local statistical capacity has to be part of the picture. And then there is all of the innovation that we're supporting, things like the Global Development Lab's work around mobile based data collection, et cetera. So I think there's some tangible ways we are doing this.

I think part of the question at a local level is how do you take all of these different data sources and actually have them so

that both decision-makers and policy makers within a country are really able to use them and citizens have the information available to them. So I think there is a baseline. I mean, there's a lot to be done in getting data, using data, et cetera. But for the new goals, our baseline is that we really work to ensure that there is good information on those goals and on our progress, and make some international investments and encourage local investments and local commitments by governments to open up their data. This is for both for the goals themselves and for the resource flows. That's kind of the minimum bar almost, and then there's a lot more to do around richer data beyond that.

ALEX THEIR: Okay, we have time for one more question. Mark in the back, please.

MARK LOTWIS:Hi, Mark Lotwis from InterAction. So I want to thank you. First I want to point out that on the Development Initiatives there are many slides we've all seen probably on how these aid flows have been changing. One change in particular I wanted to raise is where we see in the middle income countries quite a different set of flows between domestic resource mobilization, foreign direct investment, and so on. But when you look at the countries that spend less than \$500 per capita on poverty, there are about 50 or so countries that are really

still heavily dependent on ODA and maybe a little bit on remittances and so forth. And I wonder for your recommendations for this conference in July, how do we not lose the focus on those countries, maybe they tend to be the fragile states, countries with trouble with governance versus how we might approach middle income countries, which I think might be quite different? Any of the panelists can comment on that.

ALEX THEIR: Great, yeah, why don't we take a minute each because I'm getting signals, and go down the line, starting with you Will, really quickly.

WILL WARSHAUER: I don't have a good answer for you. It's tough. I've been encouraged even in some of the most fragile states with high levels of corruption where there are pockets of progress in this space and hope. That's what I would hang onto and try to build on, I think.

DANIELLA BALLOU-AARES: Yeah, I think we need to make a concerted effort in all of those phases, and it's going to take both focusing assistance and efforts to build private investment to get it there. But it's certainly not going to be one size fits all to get there.

CORDELIA LONSDALE: Yeah, I talked a little bit about this. I

think it's really about focusing ODA where the other flows aren't going basically, and that may well mean fragile states. And also, specifically, there are some institutional barriers and silos in terms of people who work in humanitarian development response and those people working in long-term development spending. And I think we need to start building bridges between using financing in short-term humanitarian assistance and long-term development spending, because the reality is that most of the goals will be hardest to meet in the fragile states. I think that's probably it.

ALEX THEIR: That's great. Thanks so much to our panelists.

[applause]

And as a segue as I bring David and his panel up here, I want to tell you just a very brief story. I was with Raj in Afghanistan for about our 90th trip a few weeks ago, and we were launching the first ever demographic health survey in Afghanistan. And if you know something about the demographic health survey, this has been one of those instruments that has been transformative both for the types of stuff we're talking about here, as well as for the successful accomplishment of the hardest goals in the MDGs and the SDGs in some of the hardest places. And Afghanistan has been this remarkable case.

And the thing that's remarkable about Raj is that we were going off to meet with presidents and stuff like that, and we couldn't get him out of the central statistics office. All he wanted to do was to sit there and get deeper into, "Well, now, how are you guys going to do this, and how are we going to learn, and when are we going to get the data?" And it's just a testament to what a great leader Raj has been, both on the big stuff, but really, really deeply caring about how we get stuff done in the hardest places.

So I haven't done a sit-in since college, but in about three or four weeks, I'm going to be outside Raj's office blocking his departure. If any of you want to join, I'll send out an email. But in all seriousness, let me introduce David and his post-2015 panel. Thanks a lot.

[applause]

MALE SPEAKER: Ladies and gentleman, if we could ask you to just please remain in your seats as our panels transition. Thank you.

DAVID BECKMANN: So this panel will be on the post-2015 goals, and we'll try to go quick so that we can have some conversation. I'm David Beckmann from Bread for the World, and I wanted to

make three points by way of introduction. First, a lot of our community's focus on post-2015 goals has been about which goals, which indicators, and shaping what the UN is going to pass. And that's important, but it's high time now that we are in 2015, to look at the bigger question of whether the United States is going to give a damn; whether our country is going to be supportive of a global effort to end extreme poverty, hunger, disease, education.

We need to talk with members of Congress, especially Republican members of Congress. Many Republicans are very weary of the UN, and so, we've got to make it clear to them that these goals are not some UN imposition on America, but that they grow out of the heart of our country. And we've got to make it clear to them that we want these goals. That work has to start right now so that if President Obama raises his hand and votes, if the U.S. votes for these goals, then he doesn't get blasted. And it needs to start right now so that there isn't a negative reaction to the UN relationship of this process in the next Presidential election. And more fundamentally than the actual endorsement of the fact that there is an international agreement is the question of do we as a country care about poverty?

What's encouraging is that on both sides of the aisle we have politicians who are talking about making this a country of

opportunity for everybody. And if this becomes a country of opportunity for everybody, then I think the American people will want to make a world of opportunity for everybody. And that really is the second point that I think we as a community, that is the international development community, we need to find ways to make common cause with the forces in American society that are trying to make America a land of opportunity for everybody. We haven't had a Congress and President together make poverty in America one of their top five priorities for 40 years, and it shows. It shows. The people at the bottom in our country are not going - even the bottom 50 percent, they are not going to support another Bono decade of, "Oh, let's go out and help the Africans." I love Bono, but they're not going to go for that. I mean, we could do that, but they're not going to go for that.

So we need to find ways to make common cause. The fact that these goals are going to be universal is a great opportunity for the international development community because at a time where there's a lot of bad news in the world, we've got this great success story to tell. What's got to come across to the American people is, "Hey, a lot of countries have been making a lot of progress against poverty. We know how to do it. We're going to do it here too and all over the world."

And then the last point I wanted to make is that there is a lot

of voltage in these goals, especially when you express them in a simple way. Most Americans don't know that the world has made progress against poverty. And when they hear it and believe it, they're absolutely stunned and excited. So for our community, if we, our organizations communicate the real feasibility of ending extreme poverty in the next 15 years and that we're going to be a part of that, I just know that's a lot of power for our organizations.

Let me tell you that at Bread for the World, we started at the beginning of 2013 to share this story, starting with our major donors. The fact that we think it really is possible to end hunger and poverty by 2030, and that Bread for the World can play a significant role in that. And we've tripled out fundraising. It's just been the most inspiring experience of my life. So if that's true of Bread for the World, I'm sure it's true of Catholic Release Services, and Save the Children, and the Hunger Project, that our donors can get excited about this. Our members can get excited about this, so that's the third point I wanted to make. So we'll go from that to Tony Pipa. Tony Pipa within USAID represents USAID in the global dialog about the post-2015 goals. So Tony, give us the big picture. What is the U.S. government doing in this process to shape and get support for these goals?

TONY PIPA: Well, to answer your first question, do we as a country care? At least we as an Administration and a government care a lot. We've been really engaged for the past couple of years in this process. A robust interagency effort, not just USAID. And with negotiations starting on the 19th, we look forward to continuing that process and to making sure that we get something that's really compelling, that drives results, similar to the original MDGs. And for that, it needs to be evidence-based and it needs to be focused.

And I think that we all agree that what we're starting with-- the open working groups, 17 goal areas, and 169 targets -- is a good basis for negotiations because there's a lot of the stuff in there that we want to stay in there. But we need to focus and prioritize, and be able to have that compelling narrative that you were just talking about actually, so that people realize the results that we can drive with a real post-2015 agenda.

We're unequivocally committed to ending extreme poverty. Raj has mentioned it. We mentioned it in the previous panel. And so we are using this opportunity to sort of finish the unfinished business of the MDGs: ending chronic hunger, preventable and maternal child deaths. Happily, through the process up to this point, those have been non-controversial. A lot of countries are agreeing that that needs to be a core part

of the agenda. At the same time, there's been a lot of inflation about what that means, and I think we can really use the help of civil society and implementing groups and our partners to really dive down in to what are the core pieces of evidence and data and targets that are going to mean the most within those particular goal areas?

There are also a set of issues that continue to be on the table that we think are going to need continued attention and political capital to make sure that they stay there. And that is inclusive, job rich growth, gender equality and empowerment of women and girls. Peace and governance, which was not a part of the original set of MDGs. Sustainable energy in the work that we're doing through Power Africa and how that can be transformative for so many of the different issue areas that we want to make progress on. And then the oceans and the environment, because we're really looking at a sustainable development mindset now. Knowing that we only have a certain amount of resources, and that we have to make progress on economic growth and on ending poverty, at the same time making use of what we have and not depleting the planet.

This is a universal agenda, and that's a critical part of it. It's great and we will look for help from the implementing partners and NGO community in really getting that common cause.

I think we want to keep in mind what's happening and what we are making progress on in the U.S., but also where we have challenges, and where we can bring to bear the progress that's being made elsewhere and create strong links there.

When we look at places where we could really partner together, we really do need this to be an implementable agenda in country. And for that to occur, it needs to be based on evidence, and looking at state of the art evidence and data to bring this into the agenda to ensure that it is focused on results is something that we can really use your help on because you have the data about what makes progress happen on the ground.

We talked a lot in the former panel about partnerships and how we unlock resources. How we take this from a north-south conversation about aid to really one about shared responsibility across the board, and how we can do that to unlock resources from the private sector, and make sure that it's inclusive and reaching the people that we want to reach. Obviously, engaging with Capitol Hill and with lawmakers about this is something we see as an important platform to drive our development agenda about what we think is important globally and how it connects to our peace and prosperity at home. We really want your partnership on that because you will be great envoys for how to make that happen.

And then finally, we are not going to get a good outcome in New York unless capitals are involved in this conversation and have a really strong voice. That means making sure that the partnerships and partners that you have on the ground in developing countries and citizens are involved, that the line ministries that are going to have to implement what we agree to in September are involved, and that governments themselves are really making the political commitments is going to be really important because otherwise, we can just get stuck in New York negotiations and come out with something that really doesn't drive the results that we want to see on the ground.

DAVID BECKMANN: Okay. Tom Hart is the U.S. Executive Director of the ONE Campaign. And ONE Campaign's done great work to monitor how we're doing on the MDGs, what's working, what's not working. And they're a global leader in campaigning around the process leading up to September and beyond. So tell us what you think about the MDGs, and how are we going to get to September.

TOM HART: Thanks, David. Thank you first of all for having me in this discussion. It's really, really important. And I do think we probably ought to kind of step back and realize that most of the world, most of this country have no idea what we're talking about. They've never heard of the MDGs. They don't

know what the SDGs are. It's all a bunch of gobbledygook. So if we're going to make a case for the next round, we ought to at least have an understanding of what we've done, in order to make the SDGs relevant, sustained, and successful.

So let's just step back. I don't know that we can do the slides, but I think there are really three reasons why the MDGs matter. One is, it got everybody on the same page. Let's not underestimate the importance that everyone signed up to the same goals. Yeah, they were imperfect. Yeah, not everybody was focused on all of the same ones, but that was a huge and transformative moment when all countries got on the same page on a limited set of goals.

Secondly, they're measurable. Again, it sort of seems obvious now, but it really has changed the way we do business in development to have very, very clear goals that are measurable targets that are out there and that we're holding ourselves accountable to. And again, I think it's become part of our work. It almost seems obvious now, but it wasn't 15 years ago.

Thirdly, I really do think it galvanized the development community. I think it galvanized governments. I think it galvanized our community around a set of targets that we wanted to achieve. And those things, I think, were tangible results in

terms of what we've been able to achieve.

I think we still have quite a lot further to go to go the rest of the distance, but I think we should celebrate how it did galvanize us. Literally, hundreds of organizations, including my own, were created or incorporated the MDG's in their own mission statements. Lots of money began to flow from foundations and philanthropists and others toward helping the MDG's be achieved. That's a big deal. That's a big deal, and I think we will see something similar post September of this year.

Soon the MDGs, what did we achieve? There has been a lot of tremendous progress. I won't go through all of this. You all can go to the UN's website and check out what's been achieved, but just pause a moment to reflect on the fact that extreme poverty has been cut in half. But for reasons only this room could understand, that is measured from 1990, not 2000. That is one of the reasons why the rest of the world looks at us with confusion, like, "What? What?" But anyway, poverty has been cut in half since 1990.

Girls will match boys in education. Almost, not quite universal enrollment, at 90 percent. Really, really good progress in education. We will meet the targets on malaria and TB if progress continues. Last year, we met our stated goal to halt

HIV and begin to reverse the trend. We've finally reached the tipping point that we've put more people on ARV treatment than caught the disease last year. Remarkable achievement. Water - we've cut in half the people without clean water. ODA, we talked about on the prior panel, 138 billion dollars. Highest level of ODA ever. Having gone through a global recession relatively unscathed. Remarkable progress.

Still, there is quite a lot of distance to go. One in four kids is stunted. The goal on hunger will not be reached unless something is done. We have made lots of progress, but not met all of the goals. 158 million kids are still out of school; 300,000 women still die in childbirth. Unacceptable. Not enough progress there. Six million kids still die from preventable disease.

So all in all, we as a community ought to be enormously proud, and, of course, developing countries themselves and their citizens should have more pride at what has been achieved. And that should give us all the confidence and motivation to do the next half of the marathon, which if anyone has done long distance running knows, is far more painful. Far more difficult and usually takes longer.

So look, some of the challenges have already been articulated.

The data, not so great. Once we start to hold ourselves accountable for measurable results, we all of a sudden needed to find out what the data was. Not great. So our community has a real challenge there on the data revolution. Resources; again, it's been talked about. You can't just rely on ODA. Domestic resource mobilization is hugely important. Private sector, innovative financing mechanisms like Power Africa, all of that needs to be on the table in much more creative and innovative and urgent ways.

Politically, I'm very worried about complacency. Progress's evil twin is complacency. People in America think we've solved the AIDS crisis, and yet 3,000 people still die every day from this disease from lack of drugs that we can buy at CVS. So all of the great things that I just talked about inspire us and prove the model to policymakers, but sometimes make people think, "Oh, well, good, let's move onto something else." The United States particularly. We're really good at crisis. Look at Ebola and the response from our government. Extraordinary. Not so good at the long-term and finishing the job. So I'm really quite worried about complacency.

And one thing that has not changed is public perception. I've been working in this arena for 15 years. The public still thinks we spend 25 percent of our federal budget on foreign aid

and that's all wasted. Those numbers haven't moved. And that is a serious challenge to our community and to the world to see the end of this project through. And that's why we need to build on the galvanizing of our community and governments and the private sector to galvanize a mass public movement around the MDGs and SDGs.

Daniella mentioned this a little bit; David did as well. I'll very briefly conclude by saying that ONE, along with a large number of organizations around the world, north and south, now nearly 1,000 organizations, have joined in something called Action 2015, very creatively called a flotilla. Not a coalition, a flotilla. We're all in the same stream, relatively going the same direction. A flotilla of groups focused on fighting poverty and climate change and rights to really seize the opportunity around the summits in September and in November to make big change.

And next week you will see, ONE is leading an effort with this group around getting 15 year olds to meet with world leaders. They were born in 2000, they're now 15, so in 15 capitals around the world on January 15 -- I'm sure there's a theme here - they will meet with world leaders to talk about their hopes and aspirations for the next 15 years. What kind of world do they want to inherit when they're 30? And I'll just say to the U.S.

government representatives here, David Cameron has agreed to meet with our 15 yearolds, so it'll be interesting to hear who you all are going have meet with our group. I never miss an opportunity to lobby in front of my friends here.

In September, we're working with Richard Curtis and others on something called Project Everyone, whose aspiration is that when the goals are adopted, seven billion people on the planet hear about them over the course of seven days, so that there is knowledge of and buy in and mobilization of people around the world. Again, north and south, to hold governments accountable and themselves in the private sector, and do their own due diligence to see these goals actually achieved.

So we hope that by the time September rolls around, we will not only have good goals -- we are not going to get perfect goals. We're not going to get a perfect number of goals, and we will have failed as a community, I think, if people outside of government only focus on getting the perfect number of words. We really do need to spend a lot of time on focusing on getting those words and that knowledge and that mobilization out there. So that's a big priority for us.

DAVID BECKMANN: Okay, Lindsay Coates is the acting CEO of Interaction, and just an outstanding human begin. It's great to

have her be acting CEO of Interaction for a while. So tell us, what will success look like?

LINDSAY COATES: I love this question because I think it gets to the root of what we're engaged in. To underline what's been said before, I think the focus on data that we've had has caused us to really understand poverty in a way we've not understood it in the past. And the result of that is we are now positioned to ask harder questions. So we're asking harder questions about governance and inequality and what does inclusive economic development look like.

So when I think about the future, I think about the platform we've created with this data, and all the other things we've talked about. And I have to be succinct because it's almost 4:00 and you all don't want to spend the rest of your afternoon here, but I think that if you ask the harder questions, then what success looks like is not simply meeting the 16 goals and 169 indicators. Because if you look at those indicators, some of them are data points, and some of them are real indicators, and some of them are political statements.

So there's a lot to unpack, and I hope that'll get done during the intergovernmental process, but what success really looks like, I think, is building, and deepening, and understanding

universality in every country. Because I think in Washington, there's a tendency to go, "Universality? Oh, it's a political program. We can't move that. That's too hard." But the fact is, if we're holding a mirror up to ourselves the way David did in his sermon at the beginning, if we're holding that mirror up, then we can legitimately expect other countries to hold that mirror up. And that changes the whole dynamic that's already been observed here. It's not just about what rich countries give to poor countries, as Tony pointed out. It's a different dynamic.

So success would look like really deepening and building the understanding of what universality looks like in every country. It also looks like having sustainable systems that measure progress. I know the World Bank is interested in showing some leadership on that issue, and I think that's really critical.

And then finally, having a development framework where financial flows come together in really meaningful and deep ways.

InterAction has been really interested in this issue. Our members contribute 18 billion a year toward development. We are now publishing to IATI. We are encouraging our members to publish to IATI. And we see a critical role for ourselves in terms of both being funders and being part of civil society that has a responsibility in that space. And also walking with,

being companions. Moving forward together.

I had an InterAction CEO say to me recently that she didn't feel that she had any credibility as a poverty advocate if she did not have viable anti-poverty programs in this country. And that's a huge mindset shift, and that's really what we're talking about with universality: we all own it, and we have data, and we're all accountable. So that's what success looks like to me.

DAVID BECKMANN: I think we ought to stick to try to get out of here at 4:00. So Jack, are you going to say a final word?

JACK LESLIE: Let's say, thanks to the panel.

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: Are there any burning questions, though? We have a minute if there's a burning question. Okay, one burning question. Come on David, we can handle this.

JEFF MEER: Jeff Meer, the Public Health Institute. David and Lindsay, wouldn't it help for President Obama to announce a United States national development strategy like we ask every other country to do? It would help in terms of building support

for universality. It would help build support for the sustainable development goals, and it would help people in the United States who desperately need help on poverty, hunger, health, et cetera. Thank you.

DAVID BECKMANN: I think the SDG's may provide a framework because when the U.S. signs on, I think the president will put forward a framework for how will we move toward the end of extreme poverty, the end of hunger in America. And how are we going to get a healthier society in our country. So I think the President may, with some encouragement, may use this international agreement as a way to put forward a plan. Now in our system, as it's got to be, the other party also needs to participate in that process. And so probably for us to get a really national development plan, a national post-2015 plan, it's the presidential debates.

So we need to insist that all the candidates, Republican and Democrat, speak to this. And this is not a partisan theme, whether it's Paul Ryan or Marco Rubio or Speaker Boehner who has given a speech on poverty recently. I've heard McConnell talk about the dramatic progress that developing countries have made against poverty. So it can also be a Republican theme. How are we going to create an opportunity in America, an opportunity in the world? In the presidential debate is where we're going

to have this debate -- maybe we'll get a president who's really committed to this and a Congress that's willing to work with her or him.

[laughter]

JACK LESLIE: That's a good note to end on. Thank you very much. Thanks to the panel. Thanks. Thank you all for joining us. I don't know about you, but I'm optimistic after hearing the level of enthusiasm and buy in that we've had from both of these panels. We don't have a date yet selected for the next meeting, but I know it will be posted on the website, so keep an eye out for that because we hope you'll join us again. In the meantime, thanks everyone. Bye-bye.

[applause]

[end of transcript]