



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID (ACVFA)

PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPT

JUNE 12, 2013

HORIZON ROOM

RONALD REAGAN BUILDING

USAID

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

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

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

B

Beckmann, David 19, 29, 35

C

Coonrod, John.....34, 48

G

Greenberg, Brian47

H

Harrison, Mark49

K

Kazi, Nabeeha.....38, 40

L

Leslie, Jack3, 12, 24, 33, 42, 54,

Lichtenberg, Marie40

Lotwis, Mark52

M

Martinez Sullivan, Lucy31, 39

Mckenna Tjada 13, 37, 43, 46, 53

Mcnamer, Bruce 15, 26, 32, 45, 48

S

Shah, Rajiv4, 51, 56

Shrier, Jonathan 17, 41, 44, 51

Storck, Elise.....41

Sullivan, Lucy.....22

JACK LESLIE: Good afternoon everyone. I'm Jack Leslie, I'm chairman of ACVFA, and on behalf of all of us on the committee we welcome you to what is our second meeting of 2013. I'm pleased because we, the committee, have made a commitment to all of you to try to hold these meetings quarterly and it looks like we're on track to do that and I hope we're able to do that for the rest of the year, handle ourselves so well for the rest of the year. As most of you know, ACVFA was established by presidential directive right after World War II. And it was really for the purpose of facilitating much better cooperation and collaboration between the United States government and various non-governmental entities who are addressing a whole host of development issues and who are represented I know by many of you who are here in the room. The President has made a recent challenge and an important one of ending extreme poverty by 2035 and that is driving much of our work and so if cooperation and collaboration were ever important it's certainly very important now, and that is in large part why the administrator has asked us to look at a number of different issues. Most recently he asked the agency, asked us to help the agency, and the Feed the Future team, develop a civil society action plan and that's going to be the topic of our discussion later on this afternoon in a conversation that I'll moderate with a number of people who'll be sitting up here. But what I'd like to do now is to turn this over to Administrator Shah and have him have a chance to talk about some of his current priorities, so we're looking forward to hearing from you Raj. Thanks very much.

[applause]

ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: Good afternoon. How are you? It's good to see you. Thank you so much Jack for your leadership of the ACVFA Board and for taking on that responsibility and pouring so much time and effort into it, it is really very helpful to all of us so we appreciate your

leadership. I also want to thank Sandy Stonesifer, who's here. Sandy stand up so folks can see you. Sandy supports, is the director of ACVFA at USAID and we're thrilled to have her bring her talents to this task. You will get to hear from an outstanding panel on food and hunger and how we can do a better job of engaging constituencies across this country that care deeply about fighting hunger and I'm not going to steal too much of their thunder but you'll hear from David Beckmann who needs no introduction, Bruce McNamer, Tjada McKenna, and Jonathan Shrier. Tjada and Jonathan, of course, representing Feed the Future, and Lucy Sullivan the director of 1000 Days. I also want to take this moment to recognize and thank some of our colleagues from the ACVFA board who were just in the private meeting. Chip Lyons and Liz Schroyer, Sam Worthington, Abed Ayoub, Nancy Boswell, Sunil Sanghvi, and Paul Meyer, your comments and leadership and support are really so helpful to help make sure that as we set and try to address big goals like ending extreme poverty, ending preventable child death and addressing child hunger around the world, we're doing that by building the excellence and insights of so many different individuals and communities into our approach.

It is wonderful to be here again and have the chance to open these meetings. Today we have the opportunity to talk more about President Obama's passion for and commitment to ending hunger and in particular improving nutrition amongst children around the world. Today we have the opportunity to focus on Feed the Future, the landmark inter-agency initiative designed to achieve those goals. And I will say, for those of you who haven't been following us or working with us in these last few weeks, it's been an exciting time for Feed the Future. Just last month in Cape Town, we launched the world's first and still only fund specifically designed to fast track agriculture related infrastructure projects throughout sub-Saharan Africa, and getting this off the ground, this was a commitment from last year's G8 group of leaders meeting. Getting this off the

ground and having it successfully work with companies like a local agricultural company based in Burkina Faso that needs to expand its processing capacity is just one example of how, when we follow through with our commitments, we actually can affect real change on the ground.

Just a few days ago in London we had the opportunity to welcome three new nations that were joining the New Alliance for food security and nutrition, which was also launched at Camp David now one year ago. We welcomed Malawi, Nigeria, and Benin into what is one of our largest public-private partnerships where companies have committed nearly \$4 billion of private investment in what is now nine countries that have agreed to make serious and committed policy reforms to welcome that investment, improve the investor climate and the confidence those investors have, and to work in a more coordinated way with G8 donor countries which have agreed to both increase their investments and better coordinate their investments. All for the purpose of moving tens of millions out of poverty and hunger and doing it not by handing out food or other services, but by enabling companies to transform and modernize the agriculture and food systems of the countries in which they work, doing so in a manner that's led fundamentally by local seed companies, local processing companies, and most importantly local farmers, most of whom are women. Today if you go to Tanzania in Dar es Salaam, you'll see a port being constructed to support fertilizer access, that's an investment that was announced last year and is already taking hold. If you visit Ethiopia you'll see a significant expansion in hybrid maize access for farmers as a result of some of these investments taking hold and actually materializing, and you see companies from small-scale local firms to large-scale international firms sourcing more food and agricultural product from new alliance countries. And I can just say on a personal note it was exciting to be in London with that assembled community having more and more countries approach us and say, "how do we join this New Alliance, what are the

reforms that we need to make to be able to follow in Malawi's footsteps of having a compact that's announced," and the Malawi announcement was exciting because President Banda herself trumpeted both the \$500 million of new agricultural investment from donors but also the very specific reform she was putting in place to enable companies that 18 months ago said you know Malawi's probably too small a market to invest in and now through the New Alliance they're saying, "No, we want to be a part of this transformation". So it has been a very exciting time.

And it's been perhaps capped off by, what days is today, is today Wednesday or Tuesday? Wednesday, okay. I was working over the weekend so I kind of lost track. On Monday morning here in Washington, David and his colleagues hosted a tremendous nutrition summit to follow on what had happened in London and we were able to participate, and through the collaboration over the last few months and weeks we've been able to announce a very serious American commitment to reduce stunting by 20 percent in our 19 Feed the Future focus countries which will result in 2 million fewer stunted children, and we know that we can achieve that because we also committed more than \$1 billion in resources for nutrition specific investments using the new evidence-based definitions coming out of the Lancet series on how to end child malnutrition and stunting using science and business. And then finally we had the opportunity to create a large scale partnership with InterAction and honor the fact that American NGOs and frankly American faith-based institutions and businesses have often been on the forefront of fighting hunger around the world and have made a \$750 million commitment to mobilize resources from those communities to achieve these goals and we're committed to establishing a partnership to do that together.

The reason I highlight all of these specific advances that have just taken place in the last few weeks is because they don't represent just a few weeks of work. They represent a profound commitment President Obama made in February of 2009 in order to make sure that America recaptures its role in leading the world to end hunger and malnutrition. And in making those commitments perhaps the headlines were taken by the resource commitments, three and a half billion of development assistance for agriculture or a deep commitment of \$22 billion from a group of 20 country partners. But what's been most important frankly is our commitment to doing things differently in these efforts to actually deliver the results and it's that commitment to doing things differently that has led to what I think has been a huge amount of progress in the last few weeks. I'd like to highlight just two before introducing the topic that will be the topic of the conversation.

We've made a concerted effort to work in real public-private partnership in how Feed the Future was designed and implemented. As a result of that commitment, when we noted about a year and a half ago that despite the increased public investment in agricultural systems of countries we were not seeing a concomitant increase in private investment activity and business activity. We worked specifically to reach out to companies and bring them in to the opportunity of solving hunger through business and science. That led to the New Alliance and some of the progress I talked about but it also required USAID and so many other parts of the U.S. government to restructure how we work to be more efficient and streamlined in putting together public-private partnerships, to spend more of our leadership time and energy reaching out and engaging with partners and developing partnerships constructs in the early phases. And we've learned a lot from that. We've learned a lot about how we need to change our systems and

processes to be better partners, and how we can push others to be better partners as well using opportunities to hold people to account in a transparent visible polite but firm manner.

A second area where we're trying to do things differently is in how we deploy American food assistance around the world, and many of you I hope have taken note of that fact in this last budget cycle, but the President proposed a bold and important reform to say that we – and six decades after the creation of our food aid programs – ought to use the 1 and a half billion we spend every year every year buying and distributing food abroad in a more flexible way in order to reach with no additional cost 4 million additional children with improved nutrition and simultaneously by buying food more locally, create incentives for local farmers and local food systems to thrive themselves, ultimately giving reality to the concept that the goal of aid and assistance should be to create self-sufficiency, independence, and dignity, not to perpetuate dependency. And we are in the, in a continued dialogue to try to make progress on this reform and we appreciate the support so many of you in this room have offered. Now we know that we still have a lot of work to do to fully transform ourselves and to be able to deliver the kind of game changing results we seek especially in the area of fighting hunger and extreme poverty. That's the idea behind the Feed the Future civil society action plan, which we hope will make more concrete our efforts to deepen engagement with civil society organizations and bring them more deeply into the fold against the task ahead. The Feed the Future working group of ACVFA will play a critical role in helping to shape the plan we would like to create to more effectively embrace, empower, learn from, and partner with civil society in all of our efforts to fight hunger and poverty whether it's in targeting nutrition to areas where its most effective, or reforming food aid and assistance implementing agricultural development programs, or importantly as we welcome significant private investment into food system transformations, we know that all of

those activities will be made more robust and more effective if they are grounded in a stronger and deeper and more effective partnership with civil society. So I'm eager to kick off this conversation by asking our panelists to come up and it's, I'd like to ask Jack to introduce the panel. But I just want to give you my absolute commitment that we intend to just as we have with the private sector with our food aid programs, with our quest to ensure that countries own the task of fighting hunger and start by investing their own resources in reforming their own policies, we intend to bring a level of persistence and focus in our efforts to better embrace civil society in the task of ending hunger and we look forward to what advice the panel has to offer so Jack we welcome you back up and thank you all very much.

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: So let me start by first making the introductions here. Tjada McKenna, who's right next to me is the deputy coordinator for development at USAID for the Feed the Future program and we're going to hear from her first in just a minute. Next to her is Jonathan Shrier who's the deputy coordinator for diplomacy and state. We will hear from him right after Tjada. Bruce McNamer is the president and CEO of TechnoServe. David, no I'm sorry, we then have Lucy Martinez Sullivan who's the executive director of 1000 Days, and David Beckmann who's the president of Bread for the World and most of you know has had a long longtime commitment to hunger issues. I thought what I would do is to start off with Tjada and Jonathan a little bit after that. Raj just went through and both just had sort of busy last few weeks with the U.S. government pledges. The great pledge from InterAction that Raj referenced. And that's obviously created an awful lot of buzz around this which we all want to capitalize on so I'd start with you Tjada to just kind of begin to frame this up if you will for us. What you know as the

deputy coordinator for Feed the Future, what are you looking to in the working group to provide as part of the civil society action?

TJADA MCKENNA: Thank you Jack and I want to thank you for helping to launch this initiative. As administrator Shah just said, USAID and the 9 other United States government agencies that make up Feed the Future recognize that to really drive sustainable change against these intractable problems of hunger and undernutrition we need to reach deeply across societies in the countries in which we work to make sure to make sure that we hear different voices and really make sure that we let it be a country led process. And civil society is a very important part of that country led process. Civil society outreach as Raj said kind of allows us to do more, better and more efficiently, particularly when we're trying to make sure that we achieve the inclusive growth that we want to include and look for equitable solutions across the landscape. The civil society action plan I think you can tell a lot about our intentions from this effort by the two gentlemen that we've chosen to lead it and that have graciously agreed to and I want to thank them. This is all about results and actions that we can take to achieve quick results and lasting result and with that David Beckmann who has a long history as a hunger fighter and who's fighting for results and very action oriented and targeted is co-chair along with Bruce McNamer who leads TechnoServe which is also an NGO that's very focused on results and action deep partnerships, so I want to thank both of them for agreeing to shepherd us through this process and also thank the members of the panel, the working group that they will lead have agreed to serve. There are others that aren't on the panel that have agreed to join such as Marie Brill of ActionAid and Rick Leach of World Food Program USA as well as others. Our goal here, by launching this panel today we really want to start the public discourse on what the solutions and next steps that we could take will be. So we'll start with the panel as well as

getting feedback from all of you in the audience. We're also soliciting feedback through social media. It's too bad we don't have a twitter wall up here today but we'll be soliciting feedback through social media after today we will also have a series of meetings and other consultation of various stake holders both here in the U.S. but more importantly in the countries in which we work to also solicit feedback. Then this working group chaired by Bruce and David will then kind of work through what we've heard and the feedback we've gotten across the range of civil society actors to come back to us with very action oriented solutions that will allow us to get to really drive deeper impacts very quickly. And our goal is to conclude this by the September meeting so like I said, action, not a long standing permanent working group. So with that, we'll...

JACK LESLIE: Great. Great. Maybe we'll start with one of the co-chairs. Bruce. TechnoServe is in 29 countries I guess and Latin America and Asia and Africa so if there's one person on the panel who kind of knows how all of this works on the ground it's you. And I know we haven't launched into it yet but you may want to talk just for a moment about some of your expectations for this as you kind of begin the work of the panel.

BRUCE MCNAMER: You bet, and I should start by saying this is in some sense the official kickoff of this working group although we cheated a little bit and started last week. Some members of the group met together to begin to lay out kind of the path from here to September, and create a sort of frame work to do our work, and as we will discuss, as many of you know, as many of you know what we're aiming for here is not the plan for civil society engagement, this is an action plan, this is not the overarching blueprint for how we engage. That process is well underway in many forums when you talk about effectiveness, if you talk about the inputs and the

strategy for feed the future and different, and the input of many actors, InterAction for example and others. What this group and unanimously in our first work group galvanized around was this was an action plan around some very specific high impact deliverables with regard to how we engage the international NGO community in delivering on the promise for Feed the Future, how we engage vitally important local actors, local civil society, how we think about a global advocacy agenda related to the goals of Feed the Future, and with targets around no more than six, seven, eight specific deliverables, targeted deliverables, and what we'd hoped to do at this conclusion of this process is to say what those are to be able to point to how those will be able to be integrated into how the U.S. government and we civil society actors do the work going forward, and to identify the mechanisms really for accountability, for measurement and accountability around this. I mean one of the risks in having a working group is that you deliver the product, a working group disbands, and that's kind of the last you hear of it, so what are the mechanisms for stating what our goals are, how are we going to hold ourselves accountable, who specifically will be accountable for achieving with an eye towards being able to say either in this forum or another, 12 months, 18 months from now, how did we do. And I think that's actually very consistent with how Feed the Future is thought about, its results framework about its scorecards and about a very transparent approach to communicating with stakeholders of progress against goals, and then we'd hope that the output from this workgroup would similarly be able to say here's what we set out to do, here's where we achieved it or we didn't, and here's what we learned in that process.

JACK LESLIE: Great. I thought maybe we could just have a couple of you comment, take a step back for a moment and just talk about the current state of play and I think we'll start with you Jonathan because you've been working now for a number of years at State on this and then

have David and Lucy comment after that, but talk to us a little bit about how you see this working what is the state of collaboration, what kinds of issues therefore should we be focusing on from your experience.

JONATHAN SHRIER: Sure. Well thanks very much Jack and thanks to ACVFA for organizing this and everyone for being here. Really since I joined the effort to years ago all I heard were stories about engagement with civil society. Civil society has really been a key part of the Feed the Future effort from the beginning and before. When we look back there were influential reports that came in from the roadmap coalition and from the Chicago council on global affairs suggesting that the U.S. government needed to do a more efficient job of a more modernized job of addressing the challenges of hunger and undernutrition around the world and a President Obama and his team chartered this idea and developed it we had a consultation document that drew in many good ideas from civil society and other sectors that helped shape Feed the Future and through the effort we've really gotten to see the many different kinds of roles that civil society organizations can play. They can certainly be implementers and that sometimes the first thing people think of is isn't a civil society organization one that takes a contract and develops a program and implements it in the field, and that's certainly true. But there's much more, civil society organizations play roles as innovators because they can develop new approaches faster than governments can very often and those can spread and grow. They can serve as key intermediaries in areas where, they, perhaps a local civil society institution is a more trusted source of information than a foreign expert whether it's a foreign expert from us civil society or a government representative. They can also help influence events in important ways; they can be sources of political pressure in the societies in which were working for positive change. I guess I can't really as a government employee say the important role that's

played here in Washington in keeping up the resource base and the attention to the fight against hunger and undernutrition. And what we've also seen demonstrated is the very important role of civil society as investors in the effort. And then you talk about our development assistance now as an investment in a better world. But last year at a civil society focused event then Secretary of State Hilary Rodham Clinton co hosted with the President of Malawi in New York we had the announcement of InterAction, I see Sam Worthington here, of InterAction and asked many members of InterAction to devote more than a billion of private non-government resources to the fight against hunger over a period of three years and that kind of approach was repeated again over the weekend with a new pledge of \$750 million over five years for the fight against malnutrition. So we know there are many ways that we can work with civil society and I want to give full flower to all of them. We want to look at the case, the best-in-class cases in current experience and see how we can spread those. And again just, my last point would be that at that civil society event that I mentioned last September, Secretary Clinton announced that we would have the civil society action plan so we're very much looking forward to this ongoing process over the course of the summer to bring that to fruition so that we can announce it to the world in September.

JACK LESLIE: Great. Great. David, you were you know an integral member, you know, of the working group that reported out in March on local capacity development and obviously have a wealth of experience in working with U.S. government and also on the ground. What from your perspective – is there a context that you'd want to see brought to this as you take on the co-chair role?

DAVID BECKMANN: My sense is that AID has taken recommendations that came out of local capacity development task force seriously, which is one reason I thought well maybe --

JACK LESLIE: Well maybe I'll co-chair this one. [laughs] --

[laughter]

DAVID BECKMANN: -- [unintelligible] could result in a few real changes, I think that sort of assessing overall, how the U.S. government and civil society are relating. I think in the advocacy area we really have done pretty well, and the "we there," and the "we there" is both you and us, both government and civil society. This administration has been, I think, really responsive to ideas and ideas from outside. Also, you've shared ideas that then civil societies picked up and incorporated into our thinking and our advocacy. We've done remarkably well in the period when there have been huge pressures to cut the budgets, to protect funding for the parts of the foreign affairs spending especially that important to international development. Funding in the current fiscal year is just a little bit down from fiscal 2010 which was the high water mark, which given [unintelligible], Congress and the President cut two and a half trillion from deficits so the fact that we've been able to maintain funding for the things that reduce poverty around the world is quite remarkable. I think in terms of communication with the American people, that's been a little bit ragged. It took the administration two to three years to even, the way you're talking about Feed the Future now as an activity of the whole government including the President of the United States, you know, the influence of the government in the World Bank, with other governments, state department, AID, that's, it took a while to even get the government to talk in a big way about what it's doing in this area let alone what it's doing on global development. And

then I think we haven't really taken advantage of the possibility of aligning communications of civil society with messages from the government in a way that would change the way that Americans think about poverty and hunger around the world. If I may just, I think that in the role of U.S. based NGOs are clearly changing. We need to talk through better. Because to some extent, it can be threatening to organizations and if we respond in an unhelpful way you know we can do a lot of damage. If we get it right if we think it through about what the changing role of us based civil society on international development issues should be that could really help us move international development forward. And then I think my sense is that the engagement of civil society and recipient countries also has a long way to go. That in quite a few countries governments putting increased pressure on civil society I'm not sure if the U.S. is doing what would be consistent with American values to protect civil society around the world and then also although I think that the intention especially of Feed the Future from the very beginning has been to engage civil society and in that way to engage people who are themselves struggling with hunger and poverty, I don't think that's happened very well and not for lack of good intentions but I think we got a lot to learn about how to make programs that the US government is supporting, how to make those transparent, how to make those responsive starting with the government of the country but then also society in the country, how to build the capacity of the society in the country to influence in an ongoing basis what's happening that affects food security and nutrition. I think we've got a long way to go in that area. In our initial conversations it was really clear that that's an area where we want to maybe set up some kind of process so that if we don't have all the necessary experience from the task force that we hear from people that are active in countries, talk about what's working and what could work better in terms of engagement in civil society, local civil society and Feed the Future.

JACK LESLIE: You know and that may be a good segue to you Lucy, you know as David talks about messaging and advocacy and some of those challenges. Most of you in the room probably know Lucy's the executive director of 1000 Days which is the 1000 days between pregnancy and age two and a terrific advocate. So as you, you know, as you've experienced, what do you see as those challenges as David's talking about them.

LUCY SULLIVAN: Right. Thanks Jack. I think that it's interesting representing an issue that is very cross-cutting such as nutrition and we've focused of course as Jack mentioned on the thousand day window, which encompasses maternal nutrition and child nutrition, so another cross-cutting issue that we care very deeply about is women, if that's an issue, but definitely, you know, the point of view of, you know, women at the center of development and, you know, and making sure that women's empowerment is very much a part of the U.S. strategy on -- in hunger and poverty. And so, from that standpoint, the engagement with the U.S. government has been, you know, really interesting because we are all operating with the same desire to see the investments that we're making in development be much more effective, yet our colleagues in the U.S. government are working with an aide architecture that is, you know, not necessarily conducive to making our investments effective and certainly efficient. So, when it comes to issues that are cross-cutting, you know, it's -- you have to work with a number of different partners within the U.S. government. And I know this comes as a surprise to many of you, but sometimes those partners within the U.S. government don't, perhaps, talk to each other or, you know, don't necessarily -- there's not a lot of coordination. But I think Feed the Future has done a remarkable job in integrating, you know, two cross-cutting issues, nutrition and women, and done so, kind of at a strategic level. The implementation of that, I think, we still have work to do together between government and civil society. I do think that moving forward, the relationship

between the U.S. government and civil society certainly has been evolving from one of, you know, tactical, civil society organizations as implementers to very strategic to civil society organizations, and I think that this meeting today is a testament to that. But there are many other examples of this that the U.S. government is increasingly seeing civil society as an equal partner at the table, not only in terms of work and the expertise that civil society brings to the table, but the resources that have been highlighted by the other terrific InterAction pledge. And I do think that some of the, you know, the distinctions have continued to where I was at this meeting in London on Saturday and Paul Pullman, the CEO of Unilever, stood up and said, “You know I represent Unilever and we’re the largest non-governmental organization, you know, working on these issues of hunger and poverty.” And I thought, well, that’s, that’s quite a statement. But, I do think that the world is changing and we all are driving to the -- trying to drive to the same end, perhaps using, you know, different ways forward.

DAVID BECKMANN: I just -- on a Thousand Days, what’s happened just the last few weeks is really an -- I think, a very exciting example of civil society and government working together, because my judgment is that, in fact, our government’s implementation has lagged behind the rhetoric, especially, you know, the former secretary of state gave four or five speeches, but the rhetoric was a little bit ahead of the implementation. And it’s just been in the last -- not that there hasn’t been any work, but with these forcing events that have happened, just their pledging conference in London, a group of civil society organizations came together and pushed, I think, in an effective way. Raj was just -- and his team -- were really great in being honest about the constraints and the difficulties and really thinking in an open way with us about how to get -- how to use the resources of the U.S. government to get better impact in terms of child -- mother/child malnutrition. And then they went through a pretty exhaustive exercise to really

figure out how much money the U.S. government across all agencies is spending in area -- on child malnutrition and things related to it.

And then, Raj has launched a strategy -- a government-wide strategy process to look at the billion over three years that the U.S. is spending on nutrition-specific things and another \$9 billion over three years on related things like agriculture and food aid. So, this strategy will give the U.S. government -- and it'll be transparent, so it'll give all of us a chance to look at how do we use that \$10 billion over three years? How do we incorporate new knowledge? We have new knowledge about how to make good use of money for child malnutrition. So, there's \$10 billion on the table that's been identified and with that strategy, I think we're going to get a lot more impact out of that money for child malnutrition, and certainly no less impact for the other things that it's doing. It's been an extraordinary success story.

JACK LESLIE: All right. We've got about 15 minutes because I do want to open it, but at 3:30 or so, we're going to open it up to all of you to ask questions. But I thought maybe we'd get a little bit in the weeds with the co-chairs here for a moment about kind of expectations, and I think you can hear from folks here, too, as to what they'd like to see in the report. But maybe starting with you, Bruce. Are there specific -- you said you had quick call, but are there particular sort of areas of focus? I mean, this is such a broad and complex area. How -- are you starting to get a sense of where you want to focus it?

BRUCE MCNAMER: Yeah, and I would just highlight what you're looking at here on the screen. That is -- I spoke about the terms of reference that this group has already adopted. And it is around, as you will see, very specific action items with regard to involvement of

international NGOs in civil society, strengthening in a meaningful way the engagement of local civil society actors, really getting our act together around an advocacy agenda, as David has pointed out. We missed it a little bit with the American public, but how can we strengthen that cooperation. And then really talking about how do we judge the quality of the engagement? And there are guidelines out there for holding ourselves accountable for engaging with civil society. And, for example, GAFSP has their own framework, which would probably be useful for us. And I would actually say this is -- we ought to hold ourselves to that standard in this process over the next three months. Is this an inclusive process? Is it meaningful? Is this a one-off or is this a commitment to a sustained engagement with civil society? And how, again, in that framework, are we thinking about integrating what we're learning in these engagements and then seeing that reflected programmatically and otherwise. And again, thinking about accountability and at the end of the day, how are we going to hold ourselves accountable and report back to all of us, to you, again, a year, 18 months from now? If you asked about, kind of, or thinking around cross-cutting issues, nutrition, gender, climate, we may pick one or two of those to have a bit of that overlay over this process. I think the early betting might be around nutrition because of the momentum we have there, but I don't want to handicap it any more than that.

[laughter]

We're looking actually for your input on this. This is the beginning of that process. We won't get all of it. We can't hear from all of you today, but we really would ask that you engage and try to frame your input to us to help us with our work, in the context of these kinds of terms of reference here. But, again, it would be these, and then what is that cross-cutting set of initiatives

that we want to look -- and again, they might not -- they might be out of the domain of gender, nutrition, and climate. But those are, I think, the three that we hit on initially. Is it around different social media and interactions for advocacy around that? There may be other things that you want to look at, let us know.

JACK LESLIE: David, it would be great for you to talk just a bit about political will because you spent time in your book, a plug for the -- a shameless plug for the book, is “Exodus from Hunger,” if you haven’t read it.

DAVID BECKMANN: [unintelligible] I didn’t even ask for that.

[laughter]

JACK LESLIE: You should. [laughs] But you talk a lot about --

DAVID BECKMANN: Where is Westminster Press?

[laughter]

JACK LESLIE: I know how to plug a book.

DAVID BECKMANN: Yeah. It’s --

JACK LESLIE: The -- but you do talk a lot about, you know, the lack of political will is really what lies behind so much of this. How would you see addressing that? How would you see, you know, the role of the NGO community and U.S. government in beginning to address the issue of a lack of political will stands in the way of so much of this progress.

DAVID BECKMANN: Well, I'm impressed that this Administration and especially Rajiv, I think, have pushed in various ways to use the money better. So, food aid reform, that's the current thing. I think procurement reform is moving in the right direction. So, that's -- that really has been -- and, you know, leveraging the private sector, facilitating private sector involvement, both NGOs and for profit groups. I think that innovation really helps -- that's a better story than just we want more money. We do want more money, but that's helped. I think going forward one thing I'm really interested and thinking about at least is, how do we do a better job talking to the American people about -- I mean, to me, the big story is that the world has cut poverty in half over the last -- since 1990. That is a huge -- in a time when a lot of people are really discouraged about the world and our country, that -- the fact that that's happened and that our country has played a big role in making that happen, or that even over the last four or five years, you know, we faced a huge surge in world hunger and our country led the world in stabilizing and then reducing world hunger. Those are really powerful messages that will help us get money for what we care about. But they will also be helpful in other ways. So, I think that's one area where we could do better, and I think it starts with the President, that we need for the President to articulate -- he spoke about world hunger last June, last May, but we need from him a big message, a message that's meant for regular folks in South Dakota and Arizona. And then somehow, not that we all jump around and, you know, say Obama's great, or -- but an alignment of messages. Sam Worthington notes that, you know, U.S. PVOs are

spending a lot of money to communicate with the American people. We know a lot about how American people think about development. And so, if we could, without being marshal about it, if we could have a collective messaging that lets the American people know that we're making tremendous progress against hunger, poverty, and disease in the world, and that if we're -- you know, we can make a big difference in that respect, it's good for us, it's good for the world, something like -- I mean, I just think that messaging possibly is still -- is a very powerful opportunity. And hunger is -- that's been the President's signature initiative. We know if you look at polling data, Americans want to reduce world hunger, so that may be part of this broader messaging about global development that we could do together.

JACK LESLIE: Lucy, do you have thoughts on this?

LUCY MARTINEZ SULLIVAN: Just on the question about building political will and cleaning up on some of the points that David made. One of the interesting things about the InterAction Pledge, both the broader Food Security Pledge and the Nutrition Pledge that was announced over the weekend, is that it's all private, privately raised. And the majority of those come from individual donors -- and you all know this -- representing NGOs that fundraise from individuals, to health sponsorships, the like. That is really, really, really powerful. That's Americans voting with their about the issues that they care about and taking that to, you know, to members of Congress and to other policymakers. It said this is what the American people care about. They care about nutrition. They care about, you know, making sure that, you know, women farmers can, you know, have the right resources that they need to be successful and feed their families. I think that alongside that messaging, you know, that this is -- this represents the American populace voting with their so to speak, and American values.

JACK LESLIE: Okay, last question before we go to the audience so now this is to the whole panel. And Bruce, you touched on a little bit in your last answer about -- when you talked about it must be inclusive and meaningful. But what does success look like? At the end of the day when you present the report, how will you determine whether this was a success?

BRUCE MCNAMER: It's a bit of a glib answer, but it is -- we will know what success looks like because we will say a priority, what success looks like. That's what the -- that's the objective of this exercise ought to be. We ought to be able to say, "This is what success will look like," and then own up to it if we don't get it, but recognize it and measure it. And that, to me, is the promise of what we're undertaking here. It's not, "Well, it feels right," or "Didn't we have a good working group," and "Wasn't that launched with the best intentions," it's we know what success looks like and we know if we did it or not.

JACK LESLIE: Yeah. David, were you going to say something, or?

DAVID BECKMANN: Well I -- you know, I think a year from now, two or three important things ought to be different.

JACK LESLIE: Good.

JONATHAN SHRIER: And if I could offer an answer --

JACK LESLIE: Yes, please.

JONATHAN SHRIER: -- from the movie "Casablanca," this could be the start of a beautiful relationship.

[laughter]

JACK LESLIE: Great. Well, with that, I think there are mics -- Sandy, are there mics around the room, or doesn't anyone have -- because I'd love to get now both questions and comments on the conversation with all of you. I found the last few meetings we usually had to cut folks off because there were so many questions, so I'm hoping that this is the same sort of thing. So, if you have a thought or a question, you may have to go without a mic for a moment -- here they come. So, if you could also just identify yourself that would be helpful to all of us.

JOHN COONROD: Thank you; I'm John Coonrod with The Hunger Project. And I really appreciate the last comment about kind of a priority and looking at what success would look like. And I'd like to recommend that the working group look way down the road, you know, at what is it when women in villages are thriving and able to meet their multiple responsibilities, and then to look big at the principles that defined the L'Aquila principles, the Rome principles, the Paris principles, the Busan principles. It's not really just about civil society and USAID. It's really about the power of American leadership to get everybody working together in a campaign modality at the country level. You know, it's going to take, just like immunization, it takes a campaign to have good governance capacity, leverage, agriculture extension, to have all of that working across a country, you know, between the bilaterals, the local governments, I mean everybody has a role to play. And if we're looking at individual initiatives or projects, we're not

going to get there; we're never going to get there. So, I'd really recommend to have a big vision like what's it take to make it work in Burkina Faso? How many districts, you know, how many communes, how many NGOs and bilaterals and government staff, and local governments are there and then start convening towards that campaign, because that's what everybody wants. You know, I don't think working together better on a few projects is going to cut it. So, that's my recommendation, and thanks.

RICHARD WELLINS: Hi, my name is Richard Wellins. I'm from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. I was wondering if you had any thoughts of what role colleges and universities might play.

JACK LESLIE: Who wants to take that?

DAVID BECKMANN: Well, what I really -- I mean, I appreciate, you know, so many U.S. universities, especially the land grants, are doing important work on agriculture and nutrition in developing countries. I'm familiar with some of those activities and in an institution like Michigan State, has been doing this and has people on the ground in a number of countries in Africa. It's just really impressive. So, clearly, you have that at capacity, and then more -- there's a network, I don't know if you're familiar with it, called Universities Fighting World Hunger. It gets people together, I think now 200 universities, and they get together once a year and think about the multiple ways that universities can be part of the fight against world hunger. And they're talking about the research capacity, the educational capacity, also the advocacy capacity of universities, you know, when university presidents go to see senators, senators meet them. So, that's part of it, too. It's not just projects in Tanzania. It's teaching the next

generation, getting university students, getting them the chance to go to Africa to have an experience in development, that's part of it. Educating, doing educational work in Africa. But also, the educational -- universities and colleges are tremendously influential institutions in American life, and so, if you speak for, say the goal of ending hunger, if that's, you know, a significant part of the strategic plans of universities, that would be helpful.

I'm struck that -- you know, it seems to me, I'm not sure that there's one university that's really made it a hallmark, you know, come to Cornell because Cornell is the place that's fighting world -- that's leading the fight against hunger. It's really a good signature thing. And I -- we could use a few universities that have it as a major part of their strategic plan.

BRUCE MCNAMER: And wouldn't it be great at the level of students?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

BRUCE MCNAMER: And if you were to tap in there. Now, I'm -- hard to point students in one direction, but -- and everybody will cite the Kony video that went viral, but boy, talk about sudden and intense engagement around topics --

[talking simultaneously]

FEMALE SPEAKER: [unintelligible], of course.

BRUCE MCNAMER: -- I think now whether 200 universities can galvanize to tell students what to think is a whole other line of inquiry. But it's tantalizing to think about the power of engaging with that demographic.

DAVID BECKMANN: Good point.

TJADA MCKENNA: I would like to add that Feed the Future from the beginning has worked really closely with universities. I think they're part of almost every aspect of our implementation, particularly most notably in the research arena where we make significant investments, but also in terms of building capacity in other countries in terms of statistics and policy advice, and also as well as students, our Borlaug Fellows program that we do with the USDA is empowering a lot of students to get more active in this sphinx, so, we will continue that and if this process brings us even closer to the university community, that would be great. It was funny that you mentioned Cornell. Beatina, who's actually helped us put all this together is going to business school at Cornell in a few weeks.

[laughter]

I saw her --

BEATINA THEOPOLD: I'll make it the hallmark of Cornell.

[laughter]

NABEEHA KAZI: Thank you, Nabeeha Kazi, managing director of Humanitas Global here in Washington. This is really terrific. We always say that civil society movements are sustainable movements, so it's very exciting to see the work you all have planned and the big task ahead of you. I have two comments for your consideration. The first one involves how we define civil society and who's going to be at the table. Oftentimes, we unintentionally keep speaking to each other. And I would charge that in this framework call to action, whatever the output is, that we also think about who from the civil society group is not at the table, who's not predisposed to hunger and nutrition, ag, food messages, that we absolutely need to engage and figure out how we do that.

My second comment regarding the U.S. piece of this, we've also found in a lot of my organization's work is the point about hunger. People are aware of it, but it's not accessible. It's really tough to participate. And so, -- or, it's big, scary, and demanding to participate. A mom is not going to pick up and go off to work in the refugee camp and leave her babies for six months to fight hunger. That might be scary for some. It's scary for me. [laughs] But, the point there is making participation accessible so there is an emotional, personal engagement, even if it's a small engagement, and perhaps even beyond the check-writing piece. But, I think giving that opportunity to Americans to know everyone has an opportunity to participate, and we can make it accessible, is going to be a huge win for you all.

JACK LESLIE: Does anyone want to address the question of how to define civil society? Have you had some interesting thoughts on that? Awfully big question. Lucy, you look like you --

LUCY MARTINEZ SULLIVAN: Yeah, no, I'd turn it around and say who do you think should be at the table? And I think maybe, you know, hearing from other members of the audience because that's important, rather than us up here trying to define that.

NABEEHA KAZI: Well, it's also, you know, at a country level, when you all are engaging, your civil society friends who are at the table say, who else isn't there, the media, are there celebrities, are there, you know, others, religious leaders who we're not thing about, teachers. So, the push is not necessarily a question at the high level out here, but creating a system that we can shift the thinking a little bit at a country level, as well.

JACK LESLIE: Very good point.

MARIE LICHTENBERG: I'm Marie Lichtenberg from Humana People to People, a network of local organizations working on the ground in 36 countries. I just wanted to say thank you for this great opportunity. I just wanted to -- just a brief comment, back-up what David is saying about engaging and developing strategies for communicating effectively with the American public. I think it's -- USAID could really play, together with civil society, a powerful role in mobilizing the American people. I'm not American myself, but I know what it means to be mobilized. And I think that in this time of less resources, huge demands, you know, critical situations, climate change around the world affecting agriculture and hunger, I think that USAID can lead by example, together with civil society, to create a campaign that really engages the American people and actually leverages the resources in a tremendous way that we have never seen before and which is definitely needed at country level. It's true country ownership.

JACK LESLIE: Other thoughts or questions? Yes.

ELISE STORCK: Elise Storck. I'm vice president of Social Impact and building on this last question or comment, rather, I would hope that as you are developing these common messages, you'll focus on the complementarities, and I believe the necessity, of a very robust cross-section of actors. When I was here at USAID I well remember Senator Helms and others saying, "Why do we need a U.S. foreign assistance program, people give their to this or that organization," thinking that that very generous American spirit actually obviated the need for a government foreign assistance program. I think we have to emphasize that we work together as partners, we have different roles to play, and the messages should reflect that. Thank you.

JONATHAN SHRIER: If I could just react briefly to that, I would just note that when Secretary Kerry took office, his first major public policy address was at the University of Virginia and it was framed around the necessity of the U.S. foreign assistance effort in all its forms. And then when he turned to specific development topics, the first one that he mentioned and focused on was the fight against hunger and under nutrition. So, I know, we have one new advocate, relatively new advocate as part of the Administration on that very message. Thank you.

JACK LESLIE: You know, I'd just make one comment, too, as somebody who's supposed to know something about communications --

[laughter]

-- and Raj calls all the time with, "Oh my God, why can't we get the message right on this," as he will attest because it's a very difficult thing, in part because there's so many different moving pieces to this that oftentimes we tend to lose the larger narrative, which I think the President has helped a bit by doing -- in his State of the Union, when he really put it into the context of ending extreme poverty in a generation, how do we connect up? So, I think one of the first orders of business is to take this -- find this broader initiative that we can then make sense of all of these things that are happening. The other thing that I've just come to learn is, a lot of this is -- some of this is luck of timing. You know, we've just gone through a deep recession, and when you talk about communicating to the American people, it's hard to communicate, unfortunately, about generosity or things that are perceived, perhaps, as generosity at a time when so many people are hurting. That's not right, perhaps, but that's a reality. The good news is that we're coming out of that. And I think the other good news is that we have opportunities we haven't too much, but like the President's trip that's coming up this month to Africa, will afford the American people an opportunity to see their President there and see on the ground, hopefully, progress and hear about a number of initiatives. So, I -- some of this is timing, some of this, I think, is how to kind of connect the dots, but I clearly agree with you that it is a central, central challenge to get the kind of mobilization that we need to really get policy moving in the right direction.

Other comments or thoughts? Yes.

VICTORIA SHEFFIELD: Hi, Victoria Sheffield, International Eye Foundation. This is a wonderful program and very ambitious, and my question is, is three years long enough?

JACK LESLIE: Three years. [unintelligible].

MALE SPEAKER: Are you referring to the Feed the Future exit?

TJADA MCKENNA: Yeah, at Feed the Future we've -- there have been funding pledges that are three years, but there's no time bound limit on Feed the Future, so we are -- we talk about our results in five year horizons, and so, we're definitely [inaudible].

JONATHAN SHRIER: All right. Yes, so you may be thinking in particular of President Obama's pledge of \$3.5 billion over three years which Administrator Shah mentioned in his remarks. And the good news is that we've met that pledge. We budgeted and obligated more than \$3.5 billion. It's now about \$3.8 billion over three years for the fight against hunger and then with nutrition. But, as Tjada said, the planning horizons are longer than that.

DAVID BECKMANN: One role of civil society is continuity because we can keep pushing whoever's President.

JACK LESLIE: Yes, right here.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Vanessa Dick, World Wildlife Fund. So, my first comment won't be a surprise to anyone in the room, but as long as we made a plug for nutrition, let's make a plug for climate. I think of all the cross-cutting issues, it's probably the one that's the furthest behind in terms of integration. A lot of that's because we're learning about its impacts right now. So, just want to maybe do the hardest one first. And my other question is a process

question. As this working group develops its -- I guess its six concrete actions, potentially, four to six, how is that going to work? What is the mechanism? Is the working group going to come up with it and then work to sort of broaden the civil society engagement and the USG engagement? It's just a boring process question that I was hoping someone could help me out.

JACK LESLIE: Who wants to help? Looking to our co-chairs.

BRUCE MCNAMER: I can talk about -

JACK LESLIE: Have you given that thought yet?

BRUCE MCNAMER: [unintelligible]

[laughter]

No, that's right. I mean, the process from here on out is, again, this is the opening of the kind of public input to this, and particularly domestic U.S. civil society engagement. And we would hope that you would take advantage of this and the opportunity henceforward to give us -- we will get pretty quickly, I think, to a draft and a working paper and then begin with more than six options, with a list of them. And then we have a calendar, or are calendaring now outreach to certain targets. One certainly, you know, all of government. We've got to get government's sort of input into this, and then vitally with host country, with local NGO input. They will be reacting not to this but to the first kind of iteration of this, try to incorporate that feedback and

then by kind of mid-August, have kind of a tentative draft of this for review by the administrator and others, again, with the September 18 deadline.

DAVID BECKMANN: I'd appreciate ideas from people in this room if -- on what would be a process that would inform this from the country -- from the local NGO perspective. So, if you're involved with Feed the Future in a country and you have a sense of local groups that are involved and who's not involved and what's working and what's not, how could we cap -- how could we learn about that? How could we hear about that? I just think that would --

TJADA MCKENNA: Well, I should also mention, we've done two things to facilitate more input into the process and to make sure that various voices are heard. One, we've set up a civil society landing page on the Feed the Future website, so that is [www.feedthefuture.gov/civil society](http://www.feedthefuture.gov/civil-society). Sandy has also agreed to let us use acvfa@usaid.gov as a mailbox to take in further input and comments to kind of answer the questions that David just put out to the group, so that will allow people to continue to interact with us beyond today.

BEATINA THEOPOLD: Just so that you guys all know, that information is also on your agendas in case you didn't scroll it down quickly enough.

JACK LESLIE: Back here though. Go ahead.

BRIAN GREENBERG: Thanks. I'm Brian Greenberg with InterAction and I wanted to try and respond a little bit to David's question with a suggestion that the group might consider. And it's essentially borrowing a page from the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition, and

looking at why it has been so successful and effective out of the gate. And, importantly, that is because they took a look, the New Alliance took a look, at the constraints affecting the business operating environment in a country and decided to mobilize a policy dialogue response, which would create a much more enabling and facilitating environment for private sector operations in those countries. Similarly, if we are indeed interested in a civil society action plan, which matters locally and that helps activate and mobilize civil society in-country, it's then important to look at the constraints which affect the operating space and the ability of in-country civil society and international civil society, to operate in the less permissive environments that are emerging in many countries. And to put policy dialogue against that, which is an inexpensive way to open the space for the dynamism, the energies, and the resources of civil society. And that is essentially a messaging kind of a challenge, which could be part of a messaging agenda here to help protect, yeah, and to mobilize civil society in-country.

BRUCE MCNAMER: And I think what we'll find, which is know, is that some of those constraints may be at a capacity level within civil society, that was taken up I think once by a working group here and acknowledged by certainly USAID, but what are the specific parts of this agenda which might help address those specific constraints?

JACK LESLIE: Yes.

JOHN COONROD: Thanks. I wanted to answer David's question because I think there's another page that was -- that we were all in a meeting about on Monday, and that is the civil society platforms that have been established for Scaling up Nutrition. With modest funding, the kind of capacity that's missing can be established and in both the AIDS work and in nutrition

work, those platforms exist and they have a little bit of money that it takes to have a platform, but those platforms are missing on food security. A few, you know, the Alliance on Hunger has helped establish a couple of them, FAO has helped establish a couple of them, but to meet with several of the big funders, put together, just like with Scaling up Nutrition, a \$10 million fund for establishing these kind of food security, civil society platforms that could interface with all the governmental arms working on this issue, that would make a big, big difference.

JACK LESLIE: Yes.

MARK HARRISON: Mark Harrison with United Methodist Board of Churches Society.

Thank you all for allowing me to invade your space right here.

[laughter]

My point -- I would like -- in his closing remarks or somebody up front, Rajiv Shah, about what - there are laws that govern what AID can do with the American public. So, I want to know what those are because some of us have been pushing AID to do more public work in informing the American people. There is a budget to inform people abroad, but there's no budget to inform the American people what you do. So, I just want to know if there are any limitations to that. And I know David Beckmann, and Kerry would have been great had he did a foreign aid reform bill as senator, I just want to say that.

[laughter]

JACK LESLIE: Well, do we have legal counsel in the room on the first question?

MARK HARRISON: Oh, just one more point. I have been trying to get the White House to explain who gets invited, why his Administration, the President gets to choose who is going to be at the State of the Union address. So, if development is key and important, the administrator from AID should be at the State of the Union address.

JACK LESLIE: Here, here. Here, here.

[laughter]

[applause]

Clap louder so they hear down the block. On the first question, I think we can get back to, I mean, the very generic answer is that there can't be direct, as I understand it, lobbying per se, that the issue really is more, I think, concerned about appropriations and looking as if the agency is interfering in the appropriations process. So, you do -- there are limits to what can be done. That said, I think the administrator every day and everyone who works for USAID are advocates for development broadly and have a fair amount of latitude in terms of communicating that steps up to some kind of a line where they might be actually, you know, pushing for a specific piece of legislation or appropriation. Is that the best way to -- I see you nodding the bit, but I don't know if that's a good answer, but that's about the best I can, as a non-legal guy, give you. Maybe, is that right?

JONATHAN SHRIER: Yeah, and we do communicate about our work in Feed the Future in various ways, most notably, issuing a progress report that was released last October, which is available on the website of Feed the Future. We're getting ready to issue a second progress report. There is a Feed the Future newsletter which people can sign up for, which again, reports on our activities month-in, month-out. And so, we are able to tell the American people what we're doing. It really is the [inaudible].

ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: Well, let me just share a thought because we looked into this pretty carefully. You know, it turns out there are some restrictions to promotion and lobbying, as you would expect, and we would never want to be in a position of using taxpayer funds to do those things. On the other hand, there's actually a pretty strong responsibility that sometimes I think our community has underperformed at doing, which I just being transparent in informing the American public about we do, why we do it, opportunities to engage in partnerships. And unfortunately for at least a decade, probably longer, and others here have more experience with this than I do, the concerns in that first bucket, in some of the legislative language in the first bucket, have essentially discouraged action and communication in the second one. So, very specifically I'd ask that this committee, this working group, look at this issue and offer some very concrete recommendations for things we can do to be more transparent, more engaged, and open up more avenues for partnership in light of the, you know, the restrictions, which are far less encompassing than I think most people realize.

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: Great. Thanks. Time for a couple more. Yeah?

MARK LOTWIS: Hi. I'm Mark Lotwis with InterAction. So, I just want to address the first -- the point that Mark just made. One thing that could really help publicly without breaking any regulations or laws is for USAID to publish cumulative impact data of your programs. We've been doing a study at InterAction on cumulative impact of a program activity and, you know, the advocacy community knows how to use data once it's published. So, if USAID publishes it, we'll take it from there. The point, though, I stood up to ask a question about was, there had been -- well, let me step back a second. In the last couple of years there's been a tremendous effort under the DLI Initiative to hire new field officers around the world, which is a tremendous effort. There's a lot of new people on the ground that can be very helpful in country. At the same time, there had been an effort to put together an NGO engagement handbook or civil society engagement handbook, and that had been ongoing for some time and then I understand that it kind of got maybe put on the side temporarily. And I wondered whether, you know, this initiative could make a recommendation to perhaps revitalize that idea to produce a civil society engagement handbook for USAID mission staff to use on the ground to train themselves and learn better about how to engage with civil society. Thank you.

TJADA MCKENNA: So, on the impact data, we actually are looking into ways to make the impact studies that we're getting back from people in terms of to make those public. I think MCC has done a really great job of making data like that public and we intend to follow suit, so stay tuned for that. On the civil society handbook, we did send a cable to the field. I was out on maternity leave, so I'm not sure [inaudible]

[laughter]

Do you know what the latest on that is?

JONATHAN SHRIER: So, actually --

TJADA MCKENNA: Or Beatina?

[laughter], sorry.

BEATINA THEOPOLD: So, we did send a cable to the field giving some information about best practices and I think that there is room, then, to also continue that discussion, that InterAction and others have brought up, and potentially under this working group. Definitely, that's a great first suggestion.

JACK LESLIE: Well, great. I'm seeing no more hands. As always, these are just great discussions. We really appreciate you spending the time. We will have our next meeting on -- don't leave though, because the Administrator is going to come up and give some closing remarks. I see everyone ready to run for the door. [laughs] But I did just want to say the next meeting is going to be on September 18, so mark your calendars because we'd like to see you back. I'd like to thank all of the members of the panel and our co-chairs for taking on this responsibility. Maybe we can give them all a round of applause.

[applause]

I don't know about all of you, but I'm just delighted that Administrator Shah has signed up again [laughs] for this term. And we're -- because I think, as you know, it's a real complex beast [laughs], and to affect the kind of change that Rajiv Shah and his team are trying to effect at USAID takes some time. And it's great that we have this continuity, and I think we're blessed to have Rajiv as our administrator, and I'm going to introduce him to make some closing remarks here. Thank you all very much.

[applause]

ADMINISTRATOR SHAH: Great. Thank you, Jack, and thank you to our panel and for that great discussion. It's great to just get a chance to listen to the back and forth. But let me just make a few comments that speak to this topic, but hopefully are more emblematic of what we're trying to do across USAID and across this President -- President Obama's development approach and agenda. First, I'd ask that this group collectively, all of us, come together and define civil society broadly, and really take to heart the challenge of coming up with a vision that helps to build broad support for the activities we pursue. You know, there are so many more opportunities to engage different parts of American society. And we really did have this aspiration for Feed the Future to be an open platform that helps to invite in everyone from students that might be inventing some great new app somewhere that could do something extraordinary on the ground somewhere else in the world to the technology labs of companies to, you know, the people who are working to end hunger in the streets of Chicago and helping to bring some of those strategies for using food that otherwise gets wasted to other parts of the world. So, I hope your approach will do that, and that is as a principle something we have been seeking to do across USAID programs and activities. And I'm proud of some of the efforts that

have helped us expand to thousands and thousands of new partners like the Higher Education Solutions Network and the Development Innovation Venture Fund and some of the other things in that space.

Second, I'd ask that you tackle controversies. You've got some comments about that here, but whether it's integrating climate, addressing biotechnology, exploring the role of private investment and trade, we have a vision of development and it can be embodied in what you do with this group -- I keep looking first at David because I expect you all to come up with the answer, of course -- but, in order to really succeed against the goal of ending extreme poverty within just two decades, we are going to have to build a new shared understanding and partnership that brings together the technology communities, the climate communities, the traditional development and poverty-fighting communities, with so many other different parts of our political system and societal groups around the world to achieve that. And that was underpinning an underlying concept of the U.N. High Level Panel Report that call for adopting the goal of zero poverty by 2030. And it ought to be an underlying concept that brings our community here together to fight for a proud American approach to development.

Third, I'd ask that you really do look at these constraints to NGOs and civil society organizations. I think one of the things that Nancy Boswell -- I don't know if she's still here -- and others would highlight is just systemically around the world we see a constricting of space for many of our most important partners. And simply articulating our values in meetings and on television doesn't seem to be effective enough at maintaining civil society's face, so I hope the group will tackle this and I want to point out that this is an underlying theme for a lot of our work in this second term.

And finally, I just want to remind everyone in this room that, you know, great things are achieved when different communities of people come together and build really movements for reform and accomplishment. And I once long ago asked -- is it Taylor Branch? Who wrote those huge books on Martin Luther King? Taylor Branch, right? And Tjada might have been there when we had this conversation with Taylor Branch. And we said what's the difference between -- when, as you looked at this history, when did a series of well-meaning and tough, you know, activities led by people fighting for the right outcomes, become a transformational movement? And the answer he offered in that setting, it was when people who were fighting for the same things for different basic reasons started to realize that they were all asking the same questions and seeking the same answers. And, you know, as I think about what it will take for our world to adopt, as we did with the millennium development goals, you know, 15, 13 years ago, to adopt a vision that has been articulated by President Obama in the State of the Union that's been underpinned by Prime Minister Cameron, Jim Kim at the World Bank and so many others all around the world, of seriously doing what David said, ending hunger and poverty against a tight deadline, 2030, 2035 whatever it is, against a tight deadline, it will require, those of us that believe in democratic governance, embracing those of us that fight for child survival, embracing a community that has effectively fought for antiretroviral therapy for patients with aids and embracing communities that recognize that climate change is real and significant and a threat to all of these areas of tremendous human progress.

And that's a tall order to ask of our ACVFA Board and of a working group related to it, but Jack we have so much faith in your leadership that we look forward to you helping to craft a vision of the future that brings us all together against that goal.

And with that, let me just say thank you for the opportunity to learn from you, again. I hope you all continue to fight hard for a strong and proud American legacy in development. And we appreciate your partnership and the chance to learn your thinking as we go forward.

Thank you.

[applause]

[end of transcript]