

United States Agency for
International Development

Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid

Thursday, January 18, 2018

Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center

Horizon Ballroom

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20004

Transcript By

National Capitol Contracting

8255 Greensboro Dr., Suite C100, McLean, VA 22102

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

A

ANU RAJARAMAN. 40, 41, 44, 48,
50, 51, 52, 58, 59

C

CAROLYN MILES. 24, 34, 38, 40,
41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50,
51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58,
59, 60

D

DAVID KIDNEY..... 3
DAVID RAY.. 34, 44, 49, 54, 58

G

GEORGE INGRAM..... 38, 57

J

JACK LESLIE..... 3, 61
JOHN NORRIS..... 31, 48, 56

M

MARK GREEN..... 5

S

SUSAN FINE..... 16

DAVID KIDNEY: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome to the stage, Jack Leslie; ACVFA Chair.

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: Well, welcome everyone, thank you for joining our first meeting of the new year. It's been some time since we've held one of these public meetings, and so it's great to see all of you here. And I just want to say, on behalf of ACVFA and myself, we thank you all for your -- for your patience, and your interests, and your continued support.

This is also the first ACVFA public meeting since Mark Green was confirmed as Administrator. And needless to say, Mark brings a deep, and a very genuine understanding of this agency, and the job, and we're thrilled to have him on board. Throughout his career in Congress, and as Ambassador to Tanzania, Mark has demonstrated the capability, and the moral clarity really, to -- that's critical, I think, to bringing effective -- in being an effective advocate for foreign assistance. Many of you heard me say this, I think maybe the last time we got together, if you were here the last time, and that is so much of the strength in our leadership in foreign development is due to the nonpartisan nature of the support that we enjoy. And, I think Mark's life-long commitment to that mission illustrates exactly that.

In just about -- in a few minutes, we are going to have an opportunity to, of course, hear from Mark on his strategic vision for USAID. In particular, he's going to talk about the ultimate aspiration for foreign assistance, and that's ending its need to exist.

Transitioning countries towards self-reliance has always been the aim of foreign development. And after his remarks -- after his remarks, Ambassador Green is going to welcome Susan Fine from the Bureau of Policy Planning and Learning, who's going to talk a bit about the work of USAID now as it's beginning to navigate that journey. And then, following that, Carolyn Miles, and other members of ACVFA's most recent working group on furthering self-reliance, is going to come up here and give you the benefit of their thinking, as they've had a number of months to study this.

We actually just had upstairs a good -- I think -- I thought a very, very productive conversation about strategic transitions. What it is, and what it is not. I think that, you know, the group recognizes that development isn't necessarily a nice, neat, linear process. And as we develop metrics and so forth, it's a complicated process that needs input from all of you who live it every day. We also, I think, talked about the fact that

it's very important -- the messaging around this is very important. That this initiative is not effective if it looks like some sort of Trojan Horse to reduce funding for foreign assistance, which it is not.

One of the things I think Carolyn will talk about is that this was really much more about a smarter, and not necessarily a smaller, USAID. So, I'm excited to hear her and her group. She'll have a number of folks, who she will introduce, who are working in subgroups of the ACVFA working group on at least, I think, three different workstreams. And, they'll walk through that.

Following the panel, we, of course, want to open it up to all of you for discussion and feedback. And, we're really eager, as I said earlier, to hear about your experiences. So, with that, I'll invite Mark to come up here, and get us -- get us going. Thanks very much, Mark.

[applause]

MARK GREEN: Well, with what Jack just said, maybe I should stop right there. That's about as good as it's going to get. Welcome everyone, this is, as Jack said, the first public meeting of ACVFA, for 2018. The last public session was in

July, just days before I was officially sworn in, and back then, instead of me, you were all aiming your fire, albeit friendly fire, at Wade Warren. So, we are about to see who the better dancer is over this next hour.

I've been on the job five months. And I can say that my goals and vision for the Agency really haven't changed during that time. As I said, both in my confirmation remarks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and when I addressed our team for the first time in this very building, as you've heard Jack and others say, I believe quite simply that the purpose of foreign assistance must be ending its need to exist. Each of our programs should aim for the day when it can end, and around the world we should measure our work by how far each investment moves us just a little bit closer to that day. Each country must lead its own development journey. But, we can help willing partners by prioritizing programs, incentivized reform, strengthened capacity, and mobilize domestic resources.

Now, we should be humble ourselves on this journey. And we should readily admit that we don't have all the answers. But, I think we should also be honest with our partners when they take steps that we know will send their journey in the wrong direction, because that's what friends do. And as countries progress on their journey to self-reliance, we should also

recognize the traditional assistance isn't the only, or in some cases, the best means for helping them along. And so, we'll look for ways to promote private-enterprise driven initiatives and programs.

In the area of humanitarian assistance, we will always stand with people when disaster strikes, or crisis emerges, because that's who we are as Americans. But, as the world's leader in humanitarian assistance, we'll also call on others to do their part, and we'll work relentlessly to ensure that that assistance is delivered as effectively as it possibly can be. And because we believe that the truest sense of compassion comes with helping others to help themselves as we respond to immediate needs, we'll also look for ways to build partner resilience, to help them withstand future shock and crisis.

I can say to you now with five months under my belt, my security badge still working -- as I come in each morning I always check -- I can tell you that my overall vision for USAID has not changed. However, the lessons that I've learned from the stellar, truly dedicated set of professionals here at USAID, not just here in D.C., but really all around the world, they've really worked to help shape and inform my sense of how we get to that vision.

And my travels have helped me in really immeasurable, irreplaceable ways. During my first overseas trip, for example, I visited a food distribution center in a northern part of Ethiopia, which is facing its third consecutive year of draught. I remember as I was walking through an area where people were dividing up their modest sacks of grain that American taxpayers had paid for, I met a woman who had just received her family's ration. And she was sitting down next to that sack of grain. As I was walking through, she raised her hand, and she wanted to know if she could ask me a question. I said, "Sure." She began by thanking America for her ration, but then she asked if I could help with what she really wanted, which was irrigation so she would never need food distributions again.

That's the spirit that we have to capture. That's why we have "Feed the Future," and that's the spirit that I want to animate every program we have, every investment that we make. That's the purpose that brings us to work each day. That's the purpose that brings all of you here. That is why you do what you do, and we do what we do. We are working towards a future where that woman can take care of herself, and never beg for food again.

Everyone, every human being desires dignity. And every leader, at least every citizen-centered leader, they feel it as well.

They want their countries to be self-reliant and prosperous. They don't want to need assistance from the U.S., or anyone else for that matter.

My visit to India in November was a crucial time for me. I learned so much during that brief time, about what is possible in a country's journey towards self-reliance, and now prosperity. So, as many of you know, when USAID was launched 60 years ago, a centerpiece of our work in India was providing food assistance, physically distributing food. It's remarkable how far India's come, and how our relationship with them has evolved. India is truly an equal partner in the work that we're doing there, and elsewhere. They turned to us for our capacity to act as conveners, as incubators, as accelerators, in their own efforts to help their own people. We helped them test new approaches, and new technologies, and then once they're proven, the government of India scales them up.

When I was there, I saw how we're supporting a government led water strategy, by helping them pilot new, private-sector owned and operated clean water kiosks. "Clean water ATM's," as they were being called. Over the next year, this collaboration will install 50 kiosks around Hyderabad in southern India, which will provide more than 150,000 people with affordable, potable, drinking water.

When I was there, I saw how we helped to bring the most cutting edge medical technologies to the government's work to eradicate tuberculosis. Some of you may know -- many of you may be surprised to know, that India accounts for 1/4 of the world's TB cases. Each and every year, 480,000 Indians die from tuberculosis. We introduced them to GeneXpert, which for the first time gave them the ability to early, and accurately diagnose hard to treat TB cases, like juvenile TB, or drug-resistant TB.

And when I was there, I saw how we're piloting innovative finance tools to lower the countries incredibly high maternal, and neonatal mortality rates. We helped launch the world's first development impact bond for maternal and child health, which is a pay for performance model. If successful, the government has told us that they will scale all across the state where it was launched.

As countries progress along their development journey, our relationship with them needs to evolve. For a country as advanced as India, it's projects like these that help them move closer, help them truly realize their full potential. So much so, that today, India is the fifth largest donor in Afghanistan.

When I was in Delhi, I met with a group of women from SEWA, the Self-Employed Women's Association. This is one of the largest non-profit associations in the country in India. It's working to provide vocational training for disadvantaged women, all across the country, but doesn't stop there. These women want to take what they've learned, what has impressed so many of us, and use it to help their neighbors. With USAID's help, they're bringing their talent, knowledge, and skills to bear, to help train more than 3,000 low-income women in Afghanistan.

SEWA will help them learn embroidery, garment stitching, food processing, jewelry making. Generating income, creating jobs, providing opportunities. They will help teach these women business management, and marketing techniques. They will demonstrate the power that women can have, even in the most difficult circumstances, to transform their lives through genuine leadership. Indian women helping Afghan women. Helping them build a brighter future for their communities, their families, their economy. So, not only is India making strides in its journey through self-reliance and on to prosperity, but is joining us to help others on their journey as well.

So, India is an obvious success story. But what about other places? Working with our partners, how do we measure the country partner's progress? Their challenges, the effectiveness

of our investments. How do we know where resources can best make a difference? How do we know what the country's needs are?

As all of you know, because so many of you help lead this, the most exciting developments, I think, in the development field, relate to data, metrics, and targets. Information, data, knowledge that can help guide our work in this regard. So, in the fall, I asked ACVFA to begin looking at ways of how we can track countries in their progress on their development journeys. To those who are here, who helped in that process, a very sincere thanks. This has been a really important project for the Agency.

In a bit, you'll hear from Susan Fine about those working groups that were developed, but just briefly I want to give you the 40,000-foot perspective. First off, to be very clear, this is a work in progress. The working groups have done some important thinking, and excellent work, and I think we're getting close. But these metrics are not ready to be rolled out yet, not acted upon yet.

First, let's restate what it is that we're working on. We're not looking at inputs, at least not in the widgets in the production line sense. As much as possible, we're trying to track and measure capacities. We're not recording the number of

bednets produced or delivered. We're looking at our partner country's ability to deliver those bednets on time, on budget, and increasingly using their own resources, and their own networks to make all of these investments sustainable and difference making.

We're taking steps to ensure that we're helping partners tackle global health challenges in the future, with well-trained teams of professionals, and support staff, well-resourced, and well-designed interventions. And an inclusive delivery system that reaches even historically underserved communities.

To be clear, what we're aiming for is not a scorecard, and it's not a formula in the MCC sense. I'm someone who helped craft the MCC. MCC's indicators dictate whether countries qualify for funding. The hard hurdle indicators, as they're called, determine when countries no longer qualify, and will no longer receive money. What we're looking for, are mile poles, mile markers in that development journey. And the reason we want to know this, is it helps us inform how we can best help our partners. To help us be more effective in helping them on their journey.

Those kinds of metrics are harder to craft, and they're certainly more complex. Metrics that reinforce human dignity,

that can be a challenge at times. Again, what will we do with these metrics? Eventually, we hope that we'll be able to use them to prioritize, and guide our programs, and countries, and regions. And we hope to use them to help us in our strategic planning. We hope that we'll be able to gain greater flexibility from Congress, and the rest of the executive branch, to target our resources over the long haul because they'll have greater confidence that our decisions are based upon sound development logic.

They should also see evidence through these mile posts, as I call them, that our investments are long lasting, are sustainable, and are supported by host country governments, and civil society. Ultimately, all of this work is aimed at a system -- building a system that is centered upon human dignity, and sovereign leadership. It's about helping people realize just what is possible.

I remember visiting the country of Senegal several years ago, shortly after the completion of an MCC compact. And I remember having a conversation with one young woman, who was part of Senegal's compact team, Senegalese. And I remember, because she thanked me for the roads that we helped to rehabilitate to the compact. And she thanked me for American support for the irrigation system that we helped to build. But then what struck

me, is she said, "You know, that's actually not it. That isn't the most important outcome from the compact." She said, "Instead, through the compact, we trained hundreds of Senegalese to implement this work, and to prove to these men and women that it was possible to perform such projects on time, on budget, with complete transparency, without paying money to government officials. "That," she said, "That's what we want to celebrate."

MCC works only with countries that have achieved key aspects of good and effective governance. At USAID, many of our partners are in a tougher place, they're in a different place in their journey. And so, when they make progress, when they get to the point that we're able to talk about new relationships, that's something extraordinary. And that's something that we really do need to celebrate. It's an aspiration that is in line with American values, and in line with universal aspirations. That is really what I want us all to focus on. How do we capture that? How do we use that to help inform our work, and make us more effective in being good partners?

To communicate that idea, and those aspirations, we're launching a new communications campaign called "USAID Transforms," which showcases stories that demonstrate the impact of the work that USAID, and partner organizations are doing all around the world.

Investments that are transforming lives, and communities, and economies. I invite you to go to the website, and take a look. And, to give you a bit of a teaser, I have a short video I'd like to show you.

[video playing]

Hope you like what you see, thank you for helping us at USAID aim high. And with that, I'll turn it over to Susan Fine, who will lead us through an important discussion. Susan, thank you.

[applause]

SUSAN FINE: Good afternoon, it's wonderful to see so many people here, we're happy for your interest in this topic. So, I am the Senior Deputy Assistant to the Administrator in the Policy, Planning, and Learning Bureau at USAID, and I am also serving as one of a number of senior leaders in the Agency, who are working on the self-reliant -- the journey to self-reliance. And in that capacity, I'm also serving as the co-chair of the ACVFA working group, along with Carolyn Miles.

And I just really want to emphasize -- amplify what the Administrator said about how valuable it was to have this opportunity for dialogue, get input from members of the ACVFA

working group on some of the aspects of the journey on self-reliance. This is very much a work in progress, and so -- but it was a good place for us to be able to start bringing together some of the work that we have -- that we were doing internally, and being able to get feedback, and improve on that. So, it was a very dynamic and iterative process, and so I'm -- we're here today to share a bit of that with you.

Okay, so we are talking today about what is referred to as "Outcome 1" of the Redesign process. And that focuses on how we're going to operationalize the Administrator's vision for the journey to self-reliance. And we have identified six different areas initially, that we think are important to focus on in order to operationalize that vision. They are listed there, and we're going to focus today on the first three.

There are also the emphasis on leveraging resources, Private sector engagement, and domestic resource mobilization. There are working groups around those areas, but those will not be the topic of our conversation today.

Okay, so we started out by saying, "Well, we need some guiding principles but, what does this mean? What are we talking about with the journey to self-reliance, and, yeah, we need some principles to, kind of, bound that work." I think the first one

is really to emphasize that we are talking about using the concept of a journey of self-reliance and apply it to all of our strategies and programs.

This is not just about looking at countries that we might want to transition our relationship with. This is really applying and using the notion of helping countries become able to manage their own development process -- lead and manage their own development process across the board. Recognizing that there are some countries that are very far away from being able to do that, and also that the process is not linear.

We are also in this process, going to build on USAID's existing expertise in partnership, or partnership approach. We know that, I think, it's an approach that is built into most of the work that we do today, however we can always improve on that process, and we think that an important part of helping countries on that self-reliance journey is to support them through our convening authority, and our ability to leverage other resources.

We also recognize that as countries move along, as they gain capacity to manage their own development, the way that we work with them should evolve as well, and so we have a number of different approaches, tools that we use in our programs. And we

know that we have to vary that mix, depending on where a country is in their development journey.

Of course, we have to bring new resources -- help bring new resources to the table, whether they come from the private sector, from other development partners, from countries themselves, as well as innovation and expertise. And, it's important to not only be able to establish sort of where a particular country is in terms of its ability to be able to manage its own development. But also, to recognize when it's really, sort of -- as the Administrator talked about India, and how it has evolved as a country. So, to be able to celebrate when countries really get to a point where they are really managing their own development process.

And finally, to emphasize that this is -- again, this is about changing the nature of the relationship that we, USAID, have with developing countries. This is not about graduations, not about close-out. We want to make sure that as countries move along their journey, that we are evolving our partnership with them. And so, one of the pieces of the work that we're going to talk about today, is about the legacy, and what happens once we transition our relationship with a country from traditional assistance.

So, we have here a kind of identified theory of change, which really posits that "if countries have sufficient capacity, both in government, in the private sector, in civil society, as well as demonstrated commitment in terms of their economic policy, open and accountable governance, then they will be able to effectively finance and manage their own development process."

We're also working on a set of metrics to be able to assess where countries are on their development journey. And the Administrator emphasized that this is not like an MCC scorecard, and the use of these metrics will be quite different from the way MCC uses their metrics. So really, we're using these metrics to inform our strategic planning processes, our programming, and also our dialogue with our developing country partners, as well as other donors, and also dialogue within the U.S. Government about our relationship with a particular country.

We've defined two dimensions that we're looking at in terms of metrics. One is country capacity, the other is commitment. Under capacity, we're looking at things like the ability of government effectiveness, rebuilding the government to provide security to its people. The capacity of civil society to hold the government accountable. And then, also, things like, you know, income level, poverty rate, inequality, and the quality of

human capital.

And under commitment, we're looking at things like trade, and capacity for trade, business climate, which, of course, is very important for countries to be able to attract private-sector involvement. Also, looking at issues of how they manage their natural resource base, and their commitment to open and accountable governance.

I should note that these indicators will be based -- all the metrics will be publicly available from independent sources. They're not things that we're cooking up ourselves, and we're really trying to take advantage of all the work that has been happening in the field of metrics indicators. Over the last few years, there were a lot of interesting new indicators out there, and I know that many of your organizations have been involved in working on those, so thank you for that. And it's also important to note that this is very much a work in progress; we are discussing some of these metrics, and part of our ongoing consultation process will be to get feedback on those metrics.

And then, I mentioned that we wanted to talk about legacy. When we -- when a country has come to the point when they have a fairly high level of capacity, and commitment to manage their own development process, we believe that it is appropriate for

us to be thinking about how we work with that country differently.

But, that does not mean that we are leaving the country. It doesn't mean we're turning out the lights and walking away. We -- the Administrator feels -- that it's very important that we remain engaged with the country for a variety of reasons. There may be some lingering development challenges, there's also the concern about potential backsliding, things could happen, and something unexpected could happen, and we want to make sure that we still have a relationship with that country.

So, we're looking at different ways that we can maintain a relationship with the country, and have a legacy. And there are things that we can do in terms of our presence. For example, have a small USAID representative office, or a -- some sort of senior development counselor in a country. We also are looking at the wealth of experience that the Agency has already, in putting in place various kinds of what we're calling "legacy programs." So, in the past we've had endowments, we've had foundations, we've had various kinds of partnerships. We actually catalogued more than 125 different kinds of legacy type programs that USAID has had, probably since the 1980s.

And we also tried to draw some lessons from those experiences,

and I would just like to highlight a couple of them. First of all, we know that early, and sufficient planning for these kinds of programs is extremely important, that you need to have a good lead time, because it is a complicated process, and it involves people, as well as institutions, and budgets, and things like that. So, an adequate lead time is really essential for developing a successful legacy program.

Also, working with the country, and having country ownership -- shared ownership of whatever the legacy is, is absolutely critical. And then I think, as a career foreign service officer, you always want to remember to think about the human impact of these processes, and particularly recognizing that this can have an impact on our staff, and most notably our foreign service national staff if we are changing the nature and footprint of our programs in some countries. And so, we are very mindful of that, and we want to make sure that we address that as part of any kind of transition planning process.

So, again, those are some of the things that we've been working on, and we are very excited to be at this particular point, where we will now be able to begin broader types of consultation on, and solicit more input on, some of these ideas and further develop them, both with the external stakeholder community, as well as internally within USAID.

And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Carolyn Miles, who is going to make some comments from her perspective, and then lead the panel. Thank you.

[applause]

CAROLYN MILES: Thank you, thanks very much to Susan, and thank you also to all the people who have worked on this, this has been a big group, actually. And I'm going to try, before we get into the panel, which has a little more specifics, I'm going to try to just identify some brief, kind of cross-cutting issues that we found in this work. And, I know you guys will have a lot of questions, so we're going to try and leave plenty of time for that. We never have time for all the questions that we've got, so we'll give that a try.

I want to start off by just thanking John Norris, David Ray, and Connie Veillette, who's actually not here. George Ingram is standing in for her, who led these three working groups: one on legacies, one on principles, and one on metrics. And you'll hear from them in a minute on the panel. There was a lot of work, and I think a great spirit of collaboration, by the way, with the USAID teams. So, we're all on the same page.

I think when Administrator Green talks about this idea that we're in this business to get out of this business, I think it's something many of us relate to. But how we get there is a whole different story. And so, the group that I was working with, really tried to say, "How do we add some constructive criticism to what we're seeing through the working groups and the data Susan shared?"

So, I'm going to go through those cross-cutting recommendations. Just a little background, we started this in October of 2017, and we've had these ongoing consultations with USAID, reviewing two rounds of documents on transition principles and metrics, and then a further along document on legacies, as well. So, just a little background.

The first cross-cutting issue, and this is not surprising, because we are early in this process, is that we really need to deepen the consultation process. And both Mark and Susan mentioned this, but we think we really need to take these principles and metrics and idea of legacy out to the broader community. And particularly need to talk to the country governments and stakeholders, as well as the country USAID teams.

The process can't be rushed because that's going to take some

significant amount of time. This is a very far reaching initiative with long term consequences, and therefore if we're really serious about making it work -- it's, by the way, not completely new, it's built on a lot of things that have been done before. But we think if we're going to be successful in really moving it to the next level, we've got to take the time and -- particularly the time at the country level. So, that was a major cross-cutting piece for us.

And it means sharing a lot of this information that we've already got, and have put together. So that's the first cross-cutting piece. And we also have to engage, obviously, people like the State Department, MCC, the Inter-Agency process also has to take place. And that has, to some extent, but probably not enough.

Cross-cutting recommendation number two is that this requires a smarter, not smaller -- USAID. So, this is not about budget cuts, and that in no way was what USAID was communicating to us, but we are in this rather difficult circumstance of facing dramatic cuts to the USAID budget. We actually would say that this work is going to take more money, not less money, right? To actually get on the road to real self-reliance, and that's going to take certainly moving things around, but it isn't going to take less funding. And so, the work that all of us do on

supporting the foreign aid budget, is going to be as important as it ever was, and we have to think about the positioning of this and how it gets portrayed, and not have it hijacked by some budget conversations. So, that is a risk, and I think we really need to make sure that that's what we're focused on. So, that's cross-cutting number two.

Number three is really promoting equity, and that should be a priority. I think it needs to be a -- it needs to be called out more in the principles, and also looked at in terms of the metrics, specifically. So, we know that in the last 25 years, many of the most disadvantaged people have actually been left behind, in terms of the progress that's been made in development. And, Mark used the example of India, and I think that's actually a great one to illustrate this point. Because, on the one hand, we have great progress in India, and I would totally agree with everything Mark said.

On the other hand, it's the country in the world with the most deaths of children under the age of 5. 300,000 kids die on the day they're born, the malnutrition rates are incredibly high, and that's because of inequity. And so, part of our work with countries has to be about, on this journey to self-reliance, that there's got to be a push on inequality. And we have to deeply root that, I believe, and our team believes, in making

that part of how this transition happens. So, we really need to take that into account, and you'll hear a little bit more about that when we get to some of the other, more detailed recommendations.

Cross-cutting issue number four, that -- and, the next couple of these cross-cutting issues are all about coordination. And so, none of this exists in a vacuum, there are many other donors, besides the U.S. Government. If we don't bring some of those other major donors into the fold, and make sure they understand what this is all about, I think it won't be as successful. So, we have to bring other donors, as well as governments, obviously, civil society, and make it clear that partnerships are a key part of this idea, right? That this is really about partnerships.

There was also not a lot in the documentation that we originally looked at about the SDGs. That's obviously a framework that the world is using, so we somehow have to reconcile. If we're not going to use that framework, or we're not going to talk about that framework specifically, what kinds of challenges, and issues does that bring up if we're trying to move on this journey to self-reliance with other donors, and with governments themselves. How does that all fit together? So, we think that's an important piece that's got to be addressed. And also,

things like the conference on financing, versus sustainable development. So, got to take into consideration the environment and what's happening outside of just USAID.

On that same theme, I think cross-cutting issue number five was about partner countries leading strategic transitions. So, again, we're talking about this as being on a journey. Local ownership is really essential, and USAID has really done a lot on the local ownership issue, and really has made significant and important changes to program guidance to put local ownership at the center. We need to make sure that with this initiative that local ownership is also at the center. And how do we help ensure that countries themselves are really in charge of this process?

There's a key piece for domestic resource mobilization this whole transition to self-reliance. And, how does what USAID does, and how does what all development actors do, actually drive that domestic resource mobilization to the right places, right? And that goes back somewhat to the inequity issue that I talked about before.

And then, finally, the final cross-cutting issue, is that we need to frame this, again around partnership, and cooperation, right? There's a little bit of a challenge, I think, with self-

reliance, and this framing of self-reliance. I think to some people we have to be very clear on what we mean about self-reliance. To some people it might, kind of, mean, "You're on your own, we're done. Off you go, good luck." Right? That isn't what we're really talking about when we talk about self-reliance, but I think this idea of embedding partnership much more into the work that we're talking about, and doing on this journey to self-reliance is going to be really important. And it helps people see that this is not about, kind of, "You're on your own, and off you go." It is this journey.

So, those are the cross-cutting issues, and as I said you're going to hear more now from the panel, and from the group that really did so much work in working with USAID on these issues. And so, I'd like to have the panel come up, and I will introduce them as they come up.

So, Anu Rajaraman, who is the self-reliance outcome lead at USAID. George Ingram, who's taking Connie Veillette's place, and George is a Senior Fellow at Brookings. David Ray, who's Vice President for Advocacy at CARE. And John Norris, who is a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress. And they have all led, really, these three working groups. John, David, and Connie; and George has been involved, and engaged in that group.

And so, we're going to hear a little bit more from them on the details, and Anu is going to actually at the end give a little more comment from the USAID side, and then we will open it up for comments from you all. So, thank you.

[applause]

All right, okay. And I think, John, we're going to start with you. We'll go down this way. And John was working on the principles piece.

JOHN NORRIS: Thank you everyone, thanks Carolyn, and thanks USAID for engaging with us in this process. You know I think the -- what Administrator Green is trying to do here, is eminently sensible, of trying to figure out what works and what doesn't work. And bring a more rigorous tent to the analytics around that. I think there's a lot of challenges that once you dig into it a little more deeply, they really pose a serious challenge to it. And in some ways, it's the old adage of, the dog that's chasing the car, what does he do when he catches it?

[laughter]

In part, because, you know, I think USAID's always actually done

a pretty good job of measuring, and understanding internally which countries actually are committed at a senior level to development, to free markets, to a democratic process, to a lively civil society. The trouble historically has been -- and this has been under presidents of every stripe -- is that AID still ends up working in a bunch of places that it knows full well are not fully committed to development. So, what do you do in those cases?

And, the reasoning why is complex, and political, but very often AID says, "You know, we shouldn't be in country X or Y. Belarus isn't a great development partner right now." And, you've got an Assistant Secretary, or you've got an Ambassador who says, "Well, this is really important." You've got a member of Congress who says, "I think this is really important." So, you end up spread out in a lot of places with very mixed results.

So, if we're measuring this, and we're really putting together the data on countries' commitment to development, what happens when we get those marks back? Do we make it public? Do we not? If you keep it private, everyone will say that AID is cooking the books, and working where it wants to, and ignoring a lack of commitment to develop some places. And if you make it public, then you set off a potential firestorm, because you're going to end up showing you are working in some places for a largely

strategic or political consideration. So, I think it gets very difficult in terms of implementation.

I think the other big issue that this highlights is if those core issues of capacity, and commitment to development are really the things that we're most concerned about in our development policy, our resources don't align with that at all. AID has become increasingly the world's megalith development agency that does help in humanitarian assistance. And I think those are both crucial roles, they have a lot of public support, and they've got a lot of congressional support. Are they the right elements if you're trying to move a country to what is lasting stability, and its own independent course, and development? So, I think these are all really important issues that need to be dug in to, as the process moves forward.

And the last point I would make, to save some time for Q&A obviously, is that all of the eminently sensible things that the Agency is trying to do right now are made infinitely more difficult by the behavior of the White House. We are seeing repeated efforts to treat development assistance as a bludgeon, that you beat up people who you disagree with. We've seen really incredibly intemperate remarks about the developing world, and we've seen the repeated presentation of budgets that would absolutely gut America's diplomatic and development

presence around the globe.

So, I support and applaud the work Administrator Green is doing, I think there are some very complex and difficult issues not very far [inaudible].

CAROLYN MILES: Great, thank you John. John always brings a dose of reality to our --

[laughter]

-- conversations. Great. David, why don't you talk a little bit about the metrics piece?

DAVID RAY: So, first I'd start just by echoing John's thanks to USAID, and to the colleagues we worked with in AID. We had a very frank, open exchange of views, and several lively conversations that we saw reflected in the documents as they evolved. We really appreciated the openness, and the transparency of which folks conducted themselves in that process. We also, just generally, would applaud the clear, and transparent, and I think fairly nuanced approach that the Agency's taking to deciding if, and when, to transition from an ODA relationship, to a different kind of relationship between any given country, and the U.S. Government.

That said, we did have some concerns about some of the framework as we saw it developing. One, and just to echo a couple of things that Carolyn mentioned, the group felt strongly, that to be successful, this would need to extend beyond USAID, and have to be a whole of government approach. And one that was coordinated broadly, certainly with all relevant U.S. government agencies, but also with outside partners, and other bilateral, and multilateral donors.

Underline two, the point around country ownership, absolutely critical to the success of any kind of venture like this. On the quantitative scorecard, and I know Ambassador Green mentioned earlier that they like to move away from that language of the scorecard, and that's, I think, a useful switch in language. But that -- whatever kind of metrics that we're using, that it's important that those be used to inform, rather than dictate decisions about what kind of relationships we will or won't have with any given country. Indicators are broad by nature, snapshots in time, and because of that, not great predictors of future performances.

So, we felt strongly that the Agency needed to create for itself, space to be flexible about the kinds of decisions that it makes. And certainly, that was reflected in the conversation

we had over lunch earlier today, and you heard it reflected, I think, in both Ambassador Green's and Susan's remarks.

One remaining point that the group has -- continues to be a little concerned about, and I think that's just because this really is just a work in progress is lack of clarity around how this -- the metrics will be used relative to other kinds of processes that the Agency already engages in, particularly at the country level. The country development and cooperation strategies in particular. And, how does this process match what that process -- how does this process match up against the kinds of metrics that are being developed by particular programs, like "Feed the Future." And how does this as a whole, make sense to the folks on the ground, who have to interpret it, and put it into use, as well as to all the other stakeholders involved.

Just a couple of other brief comments about the indicators themselves, and there are -- you can see this reflected on what was shared yet today, because it's not, I think, quite yet ready to be shared publicly. But there were a set of 16 draft indicators that were shared with the group, which we had given some reaction to. Overall, I think, generally felt quite positive about those, and about the idea that large dimensions of capacity and commitment were indeed critical to the development.

But our concern, is about subsuming indicators of need or of poverty or level development, however you want to define it, under one of those broader categories. We do feel like those need to be brought out, and lifted up in a more prominent, and transparent way.

We'd also urge the Agency to include some kind of measure of domestic mobilization. Again, that's come out in the conversation today, and I think there's intent to do that, still working on what that would look like. And also, wanted to encourage the Agency to augment the kind of national level aggregate measures with both quantitative data, as well as subnational disaggregated data, so we can get at some of the issues that Carolyn was talking about around disparities and inequalities. Both in terms of demographics, as well as geography in any given country.

Lastly, just wanted to support the inclusion of a metric around fragility. I think that's really important, and will be important to the kinds of issues that Susan raised, in terms of the kind of shifts that can happen in any country, at any given time. Thank you.

CAROLYN MILES: Great, thank you David. And obviously, this

question on metrics and how we would measure this is really important. It will drive a lot of work, and we all know sometimes metrics, kind of get a life of their own, so we want to make sure that we're all clear on what the right ones are. Thank you.

And finally, George is going to share a little bit about the group that worked on legacies. What is it we're leaving behind? So, if you go into this post-AID environment, what are the things that we want to make sure are there?

GEORGE INGRAM: Thank you. I bring greetings from Connie, and deep regrets for not being here. We all owe her a deep thanks for her superb leadership of this working group, and for deciding this morning to keep the flu bug which seized her last night at home, rather than bringing it to us.

Just a few thoughts. I think it was -- I think you could assume from both the Administrator's and Susan's remarks, that an example of how thoughtful this process has been with ACVFA, that the conversation has shifted -- evolved from a focus on graduation to the focus on more gradual long-term strategic transition, and relationship with countries. And I think that's a significant change in the conversation in the last three or four months.

This working group, rather than producing a list of mechanisms, decided to focus on guidelines and principles, because there is no one mechanism that's going to serve as the model for every country. Susan's comment about there being 120 examples, and types of mechanisms AID is engaged with, demonstrates, one, there's a lot of knowledge about this. But, two, it really argues the need for a strategic approach because most of these have been one off; most of them haven't been long in the planning. And so, one of the values of this exercise is to create a more strategic approach to creating legacy mechanisms.

Secondly, legacy mechanisms are an indication of the U.S. commitment to a country, but they also are an opportunity for innovative thinking, for new types of partnership, and for creating a platform for the Agency to reengage, if it has to.

Thirdly, David mentioned the importance of local ownership, but legacy mechanisms should include all of the elements of effective assistance. Local ownership, evaluation, accountability, evidence based decision making. So, they've got to reflect all of what we've learned in the last 10 or 15 years about how you engage in effective development.

And finally, while no sector should be presumed to be privileged

in the legacy process, the group did feel that it's very important that the process, and that these mechanisms strengthen democracy, human rights, civil society, and maintaining that open space. Thank you.

CAROLYN MILES: Great, thank you, thanks George. And obviously the question of when we eventually get to -- through this journey, what is left behind, and what are mechanisms, and what's worked in the past. I think that was one of the most important things that came out of this discussion, was we've done a lot of these, and which ones were successful and which ones were not is really important. So, Anu, do you want to say a few words before we open up for --

ANU RAJARAMAN: Sure.

CAROLYN MILES: -- questions from the audience?

ANU RAJARAMAN: Sure.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay.

ANU RAJARAMAN: Thank you very much.

CAROLYN MILES: Great.

ANU RAJARAMAN: So just three quick points. I mean, first, I just want to echo the gratitude that's already been shared to ACVFA and everyone else that was part of these working groups. You know, these three things that we sort of worked on as part of this group, the metrics, the guiding principles, the legacies. They, you know, were sort of in different stages of development, but all of them fairly early. And we benefitted tremendously from the very valuable inputs that we've gotten through this collaboration. And so, we're thankful for that. And we look forward to seeing your final recommendations, so that we can continue to improve upon these deliverables.

Second, I just want to sort of clarify upfront what others have touched on, which is sort of why we embarked on this effort in the first place. So, it's not about justifying budget cuts. It's not about determining, you know, what missions we're going to close. It's really about doing good development, or doing better development. And what is good development? It's long-term, sustained development results that are owned by countries and societies.

And that's what this is about. When we talk about the journey to self-reliance, that is our North Star. We're looking across all of our strategies, our programs, our practices, our

incentive structures to ensure that we are optimizing toward that goal of countries being able to develop, finance, and manage their own developments. And I think, probably, a number of you in the room would sort of say that that was a good development objective. So that's what this is about.

Third, just on consultation. A number of people have touched on this, and the importance of extensive consultation, to ensure that we get this right. I think the ACVFA collaboration is a perfect example of how getting external inputs are resulting in better products. We have an intensive consultation plan in place that includes consultations across USAID, both in Washington and with our field missions. And then, also, with a range of external stakeholders: The Hill, OMB, state, the rest of the interagency, NSC, and, of course, all of the organizations that you're involved with.

And this isn't, sort of, those situations where we develop a product and just kind of share it as an FYI. On the contrary, we really do want to sort of get out, share some of our early progress, and use your inputs and your feedback, the experts, across the world, to help us improve these products before we finalize them. So, I think with that I'll -- maybe we can open it up to questions.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. Thanks, Anu. And this is part of the process, in terms of getting more inputs. So, we really welcome questions. So, there's mics, I think, that are available. If you can raise your hand, just say who you are, where you're from. And if you want to direct your question to a specific panel member, please do that. So, questions, comments, inputs? All right? Okay. It's a long path [laughs].

JAMIE BAY NISHI: Hi. Jamie Bay Nishi with the Global Health Technologies Coalition. One thing that struck me in your remarks, today, is that there wasn't really any mention of sectors. So, I'm just curious, as you're doing your analyses, as you're talking about the metrics, do sectors come in as a sub-metric category? Carolyn, building on your point, you know, if you're looking at India, an emerging economy with a huge health burden. Or you look at South Africa, part of the G20, but with a huge HIV health burden. How are those sorts of disparities, when you look at one specific country, how is that being evaluated?

CAROLYN MILES: Yeah. So, I mean, I'll just say a general comment, which is -- and we talked a little bit about this earlier today, this idea that there's no one-size-fits-all, and that you've a context in which you're working is really going to drive this journey. But I don't know. David and Anu, maybe you

can take this one. David, on the metrics piece, if there's anything that specifically looks at that. And then --

ANU RAJARAMAN: Yeah, I'd be happy to.

CAROLYN MILES: Yep. Okay.

ANU RAJARAMAN: And then we'll --

DAVID RAY: Do you want to go first?

ANU RAJARAMAN: Sure, I'd be happy to go first.

DAVID RAY: Yeah.

ANU RAJARAMAN: So, excellent question. When we're -- the metrics that were discussed as part of this sub-working group are really focused on those highest level, sort of country-level metrics. And the idea is that those metrics would give us, again, a very high level, sort of snapshot or a profile of a country. And again, at very high levels, sort of tell us, sort of, what are some of the key challenges that countries are facing across those different dimensions of commitment and capacity.

But, to your point, you know, we program around sectors. Right? And we -- our programs do not sort of -- they might influence indirectly, but they're not -- there's no direct, extra, sort of, link between the program, doing it at this level, and sort that highest level.

And so, sort of the work that we do needs to bring it down a little. And so we are sort of in early discussions about what kind of complimentary analysis would be needed at the sectoral level, more of that programmatic level that would, for example, help you identify some of the root causes that are contributing. Just sort of some of those challenges that we're seeing at the highest level. Right? And so, we have a number of tools already in place within the Agency. We have political economy analysis. We have, you know, democracy and governance assessments.

All of our sectors have, you know, various assessment tools that help us dig deeper into the specific challenges we're facing within a sector that connect to capacity and commitment, as well. And those analyses I think would, sort of, really help our officers in the field think about, sort of programmatically, what types of programs and approaches we need to put in place to address those root causes. And then, hopefully, probably, maybe not immediately, because these are high level metrics, but

hopefully after, you know, years will contribute, along with a variety of other efforts, to moving the needle on those higher-level indicators. So, hope that attempts to answer a question.

CAROLYN MILES: I mean, I think this brings up a more, again, a more general point of how these things all connect. And John was talking earlier about the reality, as we have all of these things already in existence. And how does this one and this set of indicators or metrics going to fit with the others that we have? We had a question, I think, in the back. Yep.

JOHN WANDA: Thank you. My name is John Wanda. I represent the Arlington Academy of Hope. One of the most important stakeholders, probably in this conversation is the diaspora community, these people that have come from the worst countries to here, work here, live here. I think they can be a very important part of a discussion about transition. These people are probably the biggest contributors to the foreign-exchange annex of these countries.

CAROLYN MILES: Yep.

JOHN WANDA: They work here. But most of us who come from these countries, or come from Uganda, want to go back home because our families are there. But also, have a special interest in making

sure these countries are independent and growing. And I wanted them to consider working with the diaspora community here, both here in managing the transition of these people from here back to their home countries, and supporting them when they go there.

Because, while we have been here, we have learned a lot while in the country, but most of us, especially those of us from Africa, they want to go back home and help work with our communities to develop. And they're starting to put that, I think, [unintelligible], the work of this committee, and those of us who want to go back home to our countries.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. Thank you. And, I think, a good reminder on another key stakeholder group. Again, this -- we're at the beginning of the "How do we get this out and get more and more people give input?" But I think --

JOHN NORRIS: You know, one point to follow up on that that I think is really important in this discussion, is if the goal of the Agency really is to build up country capacity, I think it entails looking at some things that the Agency used to do very well, and has almost entirely gotten out of.

You look at the successful models of Korea and Taiwan. In the '60s, what was really powerful, as well as some of the alliance

for progress, stuff in Latin America in the '60s into the '70s, was bringing people to the United States, training them as economists, educating them. Innumerable of those people went back, they became Finance Ministers, they became Prime Ministers. They really shaped the development dialogue and political course of their country. We do very little of that as a development community in the United States now. And I think those are some of the kinds of investments that if the Administrator's really serious about following this to it's law, to a conclusion, they really deserve consideration.

ANU RAJARAMAN: If I can just sort of add a point to that, too. And I think we talked a little bit about this at the lunch discussion. But, sort of, the importance of this being a whole of government, U.S.G-wide approach. And that would entail bringing to bear all of the resources that -- not just USAID, but all of our agencies across the board have to offer. Because there are a number of other government agencies, as well, that do sort of, you know, very technical exchanges. In addition to what, sort of, USAID used to do, and maybe does in a more limited fashion now, but the advantage of having that whole of government approach is that we would be able to utilize a much bigger tool box to help us achieve this government-wide vision.

DAVID RAY: If I could, Carolyn. Just quickly, I think it

raises an important point, not only about the tool or the process itself, but also it -- after the fact, after the -- this system has been developed, we've -- part of our recommendation has been about augmenting the kind of high-level, third-party data with more qualitative data. And that means engaging with important stakeholders who can really give you a sense of what's happening on the ground in particular places beyond the -- that kind of high-level, third-party data. And certainly, the diaspora community would seem to be an important part of that equation.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. Thank you. Questions? Another one in the back. And one over here. Couple over here.

JULIO RANK: Yeah. Hi. My name is Julio Rank with RTI International. My question is can you give us a sense of the timeline you anticipate, perhaps on when -- maybe Administrator Green, between this particular stage, and the actual roll-out, programmatically? I mean, given -- you know, how much do you expect to accomplish in the next three years, perhaps, is the underlying question?

CAROLYN MILES: I think that one's for you, Anu.

[laughter]

ANU RAJARAMAN: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Of course, it's hard to provide a very concrete answer to that question. I mean, we have a number of projects, sort of, that kind of encompass this broader, internal redesign effort that's taking place at USAID. And each of these projects, sort of, has their own timeline, and sort of a plan, and a work plan with milestones and deliverables. Speaking to this outcome, journey to self-reliance, we want to be true to the consultative process that we've put in place. And it's hard to say, at this early stage, sort of what, the nature of the feedback is we're going to get.

But we're really, kind of, taking an accordion approach here. Right? Like, fantastic if we're able to move forward very quickly, you know, finalize metrics, develop the guidance, and roll that out to the field. But it really is going to depend on the feedback and processes that we undertake, right?

So, when we start engaging with the State Department and other Interagency actors, that obviously can lengthen the process a bit, as well as continued consultation with these external stakeholders. But what I can say is that this is a priority for the Administrator, and that we have, you know, a fully dedicated team working on this effort. But it's hard to provide, concrete dates on when things would be completed, just given the process

that we're rolling out.

CAROLYN MILES: I think I'm right, Anu, in also saying that there's an OMB, kind of blessing of the initial plan and the direction and --

ANU RAJARAMAN: That's right.

CAROLYN MILES: -- what's important.

ANU RAJARAMAN: That's right. Yes. We're in, you know, regular touch with OMB and The Hill, as well. You know, I can sit -- and you know we've briefed OMB on this outcome, and they've been very supportive. And so, you know, they are key stakeholders, part of this process. As our -- as sort of everyone else in the Interagency and externally, as well. So, yeah, that -- they're a key voice in this whole effort.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay, we've got a couple questions in the back.

FAUSTINE WABWIRE: Hi, thank you. Faustine, Bread for the World. I just want to follow-up on the metrics that Susan presented. And just seeking some clarification in the way they are presented as capacity and commitment. Seeing if we are thinking of those as mutually exclusive? And I don't think that

that's the case. We know of countries that have capacity but don't have the commitment, and the other way around.

And so, having said that, I also just want to lift up some of the great work that has gone into the Local Solution Initiative. And I'm wondering whether capacity shouldn't be the main, the overarching sort of element that should help us move into the transition process. Because we have capacity, then countries are able to do more DRM, trade, better improve their performance and procurement, and stuff like that. And, if that's the case, then I would be curious to hear from Anu whether we have an Agency-wide policy on capacity.

ANU RAJARAMAN: Great questions. Great points. And in our discussions around the metrics and specific indicators, you know, to be perfectly honest, there are certain things that could fall into the commitment bucket or the capacity bucket. We've sort of played around with how we organize these things. I mean, the conclusion we have reached, though, is that both of those dimensions are very important to the goal we're trying to achieve around self-reliance. And we agree that both of those things -- I mean, they're -- without -- you -- if you have strong capacity, but lack the government commitment to execute upon that, or use that capacity to implement the initiatives that are needed to move a country along its journey, then you're

going to fall short.

And, similarly, if you have the commitment, but then you're weak on the capacity side, then again, you're going to fall short. I mean, what these metrics do, is again, sort of help us at this higher level, sort of with that diagnosis. Right? So, where are the challenges? And then, based on those challenges that we identify, how might we engage with that country to move them along that journey? Right? And so, and we have a number of tools that we can sort of bring to the process ranging from, you know, policy reform, trade capacity, building -- the whole spectrum of capacity building that could help us, work with these countries to solve the specific challenges that they're facing, with respect to commitment and capacity.

To your specific question about, capacity building, I mean, this is an effort that has, you know, risen as a -- obviously, it's sort of an even greater priority. It's always been a priority, I think, of this Agency, but an even greater priority under this vision of self-reliance. And it's sort of a core workstream of this outcome. And so, we're going to be thinking now about, what does our Agency need to do this kind of work better?

Right? What do we already have? And what -- conducting sort of a needs assessment across the Agency in terms of the tools we already have, the guidance we already have in place. And then,

based on that needs assessment, developing the tools, the resources, the guidance, the policies to help us move even more forward in a positive direction.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. David, anything else you want to add on that, from the metric standpoint that your group talked about?

DAVID RAY: Yeah, no. Well, I mean, we did -- we had some conversation with the team about exactly that question of what fits in what categories, and whether or not those are the most useful distinctions. But at a high level, certainly. And I'd credit Sarah Rose, in particular, from The Center for Global Development for some of her work on this.

But the -- looking at -- and other kinds of analysis that's been done in transitions before. And I think, as a group, we felt pretty strongly that those broad kind of categories of commitment and capacity were relevant. As I said earlier, I think the lingering question we had was whether or not some of the kind of indicators related to poverty, to need, to those -- whether or not those were appropriately subsumed over one of those two categories, or needed to be called out, but separately under a third category of some sort like that.

CAROLYN MILES: Okay. Great. Another question in the back row

here.

ANDRES SINYUKOV: Yes, Andre Sinyukov [spelled phonetically] with SAVE. Thanks so much for the presentations. Really appreciate it. And question is almost a follow-up to the previous question. Obviously, self-reliance and local ownership is at the forefront of the Agency's thinking. Now, local ownership is something that we've been using for a very long time. It is, however, it seems to be -- it seems that it is being taken to a -- quite a different level.

So, I was curious if you can talk a little bit more about what do you mean by local ownership, and what are the potential quantitative indicators that come -- that may come into measuring that local ownership and their relations to transition, and transition into legacy programs? Thank you.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. So, maybe, John, in terms of the principles, and then George, maybe I'll ask you to say something. And Anu, too.

JOHN NORRIS: Yeah, you know I -- there's an interesting, almost dramatic tension there in terms of if you're going to measure a country's relative progress on development and its commitment and capacity. At the same time that you're really encouraging

local ownership, what do you do when those two don't exactly match? What do you do when the policy vision for a sound course of development differs when a country X or Y is saying "We think the roads are more important than the dam. We think education's more important than farming." You know, and I think using data and using metrics to have an informed policy dialogue is really important.

And I think recognizing that there will be times, where there is real tension there, is crucial to the success of it. And I also think that you can't get -- it's important to have metrics. But, at the end of the day, you can't become captive to them, because I think it is that broad political, economic dialogue, and a sense that there is a strategic commitment to development being made at the senior leadership of a country, and down to the grassroots, that is really fundamental.

And the data picks up on that often. But, as we've seen that we're much better at measuring some things than others. And some of things that we're really lousy at measuring are those that are most important in terms of country capacity.

You know, we're really good at measuring how many people we're delivering ARVs to. You know, we're really good at counting bednets. And everybody, throughout the process, stresses that

we're not going to just measure inputs. But, I think, as we've seen with all the hullabaloo around the World Bank doing business index this week, you know, you get into some much more political judgments when you start to touch on things like public administration, that are really, real essential to the development challenge.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. George, anything to add?

GEORGE INGRAM: Not much. I just -- I don't think we mean anything different by local ownership than what we mean by -- in the normal development programming. I think what changes is, as you move along the evolution, and the transition and a country becomes increasingly capable, it actually becomes increasingly easy to engage in local ownership. And if we're trying to, in the process, at a stage where we can transition, if we're not creating a mechanism, an instrument, that is meeting a need, and is not guided and driven by the local communities, it's probably irrelevant. So, it becomes a really, a North Star for a legacy.

DAVID RAY: Can I just say, Carolyn --

CAROLYN MILES: Sure.

DAVID RAY: -- one of the indicators that the USAID team has

talked about with us, is around civil society capacity. And while that's not the same exact thing as you're talking about in terms of ownership, it, at least -- it's some proxy for that. I mean, you can't have ownership at the level of people, particularly in a poor and marginalized people, if you don't have space for civil society. And so, at least that's a -- I would think of it as almost a kind of space holder for that kind of, getting at that kind of indicator.

ANU RAJARAMAN: All right.

CAROLYN MILES: Great.

ANU RAJARAMAN: All right. I would just --

CAROLYN MILES: So, Anu, I'm going to give you the last word. And then we're going to wrap up.

ANU RAJARAMAN: Thank you, yeah. So, I mean, I would say that, you know, to sort of react to some of the comments that Carolyn made at the beginning, is that partnership really is at the center of this approach. Partnership both within the U.S. government, most importantly partnership with our partner countries and societies, which includes, you know, private sectors, civil society, and other donors, the implementing

partner community. I mean, success is when all of these partners are coming together around a shared vision. And that vision, here, being supporting countries on that path to being able to manage their own development.

I mean, when we talk about local ownership, too, we all recognize that we're not going to be as successful if this is our vision alone. It does need to be a shared vision, and we need to be able to adapt to be able to capitalize on opportunities when they present themselves. I mean, the Administrator talked about India. India's a great example.

I was serving in India when Modi was elected. And he sort of identified water and sanitation as being his flagship, sort of development initiative. And we were able to react very quickly. You know, sort of get the funds that we needed to be able to support that initiative. And a key component of that initiative was actually working with the ministry that was overseeing this portfolio to help them develop a nationwide strategy for implementing Modi's vision.

And we were sort of keen, sort of infusing elements that both Indian government and us thought were important, like strengthening the government's ability to partner with the private sector to implement some of these initiatives. Bringing

together, sort of, you know, the technology and innovation, sort of communities to help them think about how they can strengthen this initiative. And so, that's the kind of support that I think about when I think about local ownership. It's not sort of our vision, but it's really sort of taking a country's vision and their priorities and supporting them to implement it on their own. Yeah, I'll stop there.

CAROLYN MILES: Great. So, I want to end, again, just by thanking John, and David, and George, and Anu, and actually two other people, who I think are both in the room, Kristin Sundell from the SAVE team, and Jessica Klein who's probably somewhere around, for -- yes, for being the ones who kind of brought this all together and kept us all on track. It's not easy when you have three working groups. So, thank you to them.

And thank you to the many people in the room who were part of this. And for all the hard work. So, we really appreciate it. Thank you.

[applause]

JACK LESLIE: I'm just being handed the -- I'm being handed the mic. But I have nothing else to say, other than thank you all for coming. Watch your emails, because the next meeting will be

probably sometime when the cherry blossoms have started to come out and the weather is better. If there were questions we didn't get a chance to answer or comments that you have, make sure you use ACVFA@USAID.gov, and send those to us, and we'll get them into the process. Thanks, all. Take care.

[applause]

[end of transcript]

This is to certify that the attached proceedings of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid at the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center, 1300 Pennsylvania, NW, Washington, D.C., on January 18, 2018 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcription thereof for the file of the U.S. Agency for International Development.