Transcript provided by the Kaiser Family Foundation[1]
(Tip: Click on the binocular icon to search this document)

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
July 23, 2009

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

[START RECORDING]

JEN KATES: Good morning everyone. My name is Jen Kates from the Kaiser Family Foundation, and on behalf of the Foundation and our partner in today's event, the Center for Strategic and International Studies Global Health Policy Center and its Director, Steve Morrison, we welcome you to our briefing this morning.

This briefing has become an annual event that CSIS and the Kaiser Family Foundation have convened starting several years ago because at that time it was our feeling that the focus of the G8, whether it was a big focus or not on global health, was something that we as a community here in DC should discuss. So we began convening a post G8 briefing to have that discussion. And focus on the health outcomes that were addressed at the G8, particularly on the role of the U.S. government in that environment.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

We are therefore very, very pleased to have Gayle Smith from the White House who will be joining us shortly to talk from the Administration's perspective on the G8, and global health, and food security, and give us her takeaway on the success or challenges that ensued.

Before the introductions to Gayle when she arrives and to other speakers, and I should also mention we are very pleased to have somebody from the Italian Embassy to speak about the host country experience as well.

I am going to say a few words about our perspective on the health agenda as it was or was not addressed at the G8, as well as provide some context for considering the agenda on health going forward.

First on the G8, thinking about what got said, what did not get said, and what the focus was, I think this was a first time in a few years where health was not an explicit headliner at the G8. There were no new

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

commitments on health. At the same time, the G8 did reaffirm its prior commitments. The G8 did put out a new accountability report where health was explicitly talked about and measured. And although there was no new headliner on health, clearly there was a big headliner on food security which is related to health. And that was spurred on in large part by the Obama administration making that such a signature effort and we will talk more about that.

In addition, I think it would be hard to separate out the G8 Summit itself from the Administration's decision to go to Ghana, to have the President go to Ghana right after to make that his first trip to Africa as President. And in addition to pushing a food security platform really did take on health among many other things at his speech in parliament where he mentioned HIV, TB, malaria, polio, neglected tropical diseases, maternal and child health. He went through the main highlights of what the

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

Administration hopes to accomplish on its Global Health Initiative. And of course, chose to go visit a clinic and highlight the importance of addressing maternal and child health, so it was tied into the G8 experience, I think for the Administration.

But what does this mean stepping back and thinking about it? I think one interpretation is that the intention of donors is to keep global health on the agenda at least, and to recognize the importance of keeping up commitments. But the other is potentially more cautious because global health now may seem more like one of the many things, and there was a lot of things tugging at the agenda at the G8, as well as this shadow of the economic crisis.

So I think it really just—it might signal an attention to keep health on the agenda, but it also I think signals a bigger intention to really watch closely what the commitments will be going forward.

And this leads me to highlight some background context from a new report we are releasing today on donor government funding for health in low- and middle-income countries. And I should say that this—one of the challenges of trying to look at this and monitor commitments is that there is always a lag in what you can measure. And so what I am going to be presenting, and I think it is actually interesting to look at it now, is our data from 2007, so before the global economic crisis. And even then I think we are starting to see some things that might raise some concern.

Before I do that, I am going to just acknowledge that we at Kaiser did this report with the Stimson Center, and Eric Lief and Jonathan Pearson researchers there, worked closely with me on the report, so thanks to them. You should have the full report in your packet.

The first thing to note is that donors have really increased the focus on global health. So not

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

only are we seeing a rise from $7.2 billion in 2001 to $22 billion in the last year in which we were measuring it, it is a significant increase.

If you look here at the ODA commitments by major sector, so where you look at health, and I also should say that we are not just looking at the traditional definition of health here, we are actually including clean water and sanitation activities in here given their importance to health. What you see is that over time, over this same period, not only have nominal health dollars increased, but the share of ODA that has gone to health has also increased from about 13-percent to 18-percent. That is good.

At the same time, if you look at that trend, the rate of increase has started to slow. And between 2006 and '07, the last year for which we can measure it thus far on health, the increase was still high, 13-percent, but it was the slowest increase yet in many, many years. And when you adjust it for inflation, and

currency revaluation, actually the real increase was about 4-percent. Why is this important? It is still an increase. I think it just gives us pause to say, what will see in the next year and the next year given the economic crisis, so something to watch for very closely.

And just a final point I am going to end with that I think is germane to our discussion today is looking at the donors, really the critical role of the U.S. here, so going forward and monitoring these commitments and trying to understand what might happen with health, this is an obvious point, but as we can see here, the U.S. is a full 27-percent of donor funding in 2007. What happens with U.S. commitments as well as with the EU and other donors, will be critical, but the U.S. playing a critical role here.

So with that I am going to turn it over to Steve who will take it from here.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

J. STEPHEN MORRISON: Thank you Jen. Welcome and good morning. Thank you all for joining us here. I want to especially thank Kaiser for hosting this yet again. This is our fifth year I believe. We have had a remarkable partnership with Kaiser going back to 2002, and it is a great complementarity and we have always been just extremely impressed with the expertise and professionalism and generosity of this organization, so we are very pleased to be back. And a special thanks to Craig Polasky, Jen Kates, Diane Rowland, Adam Wexler for their help, and from CSIS, a lot help from Johanna Nesseth who is our Senior VP who heads up a Global Food Security Initiative at CSIS, and Britany Goetsch who is an intern with us who did a lot of work here.

My first point looking back, I am going to speak largely around the Global Food Security Initiative. I will say just a very brief few words about the Russia visit and the health component of that

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

at the conclusion. But as far as the Global Food Security Initiative, I think the big takeaway from the G8 summit was this was a big win particularly for President Obama and it was a big win for the G8 organizers. And we will hear in a moment from Stefano Beltrame from the Italian Embassy as to the special measures and strategy that the Italians brought to this task in putting a focus upon agriculture in the early days, rallying many of the minister—at the ministerial level, rallying for the first time ever the G8 ministers and bringing in the much larger contingent of African heads of state into the mix which only further elevated the visibility, the salience, the urgency of acting on the question of worsening poverty and hunger rooted in weak agricultural productivity.

Now, I do think that this instance was one in which the President, President Obama, took this up and drove it forward in a fairly dramatic way, made it a White House priority, and was able to join successfully

with other members of the G8 as Stefano will elaborate. There were obviously big factors at play that drove this. Going back to 2007, the World Bank sectoral analysis of agriculture in the developing world was a big turning point in showing the stagnation, if not the regression of productivity in that sector and this was before we had hit in early '08 a runaway global food and fuel crisis that in very short order stimulated violent urban rioting in over 35 countries, most of them centered in Africa.

And stimulated a lot of activism on the part of Robert Zoellick at the World Bank, Josette Sheeran from the World Food Program, got this at least onto the discussions in Tokyo at the G8, got the G8 to make an initial commitment around global food security. That sort of laid down some preliminary commitments that then were picked up later.

And then of course when we hit September of last year and had the full onset of the global economic

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

crisis, I think that really in a way sealed the deal for food security in rural development becoming central features of concern because it then became very clear that this pattern that you could say goes back to the abandonment of rural development in the early 80s by major donors and multilaterals that contributed to a very weak sector in the poorest countries, poorest developing countries in terms of productivity and ability to feed their populations and the weakness of markets that then hit the skids with the food and fuel crisis in the worsening global economic crisis. Suddenly this was front and center.

So those were the big factors pushing this forward. Some of the other factors I think that made the White House inclined to take this up and drive it forward as what I think it is now emerging as a signature initiative for this Administration with a very strong multilateral component, is that I think—and we will hear more from Gayle Smith momentarily, this

was a White House that was looking for new signature initiatives that would be development centered and would be able to leverage contributions from others. In this case it was $3.5 billion three year commitment by the U.S. that leveraged other commitments rising up to $20 billion.

They were looking for a way to engage in with Congress and the American public and constituencies about revitalizing U.S. development agenda, and finding a way forward in reinventing USAID which is also a big issue right now. And they were looking for a strategy for rebalancing U.S. foreign assistance in several ways. Rebalancing in terms of getting out of the trap of endless year-to-year emergency food programs exceeding $1.2, $1.5 billion most years. And these are food programs that don't deal with root causes, that are palliatives, that are emergency short-term palliatives, and which because of legislative restrictions on purchasing and shipping, have huge

inefficiencies in which upwards in times of 65-percent of value is lost because of those conditionality, so we are looking to right that. And in years past, U.S. commitments on rural development were on the order of $60 million a year globally which is a pittance as compared to the demand and need, and as compared to the emergency flows that were well over $1.2 billion in any one year.

They are looking to rebalance also in terms of the mix against the side-by-side mix with the Global Health Initiative which was rolled out in May as a $63 billion six year initiative. Now you have a second companion initiative in the form of the Food Security Initiative as $3.5 billion over three years.

I think that they were also reacting to, or taking full advantage of the groundswell of interest in this issue that we have seen in the United States in the last couple of years, and that in itself is in some ways very surprising. I mean, we, CSIS got involved in

this in '08 working closely with Senators Lugar and Casey. Senators Lugar and Casey have driven forward legislation with bipartisan companion legislation on the House side lead by Representatives McGovern, McCollum, Emerson. So there has been this groundswell of focus and interest on a bipartisan basis within Congress talking about real dollars and real levels of engagement.

We have also seen very important work done by Chicago Council on Global Affairs. Catherine Bertini and Dan Glickman in partnership with the Gates Foundation which produced really a sterling report that gave a roadmap on moving forward, and we have seen lots of advocacy and operational NGOs step forward in support of this.

So this was a winner I think from the standpoint of an Administration looking at critical gaps in foreign assistance strategies, and looking for an ability to do something innovative that would draw

support from multiple places in our own society and have some credibility and some likelihood of success in getting major new commitments from the Hill on a bipartisan basis. It made a lot of sense.

The WFP role, the World Bank role, and the fact that the worsening crisis has taken on a security dimension cannot be underestimated. The fact that poverty, malnutrition and worsening ability to feed one's population is understood as a source of instability, and worsening possibility of violent instability is a big factor.

Now, what are the outstanding questions? There is a couple of outstanding questions. As with any G8 summit where pledges are made, we spend the next six months trying to sort out what were these, and where is this money coming from? How much is new, how much is real, how much is old, how do we count this? It is still hard and we are still in the early days, but there is going to be some sorting out that happens.

Another big question is, how much is different today really from the early '80s when donors and multilaterals exited this sector out of frustration and a sense of exhaustion believing that there was not political will, that the barriers were too formidable in terms of absence of adequate roads, markets, fertilizer, seed, other inputs, extension services, irrigation, that there was a deep malgovernance and urban bias in these developing countries.

Today if you go and look at most of the poorest of the poor countries, particularly in Africa, where 80 to 90-percent of their populations are rural peasant producers, your typical budget allocation in international budgets is under 5-percent of your national budgets going into agriculture.

So how much has changed is one of the big questions. And I think there is certainly a risk of hubris at this time. There is a risk of not looking adequately at what some of those barriers are. I think

what is different today is the gravity of the crisis, and the fact that there has been an enormous amount of intellectual capital formed around what needs to be done, and we have these security threat dimension of this, and thanks to the Italians, we have had a broader group of African leaderships who have come forward and will be continue to be tested I think upon this.

So just a couple of closing considerations. One is, who are going to be the African partners who are going push this forward and be serious and make the sort of internal changes essential for any reengagement on rural development to show success in the next three to five years? It is not clear to me who those are. I think there are a couple of good candidates, but it has been a very, very weak pool of voices and figures who have stepped forward.

Second, on the U.S. side, there are lots of unanswered questions as to how this initiative is going to be organized and driven forward, but I expect we

will hear more from Gayle on that. There is the outstanding question of Doha and the fact that the global trade negotiations are very fundamental to any renewal of agriculture in the developing world. Doha appears to be stuck at the moment. There was very little discussion of Doha at the G8. There were a few nominal lines in the communiqué. We have Secretary Clinton in Nairobi in the first week of August for a very large trade summit. It will be very interesting to hear what is said there. It will be very interesting to hear what is said at the G20 meeting in September in Pittsburgh on these issues about the structural barriers to any serious recovery of agriculture. This remains very fundamental and has been largely outside of the picture.

Also, there is a history, there is a memory and a history of the engagement that American institutions made in the '50s and '60s in promoting agriculture in the developing world, and it was largely

based on the science and the expertise and the discoveries that went on in American land-grant universities in partnership with their counterpart institutions. That system has largely abandoned this sector.

There may be an opportunity to bring back some of those that remain engaged like Cornell or Michigan State or UC Davis, but the reality is that industry, the biotech industry, the seed industry, the large global industries today and for sometime have been the principle source of new discoveries that have direct relevance to drought control and better pest control, and they are going to need to be at the table and a large part of this strategy for it to succeed. And that is not going to be without complications. So thank you very much.

I would like to turn to Stefano and ask him to provide his comments. Stefano is the Head of the Economic Commercial and Scientific Affairs office, the

number three slot at the Italian Embassy. Stefano, thank you so much for being with us today.

STEFANO BELTRAME: I was thanking myself for inviting me here and thanking the Kaiser and Family Foundation, and CSIS to have this vision to keep global health on the international agenda because by definition the global governance is very complicated, the agenda is overloaded, so we need to have people stimulating us to keep it on the radar. Otherwise there is a risk that other more compelling problems might take the time. For Italy, the G8 in L'Aquila, we call it G8, but by the end of the day there were 39 delegations, so it was an open G8, and it was a very nice success. I would love to give further details and the way it was built up and carried out, and why we considered it a success, but I do not want to take too much time now.

I just would like to focus a little bit on why we think it is a success for global health and for

Africa and for security. We are in the worst economic crisis by now since the 20th of last century, and there has been this movement to focus first on how to deal on the financial crisis. This brought up the G20, new format for financial crisis handling, and there was obvious—by the way, the financial crisis did not hit the G8 at the same level. Some countries like Italy and Canada for example whose banking system did not know any crisis like the UK or United States for example, so people had different sensibility over that.

But [inaudible] of the G8, we thought it would make sense to try to be complementary and focus on things which were not covered by the G20, and it was quite obvious since we are not that much touched by the financial crisis like other countries, that there was a risk that when the financial crisis became a real economy crisis then the weakest in the world would suffer most.

So that was one of the themes of the Italian presidency, and that is why we insisted to enlarge the format even though that was not accepted by every other G8 in other countries. And we built the interest for food security in Africa throughout the presidency. The G8 summit in L'Aquila maybe was not fully understood or was preceded by several preparatory open G8 meetings on ministerial level. As we said, Steven remembered very nicely, we organized the first ever open G8 ministerial meeting for agriculture, and that was focused on food security. So there was a preparation.

There was also an open G8 ministerial meeting on welfare. That was run in March in Rome and part of the declaration which came out also was included in the London G20 meeting.

The slogan at the time was No One Left Behind. There was a building up of this event. And then without to really give a push on Africa because in the format, if you divide the division of labor among the

formats, in the G20 which is more focused on finance, at the end of the day, the room for Africa is very limited. There is one African country in the 20, but the African issues are basically out of the real discussions.

You always end up with big declaration, I think that the G20 here in Washington came out with 42 points in the final communiqué including the Doha Round, but then having this open G8 which was not a fixed club of the world leaders, but it was open to everybody and focusing on Africa. I think we brought attention to this continent, and we are very pleased to see the amount of pledges that were collected in L'Aquila.

So we think we managed to bring attention back to the continent and we are very pleased to see that after meeting the African leaders, President Obama went to Ghana and launched his new approach to Africa which we like very much because we see it is not only

throwing money to the problem, it is also giving new thinking, new empathy to the problem, and personal commitment which is something that we think is needed, and also focus on the responsibility of the Africans. To the Africans as the President said is something that we like very much.

And maybe only one comment on Doha. Doha, I've been following trades for many years, and I have been here in time and again, we have to close Doha by the end of the year. That was two years ago. It was last year. It was one of the 42 points at the G20 in Washington last year. In L'Aquila I think we made a step forward because we are more honest. We move the deadline to 2010, so not in two weeks which is something—if you know the detail of one of the problem of the Doha Round is so complicated. Somebody like me trying to make sense of out it gets lost. If I get lost, for me it is difficult, then can anybody else master the issue where they are. So there is a huge

complexity there, but in L'Aquila we saw that there are generally different positions. The industrialized countries do have different position than the emerging countries, and pretend that those difference do not exist is not the way ahead.

So I think we made the point in a more honest way. So even in trade I think it was the most honest, and we notice very well that after the G8, the President went to Ghana, but then Hillary Clinton when to India, and Secretary Chu went to China. So you talk those things also on a bilateral basis.

So for me, for the Doha Round, it's very complicated, 2010 maybe, but I think it was positive. Thank you.

JEN KATES: Thank you very much both of you. We are now very pleased to be able to welcome Gayle Smith to the podium to speak on behalf of the White House. Her full bio is in your packet, but Gayle is the Special Assistant to the President, and Senior

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

Director at the National Security Council where she is responsible for basically all the things we have been talking about today, global development, stabilization, humanitarian assistance, and has led much of the Global Health Initiative focus, Africa, food security, so is really the right person to be telling us what the takeaways were from the G8, and what it all means going forward.

But in addition to a long career on these issues, a lot of us know her from the work that she most recently was doing at the Center for American Progress where she help cofound MFAN and really rejuvenated the discussion around foreign policy reform, and the development agenda, as well as having spent many, many years working in Africa. So we very much thank you for being here. We know that you have a limited time schedule today, so we will let you come and speak. And Gayle will then take a few questions I think before she has to leave.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 28 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

GAYLE E. SMITH: Sure. [Applause] Thanks, and in the spirit of addressing some questions, I will answer in advance, we hope to have a USAID administrator soon. [Laughter] That is the first question I get everywhere I go.

Good morning and thank you very much for doing this, and also for everything that you all do because I think that we are at a moment on development issues where we have got something approaching perfection. And what I mean by that is we have a House and Senate that are very interested, and an Administration that is very interested, bipartisan support and interest, but also a tremendous amount of really, really good work coming from the NGO and Think Tank communities. And importantly, work that gets to a lot of hard data and a lot of analysis that can help us as we figure out what our next steps are.

With respect to the G8, I want to focus on two things in terms of takeaways. One is on the food

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

security side, and the second is on global health. I think the lead story out of the G8 on food security was obviously this number that the President was able to reference of $20 billion over three years as a pretty big and pretty good story. I think it is a fantastic story, but I think it is a little bit of burying the lead because underneath that I think there are two things that are very significant for us to focus on going forward.

The first is that if you look at the response in 2008 to the spike in global food prices, it was significant. It was in many cases prompt and robust. But I think what happened in Italy was that there was a collective commitment to do more than, if you will, just the emergency relief phase of responding to a global trend which threatens the lives and livelihoods of a majority of people in the developing world.

And I think that is significant because what they pledged to do is to focus dead seriously over a

sustained period of time on agricultural development. This comes at a time where for many countries, our own included, the balance between what we provide in terms of relief assistance and what we provide in terms of agricultural development assistance has been rather turned on its head.

Now, I want to be very clear, by focusing on agricultural development assistance, we have no intention, nor do we believe any of our partners do, to cutback on safety nets, food assistance, and so on and so forth. What we do have an intention to do is to regrow the accounts that support agricultural development assistance.

President Obama in London announced his intention to ask Congress for an increase, a doubling of our resources for agricultural development, over a billion dollars in the 2010 budget. In Italy we were able to talk about a commitment of at least $3.5 billion over three years as our part of the $20

billion. But the other thing that is under this number is the how of implementation for this. And you made reference to some of the work and interest on development policy and foreign assistance reform, and I think for those of us who care about these issues, there is some really important pieces.

We advocated a strategy that includes five elements, and a lot of these are elements that have been talked about in Paris and Accra and they are principles we have all heard of. I think the distinction is we are talking about, all right how do we make these principles real? They are really lovely as principles on a piece of paper, but how do we actually operationalize them?

The first is the notion of supporting country strategies. I think we were all informed very much by what the AU has done in the CAADP process. Aware of their own initiative, they have set out a program for food security on the continent where countries put

together comprehensive strategies, and also importantly make commitments of their own resources to agricultural development.

We are not saying that every country involved must have a CAADP program or that all CAADP countries will definitely be in a program. What we are saying is that kind of model of a country strategy is something we want to start with.

But secondly, what we want to see is comprehensive strategies. I think we all know enough about how assistance works to know that when we talk about coordination it often means a donor meeting where everybody gets together and talks about what they are doing really without benefit of saying, well, gee, nobody is doing this, or everybody is doing that, and there is a big hole in the middle.

What we want to make sure that we have as a starting point is comprehensive strategies that look at production, distribution, markets, the natural resource

environment, the role of women, all the pieces that are necessary to make agricultural sectors work affectively and sustainably over time.

The third element is actual strategic coordination. I worked at AID during the Clinton Administration for a couple of years, and I am looking at a friend of mine, Mr. Ambassador there, when we had something called the Global Horn of Africa Initiative, Steve you will remember that, and we talked about strategic coordination. It was a well intentioned hallucination at the time. [Laughter]

I think what we are talking about here is getting all the stakeholders around the table, looking at a comprehensive plan, figuring out who is going to do what, agreeing on an implementation plan, and agreeing on a disbursement schedule so that when the faucet needs to be turned on to fund a certain component, it will happen.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 34 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

Now, that sounds like—my mother asked about this the other day and I was explaining it. She was, oh, that sounds really great. It does not sound terribly exciting, but I think for those of us who have been on the ground and seen what it looks like to manage multiple donors, to work with multiple stakeholders, the kind of unarmed Somalia that is development coordination on the ground. The notion of trying to get buy-in to a common strategy for both implementation and disbursement is something we are all very serious about and that everybody committed to that principle.

The fourth is working through both bilateral and multilateral channels. At one level that is obvious, but I think we were trying to underscore another point. There are a number of multilateral mechanisms in this space. Some very good, some potentially very good, but not yet realized, some—let me be diplomatic, fine. And I think the intent there

is to say, we have got some really good multilateral instruments out here, let us figure out how to make them work. Let us also look at those places where we gain efficiencies by working through multilateral channels.

If you think about infrastructure for example, even with increased resources, very few donors are going to be able to individually capitalize the kind of infrastructure that is necessary to support agricultural development, so multilateral channels may be important there.

The last principle is sustained and substantial commitments, and that is where we come back to the $20 billion, but importantly over three years. Donors and our partners have for years talked about the importance of predictability, and being able to know moving forward what kind of resources are in the pipeline and this is just a manifestation of our

intention to answer the mail on that and to say that we will line up at least this much over time.

One footnote on that is we understand very well that we cannot as governments do all of this, nor should we. That the private sector has an enormous role, that private philanthropy has an extremely important role, and that the NGO community, both in terms of its analytical and policy capacity, but also program capacity have huge roles to play. So this is something we envision as involving all of those actors. This is not just a kind of government club.

What comes next is a meeting in the early fall that we are just planning out now, but I think in our view should be a kind of roll up the sleeves working level, how do you actually translate all these principles that our leaders have committed to in public and in writing, and operationalize them on the ground. So hopefully we will see a lot more progress on that over the coming months.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 37 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

My takeaway on this having looked at various G8 summits and seeing the kind of build up of increased support for Africa in particular over time, but development rising on the agenda, is that the most important thing to me is that the deliverable is not just money, it gets to the how we're going to do something. And while I am a big fan of getting the resources up and maintaining high levels of assistance, I think it is as, if not more important, to also focus on the how. So I think that was a really terrific takeaway. It's also something that will be revisited this initiative at the G20 summit in Pittsburgh.

Let me go quickly to global health and say that I think there are a lot of people, I mean, some of the feedback we have had is that people were pleased that it was there, and maternal child health was there, but it was not as big or as robust as people had hoped. I think our feeling on that was that the most important thing to do at the summit on health was to lay down a

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

serious marker on maternal child health given that we are way behind on that, that it has been under funded, that there has been insufficient focus.

I think you all know that in early May we announced at the White House our own broad plans on global health and a $63 billion over six year figure, but with a key component of our health program over time being maternal child health and also capacity building, so we did not really feel an overwhelming need to re-announce that at the G8. We also wanted to be a little bit careful about not re-announcing things at every big forum because then you not only look like you are double counting, but you actually potentially are.

There is one thing you may all have missed and that is this commitment on kind of health centers of excellence, and a commitment on our part to work with our partners in Africa on research and development in the global health sphere and help establish some

institutional capacity, again, in partnership on the continent. It may not seem as big as some of the other pieces. I personally think it is quite significant and important for two reasons.

One, I think we very much want to see Africa have the institutional capacity, that it needs to assume greater leadership in its own decisions about strategies in health or agriculture or any other issue.

Second, we think that having a lot of that closer to the ground when dealing with some of the health challenges we and our partners are dealing with will make a great deal of sense, and we hope this something we can build on over time.

One last point on global health though that is kind of tied to the G8, but is a little bit more about this moment. I think we are at an amazing moment in that there has been enough done in global health now over the last many years by the government, by NGOs, that we have the foundation to do some serious analysis

and look at what works and what does not, and where we need to go moving forward. Both CSIS and Kaiser have done a lot of really good work on this with a lot of reports released just recently that are really, really helpful as we step back and say, we are making bigger investments in global health than I think any of us ever anticipated. We are building on what President Bush did, which I think we all thought was extraordinary at the time when PEPFAR was announced in terms of the dollar figure, and essentially doubling that over the next six years of PEPFAR's life and adding to it.

How can we bring science, data, analysis, numbers, a clear-eyed frank assessment of again, what works, what does not, where the gaps are, how we can more effectively coordinate and make those dollars work? How can we pull all that together?

Although it is not represented in the communiqué, it certainly was not in any of the news

stories. I think one of the things that I certainly found in the lead up to the G8 and in terms of the lead up to the G8 on global health, I was only a talking head and Dana DeRuiter in my office who leads all of that and effectively tells me what I think every morning.

I think what we have seen is a growing awareness on the part of our partners whether on the ground, government, NGO, and of other donors that now we have the opportunity not only to maintain and grow resources in global health, but get a whole lot smarter. We are in the game seriously and there is some ways moving forward that we can adapt our strategies to be even more effective than we have been over the last several years.

So again, that was not in the communiqué, but I think there is a growing consensus that now is the time to double down and take advantage of what we really know to move forward.

So I will stop there if that is okay with you, and then answer the question about when we are going to have an AID administrator and [laughter] go from there. Sure.

KARI STOEVER: Hi thank you. First I just want to congratulate the White House on their commitment to health, agriculture and despite their challenging domestic issues, are staying the course. I am Kari Stoever. I am the managing director of the Global Network for Neglected Tropical Diseases, and I am not going to ask you about the next USAID administrator.

I think what I have heard today is a section of interest that really looks across the development agenda and says, where are the wins? And I feel compelled to come and not sell what I hope this administration does with neglected tropical diseases, to really talk about some of the results and what is working.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 43 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

There was an article that was just published I think on Monday and it highlighted the progress of the African program for onchocerciasis control. It is run by Africans in West Africa, and it has been operating for almost 20 years now with the donation of Mectizan and what it has achieved is quite astounding.

For one, more than 60 million people are now protected from going blind in West Africa, and that has resulted in now people living in lands that are very fertile and rich. It is producing cash crops, it is feeding 17 million people a year, and it is producing $3.7 billion in agricultural productivity per year, and that has been at a very, very low cost.

I think the other thing that is very interesting about the agriculture and disease link, and we are seeing this now in some of our conversation with the Asian Development Bank, is the issue around worker productivity in Asia and farming. So for instance in Vietnam, we have done a study that looked at worker

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

productivity in the rice farms and we are seeing that hookworm, one of these diseases, reduces productivity by 40-percent. So simple treatment done annually costs $0.02 per person reached, really, in the field when it is done across mass populations, very cost effective.

And the other thing I just wanted to highlight briefly is that as far as neglected tropical diseases go, we are looking at cross-sectoral partnerships, so we are partnering with the Inter-American Development Bank. They have opened up a $1 billion water and sanitation fund that is now bringing in health components the governments are funding. No cost to the U.S. government.

So we are looking across sectors, education, agriculture, and health, and seeing where there are some innovative ways to pull together these partnerships. Thanks.

GAYLE E. SMITH: We'll take a few and then, sure.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 45 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

JEN KATES: Just please identify yourself

ASIA RUSSELL: Hi, I am Asia Russell, I work with Health GAP. Thanks so much for your remarks Gayle. It is really refreshing to hear a discussion that is about a smart approach to delivering aid. I think though as tough as it is for us in Washington in a time of financial crisis to talk about funding levels, it is exponentially more difficult for our partners in Africa to experience the financial crisis. You only have to read the news where you see example after example of HIV treatment programs actually being unable to enroll additional people because of shrinking external aid and shrinking domestic commitment. So my question is about funding.

I think when advocates in spring saw the launch of the Global Health Initiative; the feeling was in a way schizophrenic. A lot of support for the goals and targets, a lot of support for the focus on important integration between maternal and newborn

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

child health, and HIV, TB, and malaria, something we can all get behind, but funding levels that are dramatically insufficient, funding projections.

For example if you do back of the envelope analysis of the $63 billion over six years, it's actually a decrease of extrapolated levels starting from baseline. So my question, I guess, is how do we reach those targets without robbing Peter to pay Paul which, of course, this Administration would not want to do, particularly building on some of the data coming out of the International AIDS Society Conference in Cape Town just this week that showed, for example in Eastern Africa HIV services being delivered to kids was associated with an 83-percent decrease in non-HIV related child mortality in the region.

So the integration there in leveraging those synergies, that's critical. So I guess my question is, will the Administration reassess the funding projections in the global health initiative in order to

ensure the targets that you all have already committed to can actually be reached without pitting MDGs against each other? Thanks.

GAWAIN KRIPKE: Thanks. Thanks to CSIS and Kaiser for hosting and Gayle—I'm Gawain Kripke with OXFAM and I want to congratulate you and the White House on the G8 performance. I though the food security initiative was one of the real highlights of the event when otherwise, a lot of reiteration of commitments but one of the only real new areas. And you can tell The White House is filled with organizers and activists by the real focus on and the drive on it and the reluctance to let donors make vague commitments or to include things that are already they're doing.

The backward looking report at this G8 was a mess on food security. It included every cat and dog that you could squint and say they might be related to food security. Whereas I hope the forward commitments are real on the agriculture productivity and so forth.

But what I want to ask you, you made reference to it but maybe you could be a bit more explicit is, what's the plan going forward and how do we keep this momentum and $20 billion to me is real money, but by my math, you know, only a fraction of it is real new money.

And so that's a taste, but I want the whole bottle and how do we get more even than what's been committed at the G8? So that's my question for you.

GAYLE E. SMITH: Okay. On the first point, I mean as you know, neglected tropical diseases is something that we spoke of in the roll out at the White House in early May, but I think your larger point on integration is something that we very much want to focus on. And I think that as a community, and certainly as a government, our practice historically has been to stovepipe our development programs. Some of you heard me say this before, but the best description I've ever heard is of cylinders of excellence rather than stovepipes.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

And so there's that desire to integrate. We very much want to do that. Part of what's underlying the global health strategy is quite frankly to have a very robust PEPFAR but that does not stand alone, that is connected to MCH and capacity building and neglected diseases and then have that whole universe of global health connected to these other programs. It's very hard to do I think as you all know.

It's hard to do because funding is allocated by sector, metrics are most usually defined by sector, advocacy is pretty much organized by sector. I mean I did the Foreign Assistance Agency reviews during the transition and did 45 meetings with outside groups and by the end, the requests, all smart, heartfelt, dead serious, were that we have more for HIV, a TB initiative, a polio initiative, a neglected diseases initiative, a new water initiative, a climate change adaptation initiative, a climate change mitigation initiative, a food security initiative, several women's

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

initiatives, a small medium enterprise initiative, an FDI initiative, a trade support initiative.

And I finally said, you know, we're just going to end up being a mile wide and an inch deep and part of what we need to be able to do the integration and make the connections that you're talking about is, to the extent possible, different groups coming together to talk to us about doing things that bring the synergies that you talk about so that we can do more than one thing at a time. So we can do work on neglected diseases, but that also has returns in productivity and jobs, so that we can do work in food security that also has returns on health and the ability of people to afford clean water, nutritional food, so on and so forth.

So we're very, very serious about it. I don't want to understate how difficult it is and I do just want to lay out that to the extent to which you all can help us with that, it would be very helpful.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 51 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

On the question of funding being inadequate on global health, I think I have to take a little bit of issue with that and quite frankly I don't think back of the envelope calculations are good enough for what we need and I think we need to be a little bit more systematic about it.

I'd say a couple things, is funding for global health adequate? No. Is funding for global education adequate? No. Is funding agricultural development adequate? No. Is funding for women adequate? No. Is funding for job creation adequate? No. We've got deficits in development investments globally that are extreme in every single sector and they're deficits that we carry as donor governments, as host governments. There is some responsibility as foundations, as NGOs, as individuals. It's a reality that there are shortfalls.

I have to say as somebody who's worked on this for a long time, it's really hard for me to have the

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

response to a commitment to $63 billion over six years and a doubling of PEPFAR over the second six years be, well that's not enough. I'm a big fan of us doing more, but part of what I think we want to hear and particularly from a global health community is we want more resources in global health, but by the way we also want to see more resources in some of these other areas.

I am not one who thinks that global health is crowding out other areas, but I do think that we're not seeing the kind of increases in other areas that we've seen in global health and what I want to see us get to, yes let's grow global health, but let's also grow food security and agriculture, let's grow education, let's grow job creation, let's grow anti-corruption in governance funding, let's grow all of these things and it gets a little bit to the point I was making earlier.

I think the more we disaggregate, I think it poses some real challenges. But the other thing I

think is really important in this, and trust me, if I was in charge of the budget, there you go. [Laughter] But I also think it's really extraordinary and I don't just say this because I'm part of the Administration, I think it's really extraordinary that at a time when we're looking at the financial crisis we're facing here, when health care is the kind of hotly contested issue that it is in the United States, that the President of the United States within three months of coming into the White House, was willing to hold an event in the White House and say, by the way I'm going to commit $63 billion to global health.

That's I think extraordinary so I think we need to kind of ride on that and get to the second point, which is how do we spend that money? My personal feeling is that before I make a strong case to OMB or anybody else on more money and adjusting those numbers for the six years, I want to talk about a strategy in what we're doing. And what's going on in

the government right now is we're working on a strategy.

So are we spending the money we're spending now as wisely as possible? Are we getting the best possible returns? Are there places that we can get better returns? Are there places where we can leverage, as you suggest which I think is a absolutely critical point, and sit down with other players and say if we do this, will you do that? Are there areas that perhaps we should not be funding because the NGO community or private philanthropy or the World Bank or someone else is much more effective and we should focus in other areas?

I think before we grow the numbers, I want to grow the effectiveness of the numbers we have. Just to be clear, I'm not saying this is all it's ever going to be, don't talk to me about more. I'm saying help us do what we pledged to do better and once we do that, I

think we can grow numbers and help us grow the numbers across the development spectrum.

Going a couple points on yours, on accountability, kind of going forward and old money and new money and where this is going to go, accountability was a big discussion in the lead up and I think one of the things that there was ultimately agreement on is that on the accountability side, we need to do more than just count the numbers.

Some of you that I've worked with for a long time are probably tired of hearing me say, stop doing the quantity, focus more on the quality, but I think that's really true. I think that we can count how much—we can count $20 billion on agricultural development and at the end of the three years we can say, well it was $19.75 billion or it was $21.5 billion, but if we don't also look at how that was spent, was it efficient, was it effective, what were the outcomes, are we achieving progress, were we smart

enough to make mid-course corrections where we needed to, did we leverage assistance from others?

Those are the kinds of things that we want to start looking at because I think to hold ourselves accountable, it's not enough just to put numbers up there. That's hard and we should be held accountable on that, but it's also actually kind of the easiest part. And I think one of the things we want to achieve is not only accountability so that at the next G8 we can say to you, see we did what we said we would do. But accountability so that as we move forward, we can say, you know what? This isn't really working very well.

We're looking at what we're doing and maybe we need to do some things differently. One of the things that we agreed is over the course of the next year, there will be an experts group that really looks at some of this and how we can do some of these measurements and accountability differently.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 57 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

On the question of old money and new money in the $20 billion, frankly I think there's a lot of new money in it. There's a fair amount of existing money in it. There may be a little bit of old money in it, but what's key, and this is always, you know this very well, it's always really hard to figure out, given every country has a different fiscal year and pledges are made at different times and so on, is that what we agreed to do with the $20 billion is program it according to those principles I talked about.

While optimally as much of that as possible would be new money, the fact of the matter is if we can say that with existing money, we're going to start programming it according to this new set of principles, I think we get a little bit of bang out of that buck in a way that's important. I also think if we all have the same fiscal year, it'd be a whole lot easier, but I'm not in charge of that either.

JEN KATES: You want to take a few more?

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

GAYLE E. SMITH: Sure.

JEN KATES: I'm going to take the moderator's prerogative for a second. Steve had a question and I have a question.

GAYLE E. SMITH: And then we'll go back to your questions.

J. STEPHEN MORRISON: Gayle, I was hoping you could talk a little bit more about how we're going to organize ourselves to move the food security thing forward? I mean, when you look at some of the other big initiatives, there have been obviously different models, PEPFAR, MCC, PMI, and I'd be curious to know where your thinking is as far as trying to get some of the essential pieces in place. There's going to clearly need to be some authoritative direction coming from somewhere that will rally the different component parts, AID, USDA.

I don't know if MCC is going to play as part of this. I would assume so on some of the infrastructure.

GAYLE E. SMITH: So you mean within the U.S. government?

J. STEPHEN MORRISON: Within the government as we try to get ourselves—what kind of model are we going to pursue to push this very large initiative and complex one forward. Second piece is where do you think you can get some quick wins? Which focal countries are going to be the most promising partners? Because the rural development returns are going to be slow in coming and they're going to be expensive. So in a way, it's a little bit like MCC.

It's going to take time, but you're going to need to have some confidence as you move in there that there's a couple places where we can show early wins and you're going to have to be able to get adequate

money over multiple years to do this, because it's going to be expensive.

The last piece is does this rising commitment on all of these issues by Washington imply that you're going to take another look at the whole trade dimension because of the fact that Doha is sort of on hold at the moment and your partners are going to ultimately come back and say, okay you're making these investments, but we've got these other larger structural barriers that we have to deal with.

GAYLE E. SMITH: You think somebody's going to raise that?

J. STEPHEN MORRISON: So how do you imagine yourselves—I mean we've got the Doha Trade Summit, we've got lot of opportunities to engage on this and there's not just one answer to it, but where is your thinking on the trade dimension?

GAYLE E. SMITH: Moderator's prerogative of three questions.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 61 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

JEN KATES: That was three, but mine's an add on in a way to what Steve said, which is about the global health initiative and the approach to that. One of the other tensions, and you mentioned funding by sector, advocacy by sector, metrics by sector, it seems like we have funding by focus country, metric by focus country and we want to get quick wins and have focus countries.

At the same time, looking more globally from the Administration's perspective, —we did a chart, one of our reports looking at focus countries for each initiative, and it's a little bit staggering. So how does that figure into the broad look, looking across regions, looking across the focus countries from their perspective?

GAYLE E. SMITH: Really good questions. In terms of how to organize ourselves within the U.S. government—Steve, you should know this, we're terribly organized within the U.S. government already—the

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

interesting thing is just like we've all talked about in development and foreign assistance broadly when you get to food security, we've got a huge number of agencies that have pieces. It's not just that they have an equity or a stake, they've got tools or resources or capabilities that are really high value. We also have some really good and talented people spread around the U.S. government including some new additions where we've got some terrific expertise, so we want to take advantage of that.

Right now the way we're doing it is that we have a interagency policy committee. Each administration changes the acronym for what these things are called, they were interagency working groups and then they were policy coordination committees and now they're—anyway, an interagency group that we share with State and AID that pulls everybody together and I think for the moment, that's working.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 63 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

I think when we get to implementation, we're probably going to have to look at centering somewhere both the responsibility and the power for making things happen on time, but for also doing something that's going to be really hard in this, but I think really interesting. For the United States to be able to work on the basis of a common implementation plan and disbursement schedule is going to be a really interesting thing because as we all know, the way we program and provide our assistance is entirely flexible and really easy and you don't have any regulations or requirements.

So it's also going to take I think focused leadership because there are going to be a lot of times in this where we may have to go to the Hill, we may have to look internally at what we need to do to enable our agencies, and particularly AID to actually operate in the way we're describing. We're looking at what options for that might be. I think the trick here is

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

that this comes up all of the time, not just in development, but in foreign policy generally or in healthcare and different administrations have done it differently.

I think that the thing I want to look at is what's the relative balance between institutionalizing something and using effectively what you've got and creating an add-on or a focal point to make sure something happens. Because I think if you don't get that balance right, you can end up with all sorts of special people doing special things and I think it limits the degree to which you can institutionalize so that—the short answer, we haven't quite figured that out yet, but we're looking at it.

I think on quick wins, you're absolutely right and one of the discussions we're having is do we—and this is one that we will also be having with our other partners—do we start small, register success and then build out or do we spread ourselves a bit more broadly

and try to do more in the first phases? My personal view is start small and build out because I think that you can get some lessons learned, you can work out some of the kinks in places and circumstances where the conditions are more conducive to success and so on and so forth.

But that's an outstanding question. I think one place that might be interesting to look at, in terms of what you described as quick wins, because I think this point on metrics and focus countries and all of that, feeds into this as well, is on regional opportunities. Again, we've talked about country plans, but the other piece of this is for agriculture to work anywhere in the world, regional trading blocks and regional capability and regional markets are critical.

If you look at Africa, for example, there are plenty of regional blocks that have the same deficits where you've got governments grappling with the same

kinds of problems, fertilizer, different kinds of inputs, ag processing, quality control standards and whether there are some ways early on we can get some quick gains by doing some things regionally where we have a kind of multiplied effect.

But these are all, quite frankly, the issues we're looking at now and I think if you all have thoughts, ideas, solutions or watch-out-fors that you want to convey to us, please do that because as I say, we're grappling with all of these questions now and we'll be grappling with them with our partners shortly.

I think this question about focus countries and metrics and measurements and so on, is really, really important. It gets to two things, and one of the reasons I made the point about the fact that the increase over the last eight or nine years in global health means that we have a basis for some research and analysis, is that I think the way selectivity is done in development isn't always scientific—news flash—and I

think one of the things that happens is you've got a limited resource base and so you say we can't do this everywhere so let's pick five focus countries and maybe the five focus countries are countries that you think will be successful, maybe it's where the need is greatest, maybe it's where you have a strategic interest, maybe it's where you've got an institutional capability on the ground, maybe it's where you've already got some investment that you want to build on.

But I think the other way to think about it is to actually look at maps and trends and the state of the world and how in some of these issues, particularly health when what we're dealing with is a global trend, like diseases and viruses move and so on and so forth, where we can make some smarter selections at the outset. I think one of the things we need to shift towards is selectivity that's based on data.

Yeah,—I've never been cynical. But I think the other question this raises is the whole issue of

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

metrics and return and, Steve it gets to your point that you're right, the returns on investment in agriculture in rural areas is going to take a long time to see. I think we know that being able to make concrete measurements and have metrics in terms of global health funding—look at what's happened in terms of people's awareness of malaria and malaria funding because you can talk about this many dollars, this many bed nets, this many results.

It's extremely powerful in terms of advocacy. It's very powerful on the Hill because part of what we're all trying to say is these resources work and we can make them work and here's how we can show you that we're achieving tangible results. I'm not persuaded that we're always measuring the right thing. And sometimes the metrics end up driving the program so that if you've got—I mean the metric of how many bed nets is great and it's probably necessary, but it's not sufficient to tell you what you need to know.

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 69 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

Among other things, you're not looking at who's got the capacity to afford bed nets, where are the bed nets being produced, is malaria just migrating and mutating—I mean there are all sorts of other questions that need to be asked. Frankly, I don't have the answers. I think that some of the opportunities we have are, again there's a lot more analysis and data out there then there ever has been before, so we have a lot more to work with in looking at this.

I think there's enough interest and support for development that we can start a conversation about the need to look at outcomes and some longer term measures, and that's hard. You know, our budget is done annually and to say we're not going to be able to tell you for a few years what the outcomes are, that's tricky but I think that we're in a position where we can start that conversation and should start that conversation.

The last thing, and just to tie this back to the G8, is I think there's an opportunity in all of this to get to a point internationally where we've got good enough coordination that on your focus country point, how we measure and how we look at this, that we can be both more comprehensive and more deliberate in making sure that we're not creating gaps or duplications. And I think we'll probably be able to do all that by the early fall. [Laughter]

But I think these are the kinds of things we need to think about and, again, I'm not just saying this because I'm here and it's always smart to say nice things and say we really want your support and welcome it, we actually do because these are some tough questions that we need to figure out. We want to keep the resources up, we want to talk about what we're doing and the quality, but there's some ways where we've got to go, if you will, from shorthand to a bit more depth in now we talk about this stuff and how we

do it and we need a lot of help to figure out how to do that and then how to make the case. So, please help.

We can do a couple more and then we should take a—.

JEN KATES: We have a representative from the Italian Embassy. If you have a question you wanted to—or something you wanted to say while Gayle is still here.

GAYLE E. SMITH: Or afford me the opportunity to say thank you very much.

STEFANO BELTRAME: I don't want to take time for other questions, but for me what it was one of the best outcome of the G8 was that it was a springboard to travel the President to Africa and as a people man, I'm sorry I tend to blow out all the problems. The reason why the President went to Ghana was because he wanted to stress how politics is important about having a country develop and you might talk about specific programs and details, but at the end of the day,

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

politics is very important and the outcome of interest of politics that you have now for Africa is unprecedented.

So this is the only comment I wanted to say and thank you. Thank you.

GAYLE E. SMITH: No, no. Thank you. I think that's absolutely right and one of the things that was very deliberate in doing this trip from the G8 was to make the connections. We can do a couple more.

YOUSSRA MARJOUA: Hi, my name is Youssra Marjoua . I'm a Health Policy Fellow at the Center for the Study of the Presidency. I completely agree with the how being a very critical piece, but I also wonder about the who. And the who particularly within the U.S. government. So who is going to be—I mean I think when you say we, who is we in the U.S. government? Which departments and agencies—

GAYLE E. SMITH: I knew I should have cut it off just before that. [Laughter]

The G8 and the Obama Administration: What Happened on the 73 Global Health Initiative and New Food Security Effort?
Kaiser Family Foundation
7/23/2009

YOUSSRA MARJOUA: Where does USAID come into play and where does the State Department come into play and is the F-process still going to be in place and who's going to be in charge of these things and is there going to be, in the same way for a food initiative, is there going to be something that brings everyone together so that we're not split up through many different agencies and departments and are more effectively just kind of producing the outcomes that want to produce. Thank you.

GAYLE E. SMITH: That's a really good question. Could you make my pager go off? [Laughter]

LARRY CASAZZA: My name is Dr. Larry Casazza and I represent ACAM, African Communities Against Malaria and I also am with Hopkins School of Public Health. This was great. I live in East Africa, I come from an area where if the price of the maize meal goes up two shillings, I count the number of people walking, not even able to afford the matatu which our metro

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

system here looks like first-class seating in international airline. So these—I've heard money, I've heard agencies, I've heard policies but I haven't heard anybody really talking about the people and I know your heart is there.

So I have one question regarding G8, before leaving Nairobi, AMRAF hosted a G8 meeting with Japanese following up on things that were left hanging on previous meetings and the consensus was on this sustainability issue and justice. Anybody talking about justice? And some of the corruption issues. And the bottom line was that there are enormous resources at community levels who are not organized to the point where they sit at these tables to present their perspectives.

I'm willing to do that and I'm willing to provide whatever I could because I see that President Obama working in South Side Chicago understands communities. He knows that that makes things happen.

In terms of food production issue, what I think you didn't mention has definitely changed is advances in IT technology. When I go to communities, people share cell phones. When I look at who owns the land in Kenya, four-fifths of the land is owned by five families.

We can't talk about these production issues without addressing land reform issues. But this where I would say, yeah, there are resources. I'd be glad to share them with you. Decades of NGO involvement with solid evaluations and strategies. Thank you so much.

GAYLE E. SMITH: We'll just take one more and then do three—we've been doing three at a time.

LAURA EFROS: Hi Gayle. Laura Efros with MERCK. I appreciate the comment you made about the importance of including the private sector and whether it's around product donations like Mectizan for river blindness or around supporting building of R&D capacity in some of the health centers you're talking about or

making sure we're working cooperatively to make sure we develop the drugs and vaccines necessary and appropriate in many of these countries.

So my question is really just around process and what your thinking is around how you would be engaging with private sector on sort of developing some of these strategies and initiatives?

GAYLE E. SMITH: Okay, those are three good—Laura you know better, you used to do this. Nobody asked me—okay. On the who, who is doing what, I think right now everybody's doing everything is part of the answer, but I think that's something that we're taking a serious look at. I mean, you mention the work that I did before joining the Administration and that I think many of you here also are involved in doing. And we did all this analysis about how many government agencies are involved and so on and so forth.

It's much more extensive even than I thought in terms of the number of agencies that are not just

involved because they have program money, but they have dedicated personnel. They may have 25-percent of the policy decision is in this agency, 75-percent is in that agency. You have the State Department which has foreign policy responsibility, you've got AID that is our development agency, then you've got Treasury that's got international economic policy.

So you've got really a huge number of agencies that again, it's not just that they manage foreign assistance, but development is a fundamental piece of the policy work that they do. At this point, I think it's spread around a bit. The State Department is taking a much more active role than they have in the past. Secretary Clinton is very interested in development as being much forward leaning than we've past Secretaries be.

The White House has a whole lot of these IPCs which I run most of on food security, on global health, on all these issues as we figure them out. And part of

the task in our office is to figure out—this gets back to Steve's question on food security-how do we organize ourselves to do some of these things? It's not the same answer in every case. It's not nearly as simple as—I thought it was pretty simple—it's a bit more complicated than I thought.

What we're trying to do now is just make sure we can get strategies put together that all of the agencies that have equities are engaged in. I think the next step is to take a look at how we define leadership and where, how we really make sure things are coordinated, how we make sure USAID has the people it needs to do its job, which is something that's already reflected in the budget but is going to take some time to achieve.

I think this is a question we're looking at, is the who. I think the good news is that even comparing it to nine years ago, or whenever I was last in government, there is so much more interest,

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

awareness and knowledge of development issues across the Executive Branch today than there was nine years ago that I'm utterly astonished.

Now, does it make my life difficult sometimes? Absolutely because you've got—everybody's doing it. But the good thing is, is that I remember when we were doing some of the Africa work during the Clinton Administration. We never got resistance, but often we were asking an agency to be involved in something they had never done before. It was the first time they had engaged on Africa and with that, a lot of development issues.

So now we've got it spread across—I would say stay tuned. I mean, this is something we've got to look at and I know there are a lot of views out here and a lot of expertise out here and, again, this is an area where we want to hear from you all as we move forward.

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

The next one, on things like IT and land reform, all of those are issues that we would include under the rubric of this notion of comprehensive programs. I was short handing a bit so I certainly I didn't mean to overlook them and I agree with you entirely that there's a massive amount of expertise out there in the NGO community, among government people, most importantly among the people themselves as you point out.

One of the reasons this whole issue of building up the personnel capacity of USAID, again, is so important and one of the reasons it's reflected in the budget is that one of the things that's really important for us to do, and I say this as somebody who has been a field person more my life than a Washington person, is rely on the field. We don't need to make the decisions in Washington about whether in Kenya it makes more sense to be doing support for IT or support

for land management on the agricultural development side.

The reason we send smart, capable men and women out to the field is to do smart, capable things so that less smart and less capable people in Washington don't do it. So I think—but seriously, that's why we have people in the field and I think we want to see more people in the field. Laura, in terms of how to engage the private sector, I think there are a number of ways we want to do that.

We want to set up some structure consultations on some of these strategies as we move forward to get kind of substance feedback. Then I think in terms of practical initiatives we want to look at all sorts of possibilities. I think part of the challenge is how to do that on a systematic rather than one-off basis because it's not so hard to do the one-offs. It's harder to say, alright in global health we want to do a lot more on capacity building. What would be a broadly

defined program of capacity building that we could do with the private sector, where you might decide you want to do this piece, somebody else might decide they want to do that piece.

That's the kind of thing I think we'd like to start talking about, is how can we take the notion of these public private partnerships from the individual project level—and those are still important. Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying we shouldn't do those, but to a more strategic programmatic level because, again, there's no illusion inside the Administration that we can do everything and quite the contrary, I think something that President Obama during the campaign and certainly during his Presidency has emphasized repeatedly is—and regardless of what one of the news channels says—is the government shouldn't do everything.

I want to end on that note and make one final kind of comment and request as we move forward. The

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.

expertise, the experience and the interest in this room is invaluable to what we're trying to do. We have more interest in development in the Administration than I have ever seen in my lifetime, but to sustain it, to build on it, to do the right thing is impossible unless we're doing it with all of you.

But I'd like to ask you to think about some pieces of it in a slightly different way and one of the things the President does that's very interesting is, you talk about a problem and you say what are we going to do about it and his we isn't what's the administration going to do. It's what's the government going to do, what are we going to do as the international community and what are Americans and private organizations going to do as a part of that.

So as we proceed on things like global health, on food security and so on and so forth, our interest is getting our piece right, but looking at this is a collective challenge and not something where the U.S.

government should do this—and by the way, it's great that NGOs also have programs—but we're seriously partners in this. Food security, global health, these are huge challenges. How do we do it? So how do we actually operationalize that 'we' in a really different way than we have in the past?

That's what we want to do. So we're going to look to you for your help and let me offer my profound thanks to Italy for hosting the G8 and doing a terrific job of it and to CSIS and to Kaiser and to all of you for hosting this forum and I hope it will be the first of many. Thank you. [Applause]

[END RECORDING]

[1] The Kaiser Family Foundation makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of written transcripts, but due to the nature of transcribing recorded material and the deadlines involved, they may contain errors or incomplete content. We apologize for any inaccuracies.