THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

PARTNERSHIPS, CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY,
AND THE NEW DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

Washington, D.C.

Friday, April 25, 2014

Featured Speaker:

ANNE FINUCANE
Global Strategy and Marketing Officer
Bank of America

Moderator:

JANE NELSON
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
Director, Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative
Harvard University

Panelists:

DANIELLA BALLOU-AARES
Senior Advisor for Development
U.S. Department of State

VERA SONGWE
Nonresident Senior Fellow, The Brookings Institution
Country Director for Senegal, Cape Verde, the
Gambia, Guinea Bissau, and Mauritania
World Bank

MINDY LUBBER
President
Ceres

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. NELSON: Thanks. Okay. I think we are all -- we are all set to go. Great. I think we are set to go.

Well, good morning everyone. I'm Jane Nelson, and it's my great pleasure to both welcome you and thank you all for joining us here this morning, for what we hope is going to be a very engaging and interactive conversation about the emerging role of the private sector; and particularly to the new roles and new types of partnership, and corporate social responsibility to support a new global development agenda.

I think whether we are looking at the need to tackle the growing inequality in this country, and to improve economic growth and job creation and financial inclusion, right here in the United States. Or we are looking at new ways to end extreme poverty, and promote shared prosperity in developing countries there's, I think, a growing recognition of the private sector; whether it's small and medium enterprises, or large, global multinational corporations, have an increasingly important role to play.

And if we look within the private sector, and I think one of the most important groups are the commercial banks, institutional investors, and some other private sector financial service companies. Whether it's investing and funding infrastructure, again in this country or internationally, whether it's financing, businesses and entrepreneurs; or, whether it's providing savings and credits and insurance services to individual households and families; the financial service companies are absolutely crucial.

And yet, I think we are all very aware that in the aftermath of the financial crisis, the banks and the financial institutions are facing a pretty serious public trust deficit. And you languish at the bottom of pretty much every single public opinion poll on trust in different industry sectors. You know, the source of your constant -- your daily media headlines.

And so there's a very strong need that if they are going to play a leadership role, to first and foremost rebuild trust. And I think linked to that, is the need that most of the financial service companies are facing, to demonstrate how they are improving their risk management systems, their governance processes, their accountability and their transparency.

And yet at the same time, while we are needing to improve risk management, there's probably never been a greater need for financial innovation. And for banks and institutions, investors, and insurance companies to develop new products, new services, new technologies, new partnership platforms, and even new business models, so that they can really be part of the solution in driving more inclusive and sustainable growth. And those are sort of some of themes I hope we are going to dig into a bit more today.

First of all, how do the banks and big corporations, in general, rebuild public trust? I mean, what's happening in terms of improving risk management and governance and accountability and transparency? And then, thirdly, where are the real opportunities for innovation and new models of partnership, to drive both inclusive, but also more environmentally sustainable growth?

We've got a great Panel, a group of four fantastic leaders who are going to guide our discussion today, and from very different perspectives and experiences and different sectors. And we are going to start the conversation with some initial reflections and comments from Ann Finucane, who leads Global Strategy and Marketing at Bank of America. And has had the honor, and I'd imagine, challenge of acting as a Senior Advisor to four very, very different Chief Executive Officers and Boards of Directors over the 18 years that Anne has been at the Bank.

Anne is also a Director of a number of corporations -- corporate and nonprofit organizations in her own right, and has been a real champion for diversity and corporate responsibility, I think, in the industry, and so it's great to have you with us, Anne.

And sort of starting off, you're Head of Global Strategy and Marketing for Bank of America, it's listed as one of the top 15 -- largest 15 banks in the world in terms of assets. I think you provide financial services to one in two of every household here in the United States.

MS. FINUCANE: In the United States. Yeah.

MS. NELSON: And through Merrill Lynch, you are one of the world's leading wealth management companies, with something like over $2 trillion in assets under management. So, you are a pretty major player, to put it mildly. And with your peers in the industry, you have faced a fair amount of criticisms, some tough lessons learned, due to decisions made in the lead up to the financial crisis.

And so I'd like to sort of start by, sort of, digging in, you know, first of all, what are you doing in your business core business, as you're sort of going through and internal transformation process to rebuild trust, to sort of increase financial stability, and sort of better serve, whether it's individual clients or companies or institutional investors?

Can you just tell us a little bit about the lessons learned, and the sort of transformation process you're going through to be a leading player?

MS. FINUCANE: Sure. So, thank you. The first thing is I think that there is no end of reflection that we have done as a company, as individuals. I would speak on behalf of the management, as an employee and in terms of, I think, a reflection of where the Board has been at; and I do think we don't spend enough time talking about how much we've had to think about what happened here, and so we are neither ignoring it, nor can we wear a hair shirt about it, because we've got to progress.

Companies like ours are the financial transportation system to a country, and to the world really, and the healthier we are, the healthier economies can be. So we, on the one hand, have to deal with lessons learned, and I'll talk about that in a minute, and what we are doing about that while also trying to look forward. And not to be so stuck in the past that we are paralyzed to move to the future.

So, in terms of present day, what have we done? Well, we have had -- we've had to look at our own businesses, and you begin with your employees. I think it probably isn't lost on many that we have hundreds of thousands of employees, so do the other larger financial institutions, and they have to feel good about where they work. So, I would tell you then, in our own company, I know people in our own company just felt like, what happened here? We were a terrific company, and what did we do?

And there have been all sorts of public comment about our acquisition of Countrywide, so I won't bother to say much more about that, other than it did cost the company $50 billion, and not to buy it; that is to exit the issues. And it took 55,000 people to make that happen. So the first thing we did is try to fix what was broken. The second thing is to engage in a private and public dialogue with legislators and regulators about everything from the law. Then the regulations that would follow with Dodd-Frank, and more sort of practical levels, what would we do to simplify the Company?

In our case we sold off $50 billion worth of noncore assets. We've simplified the Company; we've exited certain businesses and geographies. We have taken a look at, in the consumer business, how do we simplify what we are doing and be a reflection of where we think our customers want to go. And that’s not rhetoric, that’s about coming up with simplified products that I can talk about, if you wish.

So, it's looking at our governance, our risk management, we've added a lot of people in terms of risk management. It's hardly perfect. We know that trust is a big issue. I would say that we've improved in all those sort of third-party scores that one seeks to improve in. Whether it's from a corporate governance perspective with the GRI Report, or Carbon Disclosure Project, or Dow Jones Sustainability, we've certainly made big progress there.

But I think we made progress in terms of operations too. It's all of it, and it's recognizing we are in a very bad place, a very bad place for our employees, not a good place for the economy, and what we were going to do get back on our feet, and also work to make sure that we could honorably, in the most trustworthy way possible, move forward.

MS. NELSON: And building on that. Where's the link with corporate social responsibility? I think, you know, many people define corporation social responsibility as being purely about philanthropy.

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MS. NELSON: Rather than actually how you make your profits, not what you do with them afterwards, and I'd be interested, sort of, how you're -- from the lessons learned, your evolution has been, in terms of corporate social responsibility?

MS. FINUCANE: Well, I'd say from a public point of view the first -- and we have to still start with ourselves, and I would say that before the economic tsunami we probably also thought of CSR as philanthropy; which I'm happy about. I mean I'm happy we did well in philanthropy, but I think we had to reset the dialogue with the business we are in, and that included, on the parts that are less sexy about risk management and governance, and the more fundamental parts, embracing some -- because we are a bank -- products that you can't overdraft, not allow overdraft.

To make sure that we are not doing business with payday lenders, some very fundamental things that seem easy enough today, but I would say that the world was about free checking, and I think now a value proposition that is transparent, simple to understand, and we compete with others, and you decide, that’s the important thing; but we have 50 million customers and they opine on us every day. And so I would say, it's first the basics, then it's the public policy, how well are we either adapting to or leading in regulation or legislation, and as a citizen. And then third, it's the philanthropy.

MS. NELSON: Mm-hmm. Great. And then on the public policy side, and how you are leading as a citizen, can you tell us a bit more about that, and what type of issues you are looking at?

MS. FINUCANE: Well, the first thing we do is look at the issues that are closest to home for us in financial education. We have -- financial education is a little bit like a root canal, the two words do not excite people, and yet you have 75 percent of the, at least, American public who feel that they are ill equipped -- to retire ill equipped, to handle their money, and don't like where they are at.

So, that’s a pretty good statistic for -- we all may not like those two words together, but we need more of it. We've partnered, and I would say that one of the big things we've tried to do is to create partnerships, to have the humility to understand that again, because of some of the issues we faced in the past, and the trust issues that many had with our industry and our company. We've got to partner with others to move forward.

So we partnered with Southcon who is, I think, by any measure, the best at providing online education for gnarly subjects, largely in education that need repeated review, that one can do, and he really breaks it down into chunks that you can understand. So we've been working with him, in our case, we called this Better Money Habits, and we do it on Twitter and Facebook, and through online.

MS. NELSON: Okay.

MS. FINUCANE: And the idea is to break down simple things like on a paycheck, what does this mean? What are these taxes taken out? What is social security? On the most basics, rent versus buy, other subjects that are, sort of, fundamental to day-to-day life. Credit scores, how do you improve your credit score? So starting with something like that.

MS. NELSON: And the Khan Academy, then, provides a platform that can reach, I'm assuming, over time, millions of people --

MS. FINUCANE: Well, we probably can --

MS. NELSON: -- in this country, but internationally on financial literacy and education.

MS. FINUCANE: Yeah. I think your -- a fair question would be, why would he be partnering with us?

MS. NELSON: Good point.

MS. FINUCANE: You didn't ask it, but I'm others are thinking it. So he partnered with us because we have 50 million customers, and he partnered because we are not going to try to sell a product in this. This is, again, we know where we were at. If you can be honest with where you're at, and you're seeking to rebuild trust, you've got to do it in an honest dialogue. That's a value to people.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. No. Absolutely, it's --

MS. FINUCANE: I mean in financial education, and hopefully we are too.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Sure. And that, and then through that, having that dialogue, and building the trust, and you're able to --

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MS. NELSON: -- actually further develop the products and services. I think going on to sort of the challenge of financial inclusion, and financial education for individuals and households, which is sort of almost like the foundation which is absolutely critical. But what about sort of financing at the sort of level of communities, and I know you've got some programs on community development finance, and actually trying to strengthen financial institutions at the community level.

It would be interesting to hear a bit more about what you're doing about that, what role do you think community, financial institutions play, both in this country, but again also, potentially, what are the lessons for international development?

MS. FINUCANE: I think it is going to be a lesson for international development, and I think it's going to take this private-public partnership that I think we'll be probably talking about in a minute.

First of all, obviously, again financial institutions, we are in the business of money, and the transportation of money, so first is lending. I think people think about lending. We lend about -- just this past year, about $10 billion in new financing to small businesses, but there's a whole population out there that is probably, by normal definition, not quite yet credit-ready, or because of the risk management issues that all financial institutions face they -- it would probably be a difficult task to lend.

So, for those of you not familiar, there is CDFIs, community development financial institutions, we have the largest portfolio, about $1.2 billion in lending in our CDFI relationships, with about 200 plus CDFIs who are locally based throughout the country, rural and urban. And the way this works is we lend money to them, sometimes at market rates, or below market rates. We often provide some level of financial expertise since sometimes we also give a grant so that they can operate well.

They, in turn, give money to startups, what you sort say more internationally, perhaps on a more microfinance perspective. So, just in the last couple of years, because of the money we give them, they've been able to give to 10,000 very small businesses, which create 16,000 jobs. So it gives you a sense of what can be done, and now we have been doing that, we do more of it today, than we did, again, before the economic downturn.

I think we are certainly more present with it, and now we are trying some new opportunities. We just announced a program with Tory Burch who, of course, because of her brand she's got a mentoring program, because of her -- who she is, she can engage a wide swath of people. She is trying to mentor women in small business. We then partnered with her on this Elizabeth Street Capital idea, where we would find -- invest and also access money through the CDFIs by putting in another $10 million into that; and hopefully that begins then.

And we've, just now, started a new program with Calvert, outside the U.S., and that's our first attempt at working with CDFIs outside the U.S., Root Capital and Calvert, to try the same idea of small loans or microfinance through CDFIs, with the backing of a big bank.

MS. NELSON: And so you are basically financing, but also to say building the capacity --

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MS. NELSON: -- of the CDFIs to serve their customers that you wouldn't be able to serve yourself, directly, or it would be more challenging to serve.

MS. FINUCANE: Right. But then we can also serve the CDFIs, and we are not -- I mean every large bank, every bank actually, does this, but the larger banks have more money to do it with, because they have more capital to loan.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Yeah, I agree. And what about the sort of environmental finance, and sort of financing the transition to a cleaner, green economy?

MS. FINUCANE: Well, that has been -- I mean for the environmentalists in the room, there are so many opinions about this. We've had some nice opportunity, both opportunity and, I think, focus, so a few years back, actually five years ago we made a $20 billion commitment to environmental initiatives, real initiatives. So some of it is philanthropy, but frankly, of the 20 billion less than 50 million of that is philanthropy. Most of it is investing, lending, and we've been able to do a great deal of that, so solar city was a billion-dollar-project to put 120,000 military homes, powered by solar, as a way of an example.

We've been able to uptick our renewable energy investment by almost 100 percent. Well, we still have coal in our portfolio, that's reduced by probably 20 percent, so I think it is focusing on the future, putting the money into the future, and this is good business for us, and we've also found it good business outside the U.S.

MS. NELSON: Where the need is even greater.

MS. FINUCANE: The need is even greater.

MS. NELSON: If you look at the energy infrastructure needs, you look at trillions of dollars needed in investment to get energy, clean water to people who still don't have access to it at all.

MS. FINUCANE: Water.Org which some of you know, and also some others know, because Matt Damon is involved is -- they came in, the fellow, his partner came in to open up a checking account in Charlotte, years ago, and we have since then lent them hundreds of millions of dollars. We have invested with them, and Water.Org is a business actually, but it's a not-for-profit, which seeks to bring clean water through a sort of transportation system and a filtering system to communities in -- largely in Africa, so --

MS. NELSON: Yeah. And before we sort of transition in bringing the rest of the Panel on, you’ve also sort of started getting more involved in sort of partnerships with organizations solving even broader, sort of, global development challenges, which you wouldn’t normally associated with a Bank. Like your recent partnership with the RED

Campaign. And sort of raising awareness and funds in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and also I mean why, you know, why that issue, why RED? What can a financial institution bring to the table on HIV/AIDS?

MS. FINUCANE: And why do Bono do business with us?

MS. NELSON: You can ask that one as well.

MS. FINUCANE: Right. I can't stress enough, when a company goes through -- when a country goes through what we've gone through, when you are a company that is that is in the crosshairs with that, there are some fundamental decisions you have to make. Which is, what are we going to do about today and the future? Your employees are the first, your customers, your shareholders, the communities at large. You want your own people to be able to explain the company, when they go home for Thanksgiving or for the holidays, or on a family vacation, or over dinner, and I think that's where we began.

And I say, because it really goes back to the business practices and the public policy. On the philanthropy the RED piece is kind of interesting, we are a Company that over the last few years, have become much more global through the Merrill Lynch merger. So Merrill Lynch brought Bank of America to geographies we had not heretofore been in, that's one. Two, we have a fairly large commitment to women and women in development, as one of our CSR Initiatives.

And so, he had talked to us about a program which actually had to do with a product he thought would be a good product. We did not think it was a good product, because it had to do with credit, and given where the company -- the company, the country and the world has been in terms of credit, we didn't that was a way to go.

So we had a dialogue about how do you bring -- how do you accelerate awareness of HIV transmission mother to child, in Africa, a woman's issue, an economic development issue, an economic opportunity issue, and a company that is trying to go -- you know, is growing by -- exponentially outside the U.S. This seemed like a good marriage, and when you can deliver 50 million people --

MS. NELSON: Your customer base.

MS. FINUCANE: Customer base on day one, and then they happen to have a song, and you can put it on the Super Bowl, you can, in 24 hours, get millions of Twitter comments, and $3 million raised in only 24 hours. So that’s the power of partnerships, participation and trying to hit it head on without promising some other things.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. And so using your platform --

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MS. NELSON: -- and access to customers and media as a platform for a partner?

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MS. NELSON: Great. Well, this is probably a good time to bring on the rest of our Panel. So we have some further commentary on the Global Development side, and then we have plenty of time for questions and answers. So, Mindy, could you -- could you all come up, and I'll introduce and I'll introduce as you get yourselves sorted out here.

Thank you, Anne, for getting us going with some initial thoughts and ideas; I think you'll hear. So, first of all to my right -- if you're getting the mic up here -- is Mindy Lubber, who is the President of Ceres, and one of the Founding Board Members of Ceres; which, as many of you will know, is a coalition of investors and companies and public interest groups here in the United States. In fact, I think you celebrated your 25th Anniversary, created in the aftermath of the Exxon Valdez disaster, and basically bringing together investors and companies to promote and encourage a more sustainable growth, both here in America and internationally.

Mindy is also the Director of the Investor Network And Climate Risk which is about 100 institutional investors of, I think, $10 trillion in assets under management; looking at how to engage the investment community more proactively, in addressing climate change, both from a risk management and opportunity perspective; so great to have you with us, Mindy.

On the other side here we have my colleague Vera Songwe, who is a Nonresident Senior Fellow here at our Africa Growth Initiative at Brookings. And is also The World Bank Country Director, and I'm going to have to read this, because it's quite a number of countries that she is directing for The World Bank; for Senegal, Cape Verde, the Gambia, Guinea Bissau and Mauritania; so busy, busy woman here.

And in addition to that there is also on the Mo Ibrahim Governance Advisory Council, and as many of you would know, I mean, Mo Ibrahim Governance Index, and the work that his Foundation has done in improving governance and accountability in Africa has been nothing short, I think, of phenomenal, in a very short period of time, and Vera serves on his Advisory Council.

And then last, but certainly not least, my former colleague and friend, Daniella Ballou-Aares, who is currently serving as a Senior Advisor to the Secretary of State, and to the State Department on the Global Development Agenda. Both to the post '15 -- post 2015 Development Agenda, and development issues more broadly. And Daniella, over the past decade has been, I think, a remarkable pioneer in framing the changing role of the private sector in development as one of the Founding Directors of Dalberg, Global Development Advisors, where she lead the sort of North America and all of America's Practice, and South America, and also set up the Global Health Practice for Dalberg.

So we've got the three great panelists who have joined Anne and myself here on the stage. And I'd like probably start with you Mindy, and just picking up on Anne's sort of opening comments, and reflecting on those a bit, in your sort of 25 years, how have you seen the role of private sector change, you know, where are we today? What more should the private sector be doing? Where are some of the obstacles and risks of private sector engagement in solving, whether it's, you know, global development challenges, or climate change, and environmental challenges?

MS. LUBBER: A broad --

MS. NELSON: A small question.

MS. LUBBER: A broad question for me. My present thinking is the following, which could be different than others. I think we are in a new day. For years, we all felt that, certainly in the United States, and I'm definitely will bring more of a United States perspective, that government was going to fix all of our problems. New rules, new policies, new perspectives, and there was an extraordinary role for government, and I used to be a government official.

As a Regional Administrator of the EPA, I am by no means anti-government, but if we look out there at the problems we face, government is no longer the answer to all those problems, a role to play to be sure. But if the world's largest capital market leaders, who reeled enormous resources, are not part of the solution, and I would argue today, more than 10 years ago, leading a lot of the solutions, not just part of it, we are not going to get there.

If we just think about a few of the problems. Let's think about climate change, which is not only an environmental issue, or national security or public health, it is a profound economic issue, it is a profound equity issue. The people who get hurt most, will be the people who have the least. The issue is dramatic and it truly will shape the future of your children's lives, my children, Abe and Jessie. They used to be little kids, now they are bigger kids, but we are delivering something very different from them, and we've got to turn that around.

The international investor energy administration says, we need $36 trillion a year to address the problem, it's been verified by thousands of economics and scientists, we are not going to take on those challenges by government alone, or by NGOs alone, or by rhetoric of, make the polluters pay, and we'll run after and bad mouth. If we can't come together in a joint set of discussions, collaborations, and frankly solutions, we can't get to $1 trillion a year.

So to think -- the old days of government tells business what to do, and NGOs yell at business, and I've been in all of those roles. I run a not-for-profit, that’s not going to get us where we need to go, we need collaboration, we need leadership, and the leadership of financial institutions is crucial. I mean, we are talking about things that demand extraordinary resources. Where government doesn't have those extraordinary resources, financial institutions are a part of that. When you think about $1 trillion a year, and it's extraordinary, although I just saw a statistic that said, we spent three -- where we spend $1 trillion every two years on wine and chocolate. And I'm not asking you to give up wine and chocolate, but the numbers are real, and they are profound, but they are doable if there's collaboration.

I mean, Bank of America, Anne talked about, you know, put $20 billion on the line and said, we are going to invest that in clean technology and clean energy. And they met the goal, and they made it, and exceeded it, and I think three years early. I could be off, maybe two, maybe four, but they made it early and then they put a $50 billion goal on the table. That’s not going to solve the problem alone, but that -- and again, I'm not here as a cheerleader for Bank of America, I think they are doing leadership work, and extraordinary, but it's hard to debate $50 billion, putting it on the table and going there, and they ought to be commended for that.

That is -- that is a down payment on the $1 trillion a year we need to get to. It's about investing in technology, it's about innovation, it's about changing their own practices, and it's ingrained in the company. I mean the very interesting thing that I'm finding, as a partner with the BofA as well as a collaborator at some times, a critic, although far less to criticize. So it's ingrained in the corporation now, it's not only a social responsibility piece of work, that Anne overseas, with 10 percent of her time. It's ingrained in goals being set at the governance level, integrated throughout the leadership of the organization. Outsiders are brought in for the discussion through a Consumer Advisory Board, where people get a fundamental view, and it's going to take that.

So, you know, the small -- the short answer is, we are not seeing the leadership from our collective government that we need, and we all want more, and we wish more, and government has a role to play. But even if government plays more of a leadership role, without the leadership of companies like Bank of America, and large institutions in solving the world's greatest problems from poverty to energy to climate change, we are not going to get there.

And so we've got to have that collaboration, we've got to have it from the top of the companies, I'm glad Bank of America has made these issues, of energy, of consumers, of poverty, they are all tied together, a priority. It actually gives me hope that we are going to get there, it's not going to be easy, but we will, we've got a shot at taking on some of the world's global problems.

MS. NELSON: Okay. Thanks, Mindy. I'll come back to you a little later, but it will great if you could also reflect on, what are the opportunities for coalitions between groups of companies, and environmental NGOs to work with government on policy advocacy issues and try and challenge government on policy advocacy issues. But I think you've done some interesting work there. So I'll come back to you on that just now.

But I'd like to go Daniella now, and your perspective, both your current role at the State Department, but also all the work that you've done with the corporate sector on global development issues over the past decade. Where do you think we are going, and what are some of the big challenges that we need to address?

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Thanks. Look, I mean, I would actually echo very much what Mindy says, and that is -- that sentiment is reflected on a global scale, which is the recognition that we are not going to achieve a set of new development goals. We are not going to actually achieve ending extreme poverty, really building inclusive growth globally, or addressing climate change and other sustainability issues, without really significant engagement from the private sector, or with governments and others.

And that’s just -- it's not a possibility to get there without that. And in some ways, that’s a really big opportunity for companies in the financial sector, and I think you already see that there's been -- I mean there are many partnerships out there, and there are things that Bank of America has done in this area, but there is, I think, a lot of scope to do more; both in terms of demonstrating what already the contribution is in business. I think something that we struggle with is -- as U.S. Government, we've been, you know, quite proactive in working with business on development issues. So we have things like the New Alliance for Food Security, which is addressing agriculture issues globally, initiatives like the Tropical Forest Alliance, which is looking at deforestation, and we were talking consumer goods companies.

Power Africa which is looking at electrifying Africa, working with a variety of investors, and other companies in our institutions, but there is really not clarity around what is the scale and nature of that contribution on these issues. So we talk a lot about it, we say we need to bring the private sector to the table, but there are skepticism around really how much are companies and investors delivering on -- you know, an agenda round addressing poverty and driving growth against sustainability.

So I think what -- some of the things that need to happen, are really around being able to demonstrate like the $20 billion commitment that you made, that is a very tangible commitment, and we are seeing that in a variety of sectors, that companies are coming together and making tangible commitments where progress can be demonstrated. So for instance, sustainable energy for all, which is a multi-sector partnership, has clear goals around doubling access to renewable energy globally, et cetera.

So I think it's kind of what gets measured gets managed theme, which businesses are always very oriented to, I think there's a real opportunity to take more seriously in demonstrating progress. And that links in a bit with this discussion of what's happening on the global stage right now, and what's the next round of global development goals, which are going to be negotiated in 2015, in the U.N.

And those are really looking likely to cover issues around ending extreme poverty, supporting inclusive growth, including through investments, for instance, in infrastructure in energy. Also, of course, covering issues like health and education, and gender, but those, all of those issues of course, particularly, I think, around infrastructure and energy have very significant private investment components.

And our ability -- I think there is a real opportunity as goals are set globally, for then companies to come forward, and say, look, this is how we are -- what we do really contributes to making this real. So, I think, you know, something that struck me in the earlier -- the starting discussion to this and, you know, there of course is a need to continue to build trust and build confidence across the globe with financial institutions. And, you know, the best way to do that is to deliver, and to show you are delivering for people, and show you are delivering for the planet. So I think really, thinking about how that can be done together with the public sector, and demonstrated a meaningful way, both at an individual company level, and collective companies has a lot of promise.

MS. NELSON: And on the sort of question of measurement, do you sort of see this as something that the PricewaterhouseCoopers, and the Ernst & Youngs of this world, the Deloittes, are sort of going to start providing services and sort of, you know, independent third-party measurement and verification as they currently do on financial performance? I mean, how do we get to this point of actually setting goals and targets, and then measuring them?

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Yeah. Look, it's a really good question. I mean, I think there's a starting point which is, companies doing some of that themselves, and just doing that reporting. And similarly, I mean, holes, obviously in the world of standards, right, where companies have come together and set certain standards, kind of in groupings and voluntarily. So I think even, if I think about a -- you know, a final piece that’s I think been very present in the discussion, and global development is the discussion of kind of open data, a data revolution, kind of really information getting out there, that empowers all actors.

So I think there are a number of ways to kind of that better data, that you might ultimately have a deeper infrastructure that is very methodical and counts as dollars in contributions. But I think there is even a lighter way to start more effectively capturing the various contributions of actors in a more kind of open source kind of way. You know, I think that’s a little bit to be defined.

MS. NELSON: Yeah.

MS. BALLOU-AARES: But I just -- you know, having worked in this realm for a long time, on many specific partnerships, where you do see some real results, I'm struck now sitting where I sit, as we go into a global process where we are making the argument that, you know, there's discussion what's the kind global partnership for development? What does that mean? And we've already said, look, that means public sector investment, but it also means private investment. These are all actors that really need to be at the table.

And when we get down to the specifics though, of how do you measure that, the only things we really have good measurement for are around development assistance, and public flows, and we have big-picture measures that are part direct investment and on a macro level. But we don't really have ways to represent the value of all the private activity that's occurring, and it makes it very hard to then, you know, kind of demonstrate the private deposit and private sector role.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Great. And I'm getting sort of independent verification of that role will be critical going forward, yeah. Sorry?

MS. BALLOU-AARES: (off mic)

MS. NELSON: And coming on to you, Vera, and particularly the perspective you have, spending most of your time on the ground. I mean, working with both the public sector, and obviously mostly African-based businesses in Africa, and institutions like the African Development Bank.

How do you sort of see this evolving role of the private sector, and some of the big, sort of, challenges and opportunities?

MS. SONGWE: Thank you. I think we've gone through, on the continent, and I suspect it's the same for many of the emerging markets in the developing countries. Around the '80s, in the developing institutions, we talked about structural adjustments. A lot of that discussion, during that phase was about the state divesting, handing over to the private sector that was going to be sort of the solution, the secret, and the know all and the end all of the process.

So a lot of privatizations that happened during that process with the hope that productivity would increase and growth take up. We didn't a lot of that. A lot of the private sector that came in was not responsible enough. And because the way that privatizations happened, did not necessarily look at maximizing shareholder value, or making profit, because a lot of it was done on the margins of building schools and this mix between sort of what was really the profit motive of the industry that was privatized, and what was a social good, it's like building schools happen during this period.

And I think we have big examples in Nigeria with Shell, and what happened during that period. We also had a lot of transfer pricing that happened during that period which was not eve well known. Neither, I think, in the developing world, or in the developed world, we couldn’t capture it, today we still don't know how to capture well enough, but I think with the help of banks like Bank of America, a lot of the financial institutions, the Dodd-Frank Law, we are beginning to get there.

Then what do we have? We have the big crisis, and all of a sudden the financial crisis; and the real sector crisis comes together. We had, in Africa, the mining sector, which was basically a huge venue for transfer pricing, for extractives happening without clear commitment to good governance, good transparency, no risk-taking either within the country outside the country. There were no rules basically, and most of the developing countries were emerging markets, they were the last frontier, and there was no, sort of clear framework for how that will happen.

Institutions like ours, and the IFC, we came up with the Equator Principles at the time, and we had a very difficult time just putting it on the table, and it was basically a set of transparency, good corporate governance indicate us to say, if you're going to do mining in a country, this is what you should do, and how can we rally people around it? It took a very long time to get the first 10 businesses in, but today we have almost everybody trying to get into the Equator Principles, because people now see that there is value to it.

Countries will not let you come into their countries if you don't sign up to the Equator Principles, and I think this whole idea of having more principles coming out, is now something that you see post 2000. 2008, we had the financial crisis, Africa continued to grow and people then stopped, and said, what's going on there, what's happening? Why is place continuing to grow? Something must have changed. A lot of the fundamentals in Africa had improved. The private sector could now actually come into continent and say, we want to do business and we could it well, and do it profitability.

And I think that discussion started changing. We had at the height of the financial crisis, a discussion that you must all be very familiar with, which is the whole issue around land. And how do we manage land in the developing world between the private sectors' own objectives, the objectives of the countries and how one works with that? Again, as you were saying, the international community came together with The World Bank, the U.N., the FAO, and we put together the Responsible Agriculture Investment Principles. And for many countries, for you to be able to come into their country you must have signed up to that.

A lot of the financial institutions then, also, made that as a prerequisite for giving credit to companies that wanted to come in. And so you started to see, I think, a lot more collaboration between institutions like ours, the public sector and the private sector. Clearly, Africa alone needs about $75 billion just to do energy. We cannot do that on public sector books. And I think as we begin to work more and more, and I think as we begin to work more and more to improve the regulation, to improve the transparency, and then initially, what do we see post of 2008, is people now believe that Africa is sustainable place to invest.

So you can actually come in with a much more long-term perspective, and when you come in with a long term then you're looking at two things. You're looking at your shareholders, but you're also looking at your stakeholders. If you are coming in short-term you do your shareholder value, you maximize it and the next day you are gone. If you're there for the long-term then you'll want to talk to your stakeholders, you will want to make sure that you are creating an environment where there is trust, where there is commitment, and where there is clarity of rules and responsibilities.

So I think that what we are beginning to see, actually, post the financial crisis is a lot of that. Dodd-Frank has really helped, because we used to say, on the continent that tax havens were star havens, were stolen asset havens, were basically leaders on the continent worked with financial institutions abroad, to sort of keep money that was illegally attained, and we could never have access to those resources.

What we see now, in the last five years, is there is a lot more discussion on financial transparency, the Financial Stability Board is looking at these issues, making sure that you know. I think for many normal citizens it's a little bit more difficult, the remittances, to transfer money because of some of the rules around better financial transparency, and that may be where the financial inclusion work that we are trying to do with little mothers and women in the rural areas, who cannot there.

But I think this is a positive, because we can now, we are all sitting together at the same tables and we can actually talk about it as one problem that affects us in different ways. In the U.S. it's tax payments, in the developing countries it's stolen assets, but it's the same banks that are keeping those resources, and we can try to work together now as a global community to get out of that.

So I think what we have seen is I think more pressure for us to work together, one, to restore stability, to create growth. We still need firms to maximize a shareholder value, we still productivity for growth. If we are going to reduce poverty, we must grow.

So in some sense I don't think that we lose sight of that aspect, but then it has to be equitable, and for it to be equitable, we cannot afford transfer pricing, we cannot afford stolen assets, we cannot land grabbing, and so we need to create a set of rules around that, that will make sure that this is done in an equitable and transparent fashion.

I think states cannot do that. The institutions like ours have great convening power, The World Bank, the IFC, we have great leveraging power but we do not have nearly half the amount of resources that are going to be needed if we want to -- our goal today is to reduce poverty to 3 percent by 2030. If we need to do that we need the whole world, all hands on deck working together with new innovations from the financial sector to figure out how we can leverage, how we can reach these women and young girls, quicker, faster.

How can we transform 50 billion into $1 trillion, these are financial innovations that happen in a different space, and our job is then to take them and translate them, we work with 178 countries in the world, so very quickly we can disseminate that information and leverage it. So I think that what are seeing is more and more of a community that is coming together behind one goal, and making sure that this works better and works faster.

MS. NELSON: Thank you. Yes. Go ahead.

MS. SONGWE: I think it's quite a small -- in addition to this, which I think, absolutely agree with many of the points is that -- and the opportunity for investment in Africa is a very kind of -- gives a very good example of where there is that one -- just need for investment capital, but also the opportunity for the public, private to address risk and enable. I mean, what we've seen in the U.S. perspective that we -- that companies, U.S. investment in Africa, while strong, is not as strong as it could be.

And there are -- the need for capital that's willing to go into

Africa and the role that the public sector can play in addressing risks, particularly in infrastructure and energies. And that's things that The World Bank does, and also that the U.S. company does in terms of risk reduction tools, guarantees, other measures, so that's a big opportunity.

And the second piece of list of flows which we are talking about is another place where the financial sectors are going to be critical in addressing it, and it's where there is a lot of capital that, you know, is not -- you know, going to governments in the forms of taxes or kind of going into the system that could be used for more productive development purposes.

MS. NELSON: I agree. And then picking up on that point to sort of bring it back a bit more to this sort environmental side of the agenda, Mindy. What are the opportunities that you see for sort of coalitions of companies, either within the same industry sector or cross sectors, to come together with NGOs, to sort of advocate from the more progressive public policy on environmental issues, you know, as well as onto some of the development issues?

MS. LUBBER: Well, there's both policy and non-policy, let me think if I could give a few examples, a big part again, of funding a clean energy future, and I'm focus on that just because I look at $1 trillion a year as being something of inordinate magnitude, but that impacts poverty, to the environment, to energy for parts of the world where it doesn't exist. A part of funding that is fixed income or bonds, and bonds are a big part of the overall future of where we are going.

Recently 12 banks, actually, but really led by four banks. BofA, Citi and a few others, made a huge commitment to put in more green bonds out in the market, but also recognized that the worst thing that could happen, if they go out full force with green bonds, it's that some of them may not be green. That you need transparency, you need the ability to examine what they are, to define what they are, and it's this group of banks that came to us as NGOs.

Suzanne Buchta from BofA, who is a terrific woman; somebody else Citi who said, the worst thing that could happen is, these green bonds will get out there and we'll lose credibility because somebody will put one that doesn't look green at all, and we'll go backwards 10 steps.

And I saw leadership on the part of the banks, them doing what they do well, which coming up with new products, which NGOs don't know how to do can't do. But recognizing where they want to partnership with NGOs, coming to us and saying, let's make sure we put out set of standards and principles that define what this means, and that are transparent, and collectively, I think the banks took a first shot but came out with a set of principles on transparency for green bonds, and then came to us and said, we need to even define that better. Let's go for a second round of transparency standards that will come out next year.

But it was a perfect example, where five years ago we would have all been fighting over defining what that meant. We don't have time to fight, we have time to get that money into the market to really be making sure that there is lighting in Africa and India. That infrastructure is paid for, that the money that these banks could bring to the table as part of their business. Not part of their philanthropy, it's going for the things that we all share the need, and that's done in a way that works. So to see the banks do what they do well, we are going to come up with the products, we are going to define it, but we need an outside verifier to make sure we are getting it right, we are doing it right. How do we work together?

And we are smack in the middle of that process. We haven't nailed it, but we've got a first of principles that is going to make sure there is integrity to what will be worth hoping $10 billion in green bonds last year in 2013. This is 2014, we are already at $11.5 billion in quarter one, so we might end the year with $40 billion in money for infrastructure, for developing in energy future that will work for the world. With $40 billion, designated for green infrastructure and green products that didn't exist before, and we are not spending our time fighting each other about what it is.

We are spending our time developing a way to make sure there's transparency, there's integrity and there's a process that will work to allow that money to flow sooner rather than later, quicker with the endorsement of a large constituency of stakeholders. So that's not policy but it's an example of where today is different than five years ago, and 10 years ago, and it is a good change and we are going to get more money into the hands, and more products because of collaboration.

MS. NELSON: Exactly. And I think a great example of this, yeah there's tension, but a very creative positive tension between what we say, and it's almost like pre-competitive collaboration where, you know, companies and food and beverage industry are coming together to improve rules on land grabs, and land access. Or the financial sector are coming together to improve, enabling environment, set rules for accountability and transparency, and still competing like crazy --

MS. LUBBER: Yeah. Right.

MS. NELSON: -- on the actual investments and the projects once you've -- once you've set the rules and the framework.

MS. FINUCANE: Right. But just if I could pick up on something Mindy has said, and Daniella, and Vera in all different ways. This comes back to this trust issue. If we can be good at what we do, each one of us, and create partnerships, it is true that we are unsure of, is that truly green?

SPEAKER: Correct.

MS. FINUCANE: Because we can find the investors, we were able to do $500 million of green bonds pretty easily, I mean that -- so the market is there, but we need the transparency of what are they investing in, and do we have some good housekeeping seal of approval on that? But I would suggest that -- and the partnerships sometimes are formalized, you talked about we have a National Community Advisory Council which literally helps us think through from civil rights and human rights and businesses, helping us figure out everything from products to this kind of thing.

But I'm not so sure that this is unique to now. In the early part of the 20th Century, there was going to be no funding of the infrastructure and I can talk about the U.S. better than globally, of the Erie Canal, or the Golden Gate Bridge without bonds, the banks, and we were one of them, so I know a little bit about that, came to the table quickly, but that was a public, private partnership. There were guarantees, there was some risk involved, so this isn't really -- I mean most of -- and then you moved to World War II pre and post, war bonds, and I mean any number of things that this was a public private combination, so it's not that this is the first time it's ever happening --

MS. NELSON: Very good point. Yeah.

MS. FINUCANE: -- but usually out of crisis something, there's a rebuilding, the rebuilding of relationships but a rebuilding of businesses. And I would suggest in the financial services industry for all sorts of reasons, there's been a rebuilding. And this is -- there's some real good that come out of it because at the end of the day we are evaluated every quarter. We are a public company, we are capitalists, we are not going to become -- to your earlier point, philanthropy is an expression of, because we do well as a company we can do good -- well, we've got to get the -- doing well also being good at what we do fundamentally.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Absolutely. I absolutely agree. Great. I'm going to very shortly open it up for questions and comments from the floor, but before that I cannot resist. Having four amazing, remarkable set of women leaders on the Panel with me, to just ask a question. You touched a little bit there, ask of you, Anne, on sort of women's economic empowerment, and the fact that we all know that women often find it very, very difficult to get access to credit, to sort of set up small businesses.

It would be interesting to just hear each of your reflections on the way you see the most innovative models and mechanisms emerging on women's economic empowerment. I see Alyse Nelson in the room here from Vital Voices, who I know has been a real leader in this area as well.

And Vera, maybe you can start. I know the IFC recently launched a partnership with Coca-Cola, among some other companies, on sort of improving access to finance for women. It would be great to hear your thoughts, on what are the opportunities for partnerships with the private sector?

MS. SONGWE: I think the -- thank you very much -- they are increasing, as Anne said, and you're right, a lot of this we are doing, maybe, timidly before, and coming out a little bit more boldly, we have the 1000 Women Initiative with Goldman Sachs that we launched as well, and so we -- I think what is now coming up, and a lot of it as you’ve said before, it's the whole literacy issue, is showing up as a bottle neck.

Because when you go, and it's now on both sides, I think for a long time when we talked about financial inclusion, and talked about financial literacy, it was always assumed that the literacy was on the side of the debtor, she didn't know enough. She couldn’t fill a document and she couldn’t -- but I think there is a lot of literacy on the other side that we've discovered is not good enough even with the best banks.

You know, how do you -- how do I know that I can determine that an agriculture entrepreneur is going to be profitable? If you don't have the capacity to access what an agricultural business is, you will never be able to look at the risk that you're taking in that domain. So I think some of the things that the IFC is doing is now putting out those SME toolkits with The World Bank, and working also to enhance the literacy of the banks. In terms of how can you assess risk, how can you accompany some of your borrowers, especially the women borrowers. I think there are some ideas now even about opening women windows so that you can actually have the time to sit down and discuss.

Women come, maybe at different times. First, they have to take the kids to school, and then they have to go to the bank, they cannot go at the same time with the men, and just understanding some of these different social cultural issues that -- addressed. Women do different crops, so if you open an agricultural business line for rice padding, it's the men that do it, so the men will have that. If you open it for peanuts, maybe the women will be the ones or male, and sesame, so there's -- just looking at going now, really down to the nitty-gritty and understanding how we can finance that whole value chain.

Also a lot of it is working together, because I think as Anne was saying, not -- no one of us has the solution for getting the access to the women, some of it is distance to the bank, and so you need a different kind of facility. The infrastructure just to get her there, then you need the education to get her forward.

Then we have the whole issue of sustaining them once they have a business. And how do you do that? And I think what The World Bank and the IFC are doing is also putting small and micro business loans into place. What we had done before is we opened a lot of credit lines into the banks, hoping that the banks will then access the women. But then we realized post to the effect that it was not happening because the banks didn't know where to go find the women.

So we are looking with other projects, education projects, health projects to say, let's try to see if we can match them in a different realm, but then bring them into something. And I think again, it's all this collaborative work, crowdsourcing. How can you do this, putting out new competitive ideas into seeing how we can get that bigger and faster?

And I think that just the whole empowerment of women, the concept of making sure that -- I think we've heard Christine Lagarde of the IMF talking about it, we've seen the Japanese talking about how important it is to bring in 50 percent of their economy -- their population into the economy, has made it clear that all governments are looking at the issue and say, we need to do something for women. Before it was something that it was almost like corporate social responsibility, it was the philanthropy part.

You do your development and then you turn around and think of the woman. Now it has to be part of the process of doing your development, and I think even that concept of making sure, now presidents on the continent talk about how many women they have in their governments. They are proud to say that they have 40 percent in parliament. It's become a benchmark in the peer review mechanism on the continent, that you have more gender empowerment globally.

The World Bank did a study on gender, which showed that the more you have women in decision and policymaking places, the faster it is to change policy that affects women. And we have, I think, a lot of evidence in India and Pakistan, on this, so more and more we are hoping that as we sort of bring women more and more into the economic sphere, we can be -- understand how to access them, and give them more financial inclusion.

MS. NELSON: Very good. Thank you. And Daniella, if I know, it's, you know, key theme for State Department as well?

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Yeah. Absolutely. And I mean very well covered in terms of the themes, but I mean, I think we'll agree very much that, I mean, both that -- we look at women's empowerment both from the leadership level. The kind of economic workforce participation level, the importance of that, which I think is -- the case has been made, and very strongly; and then also the kind of access to capital at a kind of programmatic level.

So some of the things that, you know, we certainly, both in agriculture and things like mobile money, see this as real opportunities where women need access to capital, and you can use them to drive women's economic empowerment as well. But also, I mean, just to give a tangible example, of some of the things that we do. If you take for instance Millennium Challenge Corporation, which is a US-assistance program that basically, countries have to meet a scorecard that the MCC has in order to have access to the capital that the MCC offers for economic growth.

And there's about 10 indicators related to the governance, and freedom of the economy, and other issues that they have to pass. And one of those indicators is around gender empowerment, so what you see is that with countries that are seeking to access the MCC are working with them, it creates a different dialogue because if they are not meeting that indicator and danger, it starts a policy dialogue around women's access, to land inheritance and rights, et cetera. And with -- under Secretary Clinton, and continued under Secretary Kerry, there's been a kind of an elevation of women's issues in our diplomatic dialogue.

So when we are speaking with a country about what the policy priorities of the day are it's -- you know, of course it extends to crises and security issues, but it also is a dialogue that emphasizes, you know, where do things stand in your country around women's participation and empowerment, and how can we work together to improve that.

MS. NELSON: Great. And opportunities for increased partnership with companies?

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Right. Well, you know, with companies, I mean, we sort of go by it a little differently. I mean the first thing is, half of our population in a company are women, half our management are women, senior management 40 percent, the very top of those --

MS. NELSON: Unusual, yeah.

MS. BALLOU-AARES: And so you move a lot more quickly when there are that many women, insisting that something be done. And then you mentioned Alyse, in our case, we were trying to do things in small business and domestically, but we didn't feel really fully informed about what we could do, particularly outside the U.S.

This is again, where I think a real partnership can help. Where you are sitting down with Vital Voices and Alyse and her team and saying, we want to do the right thing, but as Mindy sort of set out, we don't -- the last thing we want to do is invest money and lending and people, and go to the wrong place, and do the wrong thing. So, these partnerships, I think when there is a level of trust, and there is little momentum, a lot can happen. So we've been able to do work with Vital Voices, we've brought in experts from all sorts of walks of life for us to mentor at a ground level.

We talked to Goldman, this is a -- you know, we compete by day, I'd say, and we collaborate by night, in terms of some women's issues. But that’s when you begin to realize the capital needs were real on how we would have to do it. Mentoring was only going to go so far. So I think these are the kinds of things that we can build on.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Okay. Great.

MS. LUBBER: And I would only very quickly endorse where I think Anne was going at the beginning. We need to be doing bottom-up and we need to be doing top-down. We need more women on corporate Boards; we need more women running large companies, catalyst who reviews corporate Boards. And in particular, I did a study recently that actually showed that those companies who had women both leading it and dominating, or in larger proportion on corporate Boards were companies that were doing better. And that’s the -- you can break down the numbers and--

SPEAKER: But you just know it's so.

MS. LUBBER: Right. You just know it's so. So, we have a responsibility to think about how to make sure those Board of Directors are being populated by women who often have an affinity for some of these issues in a way that men don't. Cultural, social, it is what it is, but it works.

MS. NELSON: And practical.

MS. LUBBER: And then practical.

MS. NELSON: Great. Good. Great. Well, on that note, a challenging note; let me open it up to questions, answers, comments. What I'd like to do is sort of, like take, you know, probably three at a time, and if you can introduce yourself very quickly, and keep the questions succinct. So I think we've already got sort of three hands up there, so we go first here, and then back there, and so, introduce yourself.

MS. NELSON: Hi. Alyse Nelson, from Vital Voices. It's been really fascinating and I have to say the last 20 years I've been working on women's issues, and as you've said Mindy, I mean, the private sector coming into these issues, has just accelerated the field so much for women. So, Anne, and to everyone on the Panel, I thank you for that.

I think one of the challenges that I see and I'd love to get the thoughts of the Panel, and particularly Anne's. Is that although I see the private sector really engaging in sort of the idea of women as economic force, because we've got all this great research, and it does makes sense, and connect to the bottom line of their companies; I think there's less understanding of the valuable role that women play in leadership.

And, Mindy, you talked about this just briefly again. Women on corporate Boards, and I think there is this understanding that, yes, women's presence in the economy is important, absolutely, but how do we really tap women's power, women's leadership, women's influence? And our Global Ambassador Partnership with Bank of America, I think is really doing that the mentorship leading to leadership. But you know, as we look at post 2015, agenda, you know, how do we go beyond just economic health education? To really look at, how do we bring in women's leadership and influence and sort of the agency issues?

MS. NELSON: Thank you, Alyse. We have a hand over there. Yes. I recognize Chris Jochnick from Oxfam.

MR. JOCHNICK: Thank you. Great panel. Chris Jochnick with Oxfam. Thanks, Jane. So I'm interested in knowing a little bit more about the question of the banks' role in lobbying. And specifically, Vera mentioned -- I'd say all the panelists recognized the importance of governments to the sort of solutions that you're -- that we are looking for, and Vera mentioned some issues specifically. Like, corruption, transfer pricing, land grabs, that really require strong government policies, in places like Nigeria, not just the U.S.

And the financial services industry, I think, is either one or two in terms of lobbying spending, up around 500 million. So, I wonder, Anne, when you talk about corporate social responsibility, what do you think Bank of America's responsibility is to help push for policies like revenue, transparency or issues around transfer pricing, or corruption, or land grabs in countries around the world?

MS. NELSON: So women's leadership, sort of the policy and lobbying law. And then there was a person right at the back, I can't there -- yeah. And then we'll come to -- come to the side in the second round. So, yeah?

MS. REGAN-SACHS: I'm Rebecca Regan-Sachs, from AMGlobal Consulting, and we work with a lot of corporations in developing markets. So Vera's and Daniella's insights into Africa as an investment opportunity; was really interesting, particularly because we see China so involved in Africa. If you look at something Power Africa, it's a great initiative, but it's -- you know, it's kind of a drop in the bucket in terms of Africa's electrification needs, and in terms of what Chinese are already doing on the ground.

But American companies are so good at CSR, and public private partnerships. What specifics do you think we need to take, maybe both on the government side and the corporate side, to really get American companies involved much more strongly; maybe not at a China level, but much more involved in emerging markets?

MS. NELSON: Great. Okay. Well why don't we -- Anne, do you want to start on the women's leadership, and the sort policy dialogue and lobbying question? And then, we can probably come to the others on the third question.

MS. FINUCANE: Okay. So I'm going to start with, if I may, the lobbying question. I think that capitalism works best when you have transparency, real transparency, because we are competing. And so I think through Dodd-Frank you have a pretty good set of, a couple hundred or so, amendments that address almost every aspect of financial services, domestically. In Europe, there is, I think, some harmonization between what we are doing, and what's being done more broadly in Europe, through the European Commission, and the -- I won't speak country-by-country. I don't really think that’s the issue. I don't think the issue is developed nations, lobbying, but by intuition I think you -- I mean I'm not sure where you were going with. But are we lobbying for the right things, was the question, or --? Is that -- was that a part of your question?

MR. JOCHNICK: Well, for example, corruption, you know, and the future in Africa and --

MS. FINUCANE: Right.

MR. JOCHNICK: -- would you consider it a part of your responsibility to help women to stronger rule (inaudible)?

MS. FINUCANE: Yeah. So we would consider that we -- I think it's actually, may be a little more productive, it's how we have to do business, therefore there's going to be limited opportunities in the Continent of Africa to the degree they cannot fulfill on anti-money-laundering or other requirements that we have, or I think European banks will have. So that the flow of money gets pretty constrained if we feel that we are in any way going to break the American law, or European law; we won't do it.

I mean we -- so, I think it's sort of -- we look at it differently than you make look at it, but the end result is, both good and bad, I think it's not the corruption that’s happened, it's whether we ever make the investment. And that’s a legitimate worry. And therefore that leads you to, you’ve got -- That has to be clean up here.

So, yes, do I think that we would seek transparency and anti-corruption in developing parts of the world? Yes. But we only have so much -- who are we lobbying?

MS. SONGWE: I think if I can maybe pick up on that, it's two ways. We are actually very happy and I think one of the things that Mo has been doing, and as couple of others, have actually been lobbying. Not that the Dodd-Frank would just be, sort of passed, but that the implementing rules and regulations happen and that we begin to implement it, and that these companies begin to become more transparent. And what we have seen is that lot of the financial institutions and Bank of America and some of them have actually been on the right side of the lobbying campaign.

So we have both sides. We have American businesses that do not want to be transparent about what they are doing in Africa. We have African governments that do not want to be transparent about what's going on, and we also have American businesses, as they say, if you are not transparent, you are not competing, and that’s not pure capitalism. So what we'll begin to get, is rather than having the Democratic Republic of Congo talking with the American business that does not want to be transparent, you have a big American business talking to another big American business saying, you have to be transparent.

And, basically, that balance becomes much more important. We have the U.S. Government saying, you have to be transparent, and I think that in that sense we are actually winning the fight, I must say, because we are seeing more and more big American business on the side of saying, you need to be transparent for us to play in a level playing field.

Before that it was not the case. So it is a big lobbying industry, but under Dodd-Frank, I think that some of it has benefited us on the Continent, in Africa in particular, because we are seeing a lot more transparency; because the pressure is coming from U.S. business to U.S. business. And actually, that is why now the U.K., because a lot of the mining sector, in particular, it's U.K., Canada, Australia, and so there is now a discussion saying, well why only the U.S.?

You know, if we do Dodd-Frank in the U.S., then you, the U.K. must do it, and you Canada must do it. This is something the African governments have been saying for 50 years, it didn't happen. And now, you know, VHP is saying it, and other big companies are saying it, and it's beginning to happen, so it's a good thing in that sense.

MS. NELSON: Great. Thanks, Vera. And, Daniella, did you want to pick up the question on sort of the mobilizing, or the American businesses, you know, for investment, the third question? And then we'll quickly come back to the women's leadership question, and then come to a couple more questions.

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Yeah. I mean, I think this is -- it's not a -- you know, it's frankly not something that government can kind of direct, right, obviously; but it's something where we can do things to try to address some of the risk appetite, and also do things like expand our investment trees, or other pieces. I mean, you know, on kind of its most -- its simplest level, there has been a strong push around economic diplomacy within the State Department for some time, and saying, let's work with businesses to make sure they have the information they need to access markets, to access public procurements in markets in Africa, and otherwise.

So that’s a kind of making sure that companies are aware of what the opportunities are in Africa and getting there's a -- you know, a better kind of Web-based platform that’s enabling this, and just getting access to information, and markets were just harder to access information, and this is all public. I mean it's not creating proprietary information, but just kind of getting better information out there to U.S. companies with opportunities.

But, I think, you know -- and then second is doing some more targeted efforts, whether it's what OPEC does, or EXIM does, and expanding that to address -- provide guarantees and other risk reduction tools to government -- to businesses so that they can invest. Particularly in sectors that kind of have win-win of development in private investment opportunity, like energy, or agriculture.

But, you know, in the broader sense, it's a bit of the balancing act between having some of these good -- you know, strong kind of regulations that are saying U.S. companies need to operate in a certain kind of environment, and that's a good thing. And I think from a government perspective, some of the best things we can do is say, you know, look, these are -- the fact that our companies are adhering to these standards, make them good partners in your country.

And that's -- these are -- and we hear that a lot from governments, right. That American companies do adhere to high standards, and it's not -- you know, look, I acknowledge your point, not every -- you know, you said, some companies are on the right side, some are on -- you know, it's not across the board, always, but there is, I think, some really strong standards that we have in place. That means that U.S. companies can come, be good partners in countries and also help raise the bar there. So in the end, I think that's part of, if you do some things to try to address risk, and then really U.S. companies are kind of a preferred partner. I think those two things can make a big difference.

MS. FINUCANE: I'll just add that the emerging markets are where there are huge opportunities, so businesses are truly interested in doing business in all the emerging markets. Those that are more mature, from a government perspective, that are more transparent, are going to do better, and we are going to do better there. And it is also where you see more businesses partner with our U.S. -- in the case of a U.S. company, U.S. governments, because we are -- we want to make sure that we are treading carefully, and smarty, while also taking opportunity.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Great. And Anne, why don't you just pick up the women's leadership question --

MS. FINUCANE: Okay.

MS. NELSON: -- and then we'll come to a couple of others.

MS. FINUCANE: Well, it's hard to know what to exactly say about that, that's certainly true that we need greater leadership across the board with women. I think though -- I'm encouraged because I feel that we are seeing it, even -- it just seems to me that I'll just use one example, Christine Lagarde in the IMF. I've never heard -- with every speech she gives, she says something about women's empowerment. She talks about the economic opportunities. They did the study very quickly about the gross domestic product and what could be done in each country, at various countries, and the gap, because women are fully employed, even in the U.S. there's a 5 percent gap.

So, I would say it's when you're listening to -- her leadership, CEOs, management team, I mean, I look at it more from, obviously -- from an economic and a financial perspective because that's the business I'm in. But I see movement, and I see that even on a Panel like this it's not lost on anyone I hope, that it's female.

MS. NELSON: That's right, but it wasn't intended.

MS. FINUCANE: But it wasn't really built to be female.

MS. NELSON: No. It wasn't. Yeah. Yeah. Thank you, Anne. Great. We've got time for a couple of more -- and I know this gentleman here had his hand up, and then that lady there, and that gentleman there; if you can keep -- and please -- and keep them quick.

MR. MITCHELL: Great. Thanks. I'm Garrett Mitchell, and I write the Mitchell Report, and more important for this discussion, father of a daughter who is actively engaged in this agenda. So I like the composition of the Panel.

I've been thinking about -- it seems to me, overall, you are really looking at the question of how to effectively organize to deal with the sort of 21st Century Global Development Agenda. You have, on the one hand, the four -- it seems to me you have, sort of, four sets of players; governments, corporations, NGOs, academics. You have a second layer of complexity which is the component parts, issue identification, knowledge management, best practices, et cetera, and then you have these important elements of trust and communications, and coordination, et cetera.

And I'm interested to know, to the extent you can speak to this, is given that sort of matrix, where are the biggest and most difficult hurdles in that sort of matrix today. What are the hard parts, and what are the easier parts?

MS. NELSON: Okay. A challenging question, but we'll come back to that. Okay. Yeah. And then we have the gentleman over there.

MS. JOE: My name is Niharika Joe I work for the Tata Group of Companies. I lead corporate sustainability, corporation responsibility for Tata Group in North America. I think some of you may know about us, some of you may have never heard about us. I have a comment which is more to do with, you know, everyone talked about U.S. companies going abroad, and my challenge is, being the gold standard abroad, and working out of the U.S., and leading this function in the U.S. And the whole issue of trust, and trying to establish that as the big, bad foreign company, who is here working in our communities in the United States and in Canada.

So therein lies my challenge, and I, you know, stand to learn from all of you on how best to kind of garner that trust, and let people know that we are 24,000 people here in the U.S., and we are working in our communities, and really giving back. But I think, you know, that's the challenge that I have, and I'm always interested in learning from other corporations on how they -- how they do that.

MS. NELSON: Great. Thank you. And I think you, sort of, linked back to that third question about the Chinese businesses, as emerging markets, so-called emerging market companies from India, Brazil and China become more active. Not only in other emerging markets but here in the United States, (inaudible) -- also focus increasingly on this question, of what is it to be a responsible company and an innovative company? So thank you. And one final question there. The gentleman in the --

MR. BOCCASSINI: Hi. My name is Marco Boccassini. I'm a Consultant. I work in Climate Change Mitigation and Sustainability. On this topic of -- one quick clarification question for Bank of America and then a question for the Panel. The question or Bank of America is you mentioned that on coal you reduce your investment by 20 percent, and on solar you increase it by 100 percent. But what are the dollar amounts; just to give us a feel for where we are?

And for the Panel, in general, you mentioned that, you know, to solve the climate problem issue, we need leadership from the business sector as a whole. But I would say in the business community there is -- companies that are sort of dragging their feet, and others that are sort of aware, others that are trying to do. So where do you see them as a group, in terms of the evolution, so far, and where are they compared to where they should be in order for us to solve the climate change problem?

MS. NELSON: Great. Good. Why don't we start with you, Mindy, and if we can use your space as a wrap up comment as well, so to some of the key challenges, basically?

MS. LUBBER: Great. So I'm going to speak to these two questions, and try and conceptualize it, and then it will be my wrap up. So, your question was, how do you prioritize, or how do you package all of the different issues that run to sustainability, and equity within a company? I'm sure I didn't capture it quite -- and I think what's different today than it was maybe 20 years ago, or 10 years ago, corporate social responsibility, or environmental social governance or sustainability, are now, and must be integrated into the ethic, into the operations, into the governance, into the systems of the world's largest companies.

Having a corporate social responsibility person here, and a sustainability person there, that don't roll up into somebody who is, in essence, a decision-maker at the highest levels of the company don't work. So what we need to expect, and it is the known expectation, more or less, is that these issues are being developed, and addressed at a governance level. So goals around these issues are being looked at a Board level. They are integrated into -- even compensation goal-setting, and priorities of a company, that there's transparency. I have a staff person who is up, because she has been too busy to do it last week, reviewing BofA's corporation sustainability report, that they put out.

But it's transparent, it's about goals that are driven, it is seeking input, and not only applause, but criticism and critique from the outside community of what is right or what is wrong, and the companies then open to integrating that input. So, you need governance. You need leadership with the company with goals being set and accountability. You need transparency throughout the company that really is reaching out to a broad community, and accepting both applause and criticism. Or at least critique of what else should be done.

You need goals being set throughout the firm at a -- on performance. You need the responsibility for even your supply chain. If a company stands up and says, this is the behavior that we must live by, I think moving that though to the supply chain more and more is about how we get results, because we've got to have a multiplier effect for all of these issues. But it's integration; and it is making these issues part of the goal-setting, the enterprise risk management, the strategic planning of a company at the highest levels.

And we are seeing not only more and more corporate Boards addressing these issues, but more and more compensation metrics, being tied to sustainability goals. And it takes that people are driven by what they are compensated for, good thing, bad thing, it just is. That's the way the world works. Eventually we are going to have to deal with the short-term, long-term issue, because we can't nail it all over the short term.

In response to this gentleman, of what's it's going to take to get there policy, was it?

MS. NELSON: And climate, yeah.

MS. LUBBER: And climate change. I think one of the most important things that companies could be doing. We have slowly started changing the debate, for climate change being something that tree huggers and environmentalists care about, to it is the future of our economy and the future of our world. But changing that debate in the policymaker regime, I think is even harder. So, one extremely important thing, and I've witnessed it day after day. I have been on the Hill with colleagues from the environmental community where people say, we know this is important but we've got to worry about jobs and the economy.

When we are up on the Hill, with economic leaders and corporate leaders saying this is an imperative, not only for the future of the world, and the future of children's lives, as if that ought not to be enough, but because it is essentially about the future of our economy, when a Bank of America or when a Deutsche Bank; or when an IKEA, or when a Nike, when a PepsiCo are up there saying those things, and they are, the debate changes.

So, a crucial thing for the leading economic institutions, I think, are helping us change this debate, from somehow being a sidebar issued to being about the future of our economy. And that will eventually get us to where we could have a real debate in Congress, and frankly put a price on carbon, or have the kind of policies, we eventually will have, but we ought to be getting sooner rather than later.

MS. NELSON: Thank you, Mindy. Daniella, some closing comments from you.

MS. BALLOU-AARES: Yeah. I mean, I don't know that I'll address the specific ones, but I think there's kind of an aggregate of what I think I've heard from this Panel, and this discussion is, look we are at a place there's both, I think a recognition of public and private is critical, and it's about an agenda. Also we are talking about a very integrated global agenda, and that’s around poverty sustainability, these pieces are not kind of in conflict, this is something we need to address together.

And I think the challenge and the opportunity for businesses is to be able to say -- to be able to look across in ways that it seems to be Bank of America has actually done quite a lot of, which is, look at the core business, look at corporate responsibility, and look at all of those pieces can have different levers to further those goals. Whether it's something like RED on health, or investment in climate, they are kind of all part of a set of issues that the world agrees are kind of critical to advancing development.

And just to say, I think when we think about the round of development goals that are being negotiated, you know, to be agreed on September 2015, to 2015 to 2030 in the U.N. context, you know, I think our -- the discussion that I've had with business is the first question. What does it take for these goals to really be relevant? Because, I mean, look you can have an international agreement, agree to some goals, I mean things like that, will it really matter?

And I think what can matter in an agreement, a global agreement like this, is that those goals actually are an anchor for what businesses and governments are doing, and civil society are kind of doing together. There are only as useful -- is that they are used, and they provide something, kind of a bit of a vision of where everyone can go together. I would just say there was -- one question I was asked about for instance, in gender, or gender goal in post 2015, and how do you use that to reflect leadership?

And I would say, well, then what's important is that there is -- within that goal there is a measurable target representing leadership, either political participation, or leadership in the economy, et cetera. So, just -- I think there is a real power of kind of shared data and kind of long-term goal setting that can then play into what Mindy spoke about in terms of specific corporate goal-setting conversations.

MS. NELSON: Great. Thank you. Vera?

MS. SONGWE: Yes. Thank you. I think what the conversation here is showing is that there was convergence, but we were not converging fast enough, and I think that that convergence has sped up a little bit, both on the gender side, on the fact that the public sector, the private sector, and civil society are working together. In terms of our ethics, our corporate governance, I mean, as Mindy was saying, we don't have sort of the corporate social responsibility guides, sort of, going to talk to the little kids, and the CEO not caring about what he's doing and just wearing this T-shirt once a day.

Now all that is happening together, you know. Instead of, you know, you cannot say, oh, but I did your school, so I cannot pay taxes. It doesn't work anymore. You must pay taxes. If you want to build a school, we can discuss it, but you must pay your taxes.

So, I think in some sense that is what is happening, and on the continent, because we are a young continent, because we are growing really fast, I think the benefit of what's happening is that we are able to leapfrog into all these discussions that have taken a lot longer to sort of materialize and crystallize. And the climate change discussion, for example. It's a huge debate on the continent.

I come from country that has the second-largest water resources in Africa, Cameroon, and we are going to do hydro, and DRC is going to do hydro because we need the electricity, because only 22 percent of our population had access to electricity. And the debate is, can you do water and can you do it well? On the debate in coal, we know that -- I think that the discussion around whether you do coal and how you do it, and whether supercritical.

I think we are beginning to see that supercritical no longer works. But then the question is, and this is where the private sector comes in and comes in quickly, it's, can we find those new technologies that are cheap enough, so that it can be affordable for these countries in this continent? Otherwise, then you have the debate, and this where the speed of convergence issue comes in. Are we all going to converge to no coal tomorrow? Or, are we going to say, you know, we are going to phase out? And if it's affordable for you to do it while we figure out a different solution, then go that route while we do something else.

And I think in some sense, the global multilateralism debate is going to be around this. As we begin to agree on the principles, we agree on the framework, but how quickly do we converge and how can we help each to make sure that the convergence happens in a way that is sustainable to development and fast-tracks development?

On the continent, at least we have 15 million kids coming every year looking for jobs. We need to provide energy, we need to give them clean water, and we need to get good education going. So in some sense that is the tension that is happening there; and this convergence that's happening with the private sector will help it happen faster, and hopefully better.

MS. NELSON: Great. Thank you, Vera. And a final comment from you, Anne. Wrapping up, yeah.

MS. FINUCANE: I'll try to be quick. Well, just playing off of what Vera said in relation to your question, I don't think I could keep that matrix fully in my head, sorry. But what you last said, maybe, is what I thought and that is trust and communication. But trust and communication, I would say is probably best expressed, it's, what is the value proposition? And is it completely clear what the value proposition between public and private, customer and company, government and the public?

And I would say that's the case for internationals trying to do work domestically, here in the U.S., but certainly true of those of us who are trying to do business globally, and in that spirit in terms of climate change, we do less coal because of a couple of reasons. Not least of which is, that's being reduced just might probably, you know, it was 40-something percent, now it's 30-something percent of the electricity in the country, in the U.S.

Whereas, renewables, solar, et cetera, is where the opportunity is. There's real business there for us, so I would it's many multiples of that, but it is -- it is not about social responsibility going back to the very beginning just about philanthropy, we see the business opportunity.

MS. NELSON: Yeah. Absolutely. I think from my side, yeah, building on that I think sort the three closing comments. One, you know, there is no doubt that mobilizing private investment capital is going to be critical whether it's energy infrastructure in Africa, or green bonds here in the United States. It is going to be critical.

But secondly, getting the governance and accountability and transparency right is going to be essential to building the trust and the type of relationships needed, and that's partly going to be about new regulations, but a lot of it, is going to be about the voluntary action on the part of business to draw greater governance and transparency.

And then thirdly, if there are the frameworks for better governance and accountability and transparency I think the potential for innovation in new products, new services, new technologies, new business models, is enormous, and it's -- that's the prize out there, if we can get the governance and accountability aspects right, and build the necessary trust.

So thank you very much to our panelists. Thank you, to all of you, and hope you have you have the time chat afterwards. Thank you. (Applause)

SPEAKER: Thank you.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016