

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS:  
JOINING CORE BUSINESS INTERESTS  
WITH GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, May 7, 2015

**Moderator:**

GEORGE INGRAM  
Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development  
The Brookings Institution

**Keynote Speaker:**

ROGER FORD  
Managing Director  
Accenture Development Partners

**Panelists:**

ANGELA BAKER  
Senior Manager, Wireless Reach  
Qualcomm

KATHERINE FRITZ  
Director of Global Health and Development  
International Center for Research on Women

PASCALE WAGNER  
Country Director for Guatemala  
Project Concern International

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. INGRAM: I'm George Ingram and I'm a senior fellow here at Brookings. I am very pleased to be hosting this session on public-private partnerships with Project Concern International. Brookings is an independent policy research institution and PCI is an international global NGO that works in the space of development and relief in the United States and around the world. Particularly relevant to today's conversation, PCI has been involved in public-private partnerships and is co-hosting the session today because both they and we want to learn more about what this entity is that's called a public-private partnership. I want particularly to thank PCI press and CEO George Guimaraes for co-hosting the session with us today.

The term public-private partnership is ubiquitous in the development parlance. But as is frequently the case all too often we use terms we don't really know what we're talking about. I have found that to be my own situation, and therefore a year or so ago I began doing some research on public-private partnerships to try to understand them better. I am still involved in trying to work out that understanding, and I'm expecting that our speaker and our panelists today will help us solve this riddle or least shed some light on what are public-private-partnerships, what makes for a well-structured successful one? What are the incentives, the interests of the various parties for participating in public-private-partnerships? Where along the continuum from philanthropy to shared value does a particular PPP sit and does it make a difference from the perspective of achieving sustainable impact? And finally how do you measure the results and the success of a PPP?

Roger Ford, who is managing director of Accenture Development Partners, will launch our dialogue. In directing this part of Accenture, Roger manages what is the development practice in the organization that provides consulting services

and technology to the international development sector on a not-for-profit basis and has been involved in a number of public-private-partnerships. Prior to this role, Roger was in the energy section of Accenture, particularly in the petroleum area, and also worked on convenience retail marketing. So Roger brings to this conversation a lot of experience in business, in development and how you structure and manage public-private-partnerships. After Roger's keynote, a panel will join us on the stage for a conversation. Roger?

MR. FORD: Hello everyone and thank you George for such a great introduction. What I wanted to do first of all is just tell you a little bit about what George said and that is really the uniqueness of Accenture Development Partnerships in one of the largest organizations in the Fortune 100, and that is Accenture. We are a -- Accenture itself as you probably know is over a 230 thousand person international global consultancy that focuses on literally every industry on Earth. And one of those interesting factors of Accenture is how can you apply business consulting skills and technology skills to the international development sector? And that was really one of the key principals that was the foundation of Accenture Development Partnerships and we've been around for 13 years, and the uniqueness of this model is what George mentioned, and that is we are a not-for-profit consultancy. And being a not-for-profit consultancy means you can do a lot. First of all you can be accessible to many organizations that normally wouldn't be able to afford commercial consulting, management consulting rates that are quite high in the context of international development, but second of all you can be around for the long term. And you can take risk and you can also try out new innovations and apply different models to PPPs and development. And a lot of what I'm going to talk about today is really based on those factors.

So I've been serving as the COO and the Director of Growth and Strategy for the local organization for about eight years. Before this I had no knowledge

what so ever of international development, so I am truly coming at this as someone who had a relatively strong business background, showing up and saying, how can you apply business to development. And when I did that to my boss eight years ago, I said, I'm seeing a lot of NGOs out here, donors, private foundations? Where's the corporates? And he's like, you know, corporates and NGOs and development sectors, they just don't get along. They're at the opposite ends of the spectrum. So it's kind of interesting that we've come so far in those past eight years and what I've seen with these PPPs forming, it kind of gets me very excited as to what the next eight years are going to offer when it comes to the sustainability and the way development will function.

But we also have a very -- one thing I should mention is, we have a very unique position being commercial consultants as well as serving on the international development side of the house and that is we already serve two thirds of the Fortune 500 and about ninety percent of the Fortune 100 so that essentially gives me a hall pass in a way to approach a large oil company or a products company or healthcare, you name it -- and say, would you like to participate in this very unique concept? We're trying to impact education or health or even access to energy, and at least I can get in the door to the right stakeholder, the right individual. So that's a little bit about me and a little bit about why I think my role is unique.

So when I talk about PPPs, I'm really talking about them from the angle of a practitioner and an intermediary, as a consultant. So you can imagine when I'm approaching an organization I'm saying what can we do, how can we connect, how can we help you achieve your issue and your outcome, but at the same time, ultimately I'm also saying how can I be a convener and an intermediary between these groups. And the nice thing which has happened recently is partnerships are really the means to an end. They're not one that I say, let's create a big partnership and do some good stuff

together. It's kind of like how can I apply market forces to solve your problem?

So it's a different way of thinking about partnerships. Many NGOs would just like to jump out there and say -- I'd love to be on this bandwagon of these PPPs. I hear it. I have to have corporate engagement. But in fact they should be asking about what's the best solution for sustainability, what's the best solution of creating jobs, what's the best solution for sustainable healthcare or skill building? And a lot of that answer these days is through a partnership. It's not through, let's got to USAID and ask for a million dollars and put it into schools in Tanzania. That used to be the issue; it's not anymore. So when I'm speaking this language these days, or our team, we're talking about the partnership actually being the vehicle, being the model that solves the problem versus the other way around.

So essentially, when we think about a PPP, George touched on it -- we're thinking about both the private sector, the public sector, civil society and typically government, as an end beneficiary, but you can also think of government as also a -- essentially a bilateral funder in many cases, a multilateral funder. So you might think of government in different dimensions depending on what role they're play. So there might be more than one government involved here of course.

And I think when you're dealing with the private sector; you have to think what is driving them to a partnership. And we say this to NGOs, we say, think about this in a private sector lens. It's not really rocket science per se to understand that most of the companies are doing partnerships at scale are publically traded. And they have shareholder expectations, typically the shareholder expectations result in a higher share price or a profit. And if they do their job right, this term shared value means they can make profit but also achieve social impact at the same time. But if they focus on getting the profit right first, social impact is a natural outcome by having to diversify supply

chains, creating an inclusive workforce and entering new markets, creating great relations with other organizations. These are all natural connections that are going to happen as part of the model.

So obviously when we think about those other players -- so that's a private sector, we think about the public sector, the governments and others. If you're talking about USAID or DFID or some of the other bilateral agencies, or even the U.N. as a multilateral -- these guys are going to be driven by leverage. And they see the private sector providing leverage that they themselves -- they don't want to be the guy holding the bag anymore. Funding is tight. It's going to be increasingly tighter moving forward, and therefore by de-risking themselves from holding the bag essentially, and there's been a lot of projects over the years as we all know across the development sector that have ended with -- okay it's done the money is dried up, where do we go next?

And I think it's sometimes a little painful to kind of keep dragging on a donor funded program with no sustainable way of success being defined. So the whole idea with these guys is, let's get some skin in the game from others. They are also a little skeptical sometimes -- do we really want to be seen as helping the private sector? But if you think about it, it is the best solution for sustainability, because ultimately if the private sector, there is no market these things are not going to succeed on their own.

And then of course we have the development sector and civil society and these NGOs and others -- I mean these are really the boots on the ground. These are the warriors that are out there that know how to get things done in those countries. I can tell you that I've had many a private sector company come to me and say -- where do I get started in Tanzania or Kenya or South East Asia -- wherever it is, who would I talk to, who is good, who might not be, who may not have the best track record? It's essentially looking at using the right relations with the right NGOs and other partners. And the

NGOs have the benefit of essentially getting access to essentially resources, which you would immediately think it's money because that's what NGOs typically -- they need to keep their funding streams going, but increasingly it's expertise and it's innovation. And they are almost becoming more valuable themselves than just the dollars they may get through a typical corporate to NGO relationship so that's pretty significant to see that change happening.

So essentially, international development itself is organically changing. It's not something, you know I was talking those eight years, it's not something that anybody deliberately did, it's just the world changed around us. I used to go into markets like Kenya and Tanzania and the only thing out there was Accenture Development Partnerships. I'm talking about my own company. Now-a-days I go in there and I see our corporate and commercial partners working on true commercial engagements in those same markets. And that's what's going to continue to happen.

So essentially, I thought coming into this, when the PPP started arising that this was a novel trend. I don't think so anymore. I think that this truly is something that is going to be critical to long term growth and sustainability in these markets, and it's rapidly accelerating day by day.

So essentially, let's think about issues versus outcomes, and I like to use one example for this and it's one I've been heavily involved with for the past two to three years and that is the energy access issue. I think we're all familiar with the fact that there are approximately 1.3 to 1.5 billion people that don't have access to electricity or lighting. And there are many countries, take Uganda and others that might be 85 percent of the population. And that's the issue. Essentially, how do you solve that problem?

So what we look at is, essentially, what can be the outcome of resolving that problem? And essentially the outcome is, how do you create market based

solutions, because this isn't again a technical problem. If it was a technical -- if it's just a technical problem we would go in there and run a grid and it would be very stable and everyone would have electricity and we would be done. But this is a market based problem, and that's the challenge is, this came to me, Accenture got heavily involved with the U.N. and we basically said how can we bring market based solutions to address this issue with true outcomes?

And I've been spending a big piece of my time approaching the companies that have said, I stand up I will help you achieve this goal. And now the rubber meets the road. Well, what are you going to do? And it's going to be a challenge and I can tell you that the Secretary General would like to see by 2030, this problem being addressed. But it's going to end up having to be addressed by true PPPs that take market based approaches where we build models and we build market based approaches that are going to be sustainable and scalable. And I think that's one of the most important things is that these can't be silos anymore. For a while PPPs have been have been, George mentioned, philanthropic in nature, very silo'd, little CSR initiatives. But when you take a problem of 1.5 billion people and try to solve them with simple little silos and CSR initiatives -- I'll be grateful if we get a million people on sustainable power let alone 1.5 billion. So we're basically looking for winning formulas and solutions. We've actually put our own money behind this and we've established three micro-grids in Uganda -- basically wired up villages. And essentially what we're doing is we're testing models that we can then take forward to commercial, private sector organizations as well as NGOs and others to essentially replicate sustainable models for off-grid electrification.

So we have some small entrepreneurs that have gotten onto these micro-grids. We have a clinic. We have the school online as anchor tenants and then we're now actually spawning off true innovative social enterprises. There's a barber



shop. There's someone doing sewing, and we hope to replicate that model across Uganda and across South Africa later this year and take it from there. And then if we can get larger utilities involved and others involved, this is a type of PPP that will truly go to scale.

So essentially what are some of the key tenants of good PPPs, some of the good takeaways? They have to be first of all organizationally agnostic. You can't be saying, I really want to be working with Coca-Cola; wouldn't it be great if we got Chevron involved? I mean they may be a great player, and they may be a great plan for attacking the problem, but basically, you know, are they the best partner? Do they have the capability, the innovation, the resources; basically do they have the time to dedicate to the partnership? Essentially the impact we can achieve, regardless of who is the multinational involved or even the NGO for that matter, the impact that we ultimately achieve will trump any type of brand in any type of sector. So it doesn't matter if it started out as an oil company. Maybe you have an oil company like Chevron impacting more healthcare in Nigeria than a healthcare company could. And that's why I say it has to trump what we would think the traditional industries might look like. And then we need to be market driven. We need to harness the power of the markets, the funding, the leverage, and most importantly, you're probably hearing a lot about innovative finance. And this is really going to change the game I think. This is where we're going to get investors, you call them impact investors. You might just call them -- any person in this room, someone who wants to make sustainable profit and also help the world -- but investing in these markets we need to figure out how we're going to do that at scale because there's not enough projects and programs out there that have the compliance structures, that have the M and E, the monitoring and evaluation frameworks to really allow investment. But once this investment starts flowing, it's going to be huge, and it's

going to trump anything that the bilateral and multilateral donors are doing today and it's starting out as we speak.

And finally these things need to be sustainable and scalable. They shouldn't be dependent on any one condition being achieved, any one partner -- I've seen partners come and go, and any funding source or major assumption, because these are the things that really can kill a partnership early on. And finally, you know you should think about what happens if the partnership isn't successful and how you either transition this thing to the local population or you unwind it or what happens. And I've seen, I'll say bone yards of partnerships out there that didn't have a plan for if they weren't successful or weren't sustainable -- Micro-grids where the main generators are missing, computers on the site of a school that have no monitors anymore -- so if it's not done right, if it's not thought through -- what happens? And you need to have maintenance of the partnership as well.

So there's a lot of things I could say about what's attracting the private sector. I mean when we meet with our clients, why are they doing this? I've been bounced around every possible part of the private sector you can imagine. So when I'm approaching a large multinational or corporate headquarters I might bounce around to the CSR guy, oh let us introduce you to our foundation. Nope, it's our real estate group. Ah, I think that's our Frontier Markets Investing Group -- and I think it might be our core business, we have a little bit of residual funding left. And you can imagine it's pretty interesting to see this in action when you're actually meeting at the headquarters of a multinational, but I can tell you it happens all the time. And a lot of times that's probably the most important thing to understand is, who is funding this -- is this core business or is this CSR? And we're going to talk a little bit about that on the panel in a few minutes. But if you understand that, you'll kind of know what's behind the company and what's

going to drive the success of the partnership. Is there an internal rate of return, an IRRR in place or this just something that the foundation has some money they want to put at it this year?

Also of course, brand and reputation is critical to the private sector and you can't forget that. So the private sector does not want to be associated with partnerships or PPPs that fail. Or that might, if there is some issues out there with corruption or with things that aren't as -- things that we don't want to talk about -- it's not like you want your brand rubbed through the dirt on that stuff. What's worse than having to take a big write off of a few million bucks is having you brand written up in the Wall Street Journal negatively. And how this partnership went wrong and that's the worst thing that can happen. That can be millions off the stock price.

A licensed stock rate is why many organizations are interested in partnering, corporates. This is because they need to show the government where they're maybe harnessing resources or working to get certain business licenses or certain tax incentives. Basically if they do something good, if they're shown as inclusive in the market, the government will give them the license that they're seeking or the regulatory policy concessions. There's also the long term frontier growth and I truly believe outside of a few markets in Africa that we will see in everyone's lifetime in this room, will see the frontier markets continue to expand much more quickly than the traditional emerging markets or of course the development markets. So really exciting, I see it every day, even with our own company.

Development sector and NGOs, this is going to allow them to improve their livelihoods. A good functioning partnership allows employment. Employment allows people to get better healthcare, access to education, and access to basic services. I don't want people to forget that access to basic services by having corporates enter a

market is extremely valuable to a local population. So corporate supply chains that provide access to fortified food or other medicines and other medical supplies that may not be available, these are all very important. The only way that's going to happen is if corporate comes in there and establishes itself, in many cases products companies that can then distribute goods and services through their supply chains.

Human capital development is also extremely important. This goes into the women's issues and every other part of this is training and creating market relevant skills that can be used to develop a country's economy to develop a country's buying power. This is all around human capital development. If people don't have jobs, they don't have the skills, they'll never be competitive.

And finally the innovation, we're seeing just an amazing amount of inverse innovation now coming out of the developing world. Products and ideas like M-PESA, which is the mobile money transfer system that was developed by Vodafone with DFID and the government of Kenya. I mean the capabilities of transferring money between cellular phones and the concepts that go around with these types of services are truly innovative and they will be able to be leveraged back to the developed world. Whether there's more regulation or other constraints, that's yet to be seen, but the concepts that are propagating themselves and coming up in the developing world are truly innovative.

We also -- we already mentioned the donors so I'm not going to drain that again, but they're looking for leverage. They're looking for private sector skin in the game, and if all is done well probably the hardest stakeholder here sometimes, I'd like to say is the end beneficiary government. They are the beneficiary of growth and societal impact on their populations. But they can also sometimes be the hardest to get a partnership off the ground due to regulatory and policy constraints. And this is one we

spent a lot of time -- you might think -- oh, this is a great partnership, it's going to be between this large products company, this energy company, this donor -- I mean who wouldn't want this partnership in their country?

Believe it or not, working with a very large multinational multi-stakeholder partnership right now, where we have to sell the governments to take our partnership. We're not asking for any money, we're just selling them on the concept of this partnership, which is going to be huge for their economies, which is going to be huge for job growth. But they have other options they say. And if they don't see the benefits, if it's not clear, if it looks too private sector focused, they say they'll move on. So you can't underestimate that you actually have to do some selling to the governments themselves, which is kind of interesting because you don't usually think about it that way.

A couple lessons learned. I'll move on here to, what would be my take-aways from this whole thing? One is vision. Each of our partners needs to share a common vision and provide complementary skills. I mean if you're stepping on one another, if partners aren't seeing the shared impact, the shared value they can achieve together, the partnership probably won't succeed. I also see the fact that some partners tend to do more heavy lifting than other partners. Some partners are a partner in name only, and I don't really think it's often fair and I don't really think it's often successful when this happens, but it happens more often than not where a partner might write a check, or say they're going to be a partner but just kind of ride the teaming agreement and ride the partnership. And I think it's extremely important that everyone take an active and key role in this partnership. And I think it's done by the role that I play, and many others and that is, as an intermediary, as a secretariat -- is companies and other donors and NGOs have a lot on their plate, right? They can't just focus on one partnership. They do in many cases appoint their own partnership leads, but to not have someone focused as

their day job on the secretariat on being the nexus of the partnership ensuring that monitoring and evaluation is being done, ensuring that things keep moving -- it's going to die out. And I can tell you that a lot of these partnerships take a long time to get going. They're extremely hard, and I wouldn't say this if it wasn't true, that stage zero we call it, which is the first stage of a partnership -- it's when it's just a concept. We want to figure out a way to provide medical supplies in a market. Get supplies out to the last mile -- and who would we partner with, and we could name off some names and you know, I'm working on a partnership with stakeholders doing just that. But when you talk about how long does it take to get a partnership like that together, I'm talking years. The concept stage alone can take many, many months, just coming up with a five to ten page concept note, believe it or not. Then you have the teaming agreement. Then you have the partnership agreements. Then eventually you need to figure out who's going to be funding this thing -- what the sustainability is. You have to write volumes of proposals and functional documents and cost estimates. And then finally you just get the right to be a partnership at the end of all that. Now you have to start selling where you're going to have this partnership go. Is it going to be multi-country? What are going to be the complexities of doing that? The world is constantly changing so has the security situation changed in a country, now making it non-viable? Things you don't think about, so if you're not willing to put the time in and the investment and have an intermediary, the partnership is truly just going to be a very small and silo'd initiative.

And then I think from the NGO lens, I think NGOS need to start talking more like business people and I think they're doing that. We recently participated in some training sessions and interaction and we've been working across the sector with our NGOs. By the way we do work with the 30 largest NGOs on the planet through Accenture Development Partnerships. So we've been helping them think about what it

means to be -- what it means to work with the corporate and private sector and essentially what it means to talk business essentially. And many of these guys have a point of their own, partnership officers, their own corporate engagement leads, but when they're talking development, what does development mean? It means building markets, resilience in community, thinking about what that means to a corporate -- creation of jobs and talent that I need to run my organization. Vulnerable communities, vulnerable populations -- a corporation might see that as opportunity, a new market for both skills and possibly a customer base.

Capacity building to an NGO might be building a sustainable customer base. And shared value we already talked about, profit that leads to impact, essentially profit first, impact as an outcome of successful profit. Again I just say that we have to sell locally as well, which is extremely important.

So in conclusion, I know the sustainable development goals are on a lot of minds right now, and the key to the whole PPP is that they're going to be a key to successful STGs being achieved. It's not going to be like the millennium development goals that were very silo'd, very development oriented. These truly will be systems based approaches that will require these partnerships. So now is the time and that's why I think this eight, ten, fifteen years are going to be huge. And the last thing I'll say is that two huge trends that are coming into the sector right now are technology and digital. Accenture right now, 20 percent of its revenues are coming from digital. What I mean by digital, I always think of a digital watch, right? It's basically, it's a combination of analytics and interactive and applied social media and mobility. If you think about an Uber, right, Uber is an entirely technology driven organization. You think of bricks and mortar. Think about an NGO of the future, maybe it looks more like an Uber. It just kind of creates itself and everyone becomes part of that NGO. I think that's going to be huge. And a lot of our

clients right now are saying, how can I harness the power of analytics and big data, to basically take my organization in a much more proactive way to address these development challenges?

And then finally the other huge trend which I talked about earlier is innovative finance. And we truly think this is going to be transformational to the sector. And impact investment, development impact bonds, these are the themes that we're being approached as Accenture right now to be a part of and I really truly feel over the next 24 months you're going to hear a lot about that. So extremely excited about the future of PPPs and the fact that we are very early in the journey at this point and if we do this right we're going to be looking back at some great success, so thank you George and I look forward to the panel.

(Applause)

MR. INGRAM: So we will get miked up and continue the conversation in about one minute.

Well, Roger thank you very much. Not only did you set the context for our conversation, but I think you completed my research for me. I will capture your remarks, I'll go upstairs, I'll expand on it a little bit and next week it'll be done. (laughter)

Let me introduce our panelists. Angela Baker, in blue, is with Qualcomm and she is the Senior Manager for Wireless Reach, which is a program that brings wireless technologies to underserved communities globally, both in the U.S. and outside the U.S., correct? Before she was at Qualcomm she was at the Office of Innovation at the Department of State, and before that she was involved in an international advocacy organization and worked and lived in countries around the world.

Pascale, welcome. Pascale Wagner is Country Director for PCI in Guatemala, where she has lived and worked for over fifteen years and she manages a



portfolio that ranges from health to water, food security, disaster risk mitigation and community capacity building.

Katherine Fritz is with the International Center for Research on Women, where she is Director of Global Health and Development. And she's particularly focused on understanding how gender compromises the health of individuals, communities, and families. And prior to ICRW she was in the academic community.

Thank you all for joining us today. I want to start the conversation with each of the panelists addressing two of the issues that Roger has put on the table, and that is -- what is the interest, what is the incentive for your organization to participate in public-private-partnerships and what are the elements of success. I'm going to start with Roger and you've already addressed those questions, and I want you to ask -- to answer, you've explained to us what Accenture Development Partners is, but what was the incentive for this for-profit company to create this entity where it is pouring in its hard earned cash, and it's actually a cost loss center for Accenture. And so what was the original incentive, thirteen, fifteen years ago for that, and then in putting together a PPP, how do you get -- how do you start getting common agreement around a vision?

MR. FORD: The first part of that question really, why did Accenture create Accenture Development Partnerships -- it's a pretty easy proposition if you think back thirteen years ago, and that is, employee interest. And being able to leverage our scales, which really is our people. We don't have a product, we have people. We have 325,000 of them. And how can we get those people to leverage their skills in impactful ways around the globe? One of the most important drivers to Accenture is being able to attract the best talent.

So back then, that was a pretty novel concept. Maybe it would work, maybe we'd get a few people to come forward and be interested about working on

development project, or having impact. And nearly one thousand projects later, and that's only in 13 years, and essentially thousands of participants -- we see that this is actually a huge differentiator for Accenture, for talent attraction. And essentially when we get these MBAs that come forward today, why did you choose Accenture, why didn't you choose one of our competitors? Well its Accenture Development Partnerships, I want to create something that I can do as part of my career that's integrated, where I can do something that's extremely impactful. Where I can leverage my skills in different ways and get exposed to new markets.

So that's probably the most important thing, what we also realized besides all this attraction of getting the best talent, is also the brand and reputation of Accenture has been skyrocketed because of Accenture Development Partnerships. Google Accenture. You'll see Accenture Development Partnerships very often referenced across all of our industries and what we're doing. And increasingly now, it's become the crown jewel in the fact that our clients -- we didn't think about 13 years ago our corporates being at all involved in the sector, but what I said on the podium was that every corporate out there that is forward thinking out of the Fortune 100 and probably a good piece of the Fortune 500 is thinking about these PPPs. Or at least thinking about how they get involved in development or new markets, or have more impact. So we're in the perfect position now to differentiate our commercial programs by being able to leverage Accenture Development Partnerships.

So don't just think of us as a for-profit, profit making company that's going to maximize your business results and most of our clients hire us just for that reason. But also think of us as a partner that can be with you as you take your corporation in different ways into new markets with social impact. We're there with you. It's truly a differentiator because as a commercial business we compete with many many

other firms out there and to be able to put Accenture Development Partnerships in our proposals and case studies in the back of proposals is why we win bids today.

And to address your second question I would say -- how do you get one of these partnerships started? I think that can come in many different forms and I could probably give you a half a day's worth of discussion around it. But I think it's understanding what the drivers are of some of the companies you're working with and kind of -- there's a certain pulse and it may not be a pulse that you know is immediately out there, but you kind of know what they're doing and what they're trying to achieve commercially. So I spend a lot of my time looking through the Wall Street Journal and many of, like I said, that we already work with -- 90 percent of the Fortune 100 et cetera. But I look for what our clients, which are our commercial clients, are doing. And it gives me ideas to then approach them through our network and say -- can we -- you probably didn't know Accenture has Accenture Development Partnerships -- let's talk. And then we start building those bridges and having those ideas and bringing together the right civil society participants or the right donors and that's how it gets started in my world typically.

MR. INGRAM: All right, thank you. Those of you who are standing in the back, there are a few seats in the front if you would like to come join and take one of them. Angela, tell us a little bit about the wireless reach and in doing that answer the same question I posed to Roger, why? Why does this for-profit company have a separate operation which is designed to bring its services, its capability theoretically to people who can't pay for it, or can't pay for it at least in a way that the company can make a profit? And then talk about your experience and how you -- why Qualcomm and wireless are involved in these PPPs.

MS. BAKER: Absolutely. So I think that, from Qualcomm -- first of all,

just let me -- Qualcomm is the world's largest producer of mobile chipsets globally. So we're in your cell phones, your tablets, your e-readers. Since we're a B to B brand, some people don't necessarily know that, so I just want to make sure. We're totally focused on wireless. We're totally focused on 3G, 4G, and upcoming 5G. From Qualcomm's perspective, we formalize what is called wireless reach which is our corporate social responsibility arm, back in 2006, 2007 with the advent of CDMA technology. And we were looking sort of for that shared value, for that competitive advantage. The CSR arm is directly aligned with business goals and we're very upfront about that. We usually have a proposal process where we solicit proposals from organizations globally. And we say -- the focus of the corporate social responsibility arm is to sell more chips and is to accelerate the growth of mobile phone ownership globally.

We also have a foundation and a corporate giving side which is doing a lot of these social good things as well, but they don't directly benefit the company. So for starters, it's directly aligned with business goals and I would argue that we're not necessarily marketing to people who can't quote unquote afford our technology -- (inaudible) to that mobile space, sort of skipping over the hardware in their homes and everything is mobile. And a lot of people are getting information that way. They're getting services that way. So for a company like Qualcomm -- it is directly in line with these strategic goals and we are looking to go into emerging markets, India, parts of China, Sub-Saharan Africa, places you would think -- where there are fewer people who are connected, but eventually it will not be an issue.

In addition to that, we work in five verticals, so what we call -- so we've got education, health, entrepreneurship, public safety, and the environment. And then cross cutting across all of those are what we call M-Women, or Mobile Women. There's a lot -- there's a long runway for growth here because there's 1.7 billion women in the

world who are not currently connected from a mobile device -- there's 62 and a half million school children globally who don't necessarily have a mobile device. I mean these are long runways for growth for a company like Qualcomm if for some of these might be considered adjacent markets as opposed to the traditional just selling of chips to Sony or LG or companies like that.

So that's sort of how we are looking at it and this is the focus of the work that we do when we go into countries and we do these programs, we do these public-private-partnerships to one, sort of show the need. There has been a lot of research especially for women that says women don't, in some parts of the world who don't handle the phones maybe don't see the benefit of the mobile phone. So it's not that they can't afford it per se, it's that they don't know why they would want one. And so when you look at programs that are you know teaching women entrepreneurship skills -- educating women -- I mean there's a lot of research around a few educated women -- she educates her family and -- so sort of selling some of those resources.

We're starting to move away from that a little bit because women are seeing the value of it, but it still exists in some parts. And so those are the parts of programs that we're looking at. And when we go in -- so where I sit in the company is within government affairs, so we're on the GA side of it. And we work very closely with our business development colleagues. Of course for the new technologies that are coming out -- the new products. But it's important to work with governments and non-profits in the space for a lot of reasons.

One, there's the regulatory issues that a company like Qualcomm faces when you're going into countries, also here home in the U.S. Two, we need to open up more spectrum. Not to get too technical, but so that there are -- there's more ways for people to use their phone and their connections are moving quickly. There might be

some more technical people in the room who can address that but of course those are issues that are regulated by the government and so we need to work with governments and use advocacy platforms about what we're doing in a country or how mobile phones are being used in country by their own citizens and why they need to open up more spectrum.

In addition to that, working with non-profits, usually, or sometime universities or small social enterprises -- because when you do go in a country it has to be within a local context. Right, so we can't go into India and do something in India that we did in Senegal because it's not going to work the same. Right, because you have to localize to the culture, to the content, to the language. So I think that's how public-private-partnerships are extremely important.

So today, we've been around since 2007, Qualcomm has been around for 30 years. It's the thirtieth anniversary this year. We already have 105 programs in 40 different countries in various stages, but those are all unique to that country. It's not like we're taking one program and just replicating it. And often we find that working with the government at the front end allows it to be much more impactful and sort of what Roger was talking about -- building that scalability and that sustainability.

So just a quick example, we've been working in Morocco with mobile ultrasound devices. So working in rural areas outside of Rabat, giving women access to mobile ultrasounds and then the images are transmitted over the 3G network on tablets and smartphones so that doctors in cities can review it. So if it's a clinician that let's say taking the ultrasound but they don't know how to read it, doctors in cities can give an opinion or doctors in other parts of the world can give a second opinion if it's a particularly hairy case, let's say.

And then they can review it, they can make a recommendation based on

that. Because at the beginning of that program we worked with the regional health ministry, after one year of funding the project has now become sustainable and the government is picking it up and funding it. That's a best case scenario. It's very hard to do that of course. And especially when you're working in these issue areas like education and health which governments of course are extremely involved in, you have to bring them in from the get go. Because you cannot do something in a country around health as a multinational company and have the government pick it up at the end of it. You have to sort of bring it in from the get go. So that's kind of a lot of information but --

MR. INGRAM: Thank you.

MS. BAKER: You're welcome.

MR. INGRAM: Pascale, PCI. Tell us a little bit about how public-private-partnerships help PCI accomplish their objectives and their goals in Guatemala.

MS. WAGNER: Thank you, thank you George. I'm going to be taking the field view. I'm going to be giving you a little bit of our view and the feeling how as an organization we're looking at this powerful public-private-partnership and how it might be a viable course.

When you hear a lot about how there is such a stress and pressure from rural areas -- people moving into urban areas and how that is creating that big expansion, the big -- the bigger cities that are being created now represent a problem forward for everybody. For everybody -- for the people that live there, the communities themselves, the municipalities, the countries, their governments and also the private sector and the security issues that can also represent in a country like Guatemala.

When you're in the field you're living it. We're seeing that already. We are seeing the impact of the migration on these cities to the point that some cities, some urban and rural now -- there's a very grey line between urban and rural in certain areas,

because of these big settlements that are becoming cities, and the cities that are surrounded by big settlements, that wished it would be more -- that they would get more recognition and more a name for their cities and what not, so big issues that we're living already in the field. And that is what PCI has been trying to work with communities, finding great solutions to these great problems and also involving these communities in the solution of their problems.

So we see a huge opportunity. We're looking at how these people are working, how are they -- what are their needs, what are their solutions? How do they see their well-being? How do they see their housing solutions being fixed? What are their visions for their communities? And so we've done quite a bit of research in that sense and we work with women -- we work with families looking at what are the resources that they have available. Many of the times people that you meet in these urban areas are people that have migrated from rural areas, so from different rural areas, not from just one area. So there's a whole, a whole issue of a lack of funds, social fabric, social cohesion, that also needs to be attended and understand how that works within the community and within the city.

We've done it all -- research in that sense. So all that community knowledge that we have, that trust that we have created in these communities, the fact that we are very much aware of these issues, what do we present for them, and we work with the communities to find solutions to these issues. They are big issues. And what we can bring to the table when we're talking to private partners. So we work with communities, we work with private partners, we work with the municipalities and ministries and the national governments in trying to make a -- trying to untangle all of these issues in making something positive and something that can be solved. So in a sense, there is that big need -- this is very need driven, the fact that we're reaching out



the private sector. We're currently in different countries in Latin America and Central America talking to big cement companies for example. Which also -- this whole issue of working in these urban areas -- where you have needs for housing, where you have needs for wiring, electricity within the houses and outside the houses. So network, and how the household installation, where you have irrigation issues, water and sanitation, sewage systems that are non-existent, security that needs to be improved, communications to cell phones -- to phones, what not.

So there is such an area of services that are still missing in these communities that we can help understand better, but -- when I don't know that the people are supposed to be doing all the work, so that's when we really need to have to -- to create these relationships to help -- these relationships with the private sector to be able to take these things to scale, to take these solutions to scale and have them at the table working hand in hand with us to find greater solutions and more sustainable and scalable solutions like (inaudible).

MR. INGRAM: Thank you. Katherine. ICRW.

MS. FRITZ: Yes.

MR. INGRAM: Give us a little bit on how ICRW sees the role of PPPs and you just might want to say something about how PPPs can give women and girls more opportunities and advance women's empowerment and rights.

MS. FRITZ: Absolutely, I think it's a great question to ask what motivates an organization like the International Center for Research on Women to partner with private sector companies. We are a research organization -- applied research organization. We do a range of research that helps to illuminate how gender inequality is a barrier to global development goals -- many types whether that be in health, economic development, social development -- and we partner with a great many different types of

organizations, mostly government organizations as well as multilaterals like the U.N. But about ten years ago we started to partner with some private companies and large corporations. And I think -- and I want to just reiterate something that Roger said which I think is really important -- is that, we don't get into these partnerships kind of haphazardly. We get into them because we want to understand how the partnership can help solve a problem.

So the problem that concerns us is women's and girl's well-being, and women's representation, equality, and inclusion in economies. And it became very clear to us about ten years ago that government aid and philanthropy alone was not going to be sufficient to solve this huge issue of women's inclusion in economies. And clearly the private sector was going to have to play a role. And that was very obvious because the private sector is the source of most formal employment of course and all the training and advancement that that brings. They also can link women to markets, which is a huge -- a critical aspect of women's economic empowerment. And companies and corporations can also create products that help enhance women's economic agency.

So these are all things that are very interesting to us and we started to partner mostly in the beginning with corporate foundations and CSR operations in order to see where our mission as an organization was in alignment with the business mission. And we found some of those. We found a great collaboration with GAP, and we've been a partner with GAP for nearly a decade and we are their learning partner and help them formulate and then measure the impact of a program for garment workers in India, that has now expanded outside of India to many countries in South East Asia as well as in the Middle East now. And that's been a great partnership. Increasing I think what we're interested in and it's also thing that you mentioned which is to start moving out of the CSR and the corporate foundations phase and really understand how companies as part

of their business -- core business mission -- are opening up more opportunities for women's economic inclusion.

So those are research questions that we really want to help answer. But because it's important to us as a women's rights advocacy organization, and we understand that this also is a business -- can be part of a successful business model. And as much as -- just one last thing -- as much as I think organizations like mine perhaps are learning to speak in business terms -- I think a lot of business leaders are starting to speak in our terms as well, as a non-profit organization. You listen to many company CEOs now, for example Paul Polman of Unilever and you really get the sense that there is some really visionary thinking there around how business can start to contribute to development goals.

So I think that the partnership aspect is really interesting to us and kind of meeting at some kind of middle where we can really learn from each other and start to influence each other and have a discourse. I think that is expansive for all of us and meets those goals that we have in common.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you. Roger and Angela, let me ask you to talk about something that Katherine just mentioned, and that is the continuum from philanthropy to CSR to core values, shared value. I started this research out expecting to be able to be very clear on the distinction of the three and I range between clarity and less than being clear. You have added to my confusion today Angela, I want you to know, because you've talked about your activity as being part of CSR, in a satellite core business, to me. So if both of you would give me a little bit about this continuum and does it matter where an activity rests? Does it make a difference, particularly from the point of view of impact and sustainable results as to whether or not something is from out of philanthropy or CSR or core value?

MR. FORD: I'll take that one on. Basically I think the actual continuum might possibly be applied to the same program. And from what I've seen, typically the core business and there are different cases of course for every example. But in the cases I've seen, typically the foundation or the CSR initiatives are what kind of starts the stage zero, stage one discussions.

So the core business in often cases does not just go out there and say I want to solve a micro-nutrition problem in a market. Whereas the philanthropy side of the house, the CSR, the applied CSR side is where it usually starts and they might come up with some seed funding to perhaps do a market assessment or study. The problem is, is often you face -- is it a conflict of interest for a foundation of a company and also corporate core business to get involved in the same program. But in many cases we're talking about internally funded programs not foundation funded in the case I'm describing. So what I've found easier is to meet initially with people in the CSR space and have the discussion of what we're trying to solve in kind of a social benefit way but also talk a lot around what I think the business objective, the business opportunity will be. And ask for -- how do we get this off the ground. And typically it's easy to get that discussion going with a little bit of funding from the CSR team.

And that gets us down the road; we start thinking about what the business model might be. We might even go into two or three countries and do an assessment of the market, perhaps put together some early stage business models and a framework for what a concept might be. Once we have that concept, it then might move into a core business capability if the model has enough potential to show a core business return. And I can tell you that, again this is early days -- so we're not seeing a ton of these coming down the pipe where were seeing them turn from CSR initiatives to immediately to core business. So I can tell you it's going to take a lot of CSR

investigation, that brings us to bring in the right partners and do the investigations, and maybe one out of ten, maybe one out of twenty might turn into an idea we can then move down that spectrum from what we would call philanthropy to more tactical, strategic and eventually transformative in nature. So that's what I've been seeing out there.

MR. INGRAM: Angela?

MS. BAKER: I would say, I don't think it matters where the money is coming from as long as it's done correctly. So there has to be sort of purposeful planning. There has to be -- at Qualcomm we take monitoring and evaluation extremely seriously. We have a very robust program for our wireless reach program. But I think that -- I'll give you two quick examples, so one, we've been working since -- there's a 2006 on mobile education, looking at how mobiles in the classroom and always on, always connected devices -- again we're looking at 3G, 4G side, not the 2G side, how that can impact and improve learning outcomes.

So since we've started doing that we've got a lot of great results from programs that we were doing -- kids' test scores were improving, they were becoming more engaged in their learning. We have now spun that off to a business unit. So we are continuing on the CSR side for all the reasons that I've named earlier but we've also spun it off into a business unit that is looking at how can this be a market opportunity for Qualcomm. So as Roger said, they don't always go that way, but sometimes they go that way.

In addition, one of the things that Qualcomm is focusing on -- like a number of other tech companies because there's a huge problem, is STEM, and increasing the diversity pipeline of STEM, so to get more women involved in science, technology, engineering, and math studies -- minorities, traditionally underrepresented areas. Is that going to be a direct benefit to Qualcomm tomorrow? No, we're not going

to see a direct benefit, although a more diverse workforce, all the studies show does allow you to do business better and be more profitable, and there's a lot of research out about that.

But our philanthropy side and our corporate giving side is giving money to programs -- girls who code, Anita Borg institute, NCWIT, a lot of these organizations that are doing -- looking at ways to increase women's participation in STEM. In addition, the government affairs team and the wireless reach team is looking at how we can do actual programmatic evidence of getting more -- early engagement and continued engagement for girls and minorities has been proven to have them study STEM degrees and then get them into the pipeline.

So that's going to benefit Qualcomm in the long run, but it's not going to benefit us tomorrow. But to see, it doesn't matter if -- to me it doesn't matter if the money is coming from the corporate giving side or the social corporate responsibility side, or the BD side -- in the end if more girls and more minorities are studying STEM, then the work then -- in five, ten years, the idea is that we get coming out, the twenty years, the ideas that we get coming out are going to be much more rich and much more diverse. So does that make sense?

I think that it doesn't necessarily matter which agency does it, and again if they're doing it right -- in my opinion for Qualcomm, I work extremely closely with our business development colleagues. Any project I have, they're on the project calls, they're also meeting with the partners, so they're making sure it works from a business case as well as corporate social responsibility case as well as the PR case which is a whole other reason why companies sort of make these types of investments. So I think it's really important to sort of have that coordinated effort.

MR. INGRAM: I've got a question for Pascale and Katherine and then

I'm going to open it up to the audience. Pascale, how do you find common ground when you're trying to put corporate together with business, business with government, with civil society, and you maybe have multiple players -- how do you find that common ground to start off a partnership?

MS. WAGNER: I think for starters, we are working with the same people. It's the -- we are working with communities and the private sector also wants to get the issue of that market as well. I see tremendous opportunities in that sense for the private sector and all of the things that we're doing -- working in the -- as I was saying before -- all the infrastructure work that needs to be in the communities where we're working, this is a great market for private sector. All the --

MR. INGRAM: Let me stop you there -- so do you start at the community level and identify a problem in our opportunity that is of interest to that community and then find the partners who might work on it?

MS. WAGNER: Always start at the community level. We always start at the community level, that's where our work is based on, it's community based; it's based on the needs of the people and serving to these needs. So we always start at the community level, and often when we get to see the magnitude of the problem and realize how big the problem is, we can start doing some -- we can do some pilot project, we can do a lot of research that comes with that as well -- but then in order to take it to scale it's way too much work for a PPO by itself to do, or for the government -- weak governments which often when we work in these countries won't be able to tackle.

So we do need these types of partnerships to take things to scale and to the magnitude and to answer these big problems that they have. It's not for -- it's too much for just one sector to be able to be able to attack. So it usually comes from the ground, but as we design our programs we already have usually partners in mind.

People that we want to bring to the table and we feel that their influence, their contribution will be very valuable for the program documentation and for the results that we're seeking. So it's -- there's a very big involvement from the ground, from the participants in the program. But always from the beginning also involving the sectors that we've identified, companies or their private sector players that we feel could have insight in the issue and also in the resolution of that issue. It's really a -- getting people, getting the different stakeholders at the table, end up getting to reaching a common ground.

MR. INGRAM: Katherine, ICRW is a research institution, so my guess is you know something about evaluation, and it seems to me that evaluation would be a principal mechanism for us to identify the lessons learned and what works. What are your thoughts on how we measure the impact, the success of PPPs and how would we go about undertaking that evaluation?

MS. FRITZ: We can always count on the researcher in the room to say that we need more research. (laughter) So I will say that. But I haven't been to business school, but I know the old business adage that you can't manage what you don't measure and I think that businesses tend to be very good at measuring. But what we see, and we recently, ISRW recently conducted a scan of the top leading largest corporate initiatives around women's economic empowerment and what we actually see there is extremely little evaluation of programs. And so it's a bit curious but I think that one of the things that we're trying to do is of course encourage more evaluation of these programs, but what we also see I think is a lot of companies kind of rushing into the space, for example women's economic empowerment programming -- without having kind of refined their theory of change around what it is they're actually trying to impact. How would they know if they were successful and setting up the monitoring systems that would allow them to see that progress and that impact?



I don't know exactly what's de-incentivizing companies from setting up those rigorous systems in the way that they do collect data about their businesses but it is definitely a gap that we see right now. One of the things that I would say that is very important for a monitoring system for these partnerships is that you have to measure both social impact and business impact. Because I specialize in measuring social impact, doesn't mean that I would say that for these public-private-partnerships to function smoothly and well and for everyone to be incentivized to continue to participate in them, businesses have to know what is contributing to the sustainability and the prosperity of their business. And I think that the science is in its infancy in really understanding how to measure the interplay between social impact and business impact. That's something that interests us a lot as researchers. We'd like to be more involved with that. But there's no playbook available right now, I think to say that this is an M and E system that you would set up to capture all of that. As Roger said, I think as well we're at the early stages of seeing how these PPPs work. But I worry that a lot of opportunities are passing us by to learn from them.

A lot of really large multinational corporations are getting into the space. There are a lot of aspirations around increasing women's inclusion for example in value chains but there is very little measurement of how those programs work and whether or not they're achieving true empowerment or if they are just reaching X number of women in X number of years. And that's what we tend to see more. We see more, we'll reach twenty million women by 2020, or we'll reach ten thousand women in the ten thousand women initiative, something like that. So I think it is something where we could do a lot better.

MR. INGRAM: Well I want to turn the program over to you. There is a microphone that will find you. Please raise your hand and introduce yourself and be

concise because we have limited time. There's a hand at the back. I'm going to take three questions, so a couple other people can put up their hands.

SPEAKER: Hi, thank you, panel for sharing your thoughts; I'm Sid with the Calvert Funds. We're an impact investor based here in D.C.; this question is directed at Angela and Roger, I'd love your thoughts on how impact investors can best engage with multinationals and these PPPs in order to accelerate the change we're looking for in the world. I'd love for you to be as specific as possible. Thanks.

MR. INGRAM: There's a question up here, Madeline, right up here. And thank you for setting a model for conciseness.

SPEAKER: Hi, my name is Ann Johnson; I'm a grad student at Georgetown. I've had the opportunity to work with George on public-private partnership research. My question is, in the social impact space we've had a lot of discussions lately about failure and the importance about talking about failure in order to learn from it. Building on what your comments were just now for all of the panelists, what are some examples of projects that you have been engaged in, partnerships that you've done that have not gone so well and what insights can you draw from those for all of us to learn from?

MR. INGRAM: Good. And a hand right here. In the middle.

SPEAKER: Hi thanks everyone, my name is Ida Germine with Arabella Advisors. We're a consultancy that works with foundations, philanthropists, investors, corporations to increase their impact, social impact. I was intrigued by the comments about having to sort of sell these PPPs to governments and I wondered if you could elaborate a little bit more on the types of questions you get from governments when starting these conversations, pushback you get and what you do to try to build trust?

MR. INGRAM: Great, thanks very much. All right, Angela and Roger, I

think you can start off by giving the gentleman in the back some inside tips as to how he can move impact investing and then we'll move over into some examples of failure if you have those, in dealing with government.

MS. BAKER: Sure.

MR. INGRAM: Go ahead.

MS. BAKER: So impact investing, working with impact investors is not an area that we have delved into quite yet, but we would be open to it. And I think for -- just in my case, so at Qualcomm we have venture capital, there's a whole VC operation and there's also the CSR side and I think both of those groups would be interested in learning sort of, let's say, any impact investor, or you, had specific areas that you're looking to invest in or if there were some specific questions that you had. I think we'd be happy to sort of have those conversations. I'm not sure across the board how to engage with companies although I do find that a lot of organizations and companies are doing a lot more public things around the type of investments they're making. I think to Katherine's point, I don't think we've achieved great yet, but we're getting a lot more questions about what is the impact of this. What is the impact of these dollars that we're spending as opposed to just how many people are you reaching. And just those kind of numbers, and so I think that this is a space that we're going to see more in hopefully. And so that it will become even more important. So I don't know that it's there yet but I think it is going that way. I don't know, Roger, you're fine.

MR FORD. Yeah and you know as I mentioned earlier, impact investing is truly going to probably transform development, at least from a financing perspective which is of course probably the most critical component. And we're seeing the opportunities start to exist and arise for impact investing. The challenge is, is what is the impact investor's tolerance for risk, what the compliance regulations might be for the

particular investment. Kind of what's the driver behind the specific impact investor, are you looking for high rate of return? Is it more patient capital?

So my point is that the opportunities exist and will continue to exist and in fact what we're trying to do now is look at some new innovative financing approached, particularly around how we can almost create portfolios of development projects in specific regions. I'll call it a -- almost an investing hub per se, where an impact investor could get involved rather than at an individual project level, almost at a fund level, and then we could have the hub manage the monitoring and evaluation, manage the progress and ultimately also disperse the risk across a number of programs.

So I think you're right at the time where a lot of these concepts are coming to bear and we would love to sit down and talk to you further and link you in with some of our clients and ideas.

MR. INGRAM: The second question on failure, Roger I'm sure that in the thousand projects that you all have done that there have been some failures somewhere around. And Angela and Pascale, do you all have any experience of going in a direction and beginning to do something to that direction? I don't know how far you took it, and then sort of backing off because you realized it wasn't going to work. Why don't we start with you Pascale?

MS. PASCALE: I just want to say that I cannot think of any failure that we've had so far, but you know as with any collaboration that one gets into, there are moments that you really need to stop and rethink your strategy or make adjustments because you know, you're not working on your own, you're working with partners. And you need to reset or to rethink things over, so yes that happens as you know. You need to take a break and take a deep breath and start making some adjustments. But that's the case with any collaborative effort. And there are different types of collaborations that

would need.

MS. BAKER: So we do have examples of failure, absolutely. I'll tell you about one in Indonesia. So back in 2007, we partnered with the Grimean in Indonesia. And we were looking at a women's entrepreneurship program and giving women access to mobile phones and we put a lot of money down front at the beginning which is not always the best idea. And Grimean put in a lot of money and resources. And we did this whole landscape analysis about where the best place in Indonesia to start would be. Because we wanted somewhere where the mobile penetration rate was there but not too high because the point of it was to give women what we called a phone in a box. So there was a phone and they would buy the kit for their village, take it back to their village and they would let other people in the village use the phone and then they would make profit off it. So it was the only phone in the village and we thought this was great and we thought this would work really well.

So we did the analysis and figured out sort of where the sweet spot was where we could go -- where people were used to phones but they weren't ubiquitous and then we dumped all this money into it. And then by the time we actually got on the ground the mobile penetration rate had outgrown us and everybody had phones. And nobody wanted a phone in a box because I had my own phone so why would I go to my neighbor to use this phone. And we had to -- we had to tell the executives that we dumped millions of dollars into this project and it's not going to work. Right, which is not the meeting anybody wants to have.

And so we had -- as Pascale was saying, you have to be flexible, so you can go in with one intention and you're going down this line, and then you have to take this big swerve. And so what we decided to do at that point was have the women -- I mean to be totally up front, this is a story that has a really good ending for us, so it's a

good way to tell a bad story. (laughter) But what we did was we had the women basically become -- be able to top up minutes to their neighbors by using their phones.

So I have a phone, you used to be you had to go, especially in -- like I lived in Palestine for a while, or the Palestinian territory, and you had to go and actually buy more minutes for your phone, so the women were able to do that from their phones, so people didn't have to walk into town and it allowed them to become profitable -- it allowed them to get the phone they got from the box and actually use it to make money.

Now we've had a couple of iterations from this program and what happened next was there was a job board was invented and the women who had -- I mean there are men and women but it's predominantly women, that have the phones, were able to tell their neighbors about jobs that were available in their towns and neighboring towns and they could market that.

It has become so successful now, there are 15,000 entrepreneurs in it, about 85 to 90 percent of them are female and 100 percent of them are profitable. And they've gone -- people that stay in the program for more than four months have moved above the poverty line -- which the World Bank decides is two, two and a half dollars a day. It became so profitable that it actually spun off to its own social enterprise. So now companies like Dannon and Nestle are doing market research, right, because there are 15,000 women who have access to a mobile device, so it's really easy for a company like Dannon to say we're going to go do market research and we want to push out this survey.

So Qualcomm is no longer involved in that. We're not funding that anymore. That was a case of -- I told you there was a good ending, but that was a case that it started out and we thought we were going in great guns, and then do the research, which is never a good idea, right? Do the research on the front end; I'm sure Katherine

would agree with that. But also you have to be able to change course. So you can't be so hard and fast in your -- steadfast in what direction you were going to take is, that you can't move if it's necessary.

MR. INGRAM: So the lessons there are, do research, don't put too much money in up front, and be flexible.

MS. BAKER: Be flexible I think is key, yes, definitely be flexible.

MR. INGRAM: Roger. No failures in those thousand projects.

MR. FORD: One hundred percent success rate. (laughter) No, so essentially I could give you, I'll call them lessons learned. (laughter) Nothing is ever, you always learn from it, right? So, I'd say a good example for a partnership is one that's actually been quite successful and it's called Project Laser Beam. It's one that we were the secretariat for; it's between three large food companies, the U.N. and Global Gain. And essentially we have served as a secretariat as I mentioned and the whole idea was to address childhood malnutrition. And one of the things that I think was the biggest lesson learned from this is that although those food companies and everyone wants to solve that problem, the market forces versus the NGO forces and interests are at two sides of the spectrum. So if you go after the most vulnerable, most impoverished, most needy populations there's no market. And therefore how can you create a sustainable partnership? So kind of understanding what market you're actually targeting to make sure you can achieve the objectives of both the NGOs, civil society side of the house and the side of the market itself. And then secondly I'd say another learning from that one was the population. The NGOs wanted to go after two years and younger, and the corporate partners were like, we don't market to that audience, we want to go after the parents, the older population. So that led to some friction within the partnership.

I could give you other examples of ideas that we were going to solve

secondary education in Tanzania.

MR. INGRAM: And those frictions in that partnership. If they had been addressed early on when the partnership was being developed, would it have resolved it or would it have led everybody in a different direction and you wouldn't have had a partnership?

MR. FORD: You know that's probably one we could, in hindsight, right, have worked out up front and focused on the right demographics in the right locations and this was a five year program so we had the opportunity to course correct over the five years. But it's also one that is a sine wave over that period. So there were the ups and downs and again if you could stay the path, it led to success.

And I was just going to throw out one more. It was a partnership that we were involved in around secondary education in Tanzania, teacher shortage. The biggest problem there was ownership amongst more than one partnership. We had the government very much on board. They wanted the outcome. They were actually sold on helping them solve this problem but not enough corporate or donor funding behind the program to make it successful. So they had five thousand schoolhouses and one teacher when they needed four per schoolhouse and the funding to do that would have been tremendous. It could never raise up the donor and corporate support to do it, so ultimately the project didn't achieve its objectives.

So kind of understanding how each of the partners have a stake in the game and what they're going to be funding and what they're going to be doing is very very important so that's a learning from that.

MS. FRITZ: The fun thing about failure, and I'm really glad you brought this up, because it's also a unique challenge I think for the private sector because money that's been invested in a program, you may fail and learn lessons from it. I think one of



the higher level questions is how do those failures and lessons be made visible so that others in the sector or in the industry can learn from them. And that's one place where I think the development sector has -- you know, we have platforms for sharing what works and what doesn't. We have ways of convening groups to talk about it and to strategize. And I think for the private sector because of issues around being either proprietary concerns or just wanting to put your best foot forward to the public about what you're doing, that there just -- organically, there aren't enough opportunities to share those kind of failures or lessons learned. And build as you go from them.

MR. INGRAM: And the question of government and pushback, who wants to address that?

MS. WAGNER: Because we work very often with basic needs and basic services that are very variable, we also as PPU's are very careful and very respectful of government guidelines and government policies. So for instance, it makes it a lot easier at times to sell programs or ideas to the government because we already have from the beginning, when we are going into a country or into a community with the health program or an education program or what not, we look at what the government -- what are the plans of the government, what are they attacking this issue -- how we are attacking this issue. So from the beginning our program designs usually already take into account the priorities of that government and what we bring to the solutions very often.

So maybe from our standpoint it is easier for us to sell the idea to the government because we are already taking into account what their government and national plans are already. That for us it might be a little -- we have a different angle and might be more successful at it.

MS. BAKER: I think from a company perspective it is hard for U.S. companies to go into foreign governments and say we can help you fix your education

system. You'll get a lot of pushback for obvious reasons. And so for us when we're working in countries -- and I think that's why it's so important to engage the government from the get-go because definitely, as I said, it doesn't work to start doing something and say -- hey we want to bring you in on this, we're doing this great -- we're totally revolutionizing the way fifth grade is taught in China. Like the Chinese government is not going to react well to that. I mean so I think that that is some of the pushback, like Roger was saying, so you have to sell it, like you have to engage them from the get go because otherwise -- and these are, just as the U.S. government would act that way. The U.S. government would act the same exact way and of course they're promoting local organizations, local companies, all those types of things.

MR. FORD: Yeah, so just that's exactly a great point, is the local engagement is key in selling the government and leading to jobs and kind of getting those jobs engaged into the partnership early. I think that truly is a key differentiator for getting the buy-in of the government. You know, a lot of donor funding isn't unlocked until the government actually says go or selects the partnership, so our donors have to in many cases fund the government which in turn just turns around and selects the partnership. So if they don't say go, then we can't go, and that's the key. And also we've had -- this is a challenge also as it's taken so long to unlock that decision in many cases, the administration of the government has actually changed, so we were right there with the Ministry of health in Mozambique, and there was an election. And then the game changed, so we had to start again from day one. So it's really getting as quickly as possible the engagement of government, showing the benefits, convincing the right stakeholders and then getting someone to make a decision, it's all really, really key. But again, you'd be surprised at how many governments are cautious before they just say go. Especially in places that have been over -- there have been too many PPPs, too many

concepts being tried out; they almost feel like they're a testing ground for new business models and they're getting fatigued. So you need to realize that there might have already been five other tries that failed. They're like, you're the sixth person here -- why is yours going to be different. And we see that in many different countries. So in many cases choosing the right countries that haven't been so over tested with different concepts also is a key.

MR. INGRAM: I'm going to comment on this last conversation, but before I want to give the panelists a warning -- we're at the witching hour, so I'm going to ask you all to each leave us with a parting comment. And my comment on this is the interesting thing about this conversation about working with government and pushback from government, and earlier you gave an example which sounded to me like the government didn't trust the private sector. And if you look at the new set of sustainable development goals, compared to the MDGs, they are very much centered on the role of the private sector and what it can bring for sustainable development. And it sounds like this is a case where maybe those sustainable goals -- that aspect of the sustainable goals are ahead of where reality is with a lot of governments around the world. But Katherine, I'm going to start with you and you can say anything except that we need more research. (laughter)

MS. FRITZ: I'll say something that implies that we need more research. (laughter) I think that this is just a really fascinating and exciting time. I think we have all embarked on a really big experiment which is to see how the private sector can contribute to sustainable development and it's a very creative time. It's encouraging to see these partnerships come together and I think that the -- I guess my parting word would be just that we really examine the word partnership, to really understand what motivates each member of that partner to come together and how we can kind of align

goals and really understand and see each other's perspectives and gain from each other's expertise rather than -- it really has to be shared. I guess that's the end message is that the goals have to be shared. The tactics have to be agreed upon and I think that that is as you said a process. It takes a long time to build but hopefully we'll have some evidence ten years from now when we gather again, we'll be able to look backward and see how this whole experiment played out, hopefully to the advantage of global development.

MR. INGRAM: Pascale.

MS. WAGNER: I want to say that at PCI we are really good partners and it's in our DNA to do partnerships and really believe in partnerships and we've been good at working with partners that we've had so far -- more recently PCI has done the Clinton Global Initiative and we have the specific initiatives that are moving forward through our partners at CGI and the other urban upgrading and the women empowering initiatives and I hope that soon we will have success stories and few failures to share with you.

MS. BAKER: You didn't have any failures to talk about. I would just reiterate I think exactly what Katherine is saying that purposeful planning when you're going into a partnership, whether it's public-private or private-private, but you know bringing in partners that complement each other. Qualcomm, we're a tech company, so if we're doing an education project we definitely have to have a content provider because we're not going to come up with content and create content. So bringing in partners that complement each other I think will ensure sustainability and scalability for the program which is sort of what the private sector is looking at when they're funding these types of programs.

MR. FORD: And finally just building on that I truly feel that we're at the cusp of this true convergence of issues and outcomes between these sectors and we're

seeing it every day. We're seeing it within civil society; we're seeing it with corporates. And I just feel that this next, probably two to three years is going to be critical and also very impactful on where these things are going to go. So I would say this is almost a real time issue that if we look back even a year from now there's going to be a lot of learnings and a lot of great new ideas that are going to drive how these PPPs function and scale and deliver on their results. So I'm really really excited.

MR. INGRAM: George let me again thank you, and Richard for bringing the idea of this panel to me and this session. And I thank the panelists I thought it was a very productive conversation. Thank you.

(Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

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