

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

U.S. PRIORITIES FOR THE ADDIS ABABA CONFERENCE
ON FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Washington, D.C.
Monday, June 15, 2015

PANEL 1: U.S. COMMITMENTS ON DOMESTIC RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:

Moderator:

PAUL O'BRIEN
Vice President for Policy and Campaigns, Oxfam America

Panelists:

ALEXIA LATORTUE
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Development Policy
U.S. Department of the Treasury

ALEX THIER
Assistant to the Administrator, USAID

NORA O'CONNELL
Associate Vice President, Public Policy and Advocacy
Save the Children

PANEL 2: U.S. COMMITMENTS ON DATA FOR DEVELOPMENT:

Moderator:

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

Panelists:

SHAIDA BADIIE
Managing Director, Open Data Watch

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

BETH TRITTER
Vice President, Department of U.S. Policy and Evaluation
Millennium Challenge Corporation

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. INGRAM: Hello, everybody. Is that working? Good.

Welcome. I'm George Ingram, and I'm a Senior Fellow here at Brookings. We're pleased that you have come to this Brookings and Modernized Foreign Assistance Network-hosted event. Brookings, as you know, is a policy research institute, and MFAN is a network of policy advocates working on improving effectiveness of U.S. assistance.

Why are we here today? We're here because we're a month out from the Financing for Development conference, which is really going to lay the basis, the foundation for several subsequent meetings this fall on the sustainable development goals, on environmental issues. And those meetings -- these three together -- will really set the foundation and the direction of development for the next 10 or 15 years.

And what happens in Addis probably will tell us whether or not those sustainable development goals are going to come to reality or not.

We have two panels today. The first one is going to focus on domestic resource mobilization; the second one is going to focus on data. I will moderate that second one.

The first panel is moderated by Paul O'Brien, who's Vice President at Oxfam, is also Co-Chair of the Modernizing Foreign Assistance Network Working Group on Emerging Issues, and is one of the leading voices on the future of development and aid effectiveness. Paul, thank you for being here.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks, George. And I'm mic'd up. Okay. Well, then we're off.

Thanks to all of you for being here. I see a lot of knowledgeable and familiar faces. I do have the pleasure of moderating this great group of panelists -- and kudos to George, who is a great convener, because he gets us all to feel like we are, too -- and to Jill, Mary, and Didae at the Modernizing Foreign Assistance Network, who

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

worked closely with Brookings to put this together. They did a super job. It's well-timed, and I think we all feel the importance of this discussion, which is one of the reasons why I think pretty much every seat is taken.

So, I have the pleasure of -- this is how we're going to do it: I'm going to introduce our panelists all at once; then we'll go straight into questions, both because the room is full of great ideas -- we're not going to do lengthy presentations that seek to educate you so much as try and have a conversation. We'll finish up hopefully with enough minutes to get to hear some of your comments and questions towards the end.

So here to my right is Alex Thier, who is the Assistant to the Administrator for Policy Planning and Learning, leading USAID's policy shop. Before that, he ran the two largest missions at USAID, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Before that, he was at the United States Institute for Peace. And before that -- which is a very useful thing for this discussion -- he actually had to try and work with a government around putting in place the political institutional will to deliver on development in Afghanistan -- as Alexia Latortue, who sits immediately to his right, also has that great overseas experience from a whole variety of countries.

But that was sometime back, because she's now the Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Development Policy at the U.S. Department of the Treasury, where she plays a key role on financing for development issues. She leads their efforts to promote inclusive growth and poverty reduction -- obviously, a key role and great to have her here for this conversation -- and advises on priority reforms and innovating financing proposals for development.

Before that, Ms. Latortue was 10 years at the World Bank, where she was the Deputy CEO in her last job of the consultative group to assist the poor, better known as CGAP. And before that, she worked in a whole variety of countries, which I will not name, but it's great to have that grounded experience.

And over to the far left for you, I suppose --

MS. O'CONNELL: I was worried you were going to say I'm the far right, Paul.

MR. O'BRIEN: There's never much doubt -- fear of that, Nora. Over to the far left is -- no -- Nora O'Connell, who -- it's great to have a strong and eloquent voice from civil society here, who will hopefully engage our U.S. government colleagues in robust dialogue around where we are going, collectively.

Nora leads Save the Children's policy and advocacy work, and has done for a number of years now. Before that, she was a Vice President at Women Thrive. And I've had the opportunity in many different settings -- she's also a coleader of an MFAN working group, and has, for years, been a strong voice in civil society on development policy issues, and is keenly following what goes on, in terms of paying for these goals.

So, it's a great panel; looking forward to getting into it. I'll just say a couple of words to frame it first.

We all know that these sustainable development goals are ridiculously ambitious. It is the want of the wonks in this community to say that 17 goals and 169 targets is not only not the fridge magnet that we were offered with the MDGs, but won't actually fit on a fridge. And then we all complain about how we're ever going to implement this.

But the actual aspirations themselves are not things that many of us question. There is nothing untoward about developing countries insisting that they have goals on industrialization, and energy, and infrastructure. And so what we have now is a very ambitious agenda across the 17 goals.

The question we're here to talk about -- and that everybody will be talking about in Addis -- is, how do you pay for them? And the collective realization of many is that the most elastic form of revenues is the domestic resources of developing countries. Larry Summers likes to quote the IMF report that says from 2015 to 2030, we're going to

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

see \$9.6 trillion a year in growth of domestic resources of lower and lower-middle-income countries. That's an exponentially different level of resourcing than we have with public international finance.

So, the question is how we can harness it. The IMF came out with something really interesting this morning -- maybe we'll get to that later -- on where and how the money should flow if we're going to do that, but that's pretty much the issue. It's the biggest single-flow domestic resources. Will we be able to harness it towards poverty reduction?

And there's really three challenges that I'm hoping these guys get to. The first is, what are we going to do to help countries generate more revenues? Second, how are we going to make sure that those additional revenues get spent in the right ways? And third, it's not just about them; how do we make sure that some of the resources that are created in-country, in the places where the economic activity takes place, where the value's great, how do we make sure that that value actually stays there? And what can we be collectively doing in the development community, and what can the U.S. government be doing?

So, it's those three dimensions that we hope we get to over the course of the conversation.

So, I am going to start, if I may, with Alexia. Here's my question for you, to get us going. The Treasury Department will likely lead -- or will lead -- the FFD negotiations. And I just wanted to get a start -- to get your sense of what you think are the opportunities and challenges in that really important effort.

MS. LATORTUE: Okay. Well, I think the -- thank you very much, and thrilled to be here.

I think the opportunity for Addis is quite phenomenal. The narrative of FFD is very powerful, and it's a narrative that says, we need to and can mobilize a diversity of financial flows to help deliver very -- as you said, Paul -- ambitious

sustainable development goals.

Now I want to spend three seconds on the role of ODA -- Official Development Assistance -- because even though we recognize a multiplicity of flows, ODA is special. It's special for a number of reasons. It's special because of its concessional character. It's special because of its potential to be catalytic. And, frankly, it's special because it's fairly scarce. And so we have to deploy ODA in very clever ways to its most effective use.

And one of the most effective uses of ODA, in addition to being an important financial flow for the most vulnerable countries -- the countries that don't have access to markets, the conflict-affected countries -- is to be catalytic, and to actually lay the groundwork for these other flows -- private flows -- and domestic resources to be mobilized.

And so that's the power of the Addis story. And although it's sort of "the clock is ticking," I remain optimistic, because my very first conversation about financing for development was talking to African leaders who were saying, we must rely on ourselves.

And so within that broader narrative, their own emphasis -- not the North saying this, but their own emphasis -- on domestic resource mobilizations was frankly awe-inspiring.

Now that's one of the reasons why the United States governments -- we have made domestic resource mobilization -- DRM -- one of our top priorities for Addis. We think that if you get domestic resource mobilizations right, it allows countries to frankly own their public policies a bit more. It allows countries to invest in poverty reduction, in reducing inequality. It creates, frankly, a strong compact between a government and their citizens. And that's because it's not -- and you alluded to this -- it's not just about mobilizing the resources, but it's about spending them well. And if that's well-done, you have this powerful compact between citizens and their governments.

And, also, I would say that although domestic resource globalization very much focuses on the public side, I think if the government shows that it's managing its public purse with integrity and will, it actually has spillover effects to the wider community, including the private sector. And so you sort of get a double leverage effect.

Now it's not all roses, because it is hard work to do. And I think, Alex, you'll probably talk about some of this, as well, but to be able to mobilize domestic resources requires political will that's sometimes there, but not always there -- and tough, because, often, the people who end up having to pay taxes -- and haven't paid taxes -- are the political and economic elite. And so you're sort of changing things for them, and they might not want to go along with it.

Capacity is a huge issue. Human resources are a huge issue. You know, the salaries that are paid to people working in the tax administrations is a huge issue to work on -- just even the demographics and the economic environment of some of the countries that we work in is a challenge. So, for example, if a large group are subsistence farmers, how do you start getting to subsistence farmers to really be able to reach them and to tax them?

And then, of course, there's the issue of -- the more global issues of globalization and sort of how international corporations behave that we can also get to.

So, real challenges in terms of doing it well. I think an incredible leaning forward of the countries themselves, saying, we don't imagine in the future relying on aid for our own development. We need aid to help us on the path for sustainable development, but the future -- no one wants to depend on ODA. So, DRM -- central.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great, and really good to see the conversation starting off so insightfully, but also frankly. We're having -- straight to a conversation about whether we have political will, whether we're going to be willing to actually go where the real money may be. And thank you so much for getting us going.

Nora, to you -- I've heard you talk really eloquently about fiscal self-

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

reliance. And I think it's a lovely way to capture what it is we're aiming for. But from the civil society perspective, when the challenges are so great and political will is there at the center, what do you think we're going to head towards, in terms of achieving fiscal self-reliance coming out of Addis?

MS. O'CONNELL: So, I think that's a really key question. And I think one of the critical challenges that we face is something I like to call the "Jerry Maguire" trap. Has anyone here seen the movie "Jerry Maguire"? Raise your hand. So, can anyone tell me sort of, what is Cuba Gooding, Jr.'s refrain in the movie? What does he say over and over again in "Jerry Maguire"?

MULTIPLE: Show me the money.

MS. O'CONNELL: Show me the money -- exactly. So, I think a DRM conversation can very quickly devolve into, show me the money -- and actually lose those other critical pieces that are key to what this whole conversation is about.

And this is a conversation about financing for development. So, I think we have to put in this realm the conversation around fiscal self-reliance within a conversation about enabling countries with their citizens, with the people living in those countries, to be able to drive the development outcomes under the umbrella of the SDGs, but, really, their own vision for what they want for themselves.

And so I think one of the things that we're seeing for the first time that is really exciting is, we're seeing this political consensus -- you know, not globally, but within countries in the developed world, in the developing world, around a shared agenda around domestic resource mobilization being at the center. And I think that is one of the real bright spots, as Alexia talked about.

But I think there's also the capacity challenges that she talked about are really huge. And things that we don't want to see left off the table in that are -- we want to see the focus on increasing the government capacity to raise money. We do need more money, but we do want to make sure there is a very strong focus on expenditures

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

and on the accountability piece of it, because the citizen-state compact where the people, you know -- we use the word "citizen" broadly, in terms of global citizens, but there are refugees in-country. There are a lot of folks who don't have legal citizenship, but still have a right to development in those country contexts.

So, really, that compact really needs to be driven, which means civil society needs to be active and at the table. And we want to make sure this doesn't just become a government-to-government or government-to-U.N.-to-government conversation.

And I think that if you have that, and if that's one of the things that comes out of Addis, then you're really talking about a transformational conversation, because you're really talking about how these entities relate to each other towards this shared outcome. And that's what we really are hoping to see -- that Addis is going to be the beginning of a conversation that's going to tackle some of these challenges.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. Thanks, Nora.

So, Alex, to you -- at a number of previous conferences -- I'm thinking the (inaudible) conference, even Paris -- those of us who were doing advocacy on this had the feeling that the U.S. was not necessarily at the center of the party. I remember arriving in Addis and seeing the USAID Administrator at the time frankly surprised by some of the things that other governments had been trying to work out as potential key deliverables going in there -- and doing a great job, but really on her feet at the time saying, so how is the U.S. going to show up now?

One has the sense, if you're watching this, that the U.S. is playing a different role going into this conference -- that there's an initiative that is being fomented, that the U.S. government is one of the key players trying to make it work. I've heard the term -- I don't want to steal your thunder, but -- "Addis tax initiative." I don't know what it is. I'd love to hear a little bit more. I'd love to hear, what is the U.S. government doing? Am I overstating the role -- and what is it?

MR. THIER: Well, I was largely hired to be the center of the party. That's actually my real title. But, no, thank you; it's great to be here.

So, I think that's right, and I think it goes back to the extremely eloquent opening that Alexia began with -- that I think when we step back and look at what was possible, what was on the agenda, what was going to move us beyond Monterrey and Doha -- a couple of things for us really rose to the top, as a government.

And domestic resource mobilization really became one of the top among them. Part of that was because, as Alexia already said, we got this tremendous feedback, not as a Northern-sponsored initiative to relieve ourselves of the burdens of paying for development -- which is something that has come up -- but, rather, as a fundamentally driven-by-developing-countries agenda to want to own and increase their own resources.

And perhaps, most importantly of all, to "Jerry Maguire," when you look at the money, what you find is that, by far, if you are serious about wanting to go from billions to trillions, the path is about domestic resource mobilization, plus the path of creating enabling environments for inclusive growth. And those things are very tightly and closely interrelated. Many of the steps that you would take in terms of citizen engagement, citizen accountability are similar sorts of steps. And so this -- it's emerged as a very powerful agenda from all sides.

So, seeing that and realizing the opportunity, we first turned our gaze inward, and we did an assessment of all of the initiatives that the U.S. government currently has going on domestic resource mobilization. And we created a catalog for this. There have also been -- we have done, as the OECD has also done in the last couple of years, an assessment of return on investment for these types of initiatives.

And the impact is striking. All of these programs have not been perfect, but if you look at the growth and the potential growth in domestic resources, that our dollars invested yield a very substantial return in dollars that are available to spend on

development.

And so that got us to thinking, both, how do we do more ourselves as a government, if this is such a worthwhile investment, and how do we join together with others to grow the pie higher, I think, as our former President said? And it's working.

So, we have been engaged in a discussion, putting together an initiative called the Addis tax initiative that basically has three components to it.

The first is principles. One of the interesting things when you look at all of the work that's done around the world on tax, there's been a lot of interesting stuff -- good work, good advances, statements coming out of G7 forae, G20 forae, and so on.

And so, in some ways like the Open Government Partnership, putting some principles down on paper -- things that both of the panelists have already talked about -- about citizen accountability, talking about, you know, this sounds silly until you really think about it, but sort of customer-focused approach -- because one of the biggest problems with domestic resource mobilization anywhere in the world is making sure that taxpayers are actually willing to pay their taxes -- and why might they not be? If you don't believe that the government is going to put that money to good use; if you don't see the delivery of basic services.

And so you have to build a virtuous cycle, particularly in countries that are not well-accustomed to having a broad tax base.

What we call in this country progressive tax systems -- you don't just one-tax systems that are going to focus only on one particular group versus another. You want to make sure that it's being done in a way that benefits the poor.

And so all of those principles are very important to put on the table.

The second part is additional resources. We and another -- many of our other donor partners believe that there is room to grow the amount of resources that are invested in domestic resource mobilization. So, we are part of a band that is convincing others to put a substantial increase in investment through ODA on the table for Addis --

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

that we will invest in substantial increases in capacity, in citizen engagement -- the sorts of things that are necessary to enhance.

And then the third thing is coordination -- because if you've ever worked as a donor or in these circles, one of the things that you know is that even when donors do a lot of something, that doesn't mean that they're necessarily doing it well -- or in a well-targeted and focused fashion.

So, between the major donors and the international financial institutions, civil society groups, and the governments that we'll be partnering with, we want to enhance the coordination, so that everybody has a sense of what's going on in the sector, what's working, where, and why, and how we can increase that.

And I think with all of those things on the table, there's the potential to manifest one of the most important ideas that is going to be part of development finance for the next 15 years, and hopefully advance the field, and, ultimately, substantially advance the amount of resources that are available for development.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. Okay. So, I'm sure that will raise some questions.

But Alexia, I'll put it back to you. What do you think is going to be the elements of the policy and capacity environment required to make this initiative work -- and DRM more broadly?

MS. LATORTUE: Thanks. And maybe just -- if I could just piggyback on something that Alex said or -- I think the sort of core driver behind the Addis initiative is the concept that a country that is serious, and that has the political will, and has been interested in truly improving its ability to mobilize domestic resources, has the partner to work with -- finds the technical assistance in return. So, that's sort of, I think, the heart of the initiative.

So, how does that sort of operationalize itself? I think the first thing is really just having a really sound diagnostic of what the challenges are in a particular

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

country -- because it's very different contexts. And oftentimes, we see countries that sort of go to an international conference on DRM or on taxes and say, okay, well, that's the thing I need to do now -- or, everything I need to focus on is about base erosion and profit-sharing -- without necessarily actually doing the diagnostic of, in their country, their system, what do they need to focus on? So, I think the diagnostic bit is actually really, really critical.

And I think we have a responsibility as donors -- we sometimes also focus on the easiest little thing that sounds nice and can do a training about this -- that maybe is not getting to the most fundamental challenge a country actually faces on the issue.

Then the second is then, okay, so if you have a dialogue -- then, again, tailor and sequence the reforms needed for that particular country. So, one of the favorite things is, let's get a new IT system. Everyone wants sort of to get the new IT system. But, actually, the work of figuring out the human resources -- do we have the right people at the right educational levels with the right incentives -- you know, to actually be able to use the information that the system might produce if we get the system in -- sometimes, we don't think about those things. I think the sequencing of reforms is another really important bit.

Political will -- I'll just reemphasize again just how critical that is, and how critical it is to have that over different regimes, right? So, with change of governments, we sometimes sort of go backwards before going forwards again.

And then very much the piece on -- we want to look at not just getting money in and not defining success on DRM as how much revenues countries are able to generate, but very much, how are they spending the money they're able to generate -- and upfront building in this definition of success to include the plans for a public -- for smart, pro-development public expenditure. I think it needs to be thought about upfront, not once the money is sort of already in the bucket.

I touched on human resources already, but I guess I feel like I have to emphasize that times four, times five to the exponential power -- because it really is a real challenge that governments grapple with, you know, and they have pay scales that make, you know, corruption, you know, sort of very easy to be rife -- and their real question -- it's not just that, you know, people are inherently bad. I think these are real challenges.

For example, in Honduras, we saw that with every single new government, you know, everybody would be changed out in the tax administration and the customs bureau, and you had farmers coming in, God bless them, to, you know, be tax administrators. And so there are real challenges there.

And then maybe my final point will be, I think we have to spend special attention to those countries that are the natural resource-rich countries -- that actually probably make the numbers on domestic resource mobilization look great, because, you know, there's a lot of money being generated. But frankly, on the spend side, it can be very disappointing, and, frankly, almost, in my opinion, criminal -- so I think a special attention to countries that are rich in natural resources, as well.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great.

So, Nora, what do you think? You've just heard the U.S. aims to lead going into Addis. It's going to put something on the table, along with some other governments. Alexia says it's going to take good diagnostics people, and to know where the wealth is -- and potentially lost. What should civil society think about these aspirations?

MS. O'CONNELL: So, I mean, I have to say, it sounds great. So, just would love a lot more detail -- no, no, no. I would love to see more. But I think it actually sounds great.

And a couple of things -- like, one, I think, you know, any aid partnership -- you want to see it reflect all these principles of aid effectiveness that we've been talking

about for the last, you know, 10 plus years. And I heard you talk about the importance of country leadership on this. I heard you talk about the importance of coordination among the donors that is important in every kind of aid project, but, I think, particularly when you're talking about, you know, reforming the tax and expenditure systems at the country level.

And I heard you talk about the importance of citizen engagement on it. So, I think you hit a lot of the key things that we'll be looking for more detail on this.

I guess to, you know, contradict myself, I guess I would ask the "Jerry Maguire" question -- the "show me the money" question -- like, we want to know how big this is, and how much money is going into it, and hope that it is enough to be meaningful in the places where it's going to be piloted.

And I would say it has really symbolic importance, right? So, there's an element of size, and scope, and scale. But no matter what, I think that this is a critical thing to be putting at the center of the financing-for-development conversation. So, I think it's great to have it out there, but we'll be looking for a couple of things in it.

One -- is the whole greater than the sum of its parts? So, whatever this aid initiative and partnership is, will it actually -- is it going to be sort of a new standalone thing, or is it actually going to leverage all the work that's being done around transparency? Is it going to link to the initiative on public financial management? Is it going to link to civil society capacity-building initiatives that are all underway?

And if it becomes a way to coalesce those other pieces, then I think it is potentially much bigger than actually its component parts. So, we'll be hoping for that.

The other thing that we'll be hoping for is, Addis is obviously a moment of big visibility. But this is a really technical conversation, and what's going to happen after Addis? Is this going to sort of go back into the technocratic woodwork, or is this going to be a kickoff of a really critical dialogue about development? And is this going to be the start of something that is going to bring on more money, more initiatives, more teeth,

more partners along the way?

So, a lot of us have been calling for there to be actually a fiscal self-reliance summit that would be a promise made in Addis -- that would be a highly-visible moment, that would actually be a moment to come together for countries that have had the time to kind of digest what this initiative is, and make country-specific commitments about how they're going to move forward on DRM -- to be able to dig deeper into some of those top political negotiations that may not be reached in time for Addis, and to keep this issue on the public agenda as the issue that's really at the core of enabling the development agenda we all want to see happen.

So, we're really hoping that this is the spark that is catalytic, rather than a flash in the pan.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. And if you could just speak to Nora's questions and concerns -- but I want to put a slightly finer point on the "show me the money" thing, because many of us, Nora included -- and George and others -- have fought for years to free up the U.S. government's development money so that it can be invested more in strategic and flexible ways through local institutions that do show that political will.

And so we've now seen a little bit of progress in how much money can be invested through local institutions and so on, so forth. But what we would hate to see is that the money for the Addis tax initiative comes from the buckets that we've managed to see freed up for strategic investments through local institutions.

The big fear anytime there's a new deliverable -- and, I have to say, particularly from the U.S. government -- is that the money will be taken from the wrong pot, and it will actually just be -- instead of being additive, it will be potentially even a net loss, as money's taken from something that we loved to something that now we feel we have to do.

So, Alex and Alexia, can you say more -- a little bit about how we

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

guarantee that this supplements the U.S. government's ability to be investing with and through local institutions?

MR. THIER: Well, let me say a couple of things. I think that a really good example of this actually came up recently, when Secretary Kerry announced that we would be utilizing about \$63 million of PEPFAR funding for what we're calling an even broader kind of concept of sustainable finance.

When you look at something like the investments that are being used to create an AIDS-free generation or to get 100 million children reading -- some of these really big, important agendas that the U.S. government has invested in -- and, obviously, the world more broadly -- one of the questions that we always ask ourselves is, how do you sustainably finance these really big, important investments?

Now part of that, clearly, is around the boosting of domestic resource mobilization, and putting every country on the same path that we ourselves have been on, which is having those resources to invest in their own population.

And there are multiple things that contribute to that conversation, but what was really important about the PEPFAR announcement is that it means that we are thinking about, how do we take things that we are doing, investments that we are making, and ensuring that this agenda is not something on the side, but it's fundamentally aligned with these broader-term goals of ensuring that our development investments and the things that we put all of these resources into -- and, again, it's not just about money; it's about huge investments in capacity in these governments. It's about citizen engagement. It's about policy work -- also are backed up by the work that we're doing on domestic resource mobilization.

And so those things really have to be integrated. It also creates additional potential resources so that you're investing in a way that is likely to create sustainable finance in the future -- and not just for the dollar that you're trying to spend today. And I think that that's really important.

You know, the way our government system works, our Congress provides us with an annual budget. And it is the work of those across the government to be simultaneously working on many budgets at one time, because it is an annual budgeting process -- but, also, to be looking at, how do we do two things, right? How do we advocate for the greatest amount of resources that we can put towards the things that we want to accomplish, and how do we advocate for the allocation of those resources?

And that's a dialogue that goes on intensively every year within the administration, and between the administration and the Congress.

I think that we are very confident that our increasing investments in domestic resource mobilization is a priority for the United States government. It will be a net positive for -- the direction, frankly -- it's not about domestic resource mobilization, but the direction that development policy and development finance more broadly has gone.

I mean, we talk about how we leverage our resources much more than we used to. And if you look at something that's different from this conversation, like Power Africa, a lot of what we are trying to do with those resources that we make available for Power Africa is to leverage much greater pools of resources.

And so for us, the question simply cannot be about whether there will be permanent -- and, frankly, sometimes unrealistic hopes for some dramatic increase in official development assistance going forward into the future.

What we need to do is to think about how we use our resources to increase the other streams. And I think that this decision for us with our partners to make substantial increases in the resources available for domestic resource mobilization will have an important -- and ultimately expansive -- effect on local systems investment, on the amount of reserves that's available for development overall.

MR. O'BRIEN: Great.

So, Alexia, I don't know if you had any other responses -- either to build on what Alex said, or to Nora's comments, or I can switch gears.

MS. LATORTUE: Maybe just very, very quickly -- one thing on the PEPFAR example -- which I think is really powerful -- we talked about coordination among donors, but the PEPFAR example was also about -- at a country level, if you're looking at domestic resource mobilization, it can't just be Ministry of Finance, tax -- Ministry of Health needs to be thinking about this. You know, there needs to be coordination across the different ministries, in terms of having that vision. So, I just wanted to make that point.

And then let me just -- you know, I'm getting myself probably into trouble here, but let me be frank. I mean, funding for assistance in this current -- for development assistance in the current context of the United States is not really easy to get. I mean, so I think we just have to be really frank about this. There are a lot of good people in this room, I think, advocating for that to change, but it is an uphill battle.

Now the silver lining of that is, we are bringing, I think, collectively the USG to (inaudible) for development as much creativity as we can, and as much coalition building as we can -- because we can't just say, let's throw money at it, right?

And so that goes to your point about, is what you're doing with the initiative, you know, one component, or is it linking the components? And, actually, it very much is linking the components, because the sort of easiest -- if you're flush with money -- thing to do is, create some big fund, put money in the big fund, and go solve the problem.

But we know there are limitations to that approach, by the way. We've seen it over, and over, and over again, including with whether or not countries were well-prepared to handle the Ebola outbreak, because their health systems were not -- anyway.

So, I think the silver lining of money is hard to get -- even though we are looking at trying to get it to be additive on the initiative -- is, it really ties all the different pieces together.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. And at some level, it goes back to where

you started this conversation. A lot of it is the quality of the investments that we choose to make in strengthening the institutions that are going to need to manage things in the long term.

I was struck -- I am going to switch gears for you now -- and, Alexia, I'm going to come back to you -- but I was struck this morning. The IMF came out with a report this morning that said, okay, here's something we're now seeing from cross-country studies -- you invest additional dollars in the top 20 percent of an economy, and you actually see a negative growth correlation. You invest money in the bottom 20 percent of an economy, you see a positive growth correlation -- so basically saying trickle-down economics -- very suspect; bottom-up economics is starting to actually show real numbers.

That was a nice -- I mean, the IMF, okay (inaudible). So, we're being hit with these numbers that are increasingly proving that you invest in helping strengthen the institutions that can manage these monies more effectively. The money may be out there, and domestic resources look like potentially the largest pot.

But here's the way I want to switch gears a little bit: There's a very interesting conversation going on in New York right now, preparing for Addis. But there's a real difference of opinion between what the donor countries think is most imperative -- which is, they want to see commitments from developing-country governments to address many of the issues we've been talking about -- strengthen those revenue and expenditure systems; make real commitment to robust national development plans; and so on and so forth.

But here's what a lot of developing-country governments are saying: We're losing our wealth. Too much of our money is actually leaving the places where value's being created -- where our economies cannot thrive, and we cannot build up those domestic resources if we don't have a greater ability to keep wealth here.

And that's not a domestic capacity issue; that's a global regulatory issue

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

around taxation. It's about the fact that either it's because of face erosion or profit-sharing -- these wonky words. You are able, if you are a corporation, to remove profit from a country, pass it through a tax haven, and ultimately make sure that you pay as little taxes as possible, leaving the country which held the wealth in the first place with not enough domestic resources.

So, they want a conversation about whether we can have an intergovernmental body that better regulates taxes -- that we move with more seriousness as a global community, to make sure that a fair share of taxes are paid where value is created, where economic activity occurs.

That's a difficult issue for many donors to address. So, I'd love to hear our panelists talk a little bit about this. I don't know who'd like to go first. I know you're all grappling with it in different ways. I mean, for your side of the equation, it's, how do you strengthen as a development institution USAID? How do you strengthen governments to better negotiate those deals with corporations, and to be more effective in making sure that more of the wealth stays in countries? What should USAID be doing?

Alexia, for you, it's, where does the -- how does the U.S. deal with that? Maybe I could start with you a little bit, and, Nora, you tell me what you think.

MS. LATORTUE: First of all, the G77 would give you an award, because you represented their views very, very well (inaudible) have done well, and I spent about four hours of Saturday in New York, discussing these very issues.

Listen, I hope you remember that I mentioned this in my very opening comments when I talk about the challenges. So, multinational company tax avoidance is part of the problem. The U.S. government completely has acknowledged that, and is working very actively on that.

I think in terms of the newer -- and I'll come back to what we're doing on this in a second -- but I think in terms of the New York conversation -- you know, it is -- New York is quite politicized, and so there is this sort of tendency of, let me focus on this

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

one bit -- just the multinational tax avoidance issues -- donors and -- you know, let's just focus just on capacity issues at the domestic revenue administration level. The reality is, you need all of these things to be improved on.

And so the USG's position is, we need to work on custom administrations and domestic revenue administrations -- and on, you know, challenges with multinationals -- all of the above -- that an undue emphasis on one would not be helpful. And, by the way, long-term, the fundamentals you as a country -- your fundamental tax system is something you really want to have, if you're building for the future. So, you should really also pay attention to fundamentals.

So, the debate -- the honest debate -- not the political debate, but the honest debate is just a question of emphasis, I would say. And we think it's all of the above, but sometimes it's a little glamorous to focus on the multinationals, first and foremost.

But to show that we really are committed to also working on the multinationals, there's frankly a lot of work being done and a lot of mechanisms that exist to work on this. So, obviously, the World Bank, the IMF do a lot of work in this area. There's the G20 and the OECD base erosion and profit-sharing work, of which we're intimately at Treasury -- I have a colleague who lives this stuff -- very active around that, including working particularly hard now to reach out to developing countries so that they could be part of the discussion and creating toolkits for countries to really be able to implement some of the recommendations coming out of the BEPS work.

There's a global forum that also exists on transparency and exchange of information for tax purposes, you know, that has 126 countries on equal footing represented at that forum, talking about how to implement some of the standards around transparency and international tax norms. They talked about negotiations. There's capacity around negotiating international tax treaties. So, there's a ton of work. I'm saying there's perfection -- because, clearly, there's still a lot of problems out there.

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

But our sense is that the mechanisms are there. The work is ongoing. We have to continue to pursue it actively, but it's there.

MR. O'BRIEN: Great. Thanks for the thoughtful answer.

And if I could ask both of you to be sharp, because we're going to try and get to the audience, and we're about 15 minutes left. Alex, do you want to go next, and then we could let Nora offer a civil society reflection?

MR. THIER: So, I'm just going to give an example.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah.

MR. THIER: I was in Ethiopia recently, and Power Africa is working with the government of Ethiopia to try and start a geothermal project. And one of the most interesting things that we have discovered in all of this was not that there weren't private-sector companies out there that are interested to make these sorts of investments -- and not that the government of Ethiopia wasn't interested in trying to create this investment.

The government didn't have the type of capacity that it needed to be able, at a political level, to be comfortable that they were getting the right kind of deal. And so it creates this huge kind of bottleneck. And I've seen this in country after country -- where they actually want to move forward with these sorts of things, but the capacity, as you say, to make sure that the revenues are being shared in the right way, that the deals are on the right terms, are actually what they need to be.

And so we ended up investing in transaction advisers who are given to those governments, because they have to be working for the government. The government has to feel that they are their advocates. They are the person working for them. They can advise them on what might be the best deal, and then the government can be at the table to try to get the outcome that it wants.

And so it's important to remember that it's not just these sort of broad ideological questions; that it often really comes down to practically people feeling as though they have the understanding and comfort levels in what are extremely

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

complicated systems and negotiations, to be able to come up with an outcome that they believe in, that they can defend to their populations, and that they will ultimately be able to benefit from.

And so our ability to give them some of the resources to invest in their own capacity can be one of the critical things that makes that difference.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great.

Nora, do you buy it?

MS. O'CONNELL: Well, what I would say is, I think there's a couple of things I think we need to keep in mind.

And one is -- I think both you and Alexia talked about the political challenge. But I would say, you could also flip it, and you could see a political opportunity. And that's what we've been talking about -- the summit on fiscal self-reliance is a chance for that political opportunity -- because anytime you have a negotiation, each party asks the question, what's in it for me?

And what's great in this is, actually, there's something in it that each side wants from the other side out of this conversation. The G77 wants more conversation about the corporate side. The donors want more conversation about, what are you going to do to finance your own development? So, you actually have a space where there's something everybody wants and has an incentive to come together.

I would even add the private sector to that, because I think we can't forget that, actually, development is good for business. When you have good development, you have a healthy and educated workforce. You have active consumers. You have functioning and efficient infrastructure. I mean, you have political and economic stability. All of these things, writ large, are good for developments. So, there's actually something in the private sector to gain from this, as well.

So, I think what we have to do is keep crafting that space for people to come together and push that conversation forward. And there is a chance -- especially if

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

we focus on some of the things -- the big negotiations, yes -- but even things like transparency and beneficial ownership, where there's more that can be done. And these are incremental steps.

We could keep pushing on these things now, and keeping the conversation going -- because I think this is a long game. But there's room for progress.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great.

Well, I won't thank you all yet, but you've heard some really thoughtful and frank comments. Let's get some questions.

Right here, we have two. So, I'll start behind, and then here -- and then we'll do Jim. And if we could do the person at the very back, then, after that. Okay, yep.

MR. COONROD: Great. Hi.

MR. O'BRIEN: And if you could, guys -- I know many of you. You're very thoughtful and eloquent, but if you could actually ask a question, that would be much easier to moderate.

MR. COONROD: Great. I'm John Coonrod, with the Hunger Project, and I have a question about decentralization.

So, ODA, in general, is a centralizing force. Building up structures at the national level doesn't necessarily build the structures that will devolve resources to the county level, the subdistrict level, where citizens actually can hold people to account. So, I'm wondering what you see coming out of Addis, in terms of that gap between local governance and the central government.

MR. O'BRIEN: Great. And take a look at the last paragraph of the DRM section on that, as well, if you're curious.

Let's go right in front of you, and then we're going to go to the very back, and then we're going to go over to Jim.

Hi. Please introduce yourself.

MS. SEGERO: Good afternoon. My name is Rosemary Segero. I'm a

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

President of an organization called Hope for Tomorrow.

First, before I ask the question, let's take a moment of silence for our good friend and scholar, Randy Khomeini, who used to be here. We'll miss him dearly, and let's take a second of moment to honor him before I ask the question.

Thank you.

As I've listened to you on civil society -- and what are you going to do -- or what information do you have -- I focus on the rural areas of Kenya and Africa. Have you going to talk about the civil society, looking at farmers in the rural areas, small businesses in the rural area? You talked about refugees. Refugees live in a terrible way. They need to be resettled from where they are living to a better living standard in development. What are we going to do? Looking at civil society, coordination, collaboration, basic -- we -- when we applied to go for the conference, we didn't hear. How are we going to be part of this development?

MR. O'BRIEN: It's a great question. Thank you. So, we are going to talk about something outside of the capital cities, and how does it actually reach, yes, the rural poor.

Thank you.

MR. FREEMAN: Lawrence Freeman -- I work at the Africa Desk at Executive Intelligence Review. I've been involved in development policies for Africa for several decades.

I think infrastructure is the key to investment and changing Africa. And I was very happy to see that Chairwoman Zuma announced in a 2065 initiative high-speed rail trains crossing Africa. Water, energy rail -- this is the key.

But one thing that was left out of the discussion is a different paradigm. It was brought up in what's called the zero platform, I think, for Addis -- which is the AIB -- Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank -- the BRIC's new development bank. These are infrastructure banks, not for money but for credit -- long-term credit to build the

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

infrastructure in Africa. And this also includes the Silk Road Fund, which is almost up to a trillion.

If you look at Addis, their infrastructure is the most impressive, and it's coming from internal -- but also external -- help for development. And the United States and the West is out of this area.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great -- great question. Has the game changed with these new financing vehicles, and are we still having a relevant conversation?

Jim, please.

MR. MICHAEL: Okay, thank you. This is very interesting and very encouraging.

MR. O'BRIEN: Introduce yourself.

MR. MICHAEL: Jim Michael -- I'm a consultant, and have worked on these issues, in and out of government, for a long time.

I was struck coming to this meeting by the question of, what's new? Because this subject was emphasized at Doha. It is in the Busan Partnership declaration. It has been in numerous IMF and OECD studies for years.

And it seems to me that Alexia has hit the point here that it really is getting beyond words in an outcome document to having a plan for coordinated efforts by developing countries and external partners to make it happen. And this really, to me, is the big question for, what can you accomplish at Addis that allows something to be set up to implement this? And there's a host of issues.

You know, you're going to get into -- in the next panel, you're going to get into transparency and data -- but the data is terrible. And there are, you know --

MR. O'BRIEN: That isn't a good setup for the panel. So, everybody needs to stay.

MR. MICHAEL: So, there's a lot of things to be done. And getting more words in an outcome document is the beginning, not the end. And I just would like to

hear what your plans are for making it happen.

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, three great questions, which were insightful comments in themselves. I'll ask you to speak to one of them. And, Alexia, it seemed most obviously that you might want to talk a little bit about how the U.S. government is thinking with these new major financing instruments coming and focusing on infrastructure -- two questions kind of around the decentralization -- rural area -- and Nora, what's important that's new coming out of this?

Alexia?

MS. LATORTUE: So, obviously, infrastructure is hugely important for growth, for jobs, for productivity, but, also, we sometimes don't make the pro-proof argument for infrastructure enough -- for delivery of the basic services that are so critical to the inclusion agenda that we have.

So, has the game changed? I think the game is evolving. The multilateral system has always evolved, and now it's evolving, with particularly high speed, with the entrance of these new players.

Listen, I think saying the U.S. is absent is incorrect. I think the U.S. has less money than China at this time; that's a fact. But we're working very closely with the Chinese on the Asian infrastructure bank, to make sure that we don't have this infrastructure -- that we have quality, sustainable infrastructure, and we're having very good dialogues directly with the Chinese on this.

The U.S., as you know, are -- is the number-one, or two, or three shareholder in all the major multilateral development banks and the World Bank, and a lot of what they do is infrastructure.

For example, the Asian development bank -- about 65 to 70 percent of what it does is infrastructure. It just passed in its annual meetings in May, where I was, a massive reform with U.S. support to combine its concessional and non-concessional lending window that has enabled it to boost its lending capital by 40 to 50 percent -- so

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

from about \$10 to \$11 billion a year to about \$17 to \$18 billion a year. A lot of that -- not all of it -- will be for infrastructure.

And so I think there will -- I would see this as an opportunity to work with these new players, to see how the new players are collaborating with the existing institutions. And we're all trying to work really hard to sort of optimize the balance sheets of the current system, to make sure that they could deliver as much as possible in a sustainable way.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. Thank you.

The whole question of decentralization in the world --

MR. THIER: Well, I'm just going to give an example.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah.

MR. THIER: Because one of the most interesting ways in which we have been starting to think about domestic resource mobilization and the connection between resources raised and direct action is at the municipal level -- because, as we've all experienced in our daily lives -- and it's true around the world -- municipal governments are often closest to their people. They, almost everywhere in the world, even in the most highly centralized systems, often have some revenue-generation capacity, and they are often the last to get the sorts of resources to be able to invest in them.

And so while it is still ongoing, we have USAID's first-ever bond guarantee with the city of Dakar, Senegal, that we are now negotiating, where we are going to use our resources to guarantee -- I believe it's, like, an \$800-million bond that they are then going to use to revamp their water and sewage system for the city. So, they're going to do this on the market if it gets approved at the national level, but the city will own it, and we will use our resources -- actually, not even ODA, because most of this is just a guarantee. It's a guarantee that probably we will never actually have to pay against.

But it, A, is pressing us to speak to people at the local level, and go

beyond sub-national to deal with where the real questions of infrastructure are -- but, also, to be more innovative in how we can help these entities develop their financing.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great.

Sounds new to me -- but, really, is this rhetoric? Are we going to see anything new, really, in Addis?

MS. O'CONNELL: Time will tell. So, I think there's two levels.

One is in terms of those of us here in the U.S. My hope is that there is actually something new here. And not that we haven't heard some of these words before, but there's actually initiatives that the U.S. government has been engaged in around transparency, around the open-government partnership, these other things -- that it's not actually the beginning of a conversation, but there's a foundation and different pieces that can be pulled together.

So, my hope is that we'll actually see the U.S. government acting differently around this issue of domestic resource mobilization, with actual action plans, as you talked about.

I think from a global point of view, I think that's a question to come back a year from now and say, okay, what's new? Was there anything new? Did we see anything different come back or not? But I don't think we're really going to know until we see not what happens in July, but what happens a year from now.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks.

They were great questions. Thank you very much. Please do stay where you are, because we're going to go straight to the next panel, as on the choreography.

But I think I speak for all of us in saying thank you to our panelists for their insightful -- also, very frank -- remarks. So, I think we'd like to give them a round of applause.

(Recess)

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

MR. INGRAM: Feel free to get some coffee or some cookies if there are still some available. And there are a few seats up front. Jim, thank you for that segue between the first and second panel. You weren't even set up for that.

My three panelists with me here -- next to me is Beth Tritter who is Vice President for Policy at the Millennium Challenge Corporation. And in that position she oversees all of the MCC's work in data and transparency. So an appropriate person to be here and before that she was a leader in the AID effectiveness reform community and before that she had her career on Capitol Hill -- and she doesn't admit to that anymore but she did. Daniella Aares is Advisor to the Secretary of State for Development. And in that role, I'm going to suggest Daniella for the last two years you have been involved with the post 2015 process -- is that correct, that isn't much of an exaggeration is it?

MS. AARES: That might be true.

MR. INGRAM: That may be true. And she also is known for being a strong advocate for policy making based on data and information. And before coming to the state department about three years ago she was in global business. And our third panelist Shaida Badiee is the co-founder of Open Data Watch -- which was founded just a year or two ago when Shaida left the World Bank after having a career there where I might say she introduced the World Bank to data. And she brought it from the dark ages into the 21st century. So thank you for being with us today.

We're going to focus on two questions -- two topics. One is why data, what is this data revolution? And secondly, what can we expect in Addis and at the U.N. General Assembly?

So the high level commission on imminent persons which 18 months ago wrote a very prominent report on the post-2015 process and really helped pave the way for us -- highlighted the fact that there's a data revolution. And since then there's been a lot of conversation about a data revolution. What is the data revolution? What does it mean for the U.S. and the global community? And what are our priorities in this arena.

And let's start with Daniella, and then Beth, and then Shaida. Daniella.

MS. AARES: Thanks, and thanks so much for hosting this panel and picking up both the importance both of the financing development agreement and some of the issues that we've been working on as U.S. government. Data, particularly a couple of things just to note here -- first I think if we link this to the overall sustainable development goals -- at their core the sustainable development goals are a data story. And the MGGs were a data story -- they were about an international agreement actually setting measurable targets for the future and asking the world to track how well they were doing to achieving them. That in and of itself was such a distinction of the millennium development goals and I think what we'd hope to see the sustainable development goals also create a momentum towards progress by putting data at the center. So I think as we've looked at now the financing for development agreement -- data has become one of the aspects of it that are a distinction as well as (inaudible) since the first agreement. A recognition that a couple of aspects -- one data is really a foundation in a modern economy. If you look at the presidential open data directive -- President Obama's open data directive, the number one rationale for that was an economic one. The fact that when we open up government data it actually allows industries to be created whether data has created a multibillion dollar industry with open data on weather. So there's an economic rationale for having data be open -- the importance of data to our modern economy and then there's also a transparency and effectiveness rationale for public services. Again that applies domestically in a U.S. context as well as now as we look at as our aid effectiveness and foreign assistance.

So really I think there's been just a growing momentum around data and its importance to public services worldwide and I think that data revolution has now come to the development community and I think there's a recognition that the data revolution isn't starting here -- we're kind of joining it. And I think that's great. The world is awash in data but not always the right kinds of data that you need to solve social challenges and

when that data is there -- it's not always open, available used in the way that it could be. So I think what we've seen is really great momentum with civil society advocates, with other governments, with national statistical agencies with data scientists wanting to come into this mix and solve real problems together. And the months ahead create a milestone to bring those actors together and the new development goals create a measurable anchor of progress in the months ahead.

MR. INGRAM: Good, Beth?

MS. TRITTER: Well thanks -- I think that justice since (inaudible), this paradigm of donor recipient has changed, or that it's all about donor dollars going into recipient countries and doing development in those countries has changed. I think there's a much broader realization now that development is really about people in developing countries taking the initiative to change their own lives and there being multiple enabling factors around them that drive that process forward or help them drive that process forward.

I would say for me the data revolution in development has to be about that. It can't become another donor recipient paradigm where the large companies of the world and the large governments of the world that are rich and actually collect the good data throw data at the developing world and then say here, you have the ability to make good decisions now that you have this data. And I think that what we're seeing with respect to the data revolution and development and particularly with respect to the conversation around Addis and post-2015 is that this really has to be about enabling people in developing countries to use data to create their own data, and to hold their own governments accountable and also frankly the whole rich governments accountable. Because as Alexia pointed out -- there is a significant ODA aspect to this whole debate that isn't going to go away nor should it go away. But data has to be a driver of both good decision making and accountability. But it can only be that way if data is democratized -- with a small d. In that it's accessible to everybody, that data that's

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

created by the masses is as valid as data that is created from up on high. And that everyone has the ability to access it and use it for the purposes that they'd like to use it for. So I would say that the data revolution is a confluence of events, where it's a confluence of concepts where we understand a lot more what drives good development. And that we understand that data is an enabler of all of those different factors.

MR. INGRAM: Shaida?

MS. BADIEE: Just adding onto what's been said -- I was working as part of this report of the world that counts -- which was the U.N. Secretary General's task force on data revolution, a few months ago. And we were trying to define the data revolution but soon we gave up and articulated it as more, what is the data revolution about? And the way we have said it in the report is broadly it's about the explosion of data and the speed with which the data is being produced and also the number of producers -- increasing number of producers of data. The medium and technology -- we all see the mobile devices, the satellite sensors, internet of things. But also the new types of data that is becoming available in a citizen generated data perception and qualitative data. And so it's about all this. But also it's about the demand increasing about data which is making the data revolution very exciting all together. So you can see that it's not something that will be coming -- it's already here. And we are just in the middle of the data revolution. But for me personally being involved so much in the last few months and the data revolution discussions at the global level -- I feel that it's exciting because it's here, it's very challenging, but it brings a lot of opportunities but it's not really any organization's agenda. Or it's not IMF's or the World Bank's or anybody's. It's really for all of us to be able to bring it together and make the best of it. So it's tremendously exciting and particularly for the development and the areas that we are trying to solve in the STG's.

MR. INGRAM: Great. Well I think indicative of the fact that we are in the midst of a data revolution -- all is there, is just as many people here for this panel as for the

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

panel on where's the money. (laughter) So I think that speaks highly for people's interest in this topic. Let's move onto Addis. A month from now is the Financing for Development negotiations. And let me make three points leading up to my question -- one is Danielle and Beth. Let me commend the U.S. government for taking a very strong position on the importance of data transparency being in the zero draft and being in the document. And secondly I express my deep disappointment that when I read the zero draft a few days ago that came out in early June I barely found either word in the document.

Transparency was there only in reference to the Green Climate Fund. And data is there really as a tertiary issue to support modern terrain -- the new STGs. There's nothing in the document that would indicate an understanding that data can make an important contribution to economic socio and political development. And that it is a resource in and of itself -- both economically and socially. And I understand that there have been certain groups of countries -- particularly from the BRICs that have opposed the transparency and data part that have been suggested. So where are the politics on this, where are the developing countries who presumably would be the beneficiary of a lot of this data? And what's the likely impact going to be on Friday? A group of fifty civil society organizations issued a letter to the negotiators urging that the document include transparency, data, public participation, and even in equipping citizens to understand and use data.

So where are the politics on this and what can we hope that the final document might state on open data? Daniella, and then Beth, and then Shaida?

MS. AARES: I think it's two-fold, and thank you you're right, we have really been working to get data have strong representation in the document and it's been supported by others. I don't know if I would take quite as harsh assessment to where it stands as you have because I actually do think there is some reasonable language in there and there's many different drafts -- so I'm hoping maybe we're --

MR. INGRAM: Maybe I haven't seen the latest draft --

MS. AARES: Maybe the latest is stronger but all of that said, we want to

work to have the strongest representation there, and I think the attention that's been put on it by civil society is really important and we really found that very valuable as have others. I think in terms of the politics around data, there is truth that transparency can be a tricky issue in this and maybe the bigger risk -- as much as I think it's something that there's a group of actors I think it believes is important and that's certainly not only the U.S. but only also more advanced economies but there's champions across the globe on this issue. I would say it's not been as high a level of conversation on this issue in the FFD negotiations as we might have hoped to see. In that it's been there or there's been discussions, but it's not necessarily been something that's been as elevated in the discussion as a critical element as I think it could be and I think there's an actual opportunity and something we're really working with other governments that are committed to this -- governments like Mexico, and Columbia, and Philippines and others who really have really strong commitments both in their national statistical agencies and through open government partnership to data. We've seen a lot of interest with them and the civil society and working towards Addis and towards September as really bringing data up as a key priority. So I think working towards it for the text is important but just as was mentioned with domestic resource mobilization, equally important is how do you use this as a launching pad for something that lives beyond it. So I think we'll work on both fronts and I think just one add to that is I think we're still at early days in terms of really embedding data and data driven decision making and development in government -- at large globally. But there are champions that are emerging and I think the one thing is that is interesting here is that they're in different places. In some governments it's national statistical agencies, in some governments it's open government partnership folks. And some governments it's those working on development. So I think this is a moment where we're really trying to empower those champions to work together to push their own governments and work together to solve some of these problems.

MR. INGRAM: And you would push back at my pessimistic assessment

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

in the fact that you've seen greater interest in this topic today than two or three years ago when you started the process of the post 2015.

MS. AARES: Definitely and I think the breakthrough here and the opportunity with these agreements is an interest between those who love data and the political level of saying -- so in Addis it's finance ministers, it's foreign ministers, it's heads of state. I think the interest elevating that level -- saying look, when we make decisions as a government we need to be both transparent and data driven in how we do that. I think that's the definition.

MR. INGRAM: Beth maybe you can bring to this conversion the MCC experience on the ground, because you've got over ten years' experience now working with countries at the country level on data. And what level of interest do you see there and do you see that evolving?

MS. TRITTER: Well I would just first echo what Danielle has said -- which is this is not a sprint, this is a marathon. And this is not one conference next month and another conference in September and then it is game over. This is from the perspective of those of us who are enmeshed in this on a daily basis we're looking at this as a series of action forcing events that are happening over the course of a very long time. And they need to build on each other so you need to lay a really strong groundwork now, but I think there are going to be many opportunities to continue this discussion in a meaningful way and strengthen the commitment around data and open data and usable data and democratic data going forward. So I would echo what Danielle has said in terms of there being a bit more space than perhaps you're letting on. But I also think that we need to keep in mind that this is a long game that we need to focus on for the long term.

We see tremendous amount of interest in data on the part of our partner countries and it manifests itself in all sorts of different ways. In everything from -- just to tie in with the last panel -- domestic resource mobilization which is something that we're

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

working on in a couple of our partner countries and how open procurement systems feed into better decision making about resource mobilization and also better decision making about resource allocation which I think is the forgotten aspect of domestic resource mobilization -- it's not only getting the resources, it's making sure that they're spent well. And in order for that to happen you need data. So this is something that we're really looking at in several of our partner countries. Two, our MCAs, our committees at the country level that actually run the MCC compacts are responsible for collecting a lot of data whether its tracking data on monitoring how the programs are going, or whether it's helping with evaluation data collection -- or whether it's again financial data and procurement data that they collect. And that capacity that we help to build through our MCAs is often applicable to a lot of different aspects of those countries. So there are situation where we have -- the work that we've done with an MCA has led to helping a national statics office build better capacity to do a census -- in the case of Jordan for instance. And there are a lot of other examples where that capacity bleeds in. But really we're not doing our job if when we leave our country at the end of a compact they don't have more capacity than they had when they came in to manage funds better -- to procure better, to understand where their money is going better and to monitor the impacts of what they're spending. So I think that on the ground there's a lot of demand for it. Now on the ground versus at the political level -- I think sometimes there's a bit of a divide there and so that's where I think you get this disconnect where saying something as a principal can sometimes get very scary versus actually understanding how it works on the ground and that's why I think -- and I'm sure Shaida can bring a little bit of the concrete into this discussion where the data discussion often gets very disjointed is when we're talking about these broad concepts of data and open data and data sharing and data accessibility and we're not actually talking about how it actually drives decisions on the ground. What are those specific examples of where data has actually led to better decision making -- data has actually led to improve development outcomes? And so I

think that the challenge for all of us -- and I think civil society is on this and I think we'll see a lot of big things from them in Addis and beyond, is to bring that conversation to a level that we can actually understand and grasp. It's not the rhetorical level. It's the real level.

MR. INGRAM: Shaida, Beth has posed an interesting topic for you and also if you would comment on how you see the negotiations going and what you would hope to see out of Addis?

MS. BADIEE: Well I'm glad you're focusing on the draft outcome document because a lot of civil society groups have been worrying about that. A few months ago the data was as you said -- was only mentioned in the context of data for financial flows. But there has been a lot of discussions and persuasions and in fact the May 6th version that I have in front of me has seven paragraphs about data. They are the last paragraphs of the report but they never the less -- they're there. (laughter) But I think we're going in the right direction -- it's got the right language. It's talking about open data; it's talking about capacity building, the gaps in the segregated data on gender and other types of data. So it's actually going in the right direction and I think Addis is going to be a lot of discussions about data and hopefully we will get approval to have a site event to talk about data and also showcase some of the data impacts on policies. I think that would be really something that we can get some political attention to data.

But to answer your other question about bricks and all the countries that are coming into this -- I think my response to that is that we have a very heterogeneous group of countries coming into all this data revolution from different capacities, different competencies and of course the different cultures that they bring in. For example in the OGP as you know for BRICs in we have Brazil and South Africa which are doing quite well and they are members and they've made quite a bit of progress but we still have the rest of the countries to come along with the OGP. But for example India brings so much other benefits to data revolution in terms of the experience that they have and what

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

they're doing and some of the piloting some of the data -- things that they're doing and they're technically actually superb in many of the official statistics. So the point is everybody brings something really good to the data revolution. So if we can build some form of a partnership and bring all this energy and all this technical excellence together there's a lot to be gained. And I hope that the outcome document gives us enough to take this initiative forward.

MR. INGRAM: Shaida there's any -- some of the civil society groups were proposing an initiative which I understand is just at the conceptual level now, on an initiative for global sustainable data. Tell us about that initiative. What is that concept?

MS. BADIEE: I think the key word you forgot to say is partnership.

MR. INGRAM: Partnership, okay.

MS. BADIEE: Global partnership for -- right now they call it global partnership for systemic development but they're looking for a better name for it. And the idea there is that there is so much going on with the data revolution and there is so much opportunities and also some risks that we have to manage with the data revolution. So this global partnership is supposed to create a neutral platform if you will that will bring the different groups together to cooperate with each other, come up with shared solutions and actually do a knowledge exchange. Also there is a lot going on with the data revolution already. The thousand flowers blooming, some of them is really wonderful for example. In Africa, the African countries have come together and signed up to an African data consensus. The global -- the open data community has not come up with the open data charter that they want to get the countries to sign into at the U.N. General Assembly in September. So there is a lot going on there and maybe this global partnership on development data could actually connect those dots and make the whole bigger than the sum of parts.

MR. INGRAM: And has this partnership proposal been discussed with governments and the private sector had and what sort of response is there?

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

MS. BADIEE: There's a lot of consultations going on. And in fact there is some champion countries that are being briefed and being consulted with. On Wednesday we had a session, we hope Daniella could come. And we have champions from Mexico and a few other countries who are participating. But it's a new idea and I hope that there would be much more consultation and at the FFD in July. There would more of talking about the global partnership as well. By the way, this is an initiative that's also been recommended by the U.N. Secretary General's report on data revolution. So we hope that you will have blessing of the formal as well as informal and bring these new stakeholders like the private sector and this smaller stakeholder partnership will hopefully form by September time.

MR. INGRAM: Danielle are you going to be at the meeting Wednesday?

MS. AARES: You know I am. (laughter)

MR. INGRAM: Not to ask what the U.S. position is -- but what is the U.S. position -- (laughter) or what is our interest in it?

MS. AARES: One, I think we're very interested and supportive of the efforts to build a partnership here and look at ways that the different communities are involved, can solve problems together. Maybe I'll just step back for a moment also and think about what do we bring to the table in Addis around data and what can others bring to the table as well? And I there's -- as been mentioned this is where there's many actors. So we're -- in some ways we're one of many -- but also I think we feel that we have and can make a lot of contributions in the data space. So a couple of ways that we're seeing that -- one is opening up data. So we really -- we have opened up some really significant data sets in climate, in deforestation we recently released our humanitarian information unit. The state department has released new geospatial data, (inaudible) recently and over the last year, we released a lot of its data on its specific country programs. USAID has a significant data for development effort underway. So I think we feel that this is something that we have legitimately been making significant

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

efforts and now we need to go to the next level. Further open up our data as well as go further with our investments to build capacity for the use of that data. And that's something that again historically through things like the demographic and health survey and other long term investments we've been making in data I think have a foundation, but want to take to the next level and really make investments that will allow these more innovative actors to participate in the data system. This is kind of the core of some of what this partnership seeks to do. You have data scientists and big data -- sources of big data who really could help national statistical agencies and local actors have much more dynamic access to information but there is often not a great connection happening between the two. So I think that opportunity to bridge is significant. So I think we want to look at both how we can continue to open up, share, and invest in data, as well as participate and contribute to building a partnership that would help us solve some real data challenges together. And some of challenges just to say that I think we see as a starting point is some of the existing data gaps in health. Even though we know a lot I would say health is the area we have the most data -- we still think there is significant opportunity to know more about what's going on health at a sub national level. Gender disaggregated data around health is showing us a lot of things and there is more to know about where girls are getting infected by HIV AIDS at the subnational level and we see very significant distinctions happening there. So both the gender disaggregated, the geographic disaggregation of data are problems that we need to solve and there's pretty innovative ways using these different actors to solve them. Similar in agriculture, we have the global open data for agriculture initiative that's really tackling some specific growth genomic data as well as data related to specific global agricultural systems. So I think we see health, agriculture and gender as well as certainly climate deforestation where we've already done a lot on data as areas to start with and then look more broadly at other aspects of the STGs where we could be filling data gaps and working with innovative data sources.

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

MR. INGRAM: Good, Beth?

MS. TRITTER: I just want to add to that -- I would add that governance is another area that we think there's significant momentum and significant progress to be made and MCC is one of the founding partners of the governance data alliance and I'm sure that there are many of you in this room who are part of GDP as well and it's sort of nascent collaborative effort that brings together governance data users and consumers and enablers -- so the funders to talk through where the data gaps are, how to collaborate better on data gathering, making all the governance data that's out there actually available on a dashboard so that you can see where that data is without going to 30 different websites and trying to pick your way through the methodology of each data set. So I think that this is a nascent sectoral related effort. But I think that there is just so much work to be done on bringing together the wealth of organizations that are working to create good data to try to make it usable. And that one of the main drivers I think of this partnership that Shaida was talking about and certainly that we're encouraging from the USG perspective is to try to have a convening platform for all of the different organizations and stakeholders at the government and non-governmental level -- global north, global south to talk through these issues and identify problems and then identify solutions or at least pathways to solutions jointly. And I then I think at the user level one of the things that we've certainly been working on at MCC is a collaboration that we have with (inaudible) on data collaboratives which is an evolution of a partnership that we started late last year where we'll be working with partner countries that have not yet been locked down and really seeing what's in that countries own plan for achieving the sustainable development goals and using data to achieve the SDGs and then undertaking a number of different types of activities that could range from helping out the national statistics agency to working with civil society at a very local level on data accessibility and usage to try to drive some of those countries own plans forward. So I think that there are a number of things that the U.S. brings to the table -- both on the

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

macro data release level and also all the way down to data usability at the local level.

MR. INGRAM: Good. Danielle, I was pleased to hear you reference DHS and the U.S. government AID has a robust history over thirty years probably of generating at the country level DHS surveys. The World Bank has heavily invested in the area. But all of these surveys happen happenstance, irregularly. Is there any conversation among governments or with this partnership of creating a regularization of DHS studies. Trying to do them for all countries -- rather than just half a stance when an AID mission of the World Bank gets an interest in a country, and also tagging on economic issues which sometimes are done for DHS studies. So I'm wondering if there's any focus or any movement to institutionalizing and regularizing DHS information data and put it on a common dashboard.

MS. AARES: I might have broader view from the bank as well. I mean other actors -- I don't know that there is a conversation --

MR. INGRAM: But you haven't heard about it then?

MS. AARES: Precisely that. But I would say what's interesting that you are seeing from a national statistical agencies and some of the more forward leaning ones, is how are they doing their surveys -- their census in different way that's less costly. So using mobile based methodologies -- either for collection of data, even if they send people out or doing exclusively mobile, or using proxy data to fill gaps in their national statistics. So they don't have to wait five or ten years until the next time the survey is done. So I think you're going to start to see a mix of innovation happening to fill gaps as well as still the recognition that you need the basic statistics -- so vital registration. You still have 35 percent of births that aren't registered. And that is just the very basic. So I think there's going to be a combination of both happening.

MS. BADIEE: Two hopeful things that I've heard recently -- one is that there is a new mini-partnership which is being developed between the DHS mix which is the minimum indicator cost of surveys from UNICEF. And also the LSMS, the living

standard mission survey of the World Bank. So there's a lot of coordination now between the micro-data host agencies if you will. So I think that coordination also does a lot in coordination underground and linking to the national plans much better. So the second good thing is linking with the national plans. I think the countries are taking much ownership themselves to have national plans which is bringing these survey tools and these development partners together. So all together positive.

MR. INGRAM: Good.

MS. AARES: Can I just add one thing -- which is that --

MR. INGRAM: Please. And then we'll move to broaden the conversation.

MS. AARES: I'll be really brief --

MR. INGRAM: No you don't have to brief.

MS. AARES: The piece that we haven't spoken as much about is the private sector right? It's not just governments that collect data or people on the ground that contribute to collecting data -- you have a lot private sector companies that are collecting a lot of data all the time as well know. And some of them are really unable to deploy it for development purposes. If given the right governing conditions. So I think what we've also seen is there are organizations that are part of the broader civil society conversation that are trying to think through what is the global open data governance standard look like. Where is that line that a company that wants to make some of its data open -- what are the different assurances that it needs in order to feel good about that decision -- that its trade secrets won't be taken or that it won't be sued for privacy violations or something along those lines. So there's also a very complicated policy conversation that needs to happen around data and how it flows and who accesses it and who produces it. Because it's not just governments that are collecting all of this. It's the private sector and their data is extremely valuable from the developmental perspective. Just one example for -- an MCC we work a lot on road and transportation projects and

one way to decide where to put our money in a roads project is to figure out what the road traffic looks like on that road and how much time it takes to actually move the length of the road. You can get somebody sitting there on the road side ticking off check marks to figure out what the road traffic looks like. You can also use cell phone data which is potentially a lot more reliable because you can take it over the course of many many days and weeks and seasons and see how the road traffic changes according to the seasons and the weather and the market conditions and things like that. In order to get that you either have to purchase it or it has to be provided somehow and it's okay to make that data available for purchase -- not everything has to be free. But there do have to be certain governance standards because you can tell about who's travelling on these roads from their cell phone data. So there are a lot of issues that we as a global open data community need to figure out to enable to revolution to move forward. And how to involve the private sector in this conversation in a meaningful way because they have a lot to contribute but they also have certain equities that might not be the same equities as a lot of people in this room. We need to have that conversation and it needs to be part of the conversation at Addis and at Anga and beyond.

MR. IGNRAM: One example of the potential of the complexities is that MasterCard has an initiative that they call data philanthropy. And they will share their data with organizations for good purposes. I obviously want to know what happens to my credit card data when they share it, but that --

MS. AARES: But it will be for a good purpose so do you really care?

(laughter)

MR. INGRAM: People have different definitions of good purposes. Please, the microphone up here. There are two questioners right here. Please introduce yourself.

MS. RUSSELL: Hi, thanks a lot for the conversation. Is this on?

MR. INGRAM: Yes, it's on.

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

MS. RUSSELL: Jenny Russell -- Save the Children. I'm interested in how you all think the data revolution will touch people in conflict affected and fragile states. I'm a little bit concerned about the conversation focusing on those countries where there's political will -- those countries where we have compacts with already. And if we're going to end extreme poverty and if we're going to touch everyone in the next set of global goals -- and we're talking about trickle down. How are we going to reach those pockets of people who are the hardest to reach next time? And if you could provide your thoughts on that, thanks.

SPEAKER: Hello, Miguel (inaudible), researcher from CSIS. So this might be a little bit technical question -- but are we going to talk about interpretability. You see that discussion come in -- it doesn't matter how much data we have if we can't make it interpretable. And the second one -- I used to work for the Colombian government in information management -- what about the problem of duplication of data? You have massive actors producing a massive amount of data and some of them are producing the same data twice and three times and the cost is so high that we need to optimize the resources so I want to hear your insights on that. Thank you.

MR. INGRAM: Why don't we address the first question and that is the impact of the potential benefit of data revolution for fragile countries. Who would like to start? Shaida?

MS. BADIEE: I'd be happy to. I think that's an excellent question and I think it's one of the big risks or concerns of low capacity countries and fragile states -- if the point of entry is STGs if your point of entry is already some kind of innovation or technical excellence that will bring those communities up to partnership -- how do you not leave those countries and those groups behind? So I think that's a very critical question and it is on the radar of the people who are worrying about setting up concepts for example for global partnership or for data revolution. Two things that I've personally been watching for that group that you've been worrying about. One is in mobilizing

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

resources and funding. And we've been doing some studies on what is -- for fragile states, what is the minimum set of things that they need to do to be on the level playing field, if you will at least with the low income countries. And a lot of resources that they need because they don't have the domestic resources for data. So that's part of what FFDI hope in the outcome document -- or outcome of the FFD -- we will have some resource mobilization for the fragile states. And the other one is through this global partnership if we can set up some kind of a twinning or some kind of a technical assistance if you will, marketplace almost, for countries to be able to help each other and maybe do it a little bit differently from the past even, of how can it be made more effective. But definitely it is a big challenge of even before data revolution. But with the data revolution and the new SDGs the challenge is even much bigger.

MR. INGRAM: Daniella?

MS. AARES: Yeah I mean I think certainly for fragile states there is some of them have the weakest basic statistical capacity in the country -- I think that's true and I think there's still potential to invest in that basic capacity in the fragile state context. But also I think if you're looking at how data gets used for decision making, better using the data that does exist on fragile states to really pinpoint what the issues and challenges are and to disaggregate that data I think is still feasible and essential to getting interventions right. Because each fragile state is so different in the drivers of the challenges its facing in the demographics and so I think just a broader recognition that we need to really look at fragile states in a way that we should be looking at every country which is in looking at the country specifics of national factors and drivers of the challenges that they're facing. The other thing is that even in fragile states you still do have mobile phones and the potential to use big data and other sources and you can still use satellite data and mapping data to look at what's happening depending on what the nature of the challenge is, certainly for things like deforestation. So I think there is still the opportunity to be creative but I think in those contexts making sure that the need for

data and basic vital registration is not being missed in the package of interventions that are happening is key.

MS. TRITTER: Want me to answer that or speak to the second question?

MR. INGRAM: Go to the second one, but one thing I would add to the first question is, it seems like modern technology -- the mobile reduces the cost for collecting the data and delivering data so that it should be easier and less costly in the future to bring the potential of data into fragile states.

MS. TRITTER: Yes, absolutely. And I would also that collecting it from -- if you have people living in fragile states at many times still have cell phones and there is an ability to get feedback and information about the situation on the ground -- not just in the big data way in terms of their cellphones being tracked. But really to communicate directly with them which I think shouldn't be overlooked and certainly we at MCC are not experts in that area but I think there's certainly great potential to think creatively about how to do that. To your point on interoperability and duplication of efforts I think that a large driver behind this partnership is to look at those types of issues and to convene around them and make sure that we're solving some of these problems. I think that GODAN -- the Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition actually is working on interoperability issues with respect to agriculture and nutrition data but this partnership overall -- that's one of the issues, is that if this is an issue we should be convening around this and trying to solve it. And duplication of efforts -- I think that some of the sectoral based efforts that you're seeing right now are driven in part by this notion that collecting data is really really expensive as you said and if there's a way to collaborate among groups that are trying to collect the same thing we should be doing that. And certainly with the governance data alliance that's an intention into the future is hopefully to drive some collaborative data gathering so we can actually save people some money because it's otherwise the same people going to the same people asking for the money

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

to do the same thing. And then they're all doing it differently and aggregating it differently and analyzing it differently and that's not necessarily helping everybody as a community. So your point is taken and absolutely correct.

MS. BADIEE: Can I add one more thing to the duplication -- some of the duplication, not everything about duplication happens also because of a reason. Often in countries for example -- the data because it's not open somebody else goes and duplicates that effort. That even happens at the government level where for example there are many countries where the administrative data is not available from one ministry to another ministry so that other ministry has to duplicate and collect that data. So I think open data in many ways will not solve all the duplication but some of the duplication efforts.

MR. INGRAM: Yes in the back?

MS. RIGG: Thank you, Jennifer Rigg with the One Thousand Days partnership. Thank you all very much. I wanted to expand just quickly on -- and ask a question about some of the great examples you've already cited -- DHS, U.S. government leadership and potential there. So that we can really move beyond just talking about the revolution and actually get to the data revolution that we're living in. So in addition to gender disaggregation -- what about age? Helping us to better understand the data round the timing for when governments, when NGOs, when we're all reaching people and making sure we're reaching them at the right in addition to the great sectoral examples that you've already cited on health and governance and agriculture -- nutrition often falls through the cracks on this one -- and so gender desegregation helps us but we know that U.S. leadership on feed the future would really greatly benefit as well as leadership from all countries at local levels as well if we could better understand when we're actually reaching people. And then George you're absolutely right. The frequency is a huge barrier for policy makers. We're currently looking at data that we're lucky if I think it's updated every five years. How can we get to much greater frequency and do so

before the SDGs are already underway? Thank you.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you. Shaida, I bet you've worked on all of these issues over the last 35 years. (laughter) And maybe Daniella can say whether or not this level of detail is coming into the discussions around Addis.

MS. BADIEE: Well I think all those elements are in the wish list if you will of the data revolution and one of the things that -- as much as we don't like SDGs because there are too many of them and so on -- is SDGs actually push us to all that direction. But in terms of the disaggregation data and that push is actually what causes that -- for us to get to that data is we have to build a statistical data platform underneath it. So for example if you want to go to the level of disaggregation you have to have similar registration of vital statistics and you have to have better administrative or census data. And once you have that you actually address some of the other elements that you mentioned such as age to be able to have more of the segregate data by age. And if you have a very sustainable statistical system you address your frequency issues as well. So this information is much more frequently available so, and actually you don't always to have census every ten years. If you have good CDR system maybe you can have -- you can save some money and not have to spend so much money on census. So my asset is that this data revolution has the opportunities and the SDGs with it -- so that we will have much better statistical system to give us this detailed information that we're all seeking.

MS. AARES: Yeah I think interesting your question gets to a level of detail about talking about disaggregated data and the truth is it has. It has come up as one of the policy issues -- both in the SDGs and in financing for development. So that's a good sign that it's recognized. And really that's essential for if the idea here is to understand differentiation. In many ways what underpins the sustainable development goals and the financing for development agreement is a commitment for inclusive growth and to addressing issues of inclusion. And the only way you can do that is to understand

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

inequality and inequality outcomes and inequality in services, et cetera. So data is really is at the heart of that. Without it you don't know who's included and who's not. So I think you have seen the issue of disaggregation and the conversation which is encouraging.

MR. INGRAM: The last question -- yes?

SPEAKER: Hello (inaudible) from the Bretton Woods committee. I'm really happy that we're finally talking data -- I'm familiar with Obama's administration. I think they've done a great job with data. However one concern that I have is that it was mentioned that BRICs are reluctant or BRICs aren't reluctant. Or India's for example leader in bringing data. People were hoping with the data revolution that it would bring countries together. But in actually the opposite has happened. Russia, China, India, even Europe they're churning out their companies, their internet laws, their own data laws. So the only question that comes out of my mind is -- are we addressing these issues on how countries are creating their own data laws, their own data rules that can actually affect us going in this direction of trying to share data because it seems a little bit conflicting how we can agree on data rules. That we're going to share data when in reality domestically speaking they have very strict policies on how data is being used.

MR. INGRAM: Boy that is a big question that we can devote another panel conversation to. (laughter) But it's an interesting question -- are you seeing data bringing countries together or dividing them? And I'm guessing you've seen both. Who would like to start there? Shaida, Danielle, Beth?

MS. BADIEE: Well I think you answered it -- it has brought everybody together but because it's a big agenda and it's touching all sorts of development transparency, accountability, citizen's engagement. You name it and the society is touched by data. So in some ways if you really look at it in some ways it's also separating us because we all tend to separate from each other by country by culture so since data is the bedrock of all that is of course part of that separation, but also part of that unification. But my hope is that through for example the U.N. and Secretary General

ADDISABABA-2015/06/15

has taken a lot of interest in this topic and U.S. General Assembly bringing all the heads of nations together there would be enough items and of course the FFD, the Finance For Development and other groups bringing enough commitments for us to be able to build on. So we all stay tuned to this station to see what happens. (laughter)

MS. AARES: Agreed, I mean look it is a big topic. I think what I'd say is, as much as we're talking about data and how its potential for good here is -- the reality is data is inherently neither good nor bad -- it's information and you can use it for many purposes. And there is a lot of concern of course about data, about privacy, about how it's used. And there's a legitimate conversation that's happening the world over on these issues. And a regulatory environment and international institutions et cetera. So I would expect that's not going to away. And the tensions between how do we manage that tension -- how do we manage those trade-offs and make data available for social goods, share it in many ways but also recognize the risks -- we'll stay with this. I think the potential in the conversation like this is to not allow that conversation to prevent -- the reality is that there is very significant missed opportunities if we don't start sharing and using this data differently for really important social challenges that we're facing. So I think that can help break through some of those challenges to really see the usage potential but it's not going to go away.

One just last thing I'd say on that is I think even with all this momentum, the truth is, there are reasons why there's not the investments happening that are needed to get the data that we want to answer these problems. And there's a reason why a marketer can know that I prefer Whole Foods over Safeway. I'm sure there are many companies that can buy that data off the web -- and we still don't know how many children are born in many countries in the world. So we do have a fundamental incentives issue where there needs to be also a real citizen focus on setting high expectations of what their own governments and what the international community invest in related to data and how to use it.

MS. TRITTER: I would just go back to what I said before which is this is marathon not a sprint. And you're raising a really important point and it's a big point and it's a point that foundational to our ability to actually achieve the SDGs but data is bigger than development and so we're a tiny part of this broader conversation that you brought up. I think that one of the ways to drive this forward is again not to get overwhelmed and bogged down in the fact that this is such a large broad issue and to look for those opportunities where collaboration really yields progress -- measureable progress that you can show that's tangible that people can understand, because that's the way to chip away -- or that's one of the ways I think to chip away at some of the disincentives to sharing data. Obviously not the only way to chip away at it -- international agreements are another way and international negotiations are another way. But I think there are a lot of ways to approach it. And again it's going to be something that evolves over time.

MR. INGRAM: Well I think that's a good note to close the session. Thank you for that question. Paul I was very reluctant to schedule this panel after yours because you're such a dynamic moderator and speaker. And there is no competition between our panels. I want you to know. And you had a very dynamic panel but fortunately I did too. But I do note that the audience that stayed here for your panel stayed here for an hour. Whereas the audience that stayed here for this panel stayed here for two hours. (laughter) And no competition here -- only five people left in that last hour and their names have been taken down. (laughter) But I would like for you to thank the panel but also thank the audience for your interest in these topics. So 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