SDG-2015/09/09

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

IMPLEMENTING THE SDGs WITH LOCAL PRIORITIES IN MIND: THE 2015 DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION REPORT AND THE ROLE OF PARTNERSHIPS

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, September 9, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

HOMI KHARAS
Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Global Economy and Development
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

ERIK SOLHEIM
Chair
OECD Development Assistance Committee

ELIZABETH COUSENS
Deputy Chief Executive Officer
United Nations Foundation

ALEX THIER
Assistant to the Administrator for Policy, Planning, and Learning
U.S. Agency for International Development

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KHARAS: Good morning, everybody. Thank you all for being here. My name is Homi Kharas. I'm a Senior Fellow here at the Global Economy and Development Group and we are here to hear about the latest development cooperation report 2015 that's been launched by the DAC. I've left my copy to wave on my chair but here is a, looks like a large report but is actually comprised of a whole series of very easy to read vignettes which taken together actually convey a very interesting message. Thank you, Erik.

So the report really talks about we're going to move to implementing the sustainable development goals and talks a lot about the role of partnerships. It suggests that partnerships are really going to be the driving organizational force for implementation. And then, it draws out a number of lessons of what successful partnerships look like and also indicates that not all partnerships are successful.

And I think that's something which is really important to bear in mind. So the running order this morning is going to be as follows. I will shortly introduce and give the floor to Erik Solheim who is the Chairman of the DAC, the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. It is the DAC that has issued the report.

And we will first have a very quick, very slick video of the highlights of the report, what you can look forward to if you -- as you read the report. It's available online. Then Erik will make a few introductory remarks and then a panel will come and join Erik on the stage and we will have a discussion about the key points of the report. I have to tell you that in talking before we came into this room, there seems to be a little bit too much agreement amongst our panelists.

And so I reserve the right to try to be a little bit of an agent provocateur to try to see if we can get some more heated discussion going. We will have a discussion. I will try to leave plenty of time for Q & A and we have this scheduled to end at 12:30.

So let me quickly introduce Erik Solheim. Erik Solheim is the Chairman of the DAC. He's somebody who has taken the DAC from being a club of rich countries, although some of them aren't quite so rich any longer, but tried to make it into a much more inclusive club that actually talks systematically

about how to organize development cooperation.

And I would say that, you know, over time they come out with a series of reports, of peer reviews, of other processes to shape all these things that we talk about like accountability and learning and cooperation and try to give that some concrete meaning. Before coming to the DAC and what he brings to this position is his experience as a minister in Norway. He's the first minister to combine the environmental portfolios and the development portfolios into one.

Something that now seems obvious but I think at the time was very prescient. He's one of the people who designed and led the big partnership that the UN has on the reforestation of degraded forest lands, UN-REDD and our REDD+. He is a special envoy on the UNEP. He has several awards that he has won and he's been given, all of which are listed in the bio in front of you.

But I think beyond all of that, he is really a strong leader and a strong force and advocate for more and more efficient development cooperation. So please welcome Erik Solheim. Erik?

(Video played)

MR. SOLHEIM: Okay, good morning. The most successful politician ever in my nation, Norway, whenever he had something very important to say, he started speaking very, very, very low. And it seemed that I have learned from that. In the video here, the more important the message, the lower you speak rather than speaking up. But however, Homi has promised that if this is too boring, he will take the role as the Donald Trump of this debate. So let's see how that works out.

Let me bring into one of the, to me, very successful coalitions of the (inaudible) that's George Bush term. I guess there are not too many Bushites here so I won't speak about him but coalitions of the (inaudible), coalitions for actions or partnerships. In about 2007, the issue of how to converse the world rainforest was completely stalled in the global climate talks.

Not because anyone was opposed to the conservation of the rainforest but because some nations wanted to use the rainforest as a tool to achieve something completely different in the climate talks. They wanted to achieve a compensation for reduced oil income in the case of very successful climate deal and they used a rainforest as a tool to achieve that aim.

Then a few nations, of course, most importantly nations like Brazil, Indonesia, Papua

New Guinea, Congo and then, some of the key rainforest nations and a number of donor nations said, let's come together. We have a sufficient amount of nations who want to move ahead. There is no need that every actor on the planet is in agreement. We have the political veal and the moment to do it. Let's just do it.

And the type -- and it had enormous impact. Brazil has reduced the deforestation rate in Brazil with 80 percent; the biggest service to the environment of any nation at any time in the human history. I use big words but this is really big.

Indonesia, see again, the same, the destruction of rainforest is diving very rapidly in Indonesia. What happened? Some politicians took the lead. Let me cite one, SBY or Mr. Yudhoyono, the President of Indonesia. I was there when he called every actor in Jakarta. The diplomat call, his own government, then the business, I mean, they were all there. And he said I have made one promise to my granddaughter, just one. And that is I will go into history as the President of Indonesia who changed the track on deforestation and who saved the orangutans, the butterflies, the trees, the beauty of this.

It was enormously powerful. That was the political part. Now at exactly the same time, big companies, global companies like Unilever and (inaudible) said we cannot work with our consumers in the Americas or Europe based on the destruction of the rainforest. (Inaudible) is a key element of the products but it must be produced in another way.

Then big companies in Indonesia like, Vilmar, which is the biggest (inaudible) said we can do our business without the destruction of the rainforest. And then, civil society initiations also stepped up, Greenpeace, WWF. Greenpeace started by naming and shaming those companies who did not behave but gradually stepped into the boardrooms, into discussions with companies as to how can the change really happen.

And now Greenpeace has moved from naming and shaming into in some cases even naming and praising the companies who do well. That sits very difficult back and tell Greenpeace to name and praise big commercial capitalist companies but they do it.

And add combined forces here, politicians, business, civil society, none of them can have done this trick alone. Only the combined forces of the three could make this enormous progress. So

sure, it's a lot yet to be done but it's one successful coalition for action.

Let me cite one other. Around the late 1990s, Bill and Melinda Gates decided that they had done whatever they could do in the sector of the IT. They had been enormously successful, probably the richest on the planet. They wanted to add to their legacy to do something enormously important to the world.

They looked around and they saw that the whole sector was a sector with very limited innovation. There's a lot to be done there. And they initiated a huge number and not alone, there are many, many other partners like Gavi, the Global Alliance for Vaccinations and Immunizations and a number of the institutions. And since that point, about seven million lives have been saved that are children who are immunized and vaccinated and which according to all historical statistics otherwise would have been dead.

Of course, if you had not have been dying in one big catalystic (sic) event which will have been covered by the media but one by one in huts all over Bangladesh or Ethiopia or Nigeria, covered by no one. Missed only by the parents, that's still seven -- probably seven million lives have been saved.

That has not solved all problems in the healthcare globally but it has made the world such that the historical big killers, the polios, the smallpox, all the big -- the big transmittable disease are now rapidly declining as killers of humanity.

You know what is the biggest source or cause of this for people between 15 and 30 on the planet? Exactly, road accidents. Of course, it shows that we need to step up in road safety. But it shows the enormous, fantastic success in defeating the transmittable diseases which killed nearly everyone up to this point.

So modernity doesn't suck. Modernity is enormously positive in nearly all aspects. But these coalitions; Bill and Melinda Gates was at the core. They brought in governments, other actors, let me mention Philip Du Plessis, a French former minister played an absolutely key role in this. Set up a huge number of health-related partnerships, innovative partnership, targeted results in this sector and it paid off.

This report sets out a huge number of the partnerships. Some of them where the OECD

has been a key component like say, Aid for Trade or the Partnership for the Fragile States, there are other partnerships the OECD has been key. There are a number of partnerships where the OECD has not played any particular role whatsoever. So it's a mixed partnership and for sure, there are many, many, many partnerships which are not covered in the report but we want to set the debate about how we can achieve better global partnerships.

To me there are two main reasons why we need partnership. One is that in the complicated modern world, very few issues can be resolved by governments alone. Maybe in the past government could just give the directions and they make the decision and tell everyone to follow but now, nearly always if you want to be successful, a government must partner with business and with civil society and the local governments and with many other actors in true partnerships, not just by giving directives but in true partnerships.

So without partnerships it's very, very hard to achieve the goals which (inaudible) New York. The other is that in many -- on many issues we cannot wait until there is global agreement in any detail. If I had waited for everyone to come onboard on the rainforest, we would have achieved nothing. But it worked the opposite way.

When we have achieved a lot in the real sphere out there in the Amazon and in Southeast Asia, then they came back to the climate talks and then, everyone agreed. So now it's part of the global agreed -- global agenda but it was not at the beginning. So for these two main reasons, we cannot wait always for everyone to agree and for the latecomers and because it's too complicated for governments to achieve everything on their own, we need many partnerships.

In two weeks' time we are at the real crossroads of humanity. And because you are used to big words but this is an event which really deserves it. It's the highest level ever meeting in human history. President Obama is there. Xi Jinping is there. All the really, the sort of other elements, hard to think of, and the one who's not in New York in two weeks' time and we will set the sustainable development goals.

And these are beautiful goals basically agreed by everyone but we do need to discuss the policies under which we can achieve them and help to mobilize resources which are needed to

achieve them. And that is the -- when they set the goals, that is the next important debate and we want to intervene in that with your support about partnerships.

Finally, what are the lessons learned from partnerships? Let me mention a few. The most important is as in every other aspect of human life, it's all about leadership. You cannot do without leadership. There's a lot of issues we can be lead from bottom up, not to underestimate the lead role which can be played by a businessperson or a civil society activist. But on some issues you need the high level political leadership. You simply can't do it without it.

Secretary General of the UN has led on sustainable energy for all. That's giving that energy to that. Without President (inaudible) of Brazil, the Rainforest Coalition would not have really gained momentum without Bill and Melinda Gates. I mean, they are -- have no (inaudible) authority in the world but the world works in the way that when Bill Gates knock on the door, every president in the world will open the door and invite him in for discussion as to how we can achieve something combined. So the power is enormous even if you haven't -- you are not elected to anything.

So we need leadership and to focus on that is key. Without leadership, and politicians are very reluctant to lead, many politicians believe that if I take the lead, I will just get the problem even anything goes wrong. I will not get the benefit if anything gets right. So people are very reluctant to lead. They must be forced to lead. They must be pushed to lead. They must be encouraged to lead and that's really the issue for all of us.

Let me add that partnerships are more likely to be successful if they're as inclusive as possible. Try to bring everyone into the big tent. Don't exclude anyone. Bring everyone on board but don't wait until everyone has agreed. Then we won't achieve nothing.

We should, added to this, we should try to build the partnerships on the institutions which are already existing. Let's not invent any new institution whenever there is a new issue. Partnership is not to set up a new big structure, a new organization, a new head (inaudible), a new CEO, new central committee under (inaudible). It's nothing like that.

Partnership is the smooth working of the all the existing (inaudible) institutions of the World Bank, the regional banks, states, the Greenpeace, the WWF, all the other global, the Oxfams of

this world, bringing them together will not be without tensions obviously not. But to bring such coalitions together on the basis of what's already existing is much more powerful.

In the Rainforest Coalition, we told the United Nation Development Program and the United Nation Environment Program, you work together otherwise you won't get any money. That was the starting point to what's now called REDD+ or UN-REDD. We told the World Bank exactly the same. Unless you work with the UN and UN work with you, again, we won't fund you because we need you to be able to work together not have all the competition to achieve this great end. But we didn't event new institutions. We built upon what was already in existence.

And finally, adding to this, inclusive partnership, leadership and building upon what's already existing, I would add a strong focus on results. The kind of sector which I have been working in for the last many years of development, there have been far too often people saying that please, please remember that our intentions are good. I have a nice heart, try to do my best and for Africa or for the environment of whatever it may be.

But we cannot accept to be judged on the input or on the intentions. There must be judged on the results. Some areas it's easy to measure results. For rainforest it's very easy. I mean, the spy satellites which you Americans have very kindly provided to the world can basically photograph every single tree in the Amazon rainforest. So there is no way you can cheat on this.

We know the level or reduction of deforestation down to the last tree. So it's very easy to measure. When Bill and Melinda Gates went into vaccinations also fairly easy to count, you know the number of children you have vaccinated against polio and you know that and every children who has been vaccinated against polio won't get the disease. It's as simple as that.

Of course, it's much more complicated to make a judgment as to whether an African nation have established a healthcare system which really can give treatment to a cancer patient or to someone with heart attack. It's much more complicated. So some issues are more complicated to measure. Those are some more complicated to measure, education, but still in education we have a system to evaluate what is the level and knowledge of every 15-years old in the world. It give, for instance, amazing results that 15 year's old in Vietnam are now doing better than 15-year olds in the

United States of America or 15-years old in my nation or (inaudible) believe that we are in the top of the world in every aspect.

We, maybe time has come for us to learn from the Chinese, the Japanese, the Koreans, the Vietnamese rather than running around the world telling them how the world should be organized. So measurement is useful and focus on result is useful and it will also turn the world around on a number of issues because it will show that the one-way street where the United States, Europe, Japan were running around telling the world how to behave in development is the old days. The new days is that we can all, in different ways, learn from each other.

There is not one nation which we cannot learn something from on the entire planet. Okay, this is my introductory remark and then, you will play the role as Donald Trump so we can get into some discussion.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Erik, thank you so much. That was a wonderful introduction. Before we get started, let me introduce the rest of our panel. Sitting to the right of Erik Solheim is Elizabeth Cousens. Elizabeth is the Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the UN Foundation but has been immersed in the issues of the sustainable development goals for quite a few years as she served as the US Ambassador to the UN ECOSOC which was in charge of this huge and very inclusive process of trying to actually emerge with a consensus on the goals, a process which I would say not easy and not guaranteed of success until, as with most things in the UN, the wee hours of the morning on some occasions.

She's also been the US representative to the UN Peacebuilding Commission. She was the Sherpa on the high level panel on global sustainability. She was the vice president of the International Peace Institute. You'll hear peace a bit and one of the things I hope we talk about is how some of these principles really apply in fragile states. At the end of the day, I suspect that this is going to be where all kinds of partnerships, all interventions, all development activities are going to have the most difficulty in actually achieving results on the ground.

And so how we approach those kinds of countries, I think, will be quite interesting. At the far end is Alex Thier. Alex is the USAID Assistant to the Administrator for Policy, Planning and Learning.

He's the man who's really taken USAID and driven its new mission statement and vision statement to focus USAID on the eradication of extreme poverty.

I think he's done this because of his experiences. He was director for USAID for Afghanistan and Pakistan for several years. He's been the director of the project on failed states at Stamford and has been in development cooperation actually looking at how organizations interact with each other on the ground. The competition between them, the overlap between them, all of the nuts and bolts of actual delivery of development cooperation that I think sometimes gets forgotten in when we talk about these very grand schemes of partnerships and other things at the global level.

So Erik, I wanted to just start with one question. Usually the development cooperation report is actually about aid, aid volumes, aid effectiveness. What people look to the DAC for is money. And indeed, in the successful partnerships that you mentioned, in REDD+, money was at the heart. Norway made an enormously generous contribution for the health partnerships. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation made an enormously large contribution.

So there's a bit of a sense that, you know, historically, money has been behind, serious money is behind successful partnerships and there's a worry that today people are talking about partnerships because they don't have any money to put on the table. So are you talking about partnerships in this report because there isn't more ODA money and you don't want to say so quite so bluntly?

And, you know, if that is the case, is it really going to be, you know, are partnerships really going to be able to flourish in an environment whereas we all know aid, budgetary resources are in very, very scarce supply?

MR. SOLHEIM: Let me just first tell you that you will get all the facts and figures about development assistance also from this report. If you want to do -- want to know, say, how New Zealand is doing on development assistance or, for that matter, United States of America, you can see all the figures are here. So that's a kind of appendix to the report.

Development aid is at the highest level ever from the OECD nation. It's at $135 billion US. If you add what China and a number of others outside is providing, we are at about $150 billion.

That is the highest. It's far below the expectations and the promises given by a number of member states that promised to do more but have done so much that at least it's much higher than at any other point in human history.

But we need to compare the numbers. $150 billion US for aid compared to, for instance, $20,000 billion US which is the expected investments in the world this year. So to me it's a no-brainer to say that if the development assistance can be used to drive the private investment towards more green investment and towards more investment in the real (inaudible) difficult states, that will have much bigger impact than the use of the development assistance as such.

Let me just also add one comment about the relationship between money and politics. True, when we started the UN-REDD Norway made that substantial economic promise. What's most interesting is that most of that money has not been paid.

And President Yudhoyono came to Oslo when -- and identified an agreement with his then Foreign Minister Marty about $1 billion US contribution from Norway to the rainforest conservation in Indonesia. Just a small fraction of that money has actually been paid not because we don't want to pay, I mean, meaning Norway, but because the political and economic drivers have been much more important, the promises by the big companies which is now driving the agenda in Indonesia.

Remember that companies who represent 90 percent of the deforestation in Indonesia has promised no deforestation by 2020. That's much, much more powerful than -- and the amount of programs and projects which Norway could finance in Indonesia.

Even in Brazil, the rapid -- Norway has paid a lot of money to Brazil but also there, the rapid decline in the deforestation came first. And it happened because President Lula -- President Lula was not, you know, he was not personally involved in the same way as President Yudhoyono in Indonesia. But President Lula put his best people, Marina Silva who later became his rival, but she was the environment minister and currently Izabella Teixeira, the Environment Minister, brilliant, good people with a big heart in this.

On the computer, Izabella Teixeira, she will know the exact deforestation in every corner of Brazil. So if there is a deviation within the pattern of gradual practices, if there is a surge somewhere,

they can intervene. So while the money made this kind of somewhat easier, the main driver of the process have been political decisions at the top level in Brazil and Indonesia. And decisions at the top level of business in the two societies and so we should look into this.

I mean, money still counts. We should not at all speak as if development assistance is not important and powerful and need to increase but politics is more important.

MR. KHARAS: So development assistance is a catalyst, politics is the key driver and measurement is the key basis for action?

MR. SOLHEIM: And that, in the 1960s, a man was standing on TV in Singapore crying. His name was Lee Kuan Yew. He has just been kicked out of the Malaysian Federation and he didn't know what to do with Singapore.

At that point, Singapore had a GDP per capita $450. When Lee Kuan Yew passed away to God earlier this year, and he definitely deserves a place near to God, Singapore was at $55,000 per capita and compete with Switzerland and maybe Norway of being the richest nation on the planet per capita if depending on how you measure it.

How that happened? Well, not because he had a lot of money than anyone else but basically he got the political decisions right. When others, for instance, didn't believe in a market-based economy, he believed in that. When other didn't believe in a strong, dedicated state, he believed in that. When others said that an education's not so important, oh he said, we need to educate everyone in Singapore and we need to do it very rapidly and maybe have a hand there. But we need to do it.

And I could make so many other examples. I mean, if the (inaudible) and then, (inaudible) had not taken the power there, China would still remain very poor. So politics is the center but then it helps to (inaudible).

MR. KHARAS: So Elizabeth, the UN is the center of global politics. Do you see and feel the same kind of energy in the UN around this agenda of partnerships? Do you think that partnerships are going to be a real game changer in the development cooperation sphere?

MS. COUSENS: Well, thank you very much and first, let me thank you for this panel. Thank you very much to the OECD for this report. There is so much of a sense of urgency as we go

towards the summit about implementation, about action, about delivery results. And there has been so much, I think, genuine inquiry questioning interest in the whole question of partnerships.

So having this document as a kind of baseline for how we think about the next phase of implementation is enormously helpful and I want to thank you all for that. So your question about energy around the UN around this, I think first, just to say at a broad level, and I think everyone here probably knows this.

There has been a truly unprecedented level of engagement and inclusivity in all of the debates around the agenda we're about to launch in September. It's not a secret to those of you who have been very closely involved in it but I think it's really worthy of note. It's inclusive in the sense of all of the governments' stake in it. So I was very much a part of the negotiations leading up to the proposal that now is on the table for the summit about sustainable development goals.

Every single country in the United Nations was engaged in that process. And we actually were pretty efficient about reaching some shared agreement after difficult but genuinely, I think, mutually respectful, well-informed and serious conversation over a period of time; civil society involvement, business, et cetera, millions of people around the world weighing in. So it's something that everybody knows but I think it's worth saying and reinforcing because that contributes enormously both to the energy levels but also to the expectations coming out in September.

Are partnerships a game changer? Very possibly. I think we've already seen in many instances, Erik, you've given us some very compelling ones. I would point, for example, to sustainable energy for all. I'm not sure we would have an energy goal as goal seven in the sustainable development goals if there hadn't been that series of conversations, coalitions built, analytical work done to pave the way for really fruitful agreement around a kind of energy agenda going forward.

I think all the benefits of partnerships are very well documented thanks including to this -- to the report. I don't think it's the only issue about what will be a game changer. Politics is clearly a huge driver, enabler, et cetera.

I think the issue of data, the issue of evidence is enormously important in being able to underpin any kind of way of organizing for implementation. And I think we have to be very alert to the

challenges that are posed by collective action in general whether they take the form of multi-stakeholder partnerships or not.

In addition to leadership, the last thing I would say would be to point to the issue of strategy. I think we often talk about objectives. We talk about instrumentalities. We sometimes don't talk enough about strategy and getting the quality clarity of strategies right are going to be enormously important in implementation and delivery at the end of the day.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Alex, you know, the US, I would say for a very long time had the kind of size and ability to just get things done. So if you think back at some of the big development interventions, you know, PETFA or maybe even Feed the Future, there was this sense of the US actually being able to deliver something but without necessarily going through all of the trouble, if you'd like, of engaging with lots of other people.

Maybe partners inside the US but not necessarily outside, even if you think about Power Africa more recently, it's very much of a US-led initiative. And yet, I see in lots of your strategy documents and other statements coming out from the administration, much more willingness and desire to participate in partnerships.

So tell us a little bit about the US thinking on partnerships?

MR. THIER: Well, again, let me join in saying thank you for doing this event. It's -- and for Erik and this report and his whole team who has been doing such interesting thinking. You know, this is -- we are, like, literally this week in the middle of one of the most interesting moments that I think development and thinking about development has ever seen.

We had the Addis Summit just at the end of July. And we have this summit coming in New York and then, one followed in Paris. And although we have all been, particularly in the last 15 years, collectively thinking about global goals, about financing, about development effectiveness, it has never really before, and of course, climate, it has never really been the case that all of these things have been on the table at the same time.

And I think the reason that that's so fundamental is that the conversation right now is shifting. I think that the most important thing to come out of Addis, and we've been building up to it and

it's not a new idea, but it's certainly deeply embedded both in what came out of Addis and what's going to come out of the new sustainable development goals which are universal, which are not just about wealthy countries paying for poor countries to have services for their citizens.

But it's about a broader agenda and that is that local ownership is ultimately the key to development. That development is owned locally and, in fact, it's always been that way and that is the only way that it will ever be made sustainable. And it is certainly the only way in which we are going to ensure that we reach everybody with equality, I mean, basic, minimum equality of opportunity.

And the reason I say that in particular in response to your question, I mean, I think even if you look at the greatest development successes that we've had in the last couple of years, things like PEPFAR and providing millions and millions of people access to the drugs that they need to be able to survive that disease or access to education. All of these things are founded upon the premise that ultimately they will be carried forward by the citizens who own their own societies, who own their own destiny. Who are supposed to own their own government.

And the ultimate path is one of graduation. It's one of self-sufficiency. It's one of citizen accountability for the state and that is, I think, what was very powerfully acknowledged in Addis. What is, in fact, really at the heart of a lot of what this next round of developmental goals are really about.

And so for us, as USAID, I think along with the partners that we have first and foremost in the countries that we work in but increasingly the much broader array of partners that we have in our initiatives, whether it's through the private sector, whether it's through philanthropy which has become a major global player and increasingly, civil society organizations, of course, we think about often here are NGOs at home who help. But of course, it's increasingly those organizations in their own countries as was true in ours that are the keepers of the flame that drive development, that drive the politics and drive the reform that make true sustainable development possible.

And so for us, the only path to some of these goals is really through an expanded understanding of partnership of which finance is clearly an important part of it but I think it's much deeper. You know, so we have really come to invest and believe in this idea of ending extreme poverty. And President Obama, I think, got ahead of the world in a wonderful way in 2013 when he first announced that

the United States would join together with its allies to end extreme poverty.

That, of course, is SDG-1 or 1.1 and in many ways I think serves not only as a capstone for a lot of the other goals but it serves as this defining vision that I think is really the greatest endeavor that humanity has ever committed to undertaking, that we will truly include everyone to the level that they can enjoy a life of basic human dignity.

MR. KHARAS: So let me push you a little bit on that. So you know, some people have said, well, maybe we should have partnerships for each of the goals. So do you think it would be a useful idea to have a partnership for ending extreme poverty? And if so, what would that look like or is ending extreme poverty something that will result from many of these other partnerships that are already in place?

MR. THIER: I think it's very much the latter. I think that the idea of the partnerships, when you look at something like Feed the Future, is probably the most powerful, longstanding example in the last couple of years that this administration has really looked at the question of food security and nutrition and how do we create a partnership that has these elements of local ownership? That has public/private partnership because, again, that's the only way you're going to be able to sustain these things.

That brings in science and technology and sets clear goals. That -- those are elements of a partnership that works and I don't think that there is one formula. I think some partnerships are very small scale and targeted towards things that are needed in a particular environment. And I think others are useful for generating a broader consensus and bringing others in who maybe haven't been working so much on development.

So I don't think that there is a one size fits all formula although I do think that there is some very valuable principles that come out of this report and come out of the work that we've been doing. I think that the other thing that's critical in answering your question is that these partnerships have to be mutually reinforcing, right? It is wonderful to think about ending polio and ending malaria, creating an AIDS free generation. But one of the things I think that's most important that we've learned from PEPFAR particularly given the scale of it is that you can't see those things in a vacuum.

You have to see the ways in which they support other critical elements of the agenda. So governance is the obvious one, right? If you're not building strong institutions, if you're not doing health system strengthening, if you're not thinking about domestic resource mobilization and sustainable finance, those things are not going to work in the long term.

Similarly, we've just gone through this challenge in a number of the African countries where we're doing strategic planning like Nigeria and there is a lot of work to do on PEPFAR and there is a lot of work to do on extreme poverty. And so we're trying to get our teams on the ground who are crafting these programs to think about how they intersect. How are the areas geographically or in terms of the populations that remain mired in extreme poverty and those areas that overlap where we need to be doing more work on PEPFAR and malaria and so on, how do we bring those things together so that we can further both ends simultaneously?

MR. KHARAS: Great, thank you. So Elizabeth, I mean, here's a description of lots of partnerships but we don't them for everything. When you look down the list of goals and you think about the partnerships that are already in place, some are obviously doing much better than others. Are there any that stand out in your mind as being either places where it would be useful to have new partnerships?

And there's been some talk, for example, about new partnerships for data or strengthened partnerships. I know many people have called for a strengthened global partnership in education. Which of these sort of stand out in your mind as being places that we should really invest in?

MS. COUSENS: So I'd say two things. I think first, just to reinforce a point of Alex's that we're talking at least about partnerships at two very different levels. One is about the practical forms; specific problem driven partnerships may take to get certain things done in the world.

Underneath that is a much deeper premise about cooperation, about constituencies, about accountability that is about partnership, I think, whether it's with a large or a small p. And I think it's worth keeping both of those in mind. They often get conflated and intermix in conversations like but both are fundamentally important.

When I look at the landscape of partnerships in the first sense that are out there, and they do take a very diverse set of forms, functions, et cetera and that's important also to keep in mind. I

mean, there's an obvious depth and maturity of partnerships in some areas, notably health, I think education is another. And there are quite a few others.

New and interesting areas, some of the crosscutting areas where there really -- it's really a kind of new feel, the new terrain for bringing very different constituencies, actors, resources, ideas together, global data and data gaps in the data revolution is one of those. But I think it's worth separating out two kinds of conditions.

One is where we know what we need to do. We know what the tools and instruments are to do it but they're sitting in different places with different institutions and you need to bring -- or different actors and you need to bring those together around some very purposeful action and a vehicle to drive it forward.

There are also areas where maybe you don't know what you need to do so you have to really think about what the strategies are to get there or you have a sense of what you need to do but you don't yet have the instrumentalities that you need. And so I -- you raised the issue initially about peace, fragile states, conditions of that kind of volatility and vulnerability.

Alex, you did as well. That seems to me to be a terrain where I'm not sure it's a partnership deficit we have but I think we do have some deficits. We, as a global community, and thinking in various forms, need to grapple with which is how do you really address those deepest last mile issues which by and large occur in those contexts? And I think we have a bit of a strategy deficit at the moment and a bit of a tools and instruments deficit and resources, certainly that we really need to think hard and creatively about it.

How you then structure that around some form of partnership is a next level question but to me, the strategic one in that instance comes first. And so I hope there's some good and creative thought in particular in that area which, frankly, plays out across the entirety of the SDG agenda because it's where those issues play out and particularly for the most vulnerable.

MR. KHARAS: So I think one of the things, Erik, that partnerships are starting to do is actually innovate and Elizabeth was just saying, well, there are many areas where we don't really know what to do. What do you -- do you see partnerships as being sufficiently flexible to be able to innovate, to

renew themselves?

I mean, some of these partnerships are actually quite old. They do get locked into certain ways of doing things. What can we do to make sure that we get both the innovation and the real honest lessons of evaluation and best practice that we can share?

MR. SOLHEIM: That's, of course, also normal in humanity. I mean, the world are full presidents who are very successful in their first 5 or 10 years but who may not be as successful and they're lasting for 30 or 40 years. And so -- and you can say that you see the same in business also the ability to innovate and do something new is a key component.

Of course, partnership is exactly the same. If they start becoming more bureaucratized it's more difficult. But if you look to the two partnerships I just mentioned, obviously, the Gates Foundation and other institution, they're very innovative in finding ways to do the vaccination program. That has not been done at the scale up to now.

In the rainforest issue, I mean, it basically changed the track while we were walking. In the beginning we thought money would be the key issue. Later we tend to believe that the key issue was absolutely political dedication at the highest level and to bring business on board because the one day Nestle and Unilever and Willmar and April which are Indonesian companies say we want to deforestation. We promised of customers that we won't do deforestation.

That's enormously powerful. True, they may sometimes be cheating as everyone else but then, we have the civil society and medium others to try to go after to expose that.

If you ask for partnership, let me mention at least one. I think we need -- one of the sustainable development goals is about the oceans. We definitely need some similar partnership for the ocean similar to the rainforest coalition. There is basically nothing of that. That's a number of individual acts. I mean, President Obama, for instance, said -- dedicated some huge protected areas in the Pacific which is brilliant but there have been need a global coalition to really focus on this. The protection of the coral reefs, the protection of the fish sources, to fight the acidification of the oceans which is one of the main effect of climate change and very little talked about because maybe because we don't see it.

So we really need a global coalition to protect 70 percent of the surface of the earth just

to mention one.

MR. KHARAS: Elizabeth, I want to come back to you because Erik brought up this idea of leadership. And leadership is not always the word that springs to mind when the United Nations or the World Bank or some of these other big multilateral bureaucracies are kind of called in.

Yet at some level, they're often the basis for partnerships. They service the secretariat for partnerships. How do you use that -- and all partnerships seem to have to balance this notion of legitimacy on the one hand with effectiveness and action and just getting something done on the other hand. So how do you kind of see where we are on that spectrum and how big organizations, the UN, others, can try to better balance that trade off?

MS. COUSENS: Of course, the UN is different things, right? I mean, it's a civil service. It's a set of operational entities. It's also a platform for convening heads of state, convening ministers and for political conversations that generally involve everybody. So I think it's a lot of different things at the same time.

I actually do think about leadership sometimes when I think about the United Nations and also other international institutions. But I think this is very much a case-by-case question that really needs to be looked at in a sense less in aggregate than in a differentiated sense.

Where there are, and I think, I take very much to heart this issue of political leadership which can come in very different forms from very different places. If that is kind of understood as a necessary ingredient to a successful coalition which I think is exactly right, then you need to think about the conditions and contexts in which you incentivize that leadership. You reward it. You sustain it. You support it.

I think that's something that probably collectively we all can do more. We can all do more to support but that will be something that is, again, very much case-by-case. I would say that I think under this Secretary General, who has made kind of multi-stakeholder modes of action pretty central to his own concept of how you do development, starting -- and some of the ones that we certainly have worked the most closely on, every woman, every child, sustainable energy for all. We're very much driven by his personal leadership and very much with an open door, I think, in other quarters who

understood the value of cooperative action around some very big ideas and commitments.

MR. KHARAS: Alex, you've just come from a major partnership meeting, the Global Partnership on Effective Development Cooperation. One has these forums. They're great places to raise the political profile. They're great places for an exchange of views and other things.

But you also have people saying, well, at the end of the day it's a nice talk shop. What about the real action? What do you think about leaderships or as getting action happening? Breaking through all of these considerations versus being very nice and polite to everybody and very inclusive and but ending up just talking?

MR. THIER: Well, I think that the nice part of being part of an organization like USAID is that ultimately we are measured by the results that we get on the ground. We exist to deliver.

And so whenever we have participated in these fora or even the policy work that we do, it's always tethered to the reality that we have a responsibility to be able to deliver real effects on the ground. I think that the question about the global partnership is a great one because I've sat on the steering committee with Erik and a few others for the last couple of years and one of the most interesting things to have happened in all of those discussion was very early and powerful leadership from people like Minister Ngozi in Nigeria and others on this theme of domestic resource mobilization.

And just as this theme was kind of rising up and ultimately became the theme, I think among all others at Addis, because it is without question the largest funding stream for development. What countries are able to generate, that revenue that they're able to generate and the effective spending of that revenue is ultimately going to be the thing that drives all development and sustainability.

And I think that the folks in the global partnership coming out of Busan really caught the wave of that understanding and it helped to drive, I think, the creation of one of the most successful partnerships that came out of Addis which is the Addis Tax Initiative. So it took this big idea and got 30 plus countries and some foundations and international multilateral organizations together to say, you know what? This is a really important issue. And this is kind of like the essence of why partnerships can matter.

It's a really important issue. Some of us are working on it in some places. Occasionally,

some of us are working on it in the same places and not always talking to each other effectively. We need to have a basic understanding about some principles.

We need to increase the amount of money that goes into this issue and it ended up getting doubled as a result of the Addis Tax Initiative. And we need to be able to share information about what's working and why and where there are challenges. And also use it as a little bit of a mechanism to whip up political will because nothing in domestic resource mobilization succeeds without political will and buy-in at the local level.

And so that was a great example for me of going kind of from the highest of the high, what is this big emerging issue on the international agenda, funneling it through a group of organizations that actually have something to do with trying to make it happen both at the recipient level as well as at the donor level and then, crafting something practical out of it to actually get something done.

And I think when that's -- when you put those ingredients together then it can matter. But you shouldn't form partnerships just for the sake of partnerships. They actually have to be tethered to real issues and real organizations that actually have a mandate an obligation to get something done with the resources.

MR. KHARAS: Thanks. That's a great story. Let me now open up to the floor and I see a bunch of hands on this side of the room. So I'll start with this side of the room and maybe people at the other side will also wake up.

Let's start with that lady in the middle as you are right there. Yes, right there in green.

QUESTIONER: Yes, good afternoon. My name is Amy Johnson. I'm an international and community development consultant here in DC doing quite a bit of work on gender, youth and organizational development and thinking a lot about partnerships. And I appreciate the outline of the report and the highlights.

I look forward to getting into it in a little bit more detail and perhaps this is covered in there. But I'm really interested in kind of pushing beyond some of these success ideas or the strategies and thinking beyond lessons learned and challenges and perhaps going to what might be the dreaded "f" word of failure. And I'm really curious to get the panel's thoughts on the tolerance for risk or the tolerance

for failure in partnerships and how that might be addressed both through the results that are gathered through the data collection but also through just sort of the process evaluation. Thanks.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. I think we'll take three questions at a time and then, come back. Down in the front row, please.

QUESTIONER: Robert Sherretta with International Investor. The world's been riveted by some of the refugee crisis in Europe lately. And we're taking a special look at another side of it which is immigration and migrations around the world due to economic and environmental factors rather than conflict.

Is there a case to be made that if we don't assist some of these nations more effectively with foreign aid programs, partnerships, whatever it might be, that we're apt to see more economic and environmental migrations because people are just forced to leave their lands?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you and behind you, please. If you can just pass the mic?

QUESTIONER: Yeah, thank you. I'm John Coonrod with The Hunger Project and, Elizabeth, I want to address the point you made about a deficit of strategies and what I think I heard you talk about. From our perspective ending extreme poverty and hunger really depends on community level institutions and having goal 16 of building responsive participatory institutions, civil, governmental, private sector, at the community level.

And this commitment, and I think a real missing alliance is an alliance for the art and science of community-led development, of building those institutions. And I would just like to hear your reflection. We're trying to build such a movement. We're finding some resonance but it's going to need, as somebody said, some real political leadership and some real clout because there's just from our perspective way insufficient attention to building community level institutions because they hold everything together.

MR. KHARAS: Okay, thank you. So Elizabeth, as that was directed squarely at you?

MS. COUSENS: Sure. I'm happy to start with that and then I'll also pick up a little bit on the risk and tolerance for failure question. So I mean, I think the questions that we were trying to grapple with in what is now goal 16, peaceful inclusive societies and the kind of institutional foundations for

getting development done on a way that's inclusive, fair and impactful.

I think speaks to the community level of institutions and community led development. It also speaks to other levels of action that are also required, national, regional and so on. I think the larger question to me, so and to me, it's a profound accomplishment to have embedded as rich an agenda as is expressed in that goal and also has connective tissue across other goals. And the framework which is, again, an important, I think, corrective result to think about when we think about goal-by-goal action, to remember how much connective tissue is to cross.

But it's a very, very rich agenda which, I think, creates real ammunition for citizens, organizations at lots of different levels, lots of tools for action and mobilization. I don't it quite speaks to some of the limitations we still have certainly at the global level and in international institutions in terms of the instrumentalities we use to assist, support certain kinds of action.

And I think, I mean, this goes to questions about how you spend ODA. It goes to timelines for disbursement of official assistance. It goes to risk tolerance, actually, because if you look at where both in nature and the kind of location of some of the real institutional challenges and governance challenges, engaging in those issues over time, they're often generational investments and cooperation that needs to happen.

The timeframes are not always geared to the way we organize ourselves. And you have to have a pretty high tolerance for risk and you can't always measure results as readily as you would like.

So I think there's a whole set of questions around how to be serious about that agenda that is very advanced compared to where it was 25 years ago but still probably has room to go. And I see a lot of energy and a desire to sort of speak to it in various ways which is exciting.

And then, just as to pick up briefly on the risk tolerance for failure. I think it's very, very important and you see in the most successful, I think, expressions of partnership and collective action to build into the beginning mechanisms for learning while you go, seriousness about evaluation, metrics for thinking about it. You won't know every measurement at the beginning but really build in the investment in those tools and the inflection points to be able to make course corrections and to invite stories of failure as well as success and to reward people for candor about where you fall down on the job because that's

life.

Everybody makes mistakes. You learn from them. The important thing is that you do that and I think really being able to build in learning and evaluation into all of our actions and processes are going to be extremely important over time.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Alex, would you like to take the question on migration and development cooperation as prevention, to paraphrase a bit the --

MR. THIER: Sure. And maybe to tie back to something that Homi said at the beginning about the critical nature of our work in fragile states and challenging environments, there's no question.

No matter what way you look at the world, if we're going to achieve the objectives that are being laid out in this agenda, they are going to have to take place in environments that face multiple challenges whether it's extreme weather or corruption or conflict. There are going to be challenges and I think that this gets both to the migration and the risk question because, of course, the risk is highest in those environments.

And if the need is greatest and the risk is highest, the only math that I can do is to suggest that we're going to need more tolerance for risk in the creation of the partnerships and our investment in these environments if we're going to be able to make difference.

Unfortunately, I can tell you from very direct and repeated experience that this is not necessarily a town that applauds us risking, taking a lot of risks with our taxpayer dollars and foreign assistance and I think that there needs to be a serious dialogue about that. Because I think that the ultimate metrics of success will demonstrate that there is a high risk reward ratio. But that means that there is risk and sometimes you have to be able to accept the failures.

And if we, the sort of compact is that we can be truthful because we are so much more intensive about both evaluation and transparency these days. If we can be truthful about the experiences that we're having and what we're doing to correct the problems that we find in exchange for greater tolerance of risk, then I think that that will not only allow us to do more but critically, will allow us to bring in more partners. Because a lot of what we need to do in these environments is actually around risk reduction because there are a lot of -- I found from my direct experience in places like Afghanistan and

Pakistan and DRC and some of these environments that we're working in, there're a lot of actors that are interested in being engaged in these places.

But you have to be able to address the risk whether it's physical, fiscal or reputational in order to be able to do that. And I think that this links so closely with the migration problem.

I don't know how to separate the economic causes from the environmental causes from the conflict causes. I think we learned that very powerfully ourselves last year in our own migration crisis with unaccompanied minors coming from Central America. We have -- the administration has asked for significantly more money to address that problem in precisely the ways that I think that the question suggests.

We saw what was happening that was driving this out migration and we have committed to doing more not only directly for children but particularly looking at some of the economic and social causes that were leading to the high levels of violence are still unfortunately leading to high levels of violence that are driving some of that out migration.

And so there's no, of course, we need to have robust policies to receive people when they find themselves out in the world and looking for help. But at the same time, we really also have to have policies that try to address the challenges in those countries because most people don't want to leave their homes.

And whether it is for environmental, economic or criminal or conflict causes, addressing those problems in the places where they exist is ultimately going to be the long-term solution.

MR. KHARAS: Thanks, Erik?

MR. SOLHEIM: Migration, I mean, my nation, Norway, had the biggest per capita migration to the United States of American next to Ireland. And there were two reasons why people left and none of them Norway because they thought America was nicer than their own valley back home in Norway. They all thought to back to Norway.

But they left for two reasons. They wanted to be able to serve God in the way not decided by some priests in Norway but in freedom here and they went because they would have a much better economic and social life for themselves but maybe more importantly for their children and

grandchildren if they went to Minnesota or the Dakotas.

And it happened to basically be right. They -- nearly all of them or the vast majority got a better life here than they would have had back in Norway those days. It's exactly the same drivers of migration today, freedom to express yourself or to have your political or religious thoughts and better economic social life, more security.

So it's absolutely clear that long-term solution to the migration pressure is to assist in all different ways through investment, aid, et cetera, et cetera and improving freedom and living standards in Africa and Syria and other places. However, because that's a long-term solution it will not relieve the immediate pressure. But we need to find solutions to the immediate issues while at the same time work on the long term.

And the disturbing fact now is that many European nations will be tempted to take from the development assistance for say, Africa or Syria, and use it in say, Germany or Scandinavia because the pressure is so high.

Then on risk, that's spot on. I mean, we had Hillary Clinton, as far as I understand, in the other room just prior to this. What has dominated her agenda for the last year? To me at least seen from outside, two absolute non-issues; her emails and Benghazi. Two absolute non-issues, nothing related to her visions for America or for the world, what does she really want to achieve?

That's what I think most Americans and for sure the rest of the world want to know. We want to know what the most powerful person in the world want to do for America in the world. But it's completely consumed by these non-issues.

And of course, I can give any number of examples from Europe of issues which do not -- are not (inaudible). But when politicians are sucked into defending themselves on these issues, they tend not to be brave. Because attempt to make the calculation if I do something substantial, the chance that there would be a failure, there is no way you can do something big in the world without something to criticize.

If you sit still, do very limited. Hope that the wind is blowing somewhat gradually in other direction. It may be a much better position to be in. So we kind of teach, force politicians to be not

forward-leaning and brave but to be very, very insecure and thinking of the next election. And that's a recipe for problems in the world.

So let's do our utmost to assist politicians, to defend politicians who want to be brave. Let them get the support. Tell the media this is completely nonsense. Why are you focusing on these emails rather than on the big issues?

MR. KHARAS: Okay, thank you. So I'm going to take one more round of questions and if you could be brief so that we can get everybody in. There's a gentleman with the glasses here.

QUESTIONER: Great. I'm honored to be on the active side of the room today. I just wanted to actually take a bit of literal turn in interpreting the title of this panel which is how the SDGs can support local priorities. And I know you mean national priorities in the context of this panel but my question is actually around subnational and local governments and the role that they can play in supporting the SDGs which I know is, I think there's pretty broad recognition that they will need to play an active role.

So many of the targets and goals converge at the local level whether it's climate change and resilience to delivery of services for the urban and rural poor. So I'm just wondering what do you think the role of local governments are in this partnership you're describing? And then, specifically, I was also curious to see in looking at ODA flows, have you looked at changes over time and how they've -- whether they've gone increasingly to local governments and to what effect?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. There's a lady in the white jacket.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. My name is Usma. I'm working for the World Bank. I have two questions and both may not be very much liked by the people here but just playing a little bit of devil's advocate. I --

MR. KHARAS: One, please, question.

QUESTIONER: Okay. Indonesia in 1997, 96, before the crisis had around 20, 17 percent of people living below poverty line and after the crisis in 1998 it was having 24 percent people living below poverty line. And by 2008 it went back to under 16 percent of people living below poverty line.

I'm wondering that in your report, in fact, at your column, Erik, you mentioned and we know this figure. There are people, more than a billion people living below absolute poverty and most of these people are living in very, very poor countries. Do you think environment or deforestation or these priorities are equally important for these poorest of the countries as well where they have bigger issues to tackle? For example, eliminating poverty?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Gentleman at the back who's waving.

QUESTIONER: My name is Yayif Anousi. I'm with United State of Africa 2017 project taskforce. I do not ask question. I just make a statement less than two minutes. And if you are smart when you go to your offices, you will think about it.

MR. KHARAS: Yes, please, 30 seconds.

QUESTIONER: With regards to Africa in your -- I've not read the report yet, did you at any time figure talking to the African multibillionaires and millionaires who are creating jobs what do they consider to be the major structural impediments of capital formation and expansion. From (inaudible) they said the political divisions in Africa. They want the political (inaudible) as they exist to go. That's why they are supporting those to create the federation.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. I'll take one more question. Right here in pink, orange.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. My name is Noel Schroeder. I'm with Women Thrive Worldwide. I wanted to come back to a statement that you made, Ms. Cousens, that the SDG process was inclusive because it included all member states.

Do you feel now that we're talking about partnerships and coalitions that include partners across all levels, from the community level to local government, civil society, private sector, et cetera. Do you feel that the process was inclusive in that fashion and how can we make the process more inclusive especially including community-led development for the implementation?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. So I'm going to go back to the panel and you can pick up any of these questions but if you also would just, if there are any other thoughts that you want to leave with the audience, this is your one minute to do so. Alex?

MR. THIER: So maybe I'll just pick up very briefly on the first question about subnational

actors. I think that there is growing recognition whether it's states or cities that subnational government is an absolutely critical actor both because they are often closer to the ground, the problems that we face. I gave the example of Nigeria before.

I mean, Nigeria has problems all over the place but some of the states in Nigeria which are both very populace and have upwards of 80 percent of the population living in extreme poverty; you have to be able to deal with some of those challenges at the subnational level. And I think that that's something that we are getting better at.

And I would add that it has been the policy of USAID for the last couple of years, I'm sure many of you are aware that we committed to tripling the amount of resources that we spend through local institutions. And I just want to reiterate as we continue on that path, the reason that we believe it's so important is because ultimately, local institutions whether public or private, governmental or non-governmental, are going to be the long-term drivers of change and reform in their societies.

And those institutions having the capacity and the wherewithal to do everything from simple organizing and the accounting to the big work on policy changes is absolutely fundamental for their sustainability and longevity. And that's been a very hard push for us as an organization and it requires a lot of work on capacity building. It requires a lot of confidence building both at the national level and here at home. That I think that the results are absolutely demonstrating to us that if you are going to create longstanding partnerships that you have to be able to do it with institutions at the local level.

The only other thing that I will add because I'm very excited about it and it's related to this is that USAID has just completed and will soon launch our first ever vision on ending extreme poverty. And this is a document that does three things.

First of all, when we changed our mission statement a year-and-a-half ago to focus on ending extreme poverty, of course, everyone clamored to say, well, what do you mean by that? What is your definition? And so we've gone to a lot of effort to create a definition that we thinks speaks to the challenge.

It also includes a theory of the case. What do we think it's actually going to take to end

extreme poverty by 2030? And then, the third part obviously, critically for us is what are we going to do about it? How are we going to invest? How are we going to focus? How are we going to measure in such a way that over the next 15 years, we will be able to really draw upon our resources and drive that agenda?

And so I think it's a great thing for us. It very much speaks to this need for leadership and vision but that's going to have to be translated into reality and partnership starts at home. I know that many of the people in the audience here are our partners both intellectually as well as on the ground. And we thank you for that engagement and invite you as we launch this strategy and move past the SDGs into implementation to really be our partners in figuring out how to put meat on the bones of all the things we've been talking about today.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you so much. Elizabeth?

MS. COUSENS: Perfect. Well, I'll pick on the question about inclusivity. So I think empirically there is no question but that the last few years have been more inclusive of other stakeholders as a UN process. The various conversations, the high level panel processes, the open working group process, all the conversations that have ensued, the millions of people who engaged online in various forms, civil society groups, business community, scientific and research institutions.

Was it enough? Absolutely not. So it was more, I think, than ever before but much more needs to be done. So to me the real question is how do we build and very much as you posed it, more authentic engagement at different levels by different stakeholders, around different problems, around a whole series of sets of issues about action and implementation going forward.

I want to connect this a little bit to the question about cities and subnational actors because I think one of the things we do need to think about, especially over the next let's say year to year-and-a-half, is time. So there's a tremendous urgency about implementation.

We need to set up architecture. We need to move, move, move. We need to move money, action, resources, et cetera. I think there's also value in taking a bit of time to digest the implications, the incredible promise of the agenda that we're about to launch. Genuinely, to go deeper in many different communities of practice, of geography about what this means to them.

This goes to the local ownership question on many levels and really to think creatively, thoughtfully and smartly about what the right kind of, you know, cooperative basis, the political basis and the institutional and kind of programmatic basis is for action around specific issues and specific contexts.

I've heard some people talk about we need a period of transition to implementation and I think that's something really worth thinking about at least in some areas so we really get it right and have the genuine buy-in and engagement over time that we need. So thank you for the question.

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Erik?

MR. SOLHEIM: Great. I can then focus on the initial question since you have replied to the others and they understand it. It's also one of my favorite nations and there has been incredible progress in Indonesia. In the 1960s life expectancy was in the 40s.

Now life expectancy in Indonesia is 71. What a progress in one long generation. In the 1990s most people believe this would be the new Balkans. It would be civil wars. I mean, there were wars more or less all over Indonesia to the country. It has made peace and Indonesia probably sends few, I mean, the biggest Muslim nation on the planet probably sends much fewer people to fight in Syria than the United Kingdom or France. Maybe even fewer than my small nation of Norway.

It shows the power of peaceful Islam and a responsible Islamic leaders in a nation like Indonesia. So there is enormous progress. And fortunately, there is no need to destroy the rainforest, for that continue simply because so much is already deforested that the palm oil companies, the timber companies but also all the small holder farmers who may be the first people to drive some of the deforestation, they can all get their business done, feed my family or make my profit in a land which is already deforested.

I mean, there is six times more deforested land than you need for any of this to happen. So fortunately, there is -- it's -- there is no need to do that to bring people out of poverty.

And also, remind yourself of the scale. Indonesia is the fourth biggest nation on the planet when there are many more people living in Indonesia than in all war zones on the planet combined, many more. So when in Indonesia, I mean, it's a basically hidden, very, very rare that there is any articles in global media about this fantastic success story because it, I mean, not to say that Syria,

South Sudan, Central African Republic, et cetera is not important. It's very important.

But many more people are successful in Indonesia than those now suffering in the war zones. And then, finally one question which is related to this.

I mean, I agree with what -- underlying what you say. We have 17 goals but to me 1 goal still stands out as the goal among goals and there's no accident that that's goal number 1; to bring everyone out of extreme poverty on the planet.

And here we need maybe some new coalitions. We need, at least, some new thinking because up to now, we have brought people out of poverty globally basically by economic growth. Deng Xiaoping in China said someone has to be reached first. They never, ever focused on the (inaudible) in China.

If you go to the United States of America, my political hero, Abraham Lincoln, well, he wanted to bring railroads to America. He was even a lawyer of the railroad companies because he thought that would bring development. He thought that if every person was able to work hard on his land or in his business they would get out of poverty.

But Lincoln, except for slavery, never focused on the very poor of America just bringing economic growth and that will resolve the problem over time. However, we have set a goal by 2030 we will abolish extreme poverty.

There is no way that Africa, even with 10 percent growth in every nation, Africa from now to 2030 that poverty will be eradicated by 2030. Nor can it happen in India by 2030 just by economic growth. You need more targeted policies to the very poor if you want to succeed.

And that debate has still not really taken on board. Probably we would need cash disbursement schemes like many Latin American nations have been very successful with. Maybe micro credit, maybe targeted effort to the agricultural sector because most people will be living in the countryside. But at least, we cannot do the trick by 2030 just by economic growth.

Not to say growth is not important. It's very important but we need to add targeted policies and one quote at the end. We also need the dedication. So Lincoln is kind of my hero.

One of his most quoted remarks was the following. "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is

wrong." And I think we need the exact same clarity of purpose now. If extreme poverty is not wrong, what in hell is wrong?

MR. KHARAS: Thank you. Thank you, Erik. And thank you for bringing real passion as well as hardheaded analysis into this discussion. So I'm not going to try to summarize but I do want you to take away a few words that have come up repeatedly in this conversation.

I think the paramount emphasis that was put on politics, leadership and ultimately on local ownership as really being ultimately the key factors for success. And I think every one of the panel members talked about it.

Second, I think that there was a real emphasis that aid is at best a catalyst, something for innovation. Of course, in selected countries, it plays a very important role but one should neither overestimate the importance of aid nor undersell its value. So it's one of the toolkits but only one and I think the excitement today is that we're really broadening that through these partnerships to include many other toolkits.

We need to have much better results and data if we're really going to take action in a meaningful way. And then, last one I think this is something that we haven't really come to grips with is how do we get politicians to accept more risk? To be bolder leaders and take on more risk because in this great endeavor that we are trying to implement, risk is a major factor. And that we don't seem to, as yet, have really cracked that knot.

Maybe through partnerships we will have more risk mitigating instruments but as yet, we haven't really seen that come to the fore. So please join me in thanking our incredible panel. It's been a fantastic discussion. Thank you all so much.

* * * * *

SDG-2015/09/09

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