

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

2018 AID TRANSPARENCY INDEX:
PROGRESS TO DATE AND NEW FRONTIERS OF AID AND DEVELOPMENT DATA

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, June 20, 2018

Introduction:

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

Presenter:

CATHERINE TURNER
Acting Chief Executive Officer
Public What You Fund

Panelists:

PAUL O'BRIEN, Moderator
Vice President of Policy and Advocacy
Oxfam America

JOEL R. CHARNY
Director
Norwegian Refugee Council USA

KATHRYN KAUFMAN
Managing Director for Women's Issues
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)

AARON ROSENBERG
Head of Public Affairs
International Finance Corporation (IFC)

TESSIE SAN MARTIN
President and Chief Executive Officer
PLAN International USA

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
500 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Video shown)

MR. INGRAM: Good morning everybody. It is my pleasure to welcome you, both those of you in the room and those watching on webcast, to this launch of the 2018 Aid Transparency Index. The hashtag for the event is #2018index. I'm doing a dual role today in that I'm a senior fellow here at Brookings and I chair the friends of Publish What you Fund.

Many of you have been engaged in the effort to make aid transparent for the better part of this decade. Since it's moved from a little known movement to being endorsed by most donors at the 2011 high level forum in Boson. As background to the presentation and discussion today, it is useful to review why aid transparency. The answer is that data allows donors, governments, implementers to make better decisions, to identify what aid is needed, where and how to target it and it supports better coordination, better analysis and better evaluation.

As articulated by the 2016 high level panel report on humanitarian finance, and while this quote is targeted to humanitarian it applies to all the systems. The more we know about how money is channeled through the global system, the better equipped we are to allocate resources effectively and measure results. For donors to provide more flexible and predictable funding, they need reliable, real time prioritized comparable and open data on the needs that they are asked to finance and the results produced by the funding.

As we will hear from Cathy shortly about the next index, there has been good progress. But as we look at the next decade and the ambitions of the sustainable development goals, it is clear that we face some big challenges. Including one vastly greater need for finance, trillions not billions, well beyond foreign assistance. Two, the magnitude of resources that are being directed to easing humanitarian suffering and the urgency to build resilience through bridging the humanitarian development divide. And

thirdly, a vastly more diverse landscape including more developing countries can now finance much of their own development but they still need some external assistance. A broader array of donors, both public and private. And expanding development finance, involving public, private collaboration, private investment funds, blended funds, pooled funds, pension funds, sovereign wealth funds. They have different models, different approaches and different missions.

We need to know what they are doing and how they can be harnessed or at least guided to produce better development. We need to encourage these additional investments but we also need to maintain the transparency standards that we have worked so hard to instill. Without transparency, we will lack the tools to facilitate their working together, to help ensure effective use of resources and to hold institutions accountable.

Full transparency across the development finance arena means that we can see the whole picture, as you saw in the video, of who is financing what for what purpose and where. Having this information means that we can be smart about how we invest resources. There are still investments for which ODA is the best source of funding such as establishing rules of law. There are other areas, like job creation, where private or blended flows make more sense. Having the full picture helps avoid the gaps and the duplication that happens far too often when information is not shared.

Accountability is particularly important where we have institutions whose mission may not be poverty reduction or even development. You will hear more about this in the panel discussion. How do we know whether investments are contributing to development outcomes if we lack information on the results? Transparency on its own will not solve our development challenges. But it will go a long way to contributing to better decision making, better coordination and hopefully better outcomes.

As a preface to Catherine Turner, the interim CEO of Publish What You Fund, presenting on how 45 of the worlds largest donors are doing and an introduction to

the Aid Transparency Index. A recent academic analysis by Dan Hoening and Catherine Weaver concluded that the index has attained and exercised significant symbolic and normative power by defining clear indicators and benchmarks for donor transparency. Its authority derives from its independence and its process of working with donors and external reviewers. Catherine.

MS. TURNER: Hello. Well this is really an honor and a pleasure to be able to present the Aid Transparency Index results for 2018. First of all, I'd like to thank Brookings for this wonderful venue and George Ingram and the Board and Friends of Publish What You Fund for your support. Our fund is for their support and, of course, the Publish What You Fund team have been working tirelessly for months now to pull all of this together.

I wanted to start by sharing an experience of my own. It was quite a formative one that happened when I was new to Publish What You Fund. It was in my first few weeks in the job and I was at a conference where I met a delegate from the Finance Ministry in Afghanistan. Being new, I wanted to ask lots of questions, what are the challenges, what is it like for you, how do you think about transparency. He outlined several problems that arise when you don't have transparency or it doesn't work well. He painted a picture of donors not coordinating their activities leading to duplication and gaps. He also spoke how his government was not being consulted so he didn't know how to allocate his own budgets. I remember him telling me about the first time that he knew one donor had commissioned a major construction project was when he looked out of his window and he saw the construction workers arriving to get started on it. True story.

But this is just one story and we do hear numerous others which tell us why transparency matters. But the situation today is far better than it was. We're pleased to say that aid and development transparency has come an incredibly long way over the last ten years. Over the last decade, up to date information on projects, financial

flows and so on are more available than ever before. Now, 93 percent of the major aid donors that we look at publish at least some information in open and comparable formats. Around half of those we assess, produce information on a monthly basis. So more current information is available than ever before.

But there is still a job to do. Aid is changing. As we've heard, today we see a growing aid and development finance gap which is estimated to be in the trillions globally every year. And as well as that, we have a growing diversity of actors stepping forward with new ways to mobilize finance and funding such as development finance institutions, DFI's, the private sector and pooled or trust funds, to name just a few. Humanitarian actors have made commitments to make their aid funding more transparent too. So this requires us to renew the call for greater aid transparency across the board.

So how do things look in 2018? We have to say congratulations to the Asian Development Bank, you come first this year. It really is an impressive fete and the result of commitment from the very top, dedicated resources and technical work across teams. This year it is notable that many different types of agencies do well. Not only did the Asian Development Bank come top but DFI's dominate the very good category accounting for four out of seven agencies in it. We also have two bilateral agencies, UK-DIFD and US-MCC and also one UN agency, UNDP.

Another type of agency to do well is EC-ECHO. The EC's directorate for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations. It is in the good category but one of the best EU performers second only to DIFT and ahead of its EC counterparts.

Now I already mentioned that DFI's account for many in the very good category. It's worth looking a little bit closer at DFI's. And just to clarify for the index, when we speak about DFI's, we are talking about multilateral development banks only. Seven of these are featured in the index. All of them publish open and comparable information to the IATI standard and six out of seven of these do so in a monthly basis except World Bank's IDA which does it quarterly.

Now not only did the Asian Development Bank come top but collectively DFI's outperform other organizations. There are disparities which prompts interesting questions for the panel, perhaps. As you can see, within the DFI's group, organizations that work primarily with the private sector, World Bank, IFC and EBRD perform relatively less well.

Now I'm going to say now and not just because we have the IFC on the panel today but the IFC began publishing only recently and has made really significant progress in the index since 2016. But also echoing George's point, it would also be interesting to hear how DFI's measure their contribution to development outcomes when poverty reduction may not necessarily be their primary mandate.

Another highlight of the results is that unprecedented amounts of information are available, in a timely and in an accessible format. 75 percent of the agencies in the index publish monthly or quarterly and 50 percent monthly which is double what was the case in 2016. Only three out of 45 agencies, the three at the bottom, do not publish information in the IRT standard. This is compared with only one donor who published two IRT in January 2011.

So there is a lot to feel positive about but too many agencies aren't getting the basics right. More information doesn't necessarily mean better information. For example, over 25 percent of agencies do not provide project descriptions or the titles or descriptions they give cannot be understood by non-experts. This is a real example of a title published by a major donor found on D portal. As you can see it is present, there's a title but I might suggest it's unusable, meaningless, certainly to me if I was looking at it. Another issue is that not all organizations regularly update their information or provide accurate dates. As you can see, the plan end date for this project is 2107. Now I know that the path to self-reliance is a tough one but this kind of leaves without any hope whatsoever. But jokes aside, this actually happens repeatedly and makes data use all the more difficult.

Now we measure aid transparency according to components. There are five components that we look at. As you can see, donors perform well on average in most areas. You can also see that one component at the bottom, the red one, needs improvement across the range of donors and that's performance. By performance, we mean the sharing of results, reviews and evaluations, things like that which help assess with the projects are progressing towards or have achieved their development objectives and this is the area which has the most gaps. Collectively, donors score only 27 percent on average. This is why it matters. This information is important as it enables donors, partner country governments and civil society to monitor projects and for us all to learn from them.

Finally, is that some major donors are simply not pulling their weight. I mentioned that three organizations do not publish to IATI but they also do not make their information readily available publicly elsewhere either. While some organizations have greatly improved this time around, others are publishing to fewer indicators or less frequently than they did in 2016.

In 2018, we have a mixed picture. We have seen some impressive gains but also more work to do. Especially getting the basics right and the need to provide more performance related information. We also have to take account of an increasingly complex aid and development finance landscape. Diverse funding streams present fresh opportunities for channeling aid development finance but also fresh demands for donors to open these up. It is also high time to move beyond publication of the data alone so that it can be accessed and used for better development outcomes.

We all have a part to play. And for our part at Publish What You Fund, data use is one of the areas that we are prioritizing in our new strategy. But for donors, we urge you, for example, to encourage and engage directly with your users to get direct and helpful feedback on your aid and development activities and take feedback to improve the usability of that information further. That's enough from me. I now really look forward to

hearing the panel discussion about the changing aid and development landscape and what that means for transparency. Thank you.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you, Cathy. If the panelists would come up while I introduce the moderator. You will notice from that presentation, something that I learned two days ago when I read the report. That is that it turns out the Europeans and the Americans use the term DFI differently. We use it principally to refer to OPIC and its sister organizations and that type of public private finance where they use it to apply to multilateral banks too. So we'll let Paul sort through that.

My job here is to introduce Paul as the moderator. He's Vice President for Policy and Campaigns at Oxfam America. He was the unanimous choice as the moderator for this panel because he is a member of the board of Friends of Publish What You Fund. He's a member of an organization that is committed, Oxfam America, to IATI so he knows the ins and outs, the easy part and the hard part. But mostly because Paul is an accomplished moderator who has an analytic mind that goes to the big picture and to the trends and he can combine being provocative with being respectful that leads to a very interesting and engaging conversation. Thank you Paul.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, George, for that wonderful set up. It's great to see everybody here and thanks, Catherine, for the great presentation. It's great to see the launch. It's super to see a packed house, so many of you taking time to be here with us today. This is important stuff. Just a couple of logistics before I say a word on why. If you want to ask a question and we're going to make time at the end for you to do so, we'll talk a little bit about how we'd like you to ask them. We also have a live webcast, so if you're out there and you'd like to send a tweet to Aid Transparency we'll try to get some of those in.

So let me just say one word before I introduce our great panel. Why are we here, why is this important. You saw the results. China and the United Arab Emirates are not sitting on the bottom of that index because they are unsophisticated about the

power of information. You can't go to a sports stadium in this town without running into branding from the United Arab Emirates. They understand it. The Department of Defense is not the worst agency in the United States government on transparency because it doesn't have the resources to do it right. This is about political will, it's about a decision to use transparency, as George said, it's never going to be sufficient to solve the problems of the world. But tell me one great thing that we are collectively trying to do on World Refugee Day for people living and working on our borders and for people who are being separated from their families on our borders. Tell me anything we're trying to do these days if you don't have information about what is going on. So we're here to talk about the power of information to be used for good.

I am very honored to be with a professionally diverse group of people who are going to give you some great thoughts on that and you're going to hear less from me from now on. Introductions. Let's start with Tessie. Tessie is at the far left. Dr. Tessie San Martin is currently the President and CEO of PLAN International USA. A children's rights organization focused on promoting gender equality and ensuring every girl fulfills her potential. She worked at the World Bank for many years as a director. She was a partner at IBM consulting services. Her doctorate is in political economy from Harvard and she has been a leader in our community tying the theoretical to the practical and getting an institution to actually live those values for years. So it is just fabulous for me and for all of us to have a chance to hear her thoughts.

Joel Charny beside me known for many years and has been a leader in the humanitarian community. We're going to spend a little bit of time talking about what is particularly important when you think of humanitarian crisis. He is the director of Norwegian Refugee Council USA. Provides overall leadership for that organization which is very focused on advocacy and bringing in the resources to do so. Before that, he was a leader on humanitarian policy for our entire community interaction where he was the VP there and has had a range of positions with refugees international and actually worked for

Oxfam for longer than I have. I've learned so much from Joel over the years as have so many others of us. Principled, honest, very provocative and likely to challenge all of us and all of you today.

Katy Kaufman who I had the pleasure to meet by phone yesterday and in person today and have heard about. We are so delighted that you are here. You are currently the Managing Director of Global Women's Issues at OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, where she leads OPICs 2X women's initiative, we'll ask a little bit about that. Previously, a founding partner at McGellan Ventures and a defense policy maker in the Office of the Secretary of Defense where she also served in the United States Embassy in Beijing. So I've managed to comment already on two of her past institutions both in the foreign commercial service office and in the ambassadors office. Also she helped to make sure that the United States showed up well in the 2008 summer Olympic Games which I won't be asking about but I was very impressed with.

Last but definitely not least, very happy to see Aaron Rosenberg here. We had a great conversation yesterday. He plays a key role at the International Finance Corporation which sits at the nexus of many of things we're going to be talking about today. He is the chief of public affairs there. He is responsible for managing the IFC's policy communications and engagement with key stakeholders and manages and advises on corporate reputational risk and other strategic communications issues. He also worked in the U.S. government as the Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative and has very illustrious academic credentials as well with masters in public policy from the College of William and Mary in Virginia.

So we are just delighted. A professionally diverse group of folks who have strong views on these issues and are committed to giving you crisp commentary so that we can have a dialogue. Tessie, I'm going to start with you. So you heard George's articulation of the why, you've seen the results from this year's index. What do you think are going to be the main challenges in the delivering of this vision as we seek to crowd in

these new resources. Maybe if you could say a word about the particular challenges with these new flows, private sector flows and domestic resources of governments while we're trying to raise standards at the same time.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Yes so good question. I think it will set up the conversation nicely. So there are many but let me just say three because they're easier to remember. I think the first one is what I would call the potential for IATI fatigue. Here I'll speak personally. So we're all committed to transparency but we can suffer from IATI fatigue. I'll give the example of my own organization. I came in seven years ago super excited. We're going to just start publishing the indexes, this is really cool, we're all in it and I'm the CEO so I can do something about it. So we are publishing to IATI but it's kind of like you roll up the rock and it rolls back down. The reality, the sheer drudgery of how using legacy systems that are clunky and are not meant to collect information in an easy manner and it all has to be manual. The person you had as the champion, she leaves and then you have to train somebody else and then on and on and on.

So the secret to all of this, and we had a good conversation with some of the U.S. agencies yesterday, I think is to work on the demand side. I'll talk a little bit more about that. I'll just mention one very clever thing that I saw that we heard from MCC in doing this. So they're using Google analytics to better understand who is using their data and for what purposes and so on, that's brilliant. Because then that motivates the staff, why am I doing this, is this the upload to nowhere or is there a purpose. So that's number one. We need to be able to energize it because just simply being psyched about transparency is not enough, believe me.

The second aspect, and you've mentioned it, George, in that video we had at the beginning. So listen, IATI, we're all here celebrating ten years, this is great. Ten years ago, if we could get all the major bilateral, multilateral donors publishing to IATI, then we'd really be able to capture the information, have a really good idea of what is going on. Well that has since gone by the way side. ODA is now a small fraction of

what's actually going on of FDI and public equity and loans and philanthropists and private INGOs like ourselves. None of that is actually being captured.

So if the majority of what's going on is not being captured, is IATI really relevant? What is it telling us? By the way, all these new entities, are they equally committed to transparency. I actually think that the answer to that is not necessarily no. It's possibly very much an enthusiastic yes. But there again, there is a difference between being committed to transparency and then going through the IATI thing. We need to think about what are the interfaces that make that whole sort of IATI publication easier. But private entities, and particularly commercial ones because people, Aaron maybe you can comment on this. There is the sense that they are all very worried about commercial secrets. They don't want to go out there and share any information. I think that's a little not quite true. Wearing my private sector hat, which I wore for many years, you do want to know what is going on out there so that you can better leverage your resources. So there can be real buy in to the transparency agenda.

The third one is, and here I'm going to channel you, Paul, is data is political, isn't it. And decisions about how data is collected, what data are collected, how are they aggregated, what are we looking at are all very political. The reason I say this is because we have some really pretty big gaps in data. And gender, since you're here with us, Katy, is one big one that PLAN is certainly very concerned about. So as people, ourselves, you and I Paul, are on the board of Friends of Publish What You Fund, so we care deeply about IATI. So how does IATI contributing to addressing these big data gaps.

In an era of these humanitarian crisis, a lot of displaced people, a growing inequality. If the data transparency movement is not addressing these data gaps than this too could eventually lead to the irrelevance of IATI as part of the transparency movement. I'll leave it there.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks, Tessie, great set up. If you heard anything you

really agree with or disagree with the hashtag is up there. Katy, we will get into the gender conversation a little bit if we could with you a little later if that's possible. I think you have real expertise there. Aaron, to you next, if I may. You sit at the sweet spot that everybody is now talking about where international investment crowds in this private sector funding, crowds in public funding. At the same time as trying to get to that level of commitment investment, the IFC has been a leader in trying to raise standards so that they don't just show up but they show up in the right ways. Is that an easy set of tensions to manage at the IFC? How is it going and particularly on the transparency front.

MR. ROSENBERG: Short answer is no, it's not easy. First, thank you for the question. Thank you all for having me today, I'm glad to be here. Thanks to the partnership with Publish What You Fund. The last several years has been really fruitful for us and we're happy that our ranking has certainly improved although we and others probably have a long way to go.

With that said, let me start by first putting some context. I think you mentioned this but also George really started with the fact that the world is changing. ODA is about \$135 billion, maybe a little bit more or less, I think, depending on the year. The needs to finance the STGs are \$7 trillion. Huge, enormous gap. Where do you think the rest of that money is coming from? It's not going to be from the public sector, it's going to be from the private sector primarily if not all. So what does that look like? It's a very different world than we have been in for the last 20 years.

What I would say is this is where, I think, and I'll be the tempest, the index gets it wrong. It is set out from a primarily public sector viewpoint that doesn't apply to 90 percent of what development flows look like or are going to look like in the coming years. So if organizations like mine can only ever get to fair, what does that tell you. I think we need to be thinking about ways to encourage more private sector participation. It's not, I agree with you, it isn't that transparency is this taboo word in the private sector, in fact, the opposite. Most companies have many reporting requirements

that governments don't have or certainly can be complimentary. I think if we want to get a better picture of what the true development flows are we need to be thinking about ways to be a little bit more pragmatic.

So I'll give you from my own personal example, somebody asked me recently, why did you join IATI. I said I'm going to be honest with you, there are a couple of reasons why. Politics, I'll be honest, is number one. The second thing, I said first, when I first heard about IATI maybe four or five years ago I said what is that International Aid Transparency Initiative. We don't do aid at IFC. That's not what we do. We do development, absolutely, that's our mission but we don't do aid. So if I'm saying that, imagine what a company who is arguably contributing to development in many ways, they might think about it. I think the incentive system has to change. So why did we join IATI. We worked with IATI for a period of years to really modify the standard to incorporate more aspects of what it is like to do business in the private sector. The timelines are very different. The business cycle is different. Some of the things that businesses are measuring government is not measuring. Some things that government will put out, budgets for example, the private sector is not going to do that. I would say in many cases, it's not the most important thing.

So if you're penalizing in the standard already we're never going to get there. My CEO told me, okay I'm really glad your ranking went up, get to number one. My response is that's never going to happen and I hope that you're not giving me my performance review based on that. I think the time is changing and we need to change with it. I would like to see the index change as well.

The last point on this, I think there is great opportunity in the SDGs. Many companies are already thinking about how they're going to report their contribution to the SDGs. The last UNGA in September of last year, I was at a panel that we put together in the extractive space. One particular company said we're excited about the SDGs because for the first time, we can see how we can contribute to development.

Right there is an opportunity. So I think if we can think about ways to harness the data that companies will be putting in, and there are several initiatives already going on to figure out how companies can report in a common framework towards the SDGs, we need to be looking at that because the motivation is there. We ourselves are reporting our results to the SDGs for the first time in our annual report this fall. So I would say let's think about being pragmatic in ways we can get the private sector to be reporting more and maybe included in the index in future years.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great, thank you. Katy, I see you nodding. I assume that IATI is perfect for OPIC and you don't need it to change at all. Let me ask you more seriously this. This is such an important moment and it is great to have you here. OPIC is potentially going to grow to an entirely new scale. Some folks are talking about its portfolio doubling in the next short period.

You've got Congress paying attention to you in hopefully a good way with the Build Act proposing to create a new development finance institution growing out of OPIC so it will be the new OPIC. The same set of pressures from the U.S. perspective applies to you. You're trying to crowd in where the real money is, as Aaron says, but you're also trying to be a standard setter and do the best of American good practice. That's not always easy, as you try to do that, particularly if you've got institutions in the mix like the private sector, and we can debate, have different views about the importance of transparency in the field. So how is that going? Ray Washburn said he's committed, that the CEO of OPIC, he's committed to getting this right on both standards and growth. How easy is it going to be for you on the U.S. side and what are you thinking about?

MS. KAUFMAN: I think it's going to be really easy, unlike my other panelists. I actually want to take a second to appreciate that question. When I took this job six months ago, OPIC was zeroed out in the President's budget. I just got a question about what we're going to do now that we're doubling in size. So what caused that change in such a short period of time? I'll argue that one of the points is our commitment

to transparency and best practices.

So first, we have a new CEO. He's amazing. You should always when you're speaking publicly talk about how amazing your CEO is. He has done a great job transitioning from zeroed out to educating people on what OPIC is and the tools that we have to offer. Two, as everyone else has mentioned, the world is changing and OPIC mobilizes three private sector dollars for every dollar we invest. So moving from billions to trillions is something that we're committed to. But three, the fact that we are committed to best practices, the very top of that being transparency, we're positioning ourselves to be a counter to someone that doesn't engage in those best practices, for example. China. So they're dumping trillions of dollars into markets where we also invest and it's really important that the United States is holding up our best practices, particularly transparency. I think that very point is what has moved both Congress and the Executive Branch, hopefully the public to really feel like a development finance institution, something like OPIC, which previously thought was an oil cartel to now be a major tool of U.S. foreign policy. So I hope that answered your question.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, great thank you. I'm sure it has provoked some thoughts and questions from others. Joel, over to you and we're going to switch gears a little here because this is a really important perspective, particularly on World Refugee Day to bring into the room. All of this work to try and make the flows more transparent have a particular dimension in the humanitarian space in crisis response. Do you think that the trends and efforts that you're hearing about making aid flows more transparent have particular challenges or they are particularly important opportunities when you think about humanitarian response, Joel?

MR. CHARNY: Yeah thanks, Paul, and thanks for including a humanitarian voice in this group. I want to take the temperature of the audience before I answer. The grand bargain, how many of you know what the grand bargain is or have ever heard of it, please raise your hand. Okay so I would say more than half, that's good.

MR. O'BRIEN: Are you sure that they're concept is the same as yours?

MR. CHARNY: We'll find out. The grand bargain came out of the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. It is arguably the one thing that has the potential to have a significant impact that did come out of that massive global process. The overall idea is to not only increase the amount of money that is available for humanitarian response but to use the money that we have better. The number one component of the grand bargain is transparency. But what I'm going to argue from a perspective of Norwegian Refugee Council is transparency in and of itself is not transformative. If you look at the grand bargain, and I'm going to run through these really quickly Paul, I promise, not explaining them. There are ten interlocking things that we need together to make a difference including transparency.

Local responders, more support for local. Cash, use cash more, not delivering stuff. Reduce management costs, critical to Norwegian Refugee Council. We've got to be more efficient. Joint impartial needs assessments. So let's be transparent but let's make sure we're being transparent about the right thing, i.e., what are the problems. If we don't have a common agreement on what the problems are how are we going to get anywhere? Local participation, multiyear funding, reductions in earmarking, harmonizing reporting and finally linking humanitarian and development efforts depending on the context.

So the way I look at this fundamentally is there is an internal aspect and an external one. On the internal aspect, sure, NRC is reporting to IATI, we're happy to do that, we're committed to it. But we're still stuck in a system where we're reporting in multiple different ways to multiple donors which is just not only time consuming but incredibly expensive.

So sure, we can brag and say we're totally committed to IATI and we're doing the reporting that we need to do but our staff frankly thinks it's a burden. We've got to report to the financial track. So the Dutch and DIFI say you must report to IATI. The Swedes

say you must report to the financial tracking service. OFTA, until very recently, was insisting on quarterly reports. So my point is that if we're going to be effective in the transparency realm, we need other things to happen that are mutually reinforcing.

And then the final point I'll make and Paul, the one thing I learned at Oxfam and I'm so happy I started my career at Oxfam, is that power matters. If you are transparent but the people who matter don't actually have the power to access the information or don't have the power to actually influence what we're going to do with that information, you could argue that we're just talking to ourselves. By being transparent, yeah it'd be cool to be rated on that index and maybe if there weren't an NGO rating NRC would be number four and we'd be all happy. That helps us. Does that fundamentally help the people that we're trying to assist, the people that we're trying to empower even through our humanitarian work? I just feel a lot of the post World Humanitarian Summit debate is very much focused on technical solutions. As challenging as they are, are frankly easy compared to the political, ideological and power obstacles that we face in really changing the way humanitarian work functions.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks for that Joe, that's great. And it does make me think if there is something that we all feel, many of us feel at least, this year has been transformative in terms of power. It's the voice that women have brought to issues of power this year and to the equations of power that they are facing in the worst of crises but also in this country in many different contexts.

So Kate, I want to put you on the spot on this because you're a leading voice in an important institution on gender. You've got an initiative called the 2X initiative. It'd be nice to hear about that but how do you both capitalize on the moment of this waking up that many of us are witnessing around gender and the commitment to be more transparent and standard setting more generally and is there any relationship between the two?

MS. KAUFMAN: Okay so I hope I was crisp on my first answer and I'm

going to take some air time. For the first time ever, OPIC has been around since 1971 and for the first time ever, we have decided to explicitly call out empowering women as one of our core objectives. Our CEO has named it his top priority. When he hired me to take this job, he's from Texas. He said, I want you to do this women's initiative, just help the women. He is so committed to it and I was so excited about it and we basically talked through the correlation between OPIC's mission, which is to support private sector growth, and how everything we do has to have two things. We have to have economic prosperity and support global stability and women are key, absolutely key, if those are your core objectives.

So we took that back and said okay, what does that mean, how are we going to empower women around the world. We decided it meant everything. So we branded it as 2X so that we would not have another acronym in this town and also the female chromosome and the fact that we're catalyzing private capital. So at least for every dollar we put in we want two private sector dollars for women. And then we put a target number out the door. So we said we're going to invest a billion dollars, mobilize a billion dollars to support women around the world. It is the single largest financing commitment the United States government has ever made to global women's economic empowerment. So it's a really big commitment, a really big capital commitment.

And then we said, well that's not enough because we put out \$4 billion every year and women make up 50 percent of the population. So we need to make sure that every dollar we invest, whether it is to a micro finance institution or a large infrastructure project, has a gender lens consideration. That means that our investment officers, which are talented investment bankers, have recognized, bought in to an understand there are certain gender patterns that have implications for better financial returns. So we're just saying as an institution, we're going to be better investors because we're going to understand women and the patterns that come with that which is really exciting and sort of cutting edge.

And then the final thing that we did is as we were pitching this, I was pitching it to the OPIC board on my second week on the job and it was an all-male board except for one woman who was rolling off. That didn't sit well with me and I said we're actually going to flip this mirror on ourselves and we are, I don't know if anyone has ever heard of EDGE certification. But like a building can get lead certified, you can get EDGE certification which is the international standard to make sure your enterprise understands equality. So we'll be the first U.S. government agency to do that and we hope that the rest of our institutions follow suit.

So that's the 2X. Then we said, okay well what does that billion dollars going to go to. Is it women owned enterprises, is it women in management, is it access to clean water which affects hundreds of millions of women around the world. And again, we decided it includes everything. We look to what does it mean to be women owned and we looked to IFC and they have a definition. We're like okay, we'll use that, we want to harmonize. But the truth is, there is nothing out there that really describes all of this so we created it. OPIC has put forward this criteria, we call it 2X criteria.

Now getting to transparency and then I'll wrap up. There was a shining light at the G7 that I am sure none of you read about. Has anyone ever heard of the ice bucket challenge? So that was like when I was just out of college. I was very impacted by the ice bucket challenge, I loved it. That guy who started it went to my university.

So anyway, I decided that we would do the 2X challenge. We challenged all of our G7 counterparts to take the 2X challenge and they did. For the first time ever, every G7 DFI committed to mobilize \$3 billion towards a common aim which is women's economic empowerment. And the only way that we're going to make it work is by being transparent. We have a website. We are putting everything on the website. How much money is going to these projects, by which institution, how much is private sector, where is their public funds and how is it that this project was categorized as a 2X project. Because if they're all women owned maybe our criteria is not right. We have set up a

group that is going to be constantly looking back and saying are our interventions working and publishing that and holding each other accountable in a new and transparent way that I think is really exciting for development as a standard and more importantly for my heart for women around the world.

MR. O'BRIEN: Great, inspiring. I am going to take us to some of the more sober dimensions of the challenges we face with gender and ask Joe a question. This has been a tough year on humanities, gender and transparency. In humanitarian crisis, you're introducing precious resources into resource starved environments with communities who are on the wrong end of a power asymmetry.

This has led, I think, many of you know, if you haven't get online. It has led to big challenges for organizations like Oxfam and others in terms of what can happen when you have that much power and you're engaging on issues where some of that power disparity is also gendered. It's a deeply shameful part of what will now be our history. But we have to ask the bigger question. What can we do to make sure that these kinds of things don't happen again? And is transparency related to how we can make sure we are addressing these power asymmetries in humanitarian crises, Joel?

MR. CHARNY: There is a lot that can be done and that is being done. I'm not sure how much of it actually relates to transparency. In the sense that we need to fundamentally address the power and balance that Paul eluded to. In the meantime, there are a lot of very simple things we can do related frankly to having more women staff, more staff at local levels who are women who are making those decisions.

I also think we just need to be way better at being sensitive to and building on the community structures that already exist. And if they don't exist fine, find ways to support them. I think the transparency theme comes in just related to our own overall accountability in terms of how we're using resources. This will not change, in my opinion, fundamentally as long, and you guys have a campaign on this. As long as fundamentally humanitarian action is parachuting in with experts and stuff and we have

all the resources and the community is put in the position of in essence begging us for resources, this dynamic will not change. I think that's the fundamental issue that we need to address.

Sure, transparency is part of that in the sense of being open about the way we're working, being open about our staff numbers and what the gender balance is. Being open about how much of our resources are really going towards women empowerment and more importantly, there is a whole thing we haven't talked about yet actually in the humanitarian arena. Of course, we have an awful jargon term called accountability to affected populations. But what it fundamentally means is are we in any way responsible to or accountable to the people that we're actually trying to assist. I think there, transparency and information flow is absolutely vital.

People need to have a way to judge our overall effectiveness. If they are upset about what they see, they need to have a way to communicate that. I think that's something that we're all working on in terms of trying to -- again I insist, there is a technical aspect to that and there is also an ideological aspect.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great. It does remind, Aaron I'll go to you and then we'll close with Tessie and I hope you're getting ready for your questions. Although we may even already have some that have come from some of our partners so we'll try and fit them in too. Aaron, you said earlier on and I thought it was helpful, not an aid institution but a development institution. You wake up with a mission that's different from some of the folks you're trying to influence, the private sector and governments. How do you use that role of leveraging your influence with these other two sets of actors when they don't necessarily wake up every day with the same goal in mind?

MR. ROSENBERG: That's a good question. Really quick I wanted to say we are EDGE certified. I'm happy about that. You mentioned something in one of your answers earlier that sparked in my head that you wished there was an NGO category in the index and I wish there was a private sector category in the index so we

can relate on that.

It's a good question and I view transparency as an outcome but also a process. It has been one for us and I think it is for many companies. The key is about finding things in common and being pragmatic. So as a development institution, we have a job to do really in setting a standard we feel among private sector operations in the development space. We do that in a couple of ways.

One is joining IATI in and of itself sends a particular signal. And working with them to adapt the standard to reflect the way the private sector works is one way. So we hope to see more involvement there. Another then is the standards that we set ourselves and much like what we've done in the environment, social and governance space, our own standards have become a benchmark, in essence, for project finance in the development space globally.

What we're doing now is to take that and try to broaden it beyond the reach of our own operations to capital markets. So getting regulators, stock exchanges to look at IFC's performance standards as a benchmark to incorporate in their own ratings tools or certification schemes or whatever. That is something we feel that we can expand the reach of what we do.

Likewise, in the transparency space, we would like to see both not just our clients do what we're trying to do but beyond that. So we developed an ESG disclosure toolkit, Environment Social and Governance, which is really a guide for both our clients and companies on reporting in the sustainability space. Not just to only meet our own requirements but broader than that. So it is piggy backing off things, global movements et cetera, and then trying to shape markets beyond just the scope of what we do. That is, I think, how we can use our influence which is evolving too. Our own thought has evolved in a lot of spaces. Half our business now is done through financial institutions and we're trying to impose our transparency standards on them as well but it's a process and I think it takes time.

People operate under this myth that a lot of companies are totally secretive and they don't want to put out any information. Totally not true. Many companies put out information but it is for, like you said, a different reason. Their motivation might be different. They could be trying to raise money themselves or they might have reporting requirements to regulators, credit agencies or what have you.

The confluence though is really interesting because a lot of these things are overlapping. A lot of the things on performance particularly are things that these agencies want to know as well. So I think the more to which we can adapt and capture that, the more transparent we'll be and we'll have access to a lot more information to inform decision making.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great, thank you. Tessie, bring us home. So I'm looking out at the room here and I am seeing a community of many of them civil society actors, many friends here but also I see some folks from the U.S. government that you have been engaging with these past days on these issues. So it is a little bit of a two-pronged question. What do you think we as a community can and should be doing in light of this conversation that we've had today, in light of both the challenges and opportunities in transparency? And do you have any reflection on the engagement with the U.S. government over the past couple of days and how you think they're going. USAID probably the biggest story in this year's index, trending significantly upwards, others pretty much staying where they were. Any thought on that before we open it up?

DR. SAN MARTIN: So you did sneak that last question, okay. Yeah I got some opinions. So actually this panel has been great and actually moved well beyond just IATI to really talk about the broader transparency agenda and I think has given us a lot of food for thought. So as I reflect on it, just a few maybe to-do's for all of us. I don't have necessarily the solutions for them but what might we take away from it.

One is, for me, so IATI was created with a certain type of world that existed then and we need to be thinking about how that gets modernized to reflect the

world that we're living in now. The great thing and we've heard from two organizations that are really on the edge and have been really thinking about these issues. How do we create effective and viable partnerships between all of these institutions that are working in different parts of the aid agenda to really create a more robust reporting tool? Because at the end of the day, IATI is not the end all or be all. For me, it is hard to imagine how we create a lot of sustainability and momentum around the transparency agenda without having a robust tool which is what IATI has provided.

So that leads me to so what else should we be doing and here I'll go back to some of the things I said at the beginning which were echoed here again. We do need to work on the demand side of it. We need better examples, actually and better information about how the data itself is being used, some case studies on that. Actually, Publish What You Fund did a really nice set of case studies that demonstrated how you can use the data that are available in IATI to answer important policy questions including in this case. So what happens when the U.S. foreign assistance budget is cut drastically in a number of countries? If you can't see the case studies, I do urge you to go to the Publish What You Fund website and download them. They are enlightening and we couldn't have done those case studies if we didn't have the data. So it can be an essential instrument for having evidence based, amazing, policy decisions. So that's another aspect.

The other one, I'll go back and we've seen it here in this discussion, the whole issue of data gaps and in particular, around gender. It's not the only data gap that exists but it is a really important one and it is, I think, urgent to address it. In PLAN, we've been very involved in creating a tracker to track, along with a variety of other partners, to track progress on the SDG 5 and gender equality. What we have found is just how little data exists. Of 14 indicators that are supposed to be tracked, only about three of them have any kind of methodology behind them. While there is more data on women and girls between the ages of 15 and 49, there is almost no credible data on girls under the

age of 15, for example. We need to work on these issues.

And then, Joel, I just loved your comment that transparency is not in and of itself, transformative. So the data is out there but so what if you can't access it or you don't know how to use it. One of the things we've been involved in at PLAN I think more of that needs to be done is using data, in particular, the data that is coming out of the tracker that we're developing on gender equality. To work with groups of, in our case, young people in civil society in the countries where we work to enhance and support their efforts to build their capacity to use that data for effective advocacy. Just because you've got data out there doesn't mean that you're going to have effective advocacy and it's a skill set like any other. So really building civil society capacity in this regard of using the data and using the data effectively for advocacy is very important.

I'll say one more thing. In previous versions of this launch event, we published to IATI, Joel's organization published to IATI. The U.S. most civil society organizations do not publish to IATI, there is not requirement that that be done. I think that there should be and I think that USAID should make it a requirement because it is about getting more information out there. Sometimes just having somebody to tell you to do it, to your point, makes a difference.

Now here' the deal though and this is the last thing I'll say. This goes back to Joel's comment about the requirement. If you do that then I would say take a page from the DFID book. I think that DIFD was very clever. They said yeah, we want everybody reporting but we're just going to have one portal, one reporting function. And when you report into that portal you are reporting into DFID and you're reporting into IATI. Because if there is a requirement then I'll report to IATI but that is on top of everything else than all you're doing honestly is increasing NICRA for those of you who deal with the U.S. government. At that point, you've just increased the compliance burden and that's just not good. I'll leave it there.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great, thank you. So we've got to that fun part

where we get to hear where your minds are and how you've reacted in response to this. We also have some questions coming in on Twitter so I'm going to feed them in. If you volunteer to take a question as panelists you get to choose but if you don't you'll be left to answer whatever is the last question so be brave. Now, in asking a question, the time honored tradition, please actually ask a question and ask one question. As an NGO person, I know what a three chapter advocacy statement sounds like. Adhere to that please. If you could say your name and if you work for an organization that you think is relevant, please let us know. We have two mics in the room. Let's start here and then here and then we'll come back over there.

MS. DORSIVE: Cinnamon Dorsive Johns Hopkins. A shout out to George and Catherine and others this is really interesting. This is my one question and this, I think, is for Joel. Why don't we add why to the performance component? We talk about where, who and how but why not why. I think we've talked about that a little bit more but I'd like to hear your answer.

MR. O'BRIEN: He said that to me yesterday so I know he's got a view on that.

MR. JARVIS: Michael Jarvis with Transparency and Accountability Initiative which is a donor collaborative, five of whose members are private funders, DFID being the other. I'm pleased to say several of our members do publish to IATI even as private funders. It did raise questions internally and this is the question piece on fit for purpose and the fact that they're reporting to other platforms. I think the real motivator that Tessie highlighted is use. I would welcome the panel's thoughts on how you can actually have encouragement within your own organization. It's not just to publish but to do your own tracking of use and actually acting upon any feedback that come that way. I think you have a responsibility as a publisher, not just to publish but to actually reflect on what people do with that data, how they interact with it and what it tells you as an institution that you can do better with and to publish what you find. To have a

comparable set of data on usage as well as the metrics of the performance in the index, I think, would be a really useful thing.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks Michael. And I know you to be such an advocate that you not only asked a question in the room but you got on as Reed and Porter and asked, what's the responsibility of publishers to have to ensure data is not just useful but used. Please answer that question too, so well played. Or if Reed Porter is a different person, we're very glad to answer your question.

MS. HIGHLAND: Vanetta Highland, European Union Delegation. The booklet that you got was funded by the European Union. The European Union Institutions and DFID from the UK. So we are very committed to the initiative. I have two questions. The one is also input and use. That is a question that is not only for the panel but perhaps also to our representative on Publish What You Fund. Do you have any evidence how this is being used by the different organizations that have access to it.

The other question is, if OPIC is among the U.S. institutions that report to Publish What You Fund as the front runner what is happening amongst you and the other entities like USAID and MCC to enhance the overall score in terms of mutual learning. We are organizing as EU central learning exercise next week in Brussels. I need to do one or two comments.

MR. O'BRIEN: Oh no, just one comment please.

MS. HIGHLAND: Okay the comment on the low score of United Arab Emirates and China. I think it's great that they are part. It has taken a long time to get them on. Of course they start with a low score, give them a chance.

MR. O'BRIEN: Great, thank you. If others would like to that can be put in the form of a question. Is it a good or a bad thing that China is choosing to engage in this and is ranking rock bottom. One last question I'd like to put in the mix too and perhaps it is for both of you but it was addressed to you, Aaron. Aaron, what is your view from inside IFC about the behavior of employees in creating a culture of more

transparency and what is still pending to do in practice. I think that's just as applicable to OPIC so it would be great to get your views. Tessie and Joel, the use question, that came up in a number of different ones. If you both of you could speak to that from your long term development and humanitarian perspectives that'd be great.

MS. KAUFMAN: So I'll speak to the culture at OPIC and how we feel about transparency. I've been at this institutions for months, not years. Most people at OPIC have been there because it is consistently ranked as one of the best places to work in the U.S. government for like 20 years. I have to say there is an unbelievable amount of dedication to best practices, as I said in my opening comments. The people that I work with on a daily basis should be making millions of dollars on Wall Street, they're investment bankers. They're here because they care about the mission, they care about the work that they're doing and they want to adhere to and push the rest of the world towards these best practices and transparency.

When I was preparing for this panel, I spoke to a lot of the leadership in our organization and asked them basic questions about transparency at OPIC. To a person, it was we report everything we can and we're pushing our counterparts to be as transparence. So I see nothing but complete commitment to this and wanting to be leaders. In fact, we're signing MOU's with partner institutions that immediately call out this need for transparency. So I would say as an institution, we are at the forefront and nothing if not going to becoming more transparent as much as possible.

MR. ROSENBERG: I'll finish then on the culture side of the questions then. I think it has been a process. Let's say there are a couple of camps of people internally. There are people that get it but think it's a burden. There are people that react like oh, our clients are never going to go for this. There is the flat out no camp. Then there are also a group of people that recognize the benefits that transparency has in improving your own data quality which I cannot underestimate. When you report something it's real and you better be able to stand behind it. So that in and of itself

makes you more efficient, makes you more analytical which is all good. People use transparency for different reasons internally, I would say.

Over time, our transparency policy, the most recent one is from 2012 and it sort of dictates our whole approach to transparency in general. It was markedly an improvement over where we were before that. So when we rolled that out, we thought of it in a way, what is going to help you do this. So part of it is making it easy for people. IT has a lot to do with that but also just explaining to them this is why we're doing it, this is how it can help you in showcasing your own work which is important in any institution. Also, it is helpful in showcasing our clients work. That's what it is really about.

So we can use that and we also made brochures and things for people to work with clients to explain it to them and how this policy actually can be helpful to them too. Today, the amount of people in that camp is small. So no one is talking about or even questioning what this is, why are we doing it, they get it. They may still grumble about the process but the amount of people that question why is far less. I think that's a good thing.

MS. KAUFMAN: One more thing on the gender piece. Some of the things that Aaron said struck me. I think when we were introducing 2X to OPIC, there was this like resistance to buy in that our clients won't buy into it and it's just going to add time and cost to transactions. We have just pushed, and I'll use the example of the financial institution side. When we work with partner financial institutions and ask them how much of their borrowers, what percentage are women, and they come back and say we actually don't have sex disaggregated data, as an investor that's a problem. If you don't understand your customers that's a problem.

So we've really turned it to say let's see how this can help you become a better financial institution. I'm trying to get to this idea that it's in our clients interest and the more we can give feedback to them and make this something that they use and they benefit from and not a burden, that's really the direction that OPIC has tried to take.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you. Tessie, can you say a word about the use question to get us started and if possible, any further reflections on the role of the U.S. There was a reference made to how the different agencies are doing.

DR. SAN MARTIN: So on data use, I'll be very candid because we're among friends. When I said in my organization that we're committed to data transparency and to publish into IATI, the idea of so who the heck is going to use it. It almost to me it didn't matter. It was meant to be a signal about the importance of accountability to donors and to the communities where we work. We're very committed to local ownership of community led efforts. We're not in the business of delivering stuff. So we thought that this was congruent with that.

So we do it irrespective of how it is going to be used. As I said at the very beginning, it is a bit of a slog unless we have better information about how the data that is being published is being used. To the point made, we really don't know. I also will say another bit of frustration for me is that we're only able ourselves, so PLAN is part of a larger federated entity. So I can publish what I have control of, sort of my side of the equation. But to do a full reporting of the whole supply chain, I need the rest of PLAN International to also be publishing to IATI.

So part of my own internal effort has been to get them to do that. They finally did commit to start doing it. I'm not quite sure what the schedule is but it's huge. It's about the entire supply chain and I only represent part of it. So it's a work in progress, I don't have a great answer for that.

On the aid question, yes they've been doing better. And again, IATI is not transparency it's just simply a tool. It does reflect and an organizations improvement in the scale as imperfect as the measurement is for everyone because not one size fits all. It does reflect, I think, a deepening of a culture of transparency in the organization. I do believe that at the end of the day, the tone is very much set at the top. I think you said it when you refer to your CEO, Katy. If the head of the organization is on board and fully

committed, then it will happen, otherwise it really doesn't. I do believe, certainly my own personal observation, that the improvements that you see from the U.S. perspective are a reflection of a deeper commitment to a culture of transparency that exists in the organization.

That being said, now speaking as an implementing partner and what does transparency look like from that perspective. A partner is an interesting word. We're generally not partners and that honestly is a lost opportunity for both sides. Because the work that we're generally involved in is more than complicated, it's complex. If we are not in a real partnership, and I would say when we compare how we work with USAID and we compare that with how we work with other institutions, it's not the same type of partnership at all and that is a giant lost opportunity. Because we're not getting the best out of each other and that is, I think, leading to not producing the best possible outcomes we can for the communities in which we work.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks, Tessie. So we have about five minutes. This is going to be the last round of reflections. I'm going to ask Joel to offer a reflection on that why question which was really interesting. But if you could also, any last comments you want to make in closing this, I'll give the mic over to George in about five minutes. I do have two other questions I'm going to bring into the room for others to be thinking about as well.

For either Aaron or Katy, here's an interesting one. From Dianna Albaumb, our good friend, are there any plans to expand aid transparency to include or link with contract transparency. Do panelists think this would be helpful? A little plug, in a few hours, Oxfam will be launching its contract disclosure survey and making public. If it's true as both Katy and Aaron have said, the big money is being crowded in from private investment. How do we use transparency around contract disclosure to get them to see their own role in this? So any other comments that you have in that respect.

And Tessie, in your final comment or Joel, we had a wonderful question

from Kenya from Winne Kamal there who is the head of The Association of Freelance Journalists. Journalists in Kenya, and I think this is true elsewhere, need timely and accessible information to write the stories and inform the citizens in the country on development work being carried out by international NGO's. It is hard at the moment to see who has been mandated to do this work. What kind of steps do organizations like yours need to be doing to make it easier for local activists to hold institutions accountable. So if you could stick a sentence about that in and take us home.

I'm sorry to those of you who waited patiently because I see still one or two more hands. Unless these guys are unimaginably crisp, I may not be able to get to you.

MR. CHARNY: Why gets who into politics, why gets who into ideology, why gets who into the tough questions about core decisions that you make as to where you're going to work. I'm in the humanitarian sector. Almost every single agency when pressed, will always hide behind the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, independence and neutrality. But we need to be challenge, we need to be deconstructed. I'll brag about the Norwegian Refugee Council. In Syria, we are working in Damascus, we are working in Northeast and Eastern Syria. We are working cross border from the neighboring countries and we're working with refugees.

The reason we're able to do that, I'll also brag about my boss, is we have in our Secretary General, Jan Egeland, one of the leading humanitarian leaders in the entire world. He was able to go in and basically negotiate access inside Syria that no one else was able to negotiate. The why is the true commitment to reaching vulnerable people in Syria wherever they are found.

Others may have an approach that says we're in the anti-Assad camp and we're going to take tons of money to work with the opposition in Northern Syria. Under the circumstances, I think that's a totally understandable decision. You see the minute you get into the why, you're into politics, you're into ideology, you're into the tough

decisions that we have to make around reaching vulnerable people. So I think to throw the why into IATI or into this transparency initiative would be unbelievably challenging.

MR. ROSENBERG: Contract disclosure, I'll take that one. Very important and growing. I would say look at what we did with the extractive industries initiative and Oxfam was a great partner in that. I would say in any case now where you have increasingly a government private role, contracts are extremely important because there is a give and take there. The EITI has been particularly a great benchmark for that. I think now, most companies look at that and that is actually beneficial for them. They want to prove where the money flow is going.

So what was once a burden is now today actually a benefit. So take that forward, look at what we're trying to do now in the PPP space, Public Private Partnership space where many cases projects we're financing have a government and a private component. The department is working on creating model contracts and guidelines for contract transparency that we then hope to have all our clients apply. It's important and it's growing and I think we'd like to see this is something we can incorporate into IATI in the future as well.

MR. O'BRIEN: That's great and thanks for the push. Katy, a closing reflection from you in that regard or on any issue that you want to take away.

MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you for having me, this was fantastic. I don't have anything to add right now.

MR. O'BRIEN: Tessie, in particular our Kenyan friend who asked are we committed to giving them the information that they need to be able to hold their own institutions accountable.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Yes of course. And that's why I say it's not, for me the commitment to publish to IATI is not the end all be all but I think that civil society organizations like PLAN do have a responsibility to also be providing that information. And going further than that because data alone is not it, we do have to be working on the

axis and the advocacy side of it. So the answer is yes, we all need to make that commitment.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thanks. George, I'm about to hand it over to you but before I do, I just want to say I've done a few of these over the years. I thought this was a thoughtful, courageous, insightful, creative panel who brought a lot of great ideas into the room so please give them a round of applause. George.

MR. INGRAM: To very briefly wrap this up, Catherine, I think in spite of all the progress this has not been a rah rah session and that's great. We've identified some of the challenges. Tessie, you've talked about the difficulty in getting an organization to take on the transparency. Aaron and Joel, you've talked about how humanitarian and development finance IATI's systems don't really fit. They need to be adjusted in order to get you. Paul and Dianna, wherever you are, brought in the contracts and the need to get transparency into the contracts.

A take away that several you said the technical solutions are easy it's the political will that's so important. I'm impressed with all of your commitment. Kathy, I think all of us leave wanting to know more about 2X and being impressed with OPIC's commitment to gender and women. Paul, you said before we came in here is if all we do is talk about something that we can read about and we all know about it's not going to be a successful day. You have led this panel to be very frank and open and honest and identify some of the challenges so thank you and thank all of you for a wonderful discussion.

* * * * *

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, 2020