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We believe creative societies are prosperous societies. Our mission is to build healthy communities, vibrant and fair marketplaces, and strong nations.

RICHARD F. CHANDLER
Letter from the Editor

A n Interdependent World
When we first started working on this issue of Social Investor in mid-2019, in no way could we have imagined that, just before we were due to go to print, the world would be in the middle of a global pandemic.

The advent of COVID-19 made us pause and reflect. Sometimes, we have to “slow down to go fast.” It caused us to reflect on our values, and ask ourselves, and our contributing partners, what kind of content is needed now — not only to respond to the virus, but also to inspire us towards creative and collaborative initiatives for humanity.

We truly live in an interconnected and interdependent world. Combatting the virus goes beyond race, backgrounds, nationalities, and borders — it takes unity and a concerted global effort (p.9).

The Power of Partnerships
In the current context, the theme of our magazine this year — “Partnerships” — could not be more timely.

In Asia, where the outbreak was first reported, social investors and social-purpose organizations moved at speed with donations in response to the virus. In addition, many philanthropists and foundations found themselves deep in collaboration with their respective governments to address specific pain points in health and economic support systems (p.81). It is, points out Liberia’s former President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf (p.51), precisely this sort of strong private-public partnership that helped Liberia to rebuild the country’s health system in the wake of the 2014 Ebola outbreak, and a lesson that she advises leaders who are dealing with the virus (and its aftermath) to pay attention to.

Tim Hanstad, CEO of the Chandler Foundation, presses the point that the current pandemic highlights the importance of having a vision for collective action and a systems mindset to achieve opportunity for all (p.3). And perhaps, as highlighted in our cover interview with 2019 Nobel Prize in Economics winners Esther Duflo and Abhijit Banerjee (p.29), if data-driven evidence is applied, society will be even more resilient.

When bound by shared values and a clear purpose, partnerships can achieve outsized results. For instance, a single shared determination to solve the water crisis brought actor Matt Damon and engineer Gary White together to launch Water.org (p.63). Today, the organization is helping to build prosperity in the world by targeting the problem of water scarcity and access to sanitation, two critical factors in the age of COVID-19.

The Future is in Our Hands
The COVID-19 pandemic has had, and will continue to have, a devastating effect on our lives. But it has also offered a window through which we can press the reset button and think about the world that we want to live in and how to get there.

Do we, as in the case of Geena Davis, wish for greater gender equity (p.55), or should we delve deeper into systems-change programs that address poverty and inequality (p.35)? Can we take a leaf out of Gates Ventures’ book (p.41) and look at developing more global knowledge platforms for better health? And, now that we have “seen” Mount Everest from Kathmandu, do we believe we can address climate change with greater commitment (p.127)?

In his piece on “philanthrocapitalism”, Matthew Bishop encourages social investors to take their giving to the next level (p.123). The social-investing sector has unprecedented resources, insights, and technology at its disposal, and in this dynamic and crucial time in global philanthropy, the opportunity to go with it as well.

Richard F. Chandler, Founder and Chairman of the Chandler Foundation, once challenged: “How do we contribute to making this world a better place for all and, in so doing, a better place for ourselves?”

There’s no better time than now to answer the call.
Early Lesson: Charity is not the Solution

My work life started at the age of eight, picking strawberries in the fields along the Skagit River near my home in the Northwest corner of Washington state. We were paid by the quart. The hardest workers could make US$ 5 in a day. I never came close.

On good days, I earned a couple of dollars. For me, it was welcome pocket money for a soda and a candy habit that my parents balked at supporting.

For the migrant farm workers who labored alongside me, the dollar bills placed in their calloused hands were meant to be life sustaining — for themselves and their families.

As we rode the decommissioned yellow school bus to and from the fields, I learned of my fellow laborers’ dangerous journeys, crossing borders, rivers, and mountain ranges to my beautiful valley where they would live in shacks at the edge of farms, cooking their meals on open fires, and laboring alongside their children — because, of course, who could feed a family on our pay?

My family, who noted the migrants’ limited diets and threadbare clothing, took to occasionally dropping off food and hand-me-down clothes.

It gave me great joy and much pride to deliver these care packages. And they were received with heartfelt smiles. But as I lay in bed each night, my back sore from the hours spent hunched over in the fields, I was troubled by a feeling that our family’s well-intentioned charity made little difference. It didn’t allow the children in these migrant families to attend school, to have a chance at a better future, and it only took the bitter edge off the present for a moment.

From Band-Aids to Blueprints

Tim Hanstad, CEO of the Chandler Foundation, writes about inequality and how social investors need a shift in mindset to focus on long-term solutions to building a better world.
Forces that Matter: Government and Markets

I came to realize that these families were like leaves in the wind, blown by two powerful forces: government and the market. The failure of their governments to provide opportunity, essential services, and security in their home prompted their flight from the then lawless and poverty-stricken regions of Mexico. Facing a lack of economic opportunity, market forces pulled them to my corner of the United States where the price of their labor, while a pittance, was still more than they could hope to fetch back home.

In contrast, I grew up with the wind at my back. While poor by local standards, the historical accident of being born in the United States and as a white male in a loving, supportive family has provided a privileged tailwind. But thanks to many summers spent laboring in strawberry fields, I grew to understand that unrelenting headwinds challenged my fellow farm laborers. And I became inspired to do my part to help create a better world.

When I arrived at law school, I began working with my professor, Roy Prosterman, to help countries develop and implement land laws that could provide the sort of security and opportunity that my fellow farm laborers had needed in Mexico. Eventually, Roy and I founded Landesa, the world’s leading land rights organization, and worked with governments in dozens of countries to develop land laws and policies that gave women and men in poverty a chance at a better life.

Shifting Mindsets to Make a Difference

Two years ago, I left Landesa to lead the Chandler Foundation — joining the conversation about how social investors can best leverage their resources to achieve our shared goals.

I feel a great weight today as we engage with a world that is at an inflection point. A global pandemic is sickening millions and has killed hundreds of thousands. Businesses have shuttered, putting hundreds of millions out of work. Rising inequality has prompted calls for reimagining or even discarding capitalism. At the same time, the United States has been rocked by the realization of longstanding and widespread institutional racism and police brutality against African Americans. And of course, there is the existential threat to us all posed by climate change.

In the face of such overwhelming and deeply rooted problems, how can social investors make a difference?

A first step is to recognize that governments and markets play the most important roles in determining whether and how the world addresses our current challenges. That shouldn’t discourage social investors. It should help us define and refine our role. Think: less “doer” or service provider, and more connector, architect, catalytic strategist.

This requires a shift in mindset.

Social investors often make one of two mistakes. They either overestimate their potential to create change and think they can solve problems by simply writing a check to a worthy cause. Or they underestimate their potential and think that supporting efforts to improve governance or market systems are challenges that are beyond their scope, resources, or relational networks.

The Power of Partnerships

What both lines of thought miss is the power of partnerships, which is the theme of this year’s Social Investor magazine. Social investors can achieve breakthrough and redesign failing systems by collaborating with the forces that have the largest footprint on our planet — government and business. We can build partnerships that help government and business fulfill their mandate as strong forces for good and achieve a world where governance is strong and effective, markets are fair and vibrant, and communities flourish.

To make the most of these partnerships we should:

1. Embrace a systems mindset: Problems are always part of broader systems. Understand the system to identify levers for action and collaborators.

2. Address causes rather than just symptoms: Go beyond applying and reapplying Band-Aids. Instead, attack the problem at its source.

3. Take a long-term perspective: Most transformative social change requires many years, if not decades. Adopt the patience and persistence required.

4. Learn from others: No single person or organization has all the answers. Proceed with a beginner’s mind (see p.11). Learn from and engage with those closest to the problem.

This approach elevates our work, shifting it from a simple act of charity to catalytic social investment. When done right, this approach can repair governance and economic systems, making the systems more trustworthy and capable of creating broad opportunity. This path is not only more ambitious, it is more durable, efficient, and effective.
Solving the “Prosperity Puzzle”

In order to help the migrant workers with whom I worked, for example, adopting this strategy means going beyond the delivery of care packages. It might mean engaging with governments south of the United States border to help them improve governance, the rule of law, land rights, and policies that promote investment and economic opportunity. And it might include engagement with the business community to build a fairer and more vibrant marketplace. It could also involve broader efforts to reimagine a capitalism where purpose and principles take their rightful place alongside profits.

I have come to think of our work as social investors in terms of helping to develop economic and governance systems that expand opportunity and build trust.

I learned something in the berry fields of my childhood that has been reinforced through my work across the globe: that talent is evenly distributed around the world, but opportunity is not.

We live in an interconnected and interdependent world. As our neighbor suffers, so do we. As our neighbor prospers, so do we. How do we contribute to making this world a better place for all and, in so doing, a better place for ourselves?

RICHARD F. CHANDLER
“THE GOODNESS OF BUSINESS”

Inequality of Opportunity — a Challenge For Our Time

Today’s headlines featuring calls from Black Lives Matter, Me Too, and youth climate activists demonstrate that governments around the world have yet to deliver on a promise of equal opportunity for present and future generations.

The data from the World Economic Forum’s 2020 Social Mobility Index confirms this. The report, which measures social mobility as an indicator of opportunity, found “an individual’s opportunities in life remain tethered to their socio-economic status at birth, entrenching historical inequalities.”

This lack of opportunity and the resulting inequalities undermine social cohesion and trust. Most of us can feel the unravelling of social cohesion and trust around us today.

According to the 2020 Edelman Trust Barometer, an annual global survey of more than 2 million people, 56% of respondents believe capitalism today does more harm than good and 57% say government serves the few. The report says, “distrust is driven by a growing sense of inequality and unfairness in the system.”

But the current crises — health, economic, equity, and environmental — may be just the impetus to reverse this trend. A recent update to the Edelman report, found that 64% of respondents agreed that “This pandemic has made me realize how big the gap in this country is between the rich and the working class.” Edelman found that trust in government had surged between January and April 2020. Government performance will determine if this new confidence sticks.

From First-aid Stations to Blueprints for Success

How can social investors put their thumb on the scale to help make this happen? We social investors recognize the critical importance of opportunity and trust, but often have a hard time identifying a role for ourselves as a catalytic actor in partnerships that expand opportunity and build social trust. This issue of Social Investor provides ample models. Consider partnerships to help government officials operate in a more efficient, effective, transparent, and data-driven manner. Consider work to build marketplace systems and structures, and harness business as a tool to expand and democratize economic opportunity.

Dysfunctional systems, institutions, and markets aren’t a challenge to bypass or work around. They are an urgent invitation, an opportunity for strategic social investors to engage. To lean in, we must change our limited paradigm of social investors as a first-aid responder who treats symptoms caused by weak governments and dysfunctional markets.

Providing care packages to poor, migrant laborers is, no doubt, a good deed — but it is not nearly enough. Opportunity shouldn’t be a gift bestowed in a gesture of kindness. And it shouldn’t depend on a destination 4,000 kilometers away. Opportunity should be generated by fair, inclusive, and high-functioning governance and economic systems.

As the United States politician Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg once said: “It is less important to redistribute wealth than it is to redistribute opportunity.”

We must move from Band-Aids to blueprints and establish long-term collaborations with government, business, and NGOs. For it is only by working so, that we can build systems that expand opportunity, build trust, and provide tailwinds for all.
We are the World
A global snapshot of what businesses, celebrities, and social investors have done in response to COVID-19.
Thinking Outside the Box

In a seminal psychology experiment, researchers provided five-, six-, and seven-year-olds with a box of tacks, a matchbook, and a candle and asked them to use only these items to affix the candle to the wall and light it in such a way as to ensure that the melting wax did not fall to the floor.

Who was most likely to solve this challenge and solve it most quickly?

The five-year-olds.

That’s because the youngest among us approach this challenge with the most open minds (in psychology parlance: they have less “Functional Fixedness”). They understand, almost immediately, that a box of tacks can be used in a multitude of ways — including to create a shelf to hold the candle.

Those with more education and more experience have trouble imagining the box as anything other than a receptacle for tacks.

While this experiment was carried out in 2000, it demonstrates a timeless principle called “beginner’s mind.”

The Value of Values

Our preconceptions can limit our understanding of the world and of what is possible.

This is one of the most powerful lessons I’ve learned throughout my years working in philanthropy. And it guides our work at Co-Impact, a global collaborative that brings together funders to support groundbreaking initiatives in health, education, and economic opportunity in the Global South. The initiatives we support focus on transforming underlying systems, led by organizations and partnerships that are deeply rooted in the countries where they seek to make a difference.

At Co-Impact, our core values — beginner’s mind being one of them — underpin everything we do.

When embarking on a journey in partnership with others, it can feel intuitive to focus solely on the destination we wish to reach — our shared purpose — especially when we have big ambitious goals. But we must be equally careful not to leave unspoken the values and beliefs that will guide us there. As the philosopher James Allen warns: “Without right principles to begin with, there will be wrong practices to follow with.”

With this insight in mind, when we launched Co-Impact three years ago, I knew that we needed to recognize not only the value a partner brings to the table, but also the values they bring.

In the beginner’s mind there are many possibilities, in the expert’s mind there are few.

Zen Master Shunryū Suzuki

Co-Impact’s Core Values

Beginner’s Mind
We challenge our assumptions and frameworks. We seek to continually learn and adapt.

Outcomes-Focused
We focus on meaningful and lasting impact for millions of people. We provide program partners (the organizations leading systems change work) the space and flexibility they need to achieve results.

Program Partner- and Community-Centered
We support our program partners to exercise leadership and become stronger institutions in the pursuit of achieving lasting outcomes for people in the communities we serve.

Unity in Diversity
Our work is stronger when informed by different perspectives.

Trusting Partnerships
We actively seek to build and sustain relationships of trust with and among all of our partners.

These shared values make Co-Impact more than merely a group of committed social investors with common interests who have decided to pool their resources to effect greater change. With the help of shared values, we are a group of social investors aligned on how to achieve our shared goals in a thoughtful, principled, and effective manner.
The More You Know, the More You Know
You Don’t Know
None of these values is more important than the others. I focus on beginner’s mind in this article only because it may be most surprising.

Many of Co-Impact’s funding partners and staff have been engaged in supporting social change work for decades. And yet, this group of experienced funders has committed to beginner’s mind as a core value. Why? Because the more you know, the more you know you don’t know. And here’s what we know:
thoughtful, innovative philanthropists have been trying to do good in the world for generations.
Examples of where philanthropy has played a significant role in large-scale change exist, but are few and far between.
The reality is that deep and lasting change requires collaboration with all of the actors in a system, listening to those already working on a problem, and taking a long-term view. To really make a meaningful difference, not simply to provide a Band-Aid, we must better identify and leverage the boxes of tacks in the world.

And it is not just a matter of mustering the determination to confront a challenging learning curve. We need to adopt and exercise the principle of examining the world with a beginner’s mind.

Making a difference requires knowing that you don’t know everything, can’t do everything, and partnering with others can provide insights we could never imagine.

Strong Partnerships are Built on Shared Values
Of course, the alignment of values doesn’t mean that partners align on everything. But a partnership with a foundation of authentic and effective values fosters unity in diversity. These values allow for respectful disagreements, as it is inevitable — and at times, important — that there be differing opinions on the best way forward. Rather than sowing discord, these differences can be processed in productive tension; they can surface fresh thinking and unconventional ideas and be a powerful antidote to groupthink.

Ultimately, it is only when we are able to admit we don’t have all the answers that we learn, innovate, and craft new ways of grappling with big societal problems — and, perhaps, we may even find creative uses for boxes of tacks along the way.

The Beginner’s Mind in Practice
An example of this approach is the story of oral rehydration solution (ORS) — a simple mixture of salt, sugar, and water — that, when given orally to severely dehydrated children, eliminates the need for intravenous fluids and saves lives.

In the 1980s, the Bangladeshi organization Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) trained tens of thousands of its community health workers (CHWs) to teach mothers how to prepare ORS at home. Though ORS is easy to administer and readily available, families were still not using it years after its development. Oxfam, UNICEF, the Swedish International Development Agency, BRAC, and the government of Bangladesh adopted a beginner’s mindset to find a way forward.

BRAC interviewed its CHWs and found that they didn’t understand why diarrhea was so dangerous to children. As a result, they didn’t understand how ORS worked and hence, did not believe in its efficacy. In response, BRAC brought some CHWs to its labs to see, first-hand, how ORS worked. The CHWs were then advised to explain what they learned and to sip the solution themselves during household visits to demonstrate its safety. Over the span of a decade, CHWs reached out to more than 12 million mothers, which, along with a major social marketing campaign, resulted in the wider adoption of ORS as a lifesaving tool at home.
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January 2020
Serena Williams wins her first singles title in three years at the Auckland Classic and donates her US$ 43,000 prize money to Australian bushfire relief efforts.
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Once upon a time there lived a leader who cared deeply about education. He wanted everyone — not just the children of moneyed elites — to have access to schooling. He understood that the true power of education lay in the learning outcomes in the lives of girls and boys — that their ability to read, write, and count, as well as to analyze and think critically, was more important than schooling inputs, such as desks, textbooks, and classrooms.

The leader was an education expert, and got to work on his mission, not letting himself get distracted by people who did not share his passion. He wrote a proposal explaining the case for education for all. He marshaled evidence of what worked. He made a detailed plan that included activities, timeframes, and budgets.

Armed with this document, he went to see the Minister for Education. The minister listened and promised to share the proposal with his senior staff.

And then, nothing much changed.

Talking Ain’t Change
To be fair, there were speeches, conferences, and policies that said all the right things. But the government officials seemed to be keener about tangible things such as school buildings than children learning. Some of them even brought computers to schools, which were stored in the headmaster’s offices to keep them safe.

The leader was disappointed but did not give up. He gathered like-minded friends together. They researched more, they wrote more, and they spoke more. They created newsletters, graphics, and policy briefs and disseminated them widely. They formed an Education Sector Working Group to channel ideas to policymakers at local, national, and international levels. They garnered coverage in the education section of leading newspapers. Eventually, the leader’s work earned him a prestigious award from an international agency.

Back home, however, little had changed in education.
How Influence Works

One year, a young intern joined his organization. She was assigned to edit research reports and write policy briefs, and asked to conclude her assignments with a list of clear recommendations and a plea to the government to heed the evidence.

One day she came to the leader to suggest that instead of the recommendations, they quote Shakespeare. “Why would you want to do that?” asked the leader. “We do education policy, not literature.” She explained that the Minister for Education is crazy about Shakespeare. He asked how she knew that. She told him that she was in a book club with the minister’s daughter. The club meets at his house, where he frequently regales the group with quotes from the bard. The leader was unconvinced but let the intern quote Shakespeare.

To the leader’s surprise, soon after publication the minister called. He wanted to discuss the brief and asked him to come to his house for tea. The leader happily agreed and asked the intern to help him prepare. “We need to summarize all the data and action points,” he said. But the intern suggested a different approach: instead of restating our goals, which the minister already knows, how about trying to connect with him, to understand what he cares and worries about?

At the minister’s house, the leader remembered that the minister had been a professor of literature and a playwright. They traded stories and discovered they had mutual friends and that they both loved roasted cassava with tons of lime and chili. Just when it seemed like they would never get to talk about education reform, the minister unexpectedly remarked: “You must be frustrated that we don’t implement your recommendations. I am sorry, but the fact is that the Minister for Mining won’t let me.” The leader realized that the minister understood the evidence well, but that his cabinet colleague held an inordinate amount of power in cabinet, and sought to maintain traditional roles for women, to which progressive education was a threat.

All that Glitters is Not Gold

Back at the office the leader pondered what to do and called the intern over to discuss. She asked for time to research and came back a week later with another idea: to see the Catholic Bishop. The leader thought she was crazy. “Why him?” he asked. The intern replied that the Mining Minister was a devout Catholic. She had gone to his church and seen him listening intently to the Bishop. The leader was beginning to enjoy this line of thinking. He worked with the intern to learn more about the Bishop, who turned out to have progressive views about gender and education. They put together a case, based on case studies of real people from the Bishop’s diocese, rather than data and charts. The meeting went well. The Bishop suggested that they form a task force called “Education Justice for All God’s Children” involving both ministers, the leader, and others, including women and businesspeople who attended the Mining Minister’s church.

The task force met in informal settings where things could be discussed openly, and there was little of the defensiveness and evasion the leader had seen in formal meetings. Finally, there was progress. The government agreed to publish literacy and numeracy rates and to summarize all the data and action points, “he said. But the intern, use our funds to convene the grassroots women’s groups together to discuss education reforms?

The leader smiled. Next year was election year. Almost three decades after his initial proposal, he was finally beginning to understand how to effect change.
We live in exciting times. Private companies are putting satellites in space, producing global currencies such as Bitcoin, and using blockchain to make land records tamper-proof — all services once thought to be the sole purview of government. So, it is only natural for philanthropists to similarly consider bypassing governments in their efforts to fight poverty. After all, so many government agencies worldwide seem incompetent, corrupt, or slow to innovate.

But if my own career — which began 24 years ago working in the Indian government implementing development programs in the field — has taught me anything, it is that partnerships with governments offer undeniable advantages.

I am currently the Global Executive Director of the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL), an evidence to policy (E2P) organization at MIT, where I work closely with philanthropists, foundations, non-profits, and governments to apply scientific evidence to social policy. This journey has convinced me that: (a) while the role of the government is indeed evolving, it will continue to be the preeminent player in global poverty, development, and environment issues for years to come, and (b) relatively small investments of philanthropic dollars can drive outsized, lasting, and rapid impact through smart, nimble collaborations with governments and E2P organizations.

For example, programs evaluated by J-PAL researchers and then scaled up have, over the last 20 years, reached 400 million people, 340 million of them through “smart” partnerships with governments.
“I Don’t Trust the Government With My Money.” Yes, governments everywhere, including in many “advanced” economies, can be incompetent. Decisions are often driven not by objectivity, data, or evidence, but by ideology, instincts, and politics. The urgency of social problems can get mired in bureaucratic red tape.

So why am I suggesting that philanthropists spend dollars, time, and effort to support collaborations with governments and E2P organizations?

The Enduring, Pivotal Role of Governments
Governments have unrivaled responsibility, scale, and access.

Responsibility for social services: Ultimately governments are the ones held responsible for guaranteeing the availability of public services such as healthcare and education. So despite their drawbacks, or how competent the private sector becomes, governments will continue to be the biggest players to ensure equitable services for all.

Scale: Governments offer incredible potential for reaching people at scale — even the largest NGOs operate at a much smaller scale than governments in terms of both budgets and people reached.

In fact, some of the most successful NGOs reached scale by partnering with governments after demonstrating the success of their model. For example, Pratham, a J-PAL partner and one of the largest education NGOs in India, increased its reach massively by expanding its Teaching at the Right Level (TaRL) program to government schools after successfully piloting the program in their own schools.

Access: Governments have monopolies in sectors such as land, property, and identity records that are essential to obtaining credit, preventing crime, managing migration, and issuing identification. Each of these is becoming an even more critical part of the development equation. Indeed, many governments around the world are creating some version of unique biometric-based digital identifiers. Access to these identifiers will be an essential component of some of the most promising development innovations to help people living in poverty.

Creating Smart Partnerships
So how do we create smart partnerships that are mutually beneficial and can maximize impact?

A decade ago, I joined J-PAL to help found a dedicated policy group to engage more systematically with governments. This required a shift in the way J-PAL worked — until then, J-PAL worked primarily with NGOs. To work with governments, we first needed to share results more quickly to accommodate policymakers’ timeframes and create a suite of publications that was far more accessible than academic journals and that synthesized lessons from multiple studies. We also needed to raise funding for initiatives to leverage policy windows to catalyze scale-ups and research, hire specialized non-research staff in the field to stay updated about local policy priorities, build partnerships with governments that go beyond individual champions who can be transferred, and provide technical assistance to governments on evidence and scale.

Many successful, and even more failed, efforts later, perhaps the single most important lesson I have to share with you is that the key to leveraging the power of governments is to work with them in a way that gives them time, talent, and resources, rather than take or divert these away from them. This is a fundamental shift in the way many philanthropists and researchers currently collaborate with governments. Here are a few examples:

Time
Globally informed, locally grounded: Rather than asking governments to invest in predetermined programs that add to their work, engage with E2P organizations that map policymakers’ existing priorities with rigorous global research on what works and an analysis of what this suggests given local contexts. For instance, J-PAL’s Innovation in Government Initiative (IGI) provided US$ 250,000 to support the Zambian Ministry of Education in designing and piloting a remedial education program based on Pratham’s TaRL methodology. Other governments have recently announced a commitment of US$ 30m to J-PAL Africa for TaRL scale-ups across the continent to support the education of three million children over five years.

Investing in government’s capacity-building: We can seed an evidence-based culture within governments that supports data-driven decision-making as a default rather

Earmarking funds to leverage historic policy windows: Predictable and easily accessible funds can go a long way by leveraging a policy window. For example, J-PAL’s Innovation in Government Initiative (IGI) provided US$ 250,000 to support the Zambian Ministry of Education in designing and piloting a remedial education program based on Pratham’s TaRL methodology. Momentum from its success led to a USAID grant, and it was scaled to 1,800 schools. Evidence sharing led to further expansion, with governments in Côte d’Ivoire and Nigeria launching TaRL pilots adapted to their local contexts. Co-impact, a global philanthropic collaborative supported by Richard Chandler, Bill and Melinda Gates, Jeff Skoll, The Rockefeller Foundation, and Rohini and Nandan Nilekani recently announced a commitment of US$ 30m to J-PAL Africa for TaRL scale-ups across the continent to support the education of three million children over five years.

Talent
Embedding staff in governments: E2P organizations can embed staff who are already familiar with existing evidence. For example, J-PAL North America loaned a senior staffer to the White House to help build what is now the Office of Evaluation Sciences, which partners with federal agencies in using behavioral science insights to determine the most effective program designs. The team helped make improvements to government programs including doubling the rate at which student loan borrowers in default contracted default-resolution representatives.

Resources
Earmarking funds to leverage historic policy windows: Predictable and easily accessible funds can go a long way by leveraging a policy window. For example, J-PAL’s Innovation in Government Initiative (IGI) provided US$ 250,000 to support the Zambian Ministry of Education in designing and piloting a remedial education program based on Pratham’s TaRL methodology. Momentum from its success led to a USAID grant, and it was scaled to 1,800 schools. Evidence sharing led to further expansion, with governments in Côte d’Ivoire and Nigeria launching TaRL pilots adapted to their local contexts. Co-impact, a global philanthropic collaborative supported by Richard Chandler, Bill and Melinda Gates, Jeff Skoll, The Rockefeller Foundation, and Rohini and Nandan Nilekani recently announced a commitment of US$ 30m to J-PAL Africa for TaRL scale-ups across the continent to support the education of three million children over five years.

Investing in government’s capacity-building: We can seed an evidence-based culture within governments that supports data-driven decision-making as a default rather

A nurse uses a tablet for data collection at a clinic in Haryana, India, 2019.
The Way Forward

Governments appreciate philanthropic partnerships that bring additional resources, technical skills, speed, flexibility, and global knowledge beyond the local context. Additionally, philanthropic dollars go much further if they leverage existing government infrastructure and programs at scale.

At the heart of these partnerships are commitments by governments to use evidence from philanthropists and foundations to earmark predictable funds for evidence-policy partnerships, and by E2P organizations such as J-PAL to provide global knowledge and local staff in an effort to build better, smarter, more impactful, and more innovative government partnerships.

Private companies can provide some public goods. With foresight and resources, however, private space missions, cryptocurrencies, and blockchain land records can coexist and complement governments that are enacting data-driven and impactful policies.

Harnessing the power of big data: Around the world, vast amounts of data are now being digitally collected and stored. This creates tremendous opportunities, as time-consuming and expensive surveys can be replaced by existing administrative data sets, which often cover entire cities, states, or even countries. We can support efforts to improve decision-making in real time by expanding governments’ abilities to harness this data and creatively use artificial intelligence. J-PAL’s Innovations in Data and Experiments for Action Initiative (IDEA) is working with governments to use administrative data and machine learning to improve a range of government programs. These include reducing leakages in the distribution of subsidized food, decreasing tax fraud to increase revenue available for development, and even matching missing people to unidentified bodies to provide much-needed closure to families.

Iqbal Dhaliwal is the Global Executive Director of J-PAL. He is Co-Director of J-PAL’s South Asia office, the Innovation in Government Initiative (IGI), and the Innovations in Data and Experiments for Action Initiative (IDEA). He is also a board member of the NGO Nuna Health. Prior to J-PAL, Iqbal was a director of economic analysis at a consulting firm, managing projects in antitrust, regulations, and strategy. As a member of the Indian Administrative Service (IAS), he worked as a Deputy Secretary in a state government, director of a state-wide welfare department, and CEO of a publicly owned company. In 2019, the Government of Punjab, India awarded him the Guru Nanak Devji Achievers Award for contributions to economics and poverty alleviation and he was awarded a Director’s Gold Medal at India’s National Academy of Administration.

Iqbal holds a BSc in economics from Delhi University, an MA from the Delhi School of Economics, and an MPA in international development from Princeton University.

Iqbal Dhaliwal’s tribute to the co-founders of J-PAL

Perhaps there is no better acknowledgment of the critical role of nonprofits, researchers, and philanthropists in supporting governments through smart partnerships than the 2019 Nobel Prize in Economics, which was awarded to J-PAL co-founders Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo, along with long-time J-PAL affiliate Michael Kremer, for “their experimental approach to alleviating global poverty.”

While a lot of attention is focused on their experimental methodology — Randomized Control Trials (RCTs) — the policy action that has resulted from their research is equally significant. In fact, the Nobel citation celebrates their work to fight poverty in practice, stating that “as a direct result of one of their studies, more than five million Indian children have benefited from effective programs of remedial tutoring in schools. Another example is the heavy subsidies for preventive healthcare that have been introduced in many countries.”

The brilliance of Abhijit and Esther was in recognizing that this new research that they and a generation of creative colleagues were producing would not by itself be sufficient to reach policymakers — more would need to be done to actually make a difference in the lives of millions.

How Can Research be Translated Into Lives Changed?

Closing that gap between research and practice for the staff at J-PAL is a multi-stepped process. First, we recognize that we must greatly increase the quantity of anti-poverty research. This must be followed by making sure the anti-poverty efforts of NGOs, governments, and philanthropists are informed by the research.

Throughout this process, Abhijit and Esther have stressed how fundamental government collaborations are to this work. These collaborations can take many forms.

For example, Esther emphasizes that “working with governments to evaluate versions of these programs as they are being deployed represents a tremendous opportunity to generate evidence and improve the effectiveness of money that is already being spent. Moreover, as we have seen, the lessons that are generated from these partnerships are often actually acted upon, which means that gains from evaluation are not just potential, they are actual.”

Another example is Abhijit’s work, along with my own, on J-PAL’s Innovations in Government Initiative (IGI), which provides seed funding for the scale-up of effective innovative programs in partnership with governments. Abhijit argues that “matching global knowledge of what works and the tremendous scale-up capacity of the governments with the support of philanthropic resources is an incredibly promising and exciting pathway in the fight against global poverty.”

We thank the coalition of funders who have supported this work, including Community Jameel, Arnold Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Chandler Foundation, Co-Impact, DFAT, DFID, Hewlett Foundation, King Philanthropies, MacArthur Foundation, Marshall Foundation, Omiyar Network, and USAID, our government and NGO partners, and survey respondents around the world. Together we have, in the words of the MIT President L. Rafael Reif, “profoundly changed how governments and agencies around the world intervene to help people beat poverty.”
Practical Economics

In this exclusive interview, Esther Duflo and Abhijit Banerjee, winners of the 2019 Nobel Prize in Economics, share their thoughts on how their work can play a part in making the world a better place.

Now that you’ve won the Nobel Prize in Economics, what’s next?

Abhijit: There are constantly new questions for economics to tackle. Climate change, for example, offers huge potential for Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) research — testing mitigation in some contexts and adaptation in others; testing ideas from the lab in the field and applying technologies that work to actual policies. Likewise, migration is another topic that is increasing in importance due to forced displacement rates rising around the world. As inequality continues to be a big problem, social protection requires focused effort.

We are also looking at big data as a tool to cut across all these and other thematic areas. Governments and private companies are collecting vast amounts of data; how can we leverage this for social good?

We are exploring ways to use this data for better, faster, and less expensive evaluations that can inform urgent policy questions, while partnering closely with governments to analyze this data. This will allow us to better understand the nature of each problem, and then collaboratively design, pilot, and evaluate innovative solutions.

J-PAL — the organization that Esther, Sendhil Mullainathan, and I co-founded — is also actively working to help scale up the successful innovations.

Why did you choose a career as an economist?

Esther: I was an undergraduate student in history when I realized that economists are in a wonderful position — one that can change the world. They are able to take the time to study problems deeply, and when ready to share their conclusions, they can talk to policymakers and help inform their decisions with real evidence.

And yet, as soon as you mention the word “economics,” most people tune out. Why does economics have a reputation for being boring? As teachers and book authors specializing in the topic, how do you make economics interesting?

Esther: Many people have this perception that economics is only about GDP and interest rates. It can be hard to relate these concepts to everyday life.

But what got me excited about economics — and what I think can generate more interest in the field (especially among women and other marginalized groups) — is realizing that economics can help us find solutions to issues that are on all of our minds such as climate change, poverty, immigration, and inequality.

Often, our intuition about the best way to solve a problem is completely wrong, and experiments in economics can help us discover that what we thought was obvious is actually not obvious at all.

More specifically, how and why did you turn your attention to poverty alleviation?

Abhijit: I don’t know how one can work in economics and not work on alleviating poverty; in some ways, it’s the starkest economic problem you will ever encounter.

Having said that, I do think that my background played a role. My grandfather constructed our family home next to Kolkata’s largest slum. I played with children who lived in that slum and those families walked by my house every day. My mother, who has strong opinions about everything — including everything that is wrong in society — would run a commentary on what we saw, and made me aware of the challenges these families face. There was no escaping it.

Do you think it is possible to solve global poverty?

Abhijit: I believe that not only is it possible to solve global poverty, we have already made considerable progress in the last 30 years. Since 1990, you can see evidence of this in that the number of extremely poor people has been cut in half, infant mortality has also been cut in half, and maternal mortality has drastically reduced. Even in countries that remain poor, where GDP doesn’t increase, the quality of life for poor people has still improved because of good, pragmatic government policies that focus on human welfare and that are willing to look at the evidence.
Your latest book, *Good Economics for Hard Times*, was described by Greece’s former finance minister Yanis Varoufakis in an article for *The Guardian* as “an excellent antidote to the most dangerous forms of economics bashing.” In your opinion, what does good economics entail?

**Esther:** Economics, at its core, is the study of what people value and why they make the decisions that they make. In the past, economics has been dominated by big ideas and complex theories, with little attention paid to the facts of people’s lives: Are they actually behaving the way economic models predict? Often, the answer was no. But there has been an important shift in economics toward focusing more on the facts and realities that we can see and measure and test. Good economics is economics based in reality. Rather than creating abstract models and measuring whether people’s behavior matches up, let’s measure behavior first, and then develop the model.

In *Good Economics for Hard Times*, you also discuss the eroding legitimacy of government: “The state is perceived as unreliable or worse, by an increasing majority of the electorate.” What thoughts do you have on how that legitimacy might be restored?

**Esther:** It will have to be “show,” not “tell.” Many people in the United States (and elsewhere) are deeply suspicious of either the willingness or the capacity (or both) of the government to do anything to help them out. In part, this is because of actual incompetence, or past actions that have eroded trust (when, for example, the Indian government took land away from farmers without adequately compensating people, this made the public extremely reluctant to contemplate giving more land to build a factory, even when they were told the factory would bring jobs).

We believe that the government has an important role in dealing with many of the issues we are facing as a society. But it needs to start by choosing some area of action (for example, in richer countries this might be helping people adapt to disruptions caused by trade or by technology), design and implement successful policies, and then slowly move forward. This is why governments must continue to be willing to be innovative and to carefully evaluate their actions.

My own personal experience in the past two decades has been that there are many really competent, well-meaning and powerful bureaucrats who are very willing to greatly improve the responsiveness and efficacy of government programs. Often, all they need is access to the relevant evidence on what works and what does not, and dedicated technical advice and staff resources to help design, monitor, and execute a scale-up strategy based on that evidence.

You have both mentioned that you are part of a movement that is changing development economics to focus on using randomized control trials to test and better inform government policy and practice. What, if any, role is there in this movement for philanthropists, social purpose organizations, and/or businesses?

**Esther:** A huge role! The movement is made of researchers, practitioners, NGO activists, people who are themselves living in poverty, and, of course, funders. Most directly, philanthropists like Mohammed Jameel and a number of foundations (such as Gates and Hewlett) have played a major role in the financing of J-PAL. This funding has allowed us in the last 15 years to build J-PAL into a professional organization with an incredibly strong management team that can very efficiently implement any program in dozens of locations worldwide. As a result, researchers can take on not only more projects, but also much more complex projects, and often receive seed funding for them.

Funding has also allowed J-PAL to build a really strong policy group that makes sure the lessons from this cutting-edge research are turned into action on the ground. And we have been able to invest in building the capacity of policymakers, donors, and researchers to use evidence in the fight against poverty. More indirectly, by insisting that what they fund is backed by evidence, philanthropists and social purpose organizations can contribute to create a culture in the development ecosystem where evaluation is the norm.

Your work involves building the case for government policy and interventions based on evidence. Can you share an example of how a socially minded organization has effectively partnered with government to help it adopt research-tested best practices and policies with great effect?

**Esther:** J-PAL partnered with the Gujarat Pollution Control Board (GPCB) to help it reform and revive a third-party environmental audit system. Gujarat is the Indian state with the fastest industrial growth, and, partly as a consequence, is also the state with the fastest growth in pollution. Some of the most polluted cities on Earth are in Gujarat.

A few years ago, the Supreme Court ordered the government to set up a third-party audit system, where each plant in highly polluting sectors would have to obtain (and pay for) an annual audit administered via a private firm. The audit report would be shared with the GPCB, which could impose sanctions. This is a great idea in principle, since it forces the polluter to pay and allows the government to harness private competencies it does not possess. Unfortunately, the structure of the program created a natural conflict of interest between the auditor and the firm: since the firm chooses to hire and pays the auditor, the latter has every reason to give it a clean bill of health. The result was that while most audit reports showed pollution levels for firms to be just below the acceptable threshold, true levels of pollution that we measured via back-checks for the same firms were much higher. Following extensive conversations with GPCB over many months (which turned into a fruitful collaboration over several years), we proposed a three-part solution to alleviate the apparent conflict of interest and make the auditor loyal to society as opposed to the audited firm.

First, we proposed breaking the financial link between the audited company and the auditor, which was achieved by creating a central pool from which auditors would be paid. Second, we proposed making the monitor feel responsible for accuracy. In the first year, this was achieved by threatening to discontinue their participation in the scheme for low accuracy, and in the second year by rewarding them with higher payments for high accuracy. Finally, we began measuring accuracy through back-checks. We designed an RCT to test this new system: audit-eligible firms were randomly assigned either to the status quo system or to the new system. We found audit reports were much more accurate under the new system. Moreover, perhaps because of greater scrutiny, pollution (measured in an independent endline survey) also declined, particularly for the worst offenders.

Based on these results, GPCB successfully convinced the court and state administration to change the rules governing the scheme’s implementation. These changes
came into effect in 2015, with new guidelines requiring the random assignment of environmental auditors to firms, instituting back-checks, and imposing a fee schedule for participating businesses. What lessons do you hope philanthropists, social purpose organizations, or government actors might take from J-PAL’s work with governments?

Abhijit: The most important lesson is that evaluation is essential to move beyond instinct, ideology, and inertia that still drive so much of decision-making in governments. Things that seemed to be obvious wins to governments (like using technology to monitor and reduce absenteeism of frontline workers) turn out not to be as effective as they thought. And things that might have sounded like a waste of effort (like identifying and leveraging local social influencers to convince parents to immunize their children) turned out to have a big impact (even bigger than monetary incentives).

We hope that philanthropists bring more of a venture capital mindset to the fight against poverty and climate change. This has two dimensions: first, by funding research to have a big impact (even bigger than monetary incentives). And things that might have sounded like a waste of time (like training frontline workers) turn out not to be as effective as they might have seemed. Second, we need to convince parents to immunize their children. These are the kinds of things that matter, and we need to convince people to do them.

We hope to use collaborative philanthropy to raise the resources to greatly expand this very important work.

What motivates you to press ahead with your work at J-PAL and what advice do you have for young researchers who wish to follow in your footsteps?

Abhijit: With J-PAL, we get to work on the most pressing questions of our times (from poverty to climate change), partner with incredible people all over the world (the researchers and community members who are part of the “movement” we described), and work alongside our truly extraordinary staff. We are surprised, humbled, and learning all the time. We work with the poor and listen to what they have to say. Sometimes we even feel that we are contributing to making the world a better place. We even get a salary and honors and awards to boot. It is hard to imagine a better job!

In fact, this was the motivation to launch J-PAL’s Innovations in Government Initiative (IGI) in 2019. We now have a substantial and growing body of rigorous evidence on what works or not in poverty alleviation and climate change. Our hope is that IGI can work with national, state, and local governments around the world to take many of these innovative proven programs and policies to scale. Our experience working with partners as diverse as the United States federal government, state governments in India, and national departments in Mexico or Zambia has been that often all it takes is relatively inexpensive expert technical advising from J-PAL’s staff embedded on these projects to leverage the massive scale and resources of the government. For all these reasons I am very excited to be co-leading IGI with Iqbal Dhaliwal, our Global Executive Director, who has extensive experience working in and with governments. We hope to use collaborative philanthropy to raise the resources to greatly expand this very important work.

Abhijit Banerjee, Esther Duflo, and Michael Kremer laureates of the Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel, at the Nobel Prize Award Ceremony 2019 in Norway.
As Chief Executive Officer and Chief Investment and Impact Officer, respectively, of the philanthropic fund Blue Meridian Partners, Nancy Roob and Jim Shelton invest in strategies that can transform the lives of young people and families living in poverty. To date, the fund has aggregated more than US$2 billion from partner investors to scale solutions that increase economic mobility and build pathways out of poverty for young people and families. Here, they discuss income and opportunity inequality, and how investors can partner more effectively to boost social mobility in the United States.

The widening gulf in income and opportunity inequality in the United States has been the source of intensive debate and discussion over the past decade. What progress is being made in increasing economic mobility?

Nancy Roob: Leaders in philanthropy and the broader social sector have been working to narrow gaps in equity and economic security for decades. Yet, those gaps are getting wider and we know we have so far to go in making the progress we need to thrive as a society. The idea that our children will have a better life than we have had is, in most corners of America, more myth than reality. It’s an unacceptable fact that, if you’re born in a low-income community and on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, more often than not you’ll stay there. In fact, research shows that a child growing up poor in a southern city like Atlanta only has a 4% chance of climbing to the top fifth of wage earners.
That said, while this may sound hopeless, it isn’t. We believe and see that pioneering social sector leaders have many of the solutions to help catalyze rapid change across the country. Blue Meridian Partners identifies, invests in, and scales up the strategies of these visionaries who are making an impact on the social problems that undermine the American dream.

These are leaders such as Rahul Briggs, the National Director of HealthySteps. Rahul and her team strengthen the health and social, emotional, and cognitive development of low-income children under the age of four — who are notoriously hard to reach because most do not attend pre-K or other formal programs. HealthySteps reaches these children by adding a child development specialist to local pediatric care teams, which have contact with 90% of the nation’s children. When families visit their doctor, the specialist provides them with guidance on parenting skills, building healthy relationships, and strengthening their children’s early development. We see great promise in HealthySteps and solutions like it to help young people and families overcome barriers to opportunity on a nationwide scale.

A lack of income and opportunity equality is a national issue, so why are local leaders also key to improving upward mobility? What Nancy describes as “right sizing” means that philanthropists don’t need to break new ground: the best thing we can do is listen, learn, and help leaders bring their successful strategies to scale — whether they are working within a community or striving to address problems nationwide.

That’s what we’re doing around the country with leaders like Patrick Lawler, who started his career working in a local group home. Pat went on to become a probation officer in Tennessee’s Shelby County, where he grew up, and later helped found Youth Villages in Memphis. Under his leadership, the organization has become a champion in the national movement to downsize group foster care and build community responses that help young people transition into a healthy, productive adulthood.

As our General Partner and board chair Stan Druckenmiller put it: “As a private-sector investor and with my philanthropy, I try to stay focused on the long view. Blue Meridian’s patient model for taking proven strategies to scale is especially appealing. It fits with my resources used as effectively as possible so more children and youth have access to the same opportunities that I did.”
Inequities that advantage one community over another deny too many kids and families access to economic mobility. This truth has been validated by the Covid-19 crisis. The challenges are deep and complex, and cannot be solved by philanthropy or a single funder. Instead, philanthropy must work alongside government and can weave together community partners to help tackle systemic racism and advocate for change. 

CONNIE BALLMER
Co-Founder of the Ballmer Group & Founding Investor at Blue Meridian Partners

What lessons can we learn from the successes and failure of the past decade? With that in mind, what's next in the greater social sector to help address intractable social problems.

I truly believe that by collaborating and investing together, we have a real chance for philanthropists to help solve our most intractable social problems.

Blue Meridian exemplifies this sort of collaborative. But imagine a future where there are 20 more platforms for collaboration built on the same principles — each pooling hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars to social sector leaders on the forefront of addressing pressing social issues like health or the environment.

Blue Meridian’s Large-scale Commitments

Blue Meridian has, to date, made large-scale commitments totaling roughly US$ 845m to nine organizations with potential to achieve nationwide impact. Here are stories from two:

Youth Villages

When Ali was 14, both her parents were arrested on drug charges and she fell into the foster care system. Data indicates that this should have doomed her to a life on the margins. The United States foster care system, designed to be a temporary service to care for children whose parents cannot, has struggled to give the kids in its care the security and support they need to succeed. Nationally, only about half of children in foster care graduate high school. Nearly half go on to experience homelessness as adults.

Ali had different plans for herself, so she turned to LifeSet. Youth Villages’ LifeSet program is a comprehensive, data-driven initiative that helps young people who are aging out of the foster care system to transition to a successful, independent adult life. LifeSet counselors helped Ali get an apartment, create a monthly budget, and apply for financial aid. With their support, in June 2019, Ali graduated from college.

Year Up

Bryan Goodson was always interested in computers and wanted a career in technology. But after graduating high school and taking a few college courses, he found himself working in a Six Flags theme park pizza shop, with his goals on hold and no career plan.

That’s when he heard about Year Up, a program that bridges the gap between young adults seeking a pathway to middle-class careers and companies eager for a well-trained workforce and a cost-effective way to meet their talent needs. Year Up’s intensive one-year training program offers hands-on skills development, coursework eligible for college credits, and corporate internships designed to prepare young adults, ages 18-24, for “middle-skill” positions.

Bryan was placed in an internship with Salesforce and eventually hired there as a business analyst.

Blue Meridian has, over the last four years, invested US$ 40.5m in Year Up to help the program expand to reach more than 6,000 students annually. The first long-term evaluation of the program found it was cost-effective; graduates of the program increased their initial earnings by 53% — almost US$ 2,000 more per quarter — and sustained large positive impacts over the following year.

Blue Meridian’s US$ 36m investment in the program over the last four years has helped support the first phase of Youth Villages’ 11-year scaling plan, which is positioning the LifeSet program to strive to reach the more than 20,000 young people in the United States who age out of foster care every year.
**The Exemplar Effect**

Gates Ventures’ Managing Director Niranjan Bose celebrates progress in global health outcomes, while investigating the criteria to amplify it.

**Progress on Health Outcomes**

Spin your globe and settle your finger on Peru. Take a closer look at the country and find the southern city of Cusco, surrounded by mountaintop villages and the ruins of Machu Picchu, one of the seven wonders of the world.

A girl born in those villages 35 or 40 years ago would likely be physically stunted and cognitively impaired. She likely would not have finished school and would have started having children when she was just a teenager. Her own children would have followed a similar, though not identical, trajectory.

But the data tells us that something remarkable happens when her grandchildren are born.

They grow.

From 2008 to 2017, Peru cut its childhood stunting rate by more than half.

Peru is not alone — we have witnessed extraordinary progress on health outcomes over the last two decades in countries from Senegal to Bangladesh.

You probably haven’t heard of any these triumphs. Here’s why.

**Who Pays for Global Health Advice?**

Businesses who want to know what sort of IT will best meet their needs can rely on advisors such as Gartner or Forrester that help bridge the “know-do” gap. And investors who want safe places to park their cash can rely on Moody’s ratings. But, in the global health sector, there has been no authoritative public resource that systematically identifies positive outliers across varied settings and geographies to determine what are the best practices that governments and funders can adapt and adopt to expedite progress.

As a result, many governments and funders have relied on anecdotal evidence to make decisions about how to strengthen health systems. When tens of millions of dollars — and even more lives — are at stake, this approach is woefully inadequate.

Why did this gap exist?

Unfortunately, the marketplace doesn’t pay for knowledge on global health. Businesses will pay for IT advice, but who pays for global health advice?

When the countries that need this advice are often among the poorest on the planet, the answer must be philanthropists and funding agencies.

**Exemplars in Global Health: Stepping Up to the Plate**

That’s why Gates Ventures, where I work, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation are launching Exemplars in Global Health. This program has leading health researchers around the world working with in-country experts from the geographies which have made the most progress on key health topics to identify the policies, strategies, and programs that have helped drive their success.

Together, they expand on the strong foundational research from the World Health Organization, World Bank, and other institutions. The results of this collaboration have been surprising and groundbreaking.
Second, philanthropy can break down barriers and seed global cooperation on important research. It shouldn’t take a pandemic the likes of the novel COVID-19 to prompt global research cooperation. Social investors can build bridges to speed learning and progress every day on a range of critical issues.

Third, there are few more important roles for philanthropy than filling in the blind spots for governments. Governments need good data to make good decisions. Often the existing data is unclear or not accessible.

In the graph on the right, we see that although Ethiopia and Chad have similar per capita GDP, their health outcomes are dramatically different. Ethiopia’s under-five mortality rate is roughly half that of Chad’s. What are the lessons we can discern from these positive outliers? And how might they be adopted and adapted by other health leaders?

We’ve known for many years that Ethiopia and Chad have starkly different health outcomes. What we didn’t fully understand is why.

Through robust research and data analysis over the last two years, our research partners have gained a better understanding of how Ethiopia achieved this success. And, importantly, our research partners have distilled their findings into data-driven, actionable recommendations for leaders who want to bridge performance gaps.

The Time is Now

This knowledge has never been more critical. At this moment, COVID-19 has made a profound business case for investments in strengthening health systems, and governments around the world are pouring unprecedented resources into filling exposed gaps in the shortcomings of their healthcare systems.

We need to ensure that these (and future) resources are invested wisely, and in a manner that not only responds to an acute crisis, but builds a more resilient health system for the future as well. Countries must strengthen their health systems in ways that will provide ongoing benefits both for daily challenges, such as reducing under-five mortality, and as we battle headline-grabbing once in a century threats such as the current pandemic.

We can rebuild and strengthen our health infrastructure to achieve these twin goals. The same monitoring systems that ensure every child receives the recommended package of childhood vaccines can also be used to track disease outbreaks and hotspots. And the same supply chain that delivers vaccines to every child can be used to deliver other pandemic-related treatments or prophylactics.

Our research focuses on the health topics of childhood stunting, under-five mortality, community health workers, and vaccine delivery and pandemic preparedness, which provides models and paths forward.

We believe there is no better time to invest in improving health outcomes. National leaders from Bangladesh to Brazil and Ethiopia to Zambia have made remarkable progress. Let’s make sure the ranks of these positive outliers swell and ensure that children in mountaintop villages the world over have a chance to grow tall and thrive.

Before the work on Exemplars in Global Health, for example, few would have identified Kyrgyzstan as a global leader in reducing childhood stunting. Perhaps even the leaders of Kyrgyzstan would not have held themselves up as a model to be emulated. They simply hadn’t been tracking stunting rates as the rates declined by half, from 36% to 13%. But our research partners noted the country’s progress and worked with local health leaders to better understand what Kyrgyzstan got right. As a result, we can offer lessons in reducing childhood stunting that may apply and appeal to other former Soviet bloc countries.

Our partners have identified dozens of positive outliers such as Kyrgyzstan around the globe.

The Role of Strategic Social Investors

This work demonstrates three important roles for strategic social investors. First, the market often misses opportunities to serve those at or near the bottom of the pyramid. Philanthropists can de-risk those investments to attract private sector interest or just step in to provide the service directly with the intention of demonstrating the business case.
A New Generation Rises

Yawa Hansen-Quao, Executive Director of Emerging Public Leaders, believes that a new generation of well-trained civil servants is the key to improving Africa’s governance.

Two years ago (2018), while visiting the United States, I became unwell, was hospitalized, and later underwent an emergency cesarean section resulting in the birth of a baby that was premature and very unwell. Thankfully, my son Derek survived.

I often reflect on how different my story would have been had Derek been born in my home country, Ghana, as we had intended. Given that the under-five mortality rate in Ghana is 50 deaths per 1,000 live births (roughly seven times higher than the rate in the United States), and given the severity of his condition then, it is much less likely that he would be here today. That’s a terrifying and humbling reality. I have no doubt that my faith and love played a big role in Derek’s survival. But equally important are the roles that accessible emergency services, qualified healthcare professionals, and the availability of medical equipment played in giving him a fighting chance.

If you can call an ambulance, if you can count on a doctor or nurse being available to treat you in the emergency room, if there is a local health facility stocked with basic necessities, consider yourself fortunate. That’s a privilege that many citizens across Africa do not currently enjoy.
Building a Robust Healthcare System in Africa

Improving access to, and the quality of, healthcare across Africa will require much more than just building more or better hospitals, buying incubators and ambulances, and training health professionals or scaling community health. Improving that access to healthcare, and its quality, will require doing all of these things and improving governance. We must improve the capacity, competency, and integrity of government so that it can connect hospitals, ambulances, incubators, and health professionals, and deploy them in a strategic manner to create a functional and responsive health system that is as capable of saving children such as Derek as it is meeting a country’s most pressing and changing needs in preventing pandemics and serving the most vulnerable citizens. This, for me, is one of the promises of good governance and it is why I believe that investing in a new generation of government leaders is the innovation that Africa needs most.

When citizens accuse their governments of incompetence or corruption, too often NGOs and funders respond by building parallel systems of service delivery. Ultimately, we will not achieve our development goals by building yet more parallel systems of delivery. Governments are not roadblocks to be bypassed. They are necessary partners in achieving sustainable, catalytic, durable, systemic change.

Improving government performance can seem like an impossible task. It is not.

On the global scale, governments dealing with underperforming institutions face four key challenges:

- A culture of corruption and poor leadership: perceived and realized
- Low capacity to perform: as processes and policies are not well defined nor efficient
- Lack of high-performing staff: with few incentives for excellence or meritocratic career promotion
- Low capacity of incoming and current staff at all levels: with top performers recruited into private sector and general education systems that have not prepared graduates for today’s challenges.

Investing in Public Service Leaders

These challenges aren’t insurmountable.

At Emerging Public Leaders, we believe we can interrupt the powerful forces that keep government performance low by recruiting and placing well-trained committed civil servants in the government and supporting them. We can stack the civil service with staff who believe in serving their country and are equipped with the skills necessary to change civil service culture and processes/policies to improve efficiency and performance, help to advance innovation and ensure long-term development and growth.

After more than a decade of working with the government of Liberia, and now Ghana, we have seen first-hand that investing in and supporting the next generation of civil service leaders is transformative. When a civil service is strong, responsive, and can adequately deliver services and envision them for the future, it recasts the image of the government and the image of the country.

Our Public Service Fellowship program provides a merit-based pathway for skilled youth to enter government. We offer selected university graduates two years of salaried employment in government institutions, with training and mentoring that positions them to contribute to improved public service delivery, spur good governance,

Our vision is to build a new cadre of public servants that think critically, work competently, and will really drive change in Africa.

YAWA HANSEN-QUAO
and promote growth. Post-fellowship, our graduates carry forward with meaningful careers in public service.

Not only do such efforts create a more effective and trusted government, they also create a more inclusive government. Merit-based approaches to recruitment bring more women and rural dwellers into government. This has a knock-on effect of making government more knowledgeable and responsive to the needs of everyone. And if you think our 160+ fellows in Liberia and Ghana can only make changes around the margins given the thousands of people in the civil service, think again.

Nyanda Finda Davis, a graduate fellow in Liberia, became the first female head of passports, where she cut the passport processing time from one month to three days, and now serves as a Counselor in the Liberian Embassy in Washington D.C. Another graduate, Johnson Williams, created Liberia’s first web-based budgeting platform and now serves as the Assistant Director for National Budget Development. Another graduate cut the process for applying for a mining license from between three and five months to seven to 15 days.

When Ebola broke out in Liberia, our graduate fellows were on the frontlines of Ebola response and Liberia benefited from having a trusted network of trained and ethical young leaders during a time of profound crisis. Their impact over time grows exponentially as they inevitably advance within the civil service to become influential ministers, directors, and superintendents.

Emerging Public Leaders was founded in 2009 as the President’s Young Professionals Program (PYPP) in Liberia. A decade since our founding, we are pleased that an increasing number of private-sector leaders, development partners, philanthropists, and NGOs such as African Leadership Academy, Ashesi University, Global Health Corps, AMP, EJS Presidential Center, and Apolitical Academy have recognized that building a strong, competent, and ethical public service is a requirement for achieving our development goals.

Join me in creating a pipeline of qualified, dedicated public servants that will drive change and deliver the good governance that Africa deserves.

Yawa Hansen-Quao is the Executive Director of Emerging Public Leaders. For nearly a decade, she has nurtured female leadership and social entrepreneurship in Africa through the Leading Ladies Network (LLN), a nonprofit she founded in Ghana. In May 2012, at the World Economic Forum on Africa, Yawa was recognized as one of Africa’s Rising Leaders and in 2016 was awarded an Eisenhower Fellowship in honor of her pioneering work nurturing emerging women leaders. Yawa also served for three years on the Foundation Board of the World Economic Forum’s Global Shapers Community, and is a current member of the Board of Directors of Ashesi University College. She previously served as a leadership consultant to UN Women, helping to develop leadership curricula to enhance the capacity of women leaders in East and Southern Africa. Additionally, Yawa served for two years as a member of the Advisory Board of the Women’s Institute for Global Leadership at Benedictine University. Yawa holds an MA in Gender, Peace & Security from the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Center, Honors studies in Entrepreneurship & New Product Development at the American University of Rome, and a BSc in Business Administration from Ashesi University College.
In this interview, Liberia’s former President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf discusses post-pandemic nation rebuilding and how women’s empowerment will unlock further progress for her country.

You successfully led Liberia through the Ebola epidemic from 2014 to 2016 — helping stop the disease within your country and preventing its spread beyond West Africa. What advice do you have for global leaders as they grapple with COVID-19 and the aftermath?

Ebola infected more than 10,000 Liberians, and killed more than 4,800 people, including 10% of our doctors and 8% of nurses and midwives. It brought our GDP growth into negative territory and it demonstrated the human costs of a poorly functioning health system.

My advice to today’s global leaders in the age of COVID-19 is: when planning your recovery, do not overlook addressing the gaps in your healthcare and social service systems that allowed the virus to sicken so many, so quickly. These structural reforms will make your society stronger, more resilient, and better equipped to recover and address the next challenge.

In Liberia’s case, this meant connecting rural populations — that previously often had no access to healthcare whatsoever and distrusted the health system — with basic healthcare services and the national healthcare system. We did that by launching a national community health worker program immediately after the Ebola crisis ended.

For many wealthier countries battling COVID-19, we see the lack of access to healthcare, the lack of paid sick leave, and a lack of coordination as potential Achilles heels.

During your time as president, you successfully managed to secure debt forgiveness, launched the national community health worker program, made basic education free and compulsory, and oversaw the first peaceful transition of power in decades. How were you able to achieve so much in a fragile democracy just recovering from a civil war that killed nearly 10% of the country’s population and destroyed physical and social institutions?

Yes, we inherited a wounded country with dysfunctional institutions, but far beyond the physical destruction and deprivations, it is important to recognize that we were also divided. When I look back and consider the scale and scope of the challenges, this one issue remains at the forefront of my memory — Liberia needed healing. If our house had remained divided, we would not have made any progress, no matter the expense or effort.

We were able to achieve these successes (and others) thanks to two things: a unifying vision that pulled the country together and a team with shared values. Helping to address the needs of a poor country — a country well-endowed, but with deep divisions and limited capacity required being bold in our vision for development and growth within Liberia as well as partners across the world who believed in that vision, invested in it by working alongside us, and supported us. This included helping us build and invest in the capacity within our government and our country, and having philanthropic and development partners who were willing to take risks and have patience.

What do you see as the key to further progress in Liberia? I see two mutually reinforcing levers for further advancing Liberia’s development, as well as development of our neighbors and friends across the continent. Using both of these levers requires support from partners.

First, investing in the capacity of government to deliver basic services is critical, as is building the capacity to help scale and sustain innovations. Public servants are what my friend Mo Ibrahim calls “unsung heroes.” We have to invest in these leaders as an engine for great programs and policies. We need to change the perception and reality of leadership.

Second, as we build a pipeline of leaders in public service, we need to ensure the inclusion of women as leaders. If we harness the potential of women and girls, broadly, in and out of government, we can achieve the transformational change my country and the continent desperately need. This includes training women, hiring women, promoting women, and electing women.
These two critical issues are connected in Emerging Public Leaders (see p.45), which builds on the model of President’s Young Professionals Program, both of which I launched with Betsy Williams to recruit and train the top university graduates into civil service careers.

We’ve found that providing meritocratic recruitment pathways is a critical ingredient for unlocking women’s leadership in the public sector. What’s more, when talented women get the chance to play key roles in governance, they help to fill capacity gaps that limit government effectiveness. It is common sense that a government of men alone cannot possibly represent the best minds a country has to offer. The program has helped recruit and promote some of the best women and men in the country to public service.

Ensuring inclusive and dynamic leadership, especially from women, is also why I have launched the Ellen Johnson Sirleaf Center for Women and Leadership, which started in March with the kickoff of our Amujae Program for Political Leaders. Meaning “lift up” in Kru, our local dialect, its mission is to inspire and prepare women to unapologetically take up roles and excel in the highest echelons of public leadership, including elected office, and to bring other women along.

I was the first democratically elected woman to lead an African nation. I am waiting, Africa is waiting, for other women to follow. The programs I am supporting are to help make this happen, not in 10 years or 20 years, but now.

These efforts, together with the promotion of democracy, checks and balances, and accountability will lead to improved institutions and economic policies. We should add that the necessary conditions for development also rely on improving the rule of law, assuring democratic transitions, controlling corruption, and assuring property rights. Strong institutions to protect these rights are indispensable. But it starts with the right people.

What do you see for your country’s future? Liberia’s success will depend upon the continued strengthening of weak institutions and combating endemic corruption and patron-clientelism politics, which are the most formidable barriers to making democracy work. These ills must be fought with all tools available from many partners; improving civil service capacity, ensuring institutions are stronger than the individual, and removing the educational, societal, and institutional structures that disadvantage women. There is no substitute for this in Africa, or indeed, anywhere.

The good news is that corruption struggles to remain hidden in a world where technology and information systems have brought us unprecedented opportunities for transparency. Today, social media empowers everyday citizens to become watchdogs. Though, at the same time, social media can bring its own threats to democracy and truth, which must be recognized and managed.

We can seize this potential and support a mentality change in society. We must recognize that progress demands our collective efforts to improve government and the institutions from which they lead and deliver.
If She Can See It

She Can Be It

Academy Award-winning actor Geena Davis advocates equal representation of women in media.

The Power of Media Images

Sixteen years ago, while watching a pre-school show with my then two-year-old daughter, I was stunned to see that there seemed to be far more male characters than female characters in something made specifically for the youngest kids. Then, I noticed it everywhere in children’s fictional media and entertainment. As a mother, I thought — in the 21st century — why on earth would we be showing kids from the beginning that boys are far more important than girls? There are some exceptions, of course: the Teletubbies are gender-balanced, though it may be hard to tell.

Media images have a powerful impact on shaping our perceptions of our value to society. When you see someone like yourself on-screen, doing interesting and important things, you get the message: “There’s someone like me. I must matter.”

The stark inequality in media aimed at young children is significant, as content — whether digital, television, movies, or gaming — wields enormous influence on kids when they’re developing a sense of their role and purpose in our society. And since children watch the same content repeatedly, negative stereotypes get imprinted again and again.

If the content we’re making for them has a profound lack of unique and diverse female characters, boys and girls are unconsciously taking in the message that girls, women, people of color, people with disabilities and members of the LGBTQ+ community are not as valuable as white men and boys. This may inform their views throughout their lives.

My theory of change is this: one of the most powerful ways to immediately impact the stubborn issue of inequality — in all sectors of society — is to change what images people see in popular culture. If it happens on-screen, it will happen in real life: life will imitate art.
When Real Life Reflects Reel Life
Why unwittingly teach gender and cultural bias to young children, when it’s so hard to get rid of later? Just show kids from the beginning that boys and girls share the sandbox equally; that they are equally impressive, fun, and essential, and they’re each — by the way — half of the population.

When I first started speaking to content creators about gender inequity I’d observed in kids’ media, they said: “Oh no, that’s not so anymore; that’s been fixed.” They truly felt a responsibility to do right by girls, and they thought they were. They had no idea that the fictitious worlds they were creating were near benefit of meaningful female presence — probably because they grew up seeing the same gender imbalance too.

I realized then that I needed data if I was to prove to them that we are indeed still sending the message to kids that men and boys are far more valuable than women and girls. Here’s one example of what the research revealed: when we looked at the occupations of characters in family films, 81% of the characters with jobs were male. And the number of women in top professions was profoundly underrepresented — even compared to the low real-life statistics.

In other words, however abysmal the numbers are in real life, it’s far worse in fiction. Where you make it up, it can be anything we want, and we chose to make it even worse than the unfortunate reality. Do we really want to stand by the idea that it’s fine for female characters to be one-dimensional, narrowly stereotyped, hyper-sexualized, unempowered... or simply not there at all?

Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media: Data-Driven Research
In 2004, I launched the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media and sponsored the most extensive research on the representation of female characters in children’s movies and TV programs ever done. Our results were astonishing and borne out my observation that there was significant inequity: at that time, we found a 3:1 ratio of male to female characters in both family films and television shows aimed at kids. Since our inception, my Institute works collaboratively with the entertainment and media industries to reduce negative stereotyping and to achieve cultural equity and inclusion onscreen, with a special focus on content targeting children 11 and under. We are the only research-based organization engaged in information and communication technologies for the UN’s International Telecommunication Union, which champions women and diverse voices in all forms of media. Davis holds honorary degrees from Boston University, Bates College, and New England College.

Achieving Historic Gender Parity
In fact, we recently achieved two of our top goals in this work: we’ve reached gender parity for lead female characters in children’s television for the first time in history, and we’ve achieved gender parity for female lead characters in family films (G, PG, PG-13) for the first time as well. This reinforces to us that our theory of how to drive systemic culture change in this area works. We still have a long way to go to achieve intersectional gender equity across the whole population of the fictitious worlds being created, but we are seeing progress — including concerning race.

People frequently ask me: “What can I do?” Parents, relatives and teachers can have a tremendous impact by watching media with children and pointing out stereotyping and discrimination to them. “Why do you think there’s only one girl in that story?” “Why do you think she’s wearing that if she’s going to go rescue somebody?” For content creators, the quickest and simplest way to reach gender parity onscreen is to go through a script that you’re already going to make, cross out a bunch of first names of ensemble and supporting characters, and make them female. With one stroke, you have created some non-stereotyped female characters who might even be more interesting now that they’ve had a gender swap!

On-screen is the one area of gross inequality where the underrepresentation or misrepresentation of diverse women can be fixed absolutely overnight. No matter what a creator has made before, their very next project can go straight to gender parity and racial justice. For those of you interested in shifting the cultural narrative and actively advancing social justice — in any sector of society — I encourage you to finance content creators and organizations such as mine that are working on cultural change through transforming program development for children.

When Life Imitates Art For the Better
Here’s a fun example of how life can imitate art. My archery coach called a couple of years ago to tell me about an interesting phenomenon: the participation of girls in the sport suddenly skyrocketed in 2012, shooting up an astonishing 105%. So, what happened in 2012 that could have caused such a stunning change? Well, Hunger Games and Brave came out that summer — both of which had female archers as their protagonists. The reaction from girls was instant: they essentially left the theater and bought a bow. There are myriad examples like this, all of which prove the truth of our motto: “If she can see it, she can be it.”
The chart on the right depicts one of the most stubborn and pernicious gaps in the world today. My country’s farmers here in Tanzania are represented by that bottom blue line. They produce about one-tenth as much maize, per hectare, as a farmer in Alberta or Iowa, and about half as much as a farmer 3,000 kilometers to the south in KwaZulu-Natal.

In an effort to boost productivity, food security, and incomes, many well-intentioned African governments, my own included, invited foreign investors to buy or lease land, and establish large-scale commercial farms — the kind you see stretching to the horizon in places like Alberta, Iowa, and KwaZulu-Natal.

What followed, in many cases, captured headlines around the world: thousands of smallholder farming families pushed off their land — often without adequate consultation or unfair compensation.

The Foundational Role of Land Rights
Both the government and private investors soon learned that Africa’s smallholder farmers’ meager harvest isn’t just the result of poor access to markets, agricultural extension agents, and high-quality seeds and fertilizer. Africa’s smallholder farmers labor without something even more fundamental: secure rights to their land. In fact, according to the World Bank, about 90% of the agricultural land in sub-Saharan Africa is undocumented. That means that many governments simply do not have a registry of who owns what land or their registry is out of date. As a result, much of the land that governments think is unused and available for investors, is actually occupied.

In Ghana, for instance, the Lands Commission estimates that their records include only about 2% of all farms.

This may sound like a technical or bureaucratic problem. But it is far larger. Weak, unclear, and undocumented land rights are just the most visible element of a systemic failure, a failure that undermines smallholder farmers’ security and willingness to make productivity-enhancing investments in their land. Insecure land rights also undermine farmers’ ability to lease their land and move on to more remunerative work. And undocumented land rights are particularly problematic for women, who do more than half of the farming, but often have to depend on their husbands, brothers, or fathers to access land.
Our Partnerships are Guided by Five Key Principles

1. Unity is Power
   It has become apparent that the complex environmental and social challenges of today can't be solved by a singular actor or even within one sector.

2. One Plus One Equals Three
   When it comes to collaboration, we can get exponentially more done when we work together than when we each work alone.

3. Local Perspective is Key
   We have knowledgeable local staff who can provide added value to our partners, and we constantly seek to learn more about areas where we can add value to our common cause.

4. Be a Humble Servant
   We recognize that the work won’t get done without our partners. Sometimes working from the back seat can be the most effective way to move toward a shared goal.

5. Cross-Sector Partnerships Add Value
   We look for chances to reach across silos to achieve milestones in development, and to foster relationships with organizations working on climate change and conservation, livelihoods, health, and education.

The dysfunction occurs at multiple levels. In many countries, land laws and policies are outdated, unclear, or conflict with the customary law practiced throughout rural areas. Even when laws and policies are clear, if a farmer’s land rights are violated, they often have no access to justice and therefore little recourse. And in geographies where land is managed communally, often roles and responsibilities within that community are unclear, disempowering of women, with little oversight to ensure everyone within the community benefits equally.

Both governments and private sector investors now recognize that a dysfunctional land tenure system isn’t just a problem for smallholder farmers, it is a problem for investors who can’t establish commercial farms if they can’t identify who to negotiate with to buy or lease land. This dysfunction poses further risk to business if their large-scale land-based investments will not be documented, respected, or protected.

It is hard to overstate the importance of this challenge. Agriculture remains the primary economic activity in Tanzania, employing more than 65% of the workforce, and directly contributing to the livelihoods of more than 80% of the population (Hella et al. 2014). And Tanzania is not an outlier in this regard.

The Solution
The solution starts with documenting women and men’s land use and rights, but it doesn’t stop there. It must also include improving women and men’s understanding of their rights and providing access to justice when those land rights are violated. A systemic solution must clarify and update national land laws and policies to better protect male and female smallholder farmers and communal rights to land. And finally, a systemic solution must develop, test, and disseminate a recommended set of best practices for businesses, governments, and communities engaging in large-scale land-based investments.

Neither the private sector, nor governments, nor civil society alone has the capacity to develop such a multi-layered solution. But together they can.

My organization, Landesa, has helped forge such a partnership between governments, private sector investors, commercial farming companies, civil society groups, and communities to develop such systemic solutions — illuminating a path forward that will benefit all of the parties involved.

Collaborate, Don’t Criticize
In Tanzania, we are working with the government, the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlement Development, the Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, a range of academics, and civil society groups. Our collaboration is focused on addressing land rights and policy issues, strengthening land governance, and fostering responsible investment. We have a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the National Land Use Planning Commission that spells out our collective goals and responsibilities. We quite literally tick each item as we move through the MOU, helping the government, along with a range of other partners, improve its land policies. We are all partners in this work.

We have found it far more effective to collaborate with government than to criticize. The work that must be accomplished is simply much bigger than any of us alone can manage, and each actor plays an important role in addressing the challenges.

We have also worked closely with the private sector. For example, we developed a partnership with Illovo Sugar Africa, the largest sugar supplier in Africa, to train their staff on land rights and to develop the “LandAssess Tool.” The tool helps companies conduct land rights due diligence and monitoring, including helping companies to better recognize and respect communities and smallholder farmers’ land rights. That improves security and reduces conflict for all.

This partnership approach is also evident in our work on the Responsible Investments in Property and Land (or RIPL) Resource Platform, which offers practical, step-by-step guidance for investors, governments, and communities to navigate large-scale land-based investments.

Similarly, we are creating the Social License Platform (SLP), an online tool that matches companies looking to invest in agriculture with service providers and non-profit groups able to help them create investments that include farmers, women, and local communities as beneficiaries of the investment. Both RIPL and SLP are being piloted in Tanzania, and we continue to seek partners to work with us on these platforms.

Dr Monica Magoke-Mhoja is Landesa’s Tanzania program director. She has more than 25 years of experience in managing and leading women’s and children’s rights programs. She is the first chairperson of Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF) Tanzania, founder of the Children’s Dignity Forum, and in 2007 initiated Tanzania’s first national forum to end child marriage. Monica is also the founder of the Women’s Legal Aid Center (WLAC) and is a 2003 recipient of the American Bar Association’s International Human Rights Award.

landesa.org
United by Purpose

Ten years ago, an engineer and an actor got together, determined to find answers to the desperate situations we witnessed all over the world. We had each been working for many years amid one of the greatest needs and most far-reaching philanthropic efforts of modern times: the global water crisis. In 2009, we merged our separate organizations and created Water.org.

The idea that brought us together was a simple one, as any uniting idea should be: that everyone should have access to clean water. We had both met families living at the base of the economic pyramid who struggled every day to pay for each liter of water; we saw those with the lowest incomes pay the most for it and get the most contaminated water for their money. We met people who had to spend much of their days looking for water and for a place to use the toilet. We saw this enormous daily expense, and we realized that families could be healthier, more productive, even better educated, if they could access small, affordable loans to finance household taps, toilets, and other lasting improvements to their lives.
We named this solution WaterCredit, and with it Water.org has enabled more than 25 million people to obtain the means to a lifetime of safe water and sanitation. We partnered with microfinance organizations across 13 countries to mobilize 5.7 million loans worth US$ 2.1 billion in commercial capital for water and sanitation. The proof of the model is a repayment rate of 99%. Along the way, the original partnership between our two water organizations turned into partnerships involving hundreds of organizations.

To Partner is to Multiply and to Learn
In the simplest model of partnership, organizations partner to share a burden. I do what I do best, and I count on you to do the same.

A more sophisticated model recognizes the potential for synergies, how together we can carry even more of the burden, to become greater than the sum of our parts.

But the benefits of partnership go beyond even this.

Perhaps because of how Water.org started, we tend to see partnering in another light. Every partnership offers an opportunity to learn from people who operate in very different spheres, and to learn together as we advance together.

Any society with the guarantee of safe water has a chance to realize its full potential.

GARY WHITE

Four key things we’ve learned through our partnerships:

1. The People at the Base of the Pyramid Can Solve This Problem Themselves

Back in the 1990s, we knew people were throwing money away every day to get access to water and toilets. The water they gathered, although free, had a hidden cost. Sometimes the water was contaminated, costing people their health. And always water collection cost people their time. Around the world, women and children spend 200 million hours each day collecting water. We knew they were open to an opportunity to trade this expense for an affordable and sustainable solution that would buy them this part of their lives back to do something better. They needed a partner to help them.

We see our role as being a catalytic partner. We have helped microfinance institutions, self-help groups, community-based organizations, governments, utilities, and supply chain entities recognize that the people at the base of the pyramid, empowered with access to finance, really can solve the water crisis.
2 Capital is Critical
The demand from individuals for affordable financing to provide access to water and sanitation was an US$ 18 billion opportunity. Existing financing didn’t come close to meeting the market demand. Our experience working with financial institutions and water and sanitation enterprises in emerging markets taught us that, with access to more dedicated capital, we could reach more people, more quickly.

And so, in 2017, we founded a new organization, WaterEquity, the first-ever asset management firm dedicated to ending the global water crisis, with an exclusive focus on raising and deploying capital to financial institutions and water and sanitation enterprises in emerging markets.

In April 2017, WaterEquity launched a US$ 50m impact investment fund to invest in financial institutions and water and sanitation enterprises in India, Indonesia, Cambodia, and the Philippines. Composed of two equity classes and a catalytic debt facility, this fund also includes a US$ 5m first-loss guarantee that allows investors to cultivate a nascent market with low risk. Additionally, Bank of America provided a US$ 5m zero-interest loan for this fund. Bank of America’s support helped to attract investments from foundations, corporations, high-net-worth individuals, and development finance institutions.

As of March 2020, WaterEquity’s first two funds have successfully reached 1.6 million people living in poverty with access to safe water or sanitation.

3 Synchronicities can be Powerful
Our research and our partners tell us that in some communities, installing a tap or toilet isn’t the full solution because of ingrained practices.

Water.org has been collaborating with UNICEF, the largest organization promoting health and hygiene education around the world. One of UNICEF’s major goals right now is to end open defecation in the places where it is still the first, sometimes only, option for many people. Through our collaborations, we collectively harnessed the power of linking education directly to accessible solutions. UNICEF led the community-level education that created demand for a toilet or tap, and we enabled household-level financing, thus removing a critical barrier to action. Where we have knitted our efforts together in India and the Philippines, UNICEF has seen marginalized low-income communities use accessible finance to construct the toilets and taps that make a sustainable change in behavior possible. Recently, innovative finance became one of UNICEF’s global strategic priorities.

Over the years, we have learned how much of a boost there is to water solutions from community-based demand generation when we work in the same places as UNICEF.

4 Governments can Multiply Impact Exponentially
UNICEF’s amazing network of government relationships has inspired and helped us to grow our work in the water policy arena. Having been a key member of a coalition that successfully lobbied to make water and sanitation part of Priority Sector Lending for India, our team realized the multiplicative power of combining bottom-up and top-down approaches. Water.org’s strategic plan now includes systems impact: impact on the whole enabling environment, the policies, practices and the systems that affect anyone who wants to invest in their own water solution.

This partnership with UNICEF only scratches the surface of our work with institutional and sector-level partners, networks, and government entities. The aims are highly contextual, and there is no script for these kinds of partnerships. It’s a matter of finding everyone who has a positive role in the sector — the actors, as the jargon has it — and connecting them to one another to accelerate impact.

I have been working in the water industry for a long time, but I have never seen so much global attention being placed on the importance of water, sanitation, and hygiene as it has in the past few months. The pandemic has made clear that water is basic “PE.”

If there’s one positive thing to take from the current pandemic, it is that COVID-19 has focused a major spotlight on the fact that safe water and good hygiene are critical to the health of each and every one of us around the world, especially for those living in poverty. Without equitable access to the services they need to prepare and protect themselves from this pandemic, they are the most vulnerable.

Now more than ever, we must ensure every country makes water and sanitation a part of its COVID-19 response — it has become obvious that this is fundamental. Governments need to ensure all their citizens have access to safe water and sanitation. They need to allocate significant budgets and adopt policies that ensure sustainable services for those living in greatest poverty and density. Well-functioning water and sanitation services are key to our long-term resilience against future pandemics. What we do right now determines our future.

A crisis of this magnitude is incredibly disruptive. However, we also have an unprecedented opportunity to create the world we want to live in. Those who are able can lean in with philanthropy to help correct inequalities that prevent people from accessing safe water to practice good hygiene. Impact investing has a role to play as well, putting money to work to solve critical social challenges that threaten global health and prosperity.

With public and private partners, we can bring the resources to bear on the global water crisis to deliver solutions and build the resilience to face future shocks. The future of global health is in our hands.
Thanks to a municipal water line that runs through this area, most of the residents on the street in Bangalore’s Kodihalli village get safe water several hours a day, India, 2014.

We always feel like “actors” is an odd word to use here — and not just because one of us is an actor of some experience. The word is also an imperfect fit whenever talking about water, because everyone is an actor. Everyone must make decisions about their water. For some, that means paying a monthly bill and turning the tap. For others, it means walking an hour each way to collect it, a brave and exhausting daily action.

What interests us is not just water actors, but water investors. This highlights the active investment of what many other organizations dub their “beneficiaries.” Yes, they benefit from our work, but so does everyone else — businesses that will have healthier workers and governments that will have healthier and more productive citizens.

Millions of people can make lasting investments in safe water or a toilet if empowered to do so by the investments of others. Investment on every possible level is what will end the water crisis and bring water and sanitation access to all. We are proud to partner with all the investors, to align our efforts, to leave no one behind, and to continue to learn and to innovate together.

Gary White is the CEO and co-founder of Water.org and WaterEquity. Gary developed Water.org’s WaterCredit Initiative, creating new financing options for poor populations to meet their water supply and sanitation needs. Over the past 25 years, Gary’s entrepreneurial vision has driven innovations in the way water and sanitation projects are delivered and financed, innovations that now serve as a model in the sector. He is a founding board member of the Millennium Water Alliance and Water Advocates. Gary was selected as a Skoll Foundation Social Entrepreneur in 2009 and a Schwab Foundation Social Entrepreneur in 2012. In 2011, he was named to the TIME 100 list of the world’s most influential people. In 2014, he was named to the World Economic Forum’s Global Agenda Council on Water.

Academy Award-winner Matt Damon is an actor, screenwriter, producer, and humanitarian. Inspired during his travels throughout Mexico and Guatemala as a youth, he has long been devoted to environmental and social issues. Learning about the immense challenges of accessing safe water and sanitation in Sub-Saharan Africa, Matt launched the H20 Africa Foundation. In 2009, he teamed up with Gary White to merge their organizations and Water.org was born. For his work as co-founder of Water.org, Matt was recognized as one of the TIME 100 most influential people in the world in 2011 and received the Environmental Media Award from The Environmental Media Association in 2013. In 2014, the World Economic Forum named Matt as the Crystal Award winner. Matt's active participation in his organization’s work, including site visits, strategy development, advocacy, and high-level meetings with institutions such as the World Bank and the World Economic Forum over the past decade, has positioned him as one of the world’s experts on water and sanitation issues.
How has your organization’s strategy and use of partnerships changed over the years?
Jennifer Schorsch: Gary White founded Water Partners in 1990. The organization started with the very straightforward approach of underwriting the full cost of communal water and sanitation projects. With this strategy, the organization reached one million people after 22 years in operation. Which is wonderful.

But then in 2012, we shifted our approach to deploy philanthropy catalytically, using donated funds to mobilize commercial capital and thus reach more people faster and more efficiently. We now reach two million people each quarter. With this experience base, we see our role very much as a “dot connector”— connecting insights and partners for impact. As Matt and Gary explain in their article (p.63), we work with governments to help shape policies and practices that will bring more services to people living on less than US$ 6 per day. We work with a wide range of financial institutions to make the case for small loans to people living in poverty that allow them to purchase and install their own improved water and sanitation infrastructure. And we work with utilities to improve and expand services to the poor. Through this more networked approach we have been able to reach more people more quickly and sustainably — 24 million people in just seven years.

Which other sectors and partners are needed to solve the water crisis?
Financial institutions globally and locally are critical partners. We are working to increase the engagement of banks, micro-lending groups, governments, multi- and bilateral institutions, and development finance institutions. Those who can mobilize large-scale capital.

And, of course, we need social investors to enter this space. Anyone with deployable capital should consider using it to address one of the greatest challenges we face — the water crisis. The two billion people without access are a market to be served.

Finally, we need philanthropists to consider how they can extend the impact of their philanthropy, directing it to high-performing NGOs with a track record of success, supporting sustainable market-driven solutions, and using philanthropy more catalytically to mobilize additional capital.

Why aren’t banks and micro-finance organizations meeting these needs? Why doesn’t the market recognize the need and respond to the opportunity to serve people living in poverty?
There are a few reasons for this failure. Water is viewed as a human right and that has led to assumptions that water and sanitation services are delivered solely by government.

Further, when people see the absence of water and sanitation or other basic services, they think the solution is aid — building wells or toilets for communities for free, which can seem like an endless and expensive undertaking.

The market also operates with certain assumptions about what people living in poverty will and will not invest in. As a result, markets in general tend not to respond to the needs of people in poverty. That is because no one realizes that people living in poverty can participate in their own solutions.

Many micro-finance institutions and banks think of loans only for income-generating opportunities. What they may not appreciate is that access to water and improved sanitation is income-enhancing. People in poverty already pay enormous costs as a result of their lack of access. Waiting, walking and illness due to the absence of safe water and sanitation translate into higher costs, lost income and lost time — globally it’s a US$ 260 billion annual economic impact.
These costs can be redirected to sustainable solutions. Once clear on the costs presently incurred, it is easier to see the opportunity in water solutions.

What does this say about the role of NGOs? Is there a case to be made that one underappreciated role is to make the business case for serving the poor? NGOs can indeed shine a light on market opportunities and engage the private sector in sustainable solutions. As a social enterprise with market-driven solutions, we at Water.org work to demonstrate that enterprises can achieve both social good and economic good—not just one or the other. We believe that we can have a transformative effect on our sector by making the case for market-driven solutions to increase water and sanitation access for people living in poverty.

And we believe that other NGOs working in other sectors may magnify their impact if they likewise look to involve the private sector to close gaps. So is there an opportunity to increase impact by harnessing the market? Absolutely. We can address market failures and nudge the market to get it to self-correct. To do this, we need data, pilots, and patient capital to build this evidence base and advocacy case. And we need partners to join us.

Is it possible to mend the market, and if so, how? NGOs bring local market knowledge. We know the customers and their needs, and we can pilot innovations to demonstrate the business case. This can change the behavior of the market in important ways. For example, One Acre Fund can demonstrate the business case for providing agricultural services to smallholder farmers. Water.org demonstrates the business case for affordable finance and investments in water and sanitation. NGOs can bring valuable customer insights that can turn a “problem” into a potential business solution.

But this requires a mind-shift both for NGOs and their funders. We must see NGOs not as emissaries of aid, but as solution-seekers and drivers. Water.org is trying to share these insights widely with potential partners to deliver solutions. We need more actors of influence to come into these spaces.

We can address market failures and nudge the market to get it to self-correct. To do this, we need data, pilots, and patient capital to build this evidence base and advocacy case. And we need partners to join us.

Is it possible to mend the market, and if so, how? NGOs bring local market knowledge. We know the customers and their needs, and we can pilot innovations to demonstrate the business case. This can change the behavior of the market in important ways. For example, One Acre Fund can demonstrate the business case for providing agricultural services to smallholder farmers. Water.org demonstrates the business case for affordable finance and investments in water and sanitation. NGOs can bring valuable customer insights that can turn a “problem” into a potential business solution.

But this requires a mind-shift both for NGOs and their funders. We must see NGOs not as emissaries of aid, but as solution-seekers and drivers. Water.org is trying to share these insights widely with potential partners to deliver solutions. We need more actors of influence to come into these spaces.

Water.org has had success increasing the flow of micro-loans to the poor to improve sanitation and access to clean water. Likewise, One Acre Fund has increased the flow of micro-loans to the poor to improve agricultural production. What other opportunities do you see for providing loans for income-enhancing investments? Renewable energy is a big opportunity in this area. Consider what access to electricity does for income generation and for education. Innovative financing in this area could be transformative.

Identifying areas where this approach could be adopted is about examining the coping costs. In the case of water, what are the incremental costs for not having access? Girls don’t attend school and women can’t work because they are spending too much time gathering water.

If the coping costs are high — as they are in the case of water and sanitation — people living in poverty will engage in solving the problem if given the opportunity.
The General Education Board, a precursor to The Rockefeller Foundation, included many of John D. Rockefeller Sr.’s most trusted philanthropic advisors, United States, 1915.

One of the most successful and instructive public–philanthropic partnerships (PPPs) in United States history came about because of a pest — the cotton bud-eating boll weevil, thought to be native of Central Mexico. This story, which begins more than 100 years ago, is worth retelling now, at a time when PPPs are increasing in number, scale, and sophistication, as it highlights both the promise and pitfalls of such partnerships.

In 1903, when the boll weevil began to creep north, threatening to devastate the United States cotton crop, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) turned to a septuagenarian professor of agriculture, Seaman Knapp, to set up model farms in the counties affected by the weevil in the US Southwest. Knapp and his team would teach one farmer in each county methods of crop and soil management that could minimize the damage caused by the weevil. USDA agents might even provide the farmer with the necessary equipment and seeds. When the farmer’s neighbors saw the good results, the USDA hoped they would take up the new agricultural approach as well.

Lessons of History

Historian Benjamin Soskis tells the story of the boll weevil crisis of 1903, and the lessons that the philanthropic community can learn from that event.

The General Education Board, a precursor to The Rockefeller Foundation, included many of John D. Rockefeller Sr.’s most trusted philanthropic advisors, United States, 1915.
The plan seemed to work: the lessons from Knapp’s demonstration farms spread throughout the region. But officials from Standard Oil tycoon John D. Rockefeller’s General Education Board (GEB) saw potential for even greater impact. They thought that Knapp’s agricultural methods could help boost productivity even in counties that had not yet been subject to the weevil’s onslaught. They pitched this plan to Knapp, who informed them that since Congressional appropriation for the farm demonstration program was specifically allocated to repel the invasion of an interstate menace, the Secretary of Agriculture did not believe he had authorization to extend the program into parts of the South not already threatened by the weevil.

Seeing an Opportunity in a Crisis
The secretary of the GEB, Wallace Buttrick, saw an opening. He believed the key to improving public education in the South was to boost the local tax base, which could be done by increasing agricultural productivity. In April 1906, he signed a Memorandum of Understanding with United States secretary of agriculture James Wilson, which allowed the farm demonstration program to spread, under the USDA’s direction, but with GEB funding nearly all direct and indirect costs. The USDA would pay a new corps of farm demonstration agents a nominal salary of one dollar a year; the rest of their salaries and equipment would be covered by the GEB. As soon as the weevil showed up in a state, the USDA could begin assuming all expenses.

From 1906 to 1914, the GEB provided US$ 925,750 for farm demonstration work in 15 southern states. They covered the salaries of some 600 special Department of Agriculture agents (many of whom they hand-selected). By 1912, the farm demonstration program had spread to more than half the counties in the South, assisting an estimated 106,621 farmers.

By the GEB’s accounts, the program doubled the average yield in pounds of seed cotton and bushels of corn on participating farms. And just as importantly, GEB officials claimed that participating counties reaped additional benefits in the form of increased expenditures for, and increased percentages of local taxes directed toward, public education.

Putting the Cause Before Self
Rockefeller philanthropic officials considered the partnership an overwhelming success, but when officials at USDA who supported competing farm demonstration programs disclosed the GEB’s role to the public, the arrangement provoked considerable alarm. Rockefeller was one of the more divisive figures in American society at the time, and many citizens believed a federal partnership with one of his foundations conferred on him a moral legitimacy he did not deserve and granted him illegitimate power over a public agency. Here again Rockefeller officials saw an opportunity, ceding (and seeding) ground to Congress, which soon appropriated funds to continue the work which had previously been funded by the GEB. In fact, in May 1914, Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act, which increased federal funding for farm demonstration work to US$ 4m — much more than the aggregate sums given by the GEB.

Benjamin Soskis is a Research Associate at the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy at the Urban Institute and the co-editor of HistPhil. A historian and a journalist, he is co-author of “The Battle Hymn of the Republic: A Biography of the Song that Marches On” (a finalist for the Gilder Lehrman Lincoln Prize). Benjamin received his PhD in American history from Columbia University.

By following Seaman Knapp’s advice, farmer Daw Jacks (pictured) managed to grow an abundance of cotton, sweet potatoes, and corn on his demonstration plot near Marianna, Arkansas, United States, 1908.
A political cartoon of John D. Rockefeller from 1892 published in “The Inter-Ocean Illustrated Supplement” as part of the promotion leading up to the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, United States.

Mind the Gap

Rockefeller officials identified a social good with a ready demand that the government was not — but probably should have been — providing. They did not seek to “disrupt” or compete with existing governmental functions so much as to complement them. Public-philanthropic partnerships are often strongest when they are closely attuned to the gaps within the current system, which can evolve not through conscious design but through happenstance (it was, after all, the vagaries of the appropriations process that initially limited Congressional funding of an expanded farm demonstration program).

Be Transparent

The arrangement between the GEB and the USDA was not secret. But the GEB deliberately chose not to publicize it, and many of the farmers whose salaries derived from Rockefeller philanthropy had no idea where their funding came from. Because of Rockefeller’s controversial reputation (the product of a series of high-profile investigations into his business dealings), when news of the partnership leaked, this silence lent an air of conspiracy to the arrangement, fueling an intense backlash in Congress. Upon learning of it, one senator, for instance, complained about an “invisible government.” Because PPPs can stoke long-standing concerns about the power of concentrated private wealth in a democracy, it’s wise not merely to rely on a passive policy of transparency when discussing such partnerships, but to actively educate the citizens most impacted by them.

You Got to Know When to Fold Them

Every partnership has a shelf life, and PPPs are no exception. In the most effective arrangements, the partners actively monitor when it makes the most sense for the partnership to end. But this termination doesn’t have to be regarded as a failure; it’s often a sign of success. In the case of the GEB-USDA partnership, it ended in a cloud of controversy, but also because Congress picked up the tab — and then some — which Rockefeller had initially taken on. In fact, the scrutiny directed to agricultural education through the high-profile partnership was key to encouraging Congress and the federal government to take agricultural and vocational education even more seriously. Rockefeller philanthropy stepped aside and let public institutions take on additional responsibility.

The End Isn’t Necessarily the End

Even when public-philanthropic partnerships officially end, they can have an afterlife which is just as consequential. PPPs create institutional experience, expertise, and relationships that endure and that represent valuable philanthropic resources that can be tapped in the future. The GEB-USDA partnerships present a spectacular example of such posthumous impact. That experience with farm demonstration work encouraged the GEB to support similar projects throughout the South. In the 1940s, veterans of such campaigns pushed to replicate them in Mexico. In 1943, the Rockefeller Foundation, working closely with the Mexican government, created the Mexican Agricultural Program. That program served as the model for similar efforts to increase agricultural productivity in Latin America, Asia, and the Indian subcontinent. So, in many respects, the GEB-USDA planted the seeds of the Green Revolution, one of the most significant philanthropic initiatives of the 20th century.

Everything Old is New Again: What PPPs Can Learn from GEB-USDA
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The Secret Sauce of Asian Philanthropy

Naina Subberwal Batra, Chairperson and CEO of AVPN, writes about the growth of social investing in the region and its unique characteristics.

I grew up in India in the 1970s and 1980s, a time when conspicuous consumption was frowned upon, spiritual values admired, and the West was seen as a glittering bazaar of fancy brands that Indians could only admire from afar.

Few would have predicted that less than a generation later, my hometown of Bangalore would be a global high-tech hub known for its pulsing nightlife; India would have more billionaires than any other country in the world, besides China and the United States; and the Mumbai skyline would include the world’s most expensive private residence, a 27-story mansion with three helipads, 50-seat movie theater, and garage parking for more than 100 cars.

Asia is Set to have the World’s Largest Concentration of Wealth

This Cinderella story has played out again and again across much of Asia. In 2017, Asia’s ultra-wealthy population grew by 18.5% and its total wealth shot up by 26.7%, twice the rate seen in the United States. In China alone, there are 799 billionaires, with four out of every 10 new billionaires created coming from this nation.

As Asia’s wealth has increased, so too has its philanthropy sector.

Indian tech tycoon and philanthropist Azim Premji leads the way with his donation of US$ 21 billion to his Azim Premji Foundation — making it one of the largest foundations in the world. But Premji isn’t alone. We’ve witnessed a continent-wide transformation — from a deep tradition of “charity,” given privately to needy family and friends, we have seen a shift to more strategic and institutional philanthropy that is leveraging hundreds of billions of dollars in wealth to do great good in the world.

Asian Philanthropy is Growing at an Unprecedented Pace

Charitable giving in China has more than doubled in just seven years, from US$ 10.5 billion in 2010 to US$ 23.4 billion in 2017. Philanthropy in India is on a similar, exponential trajectory, growing from US$ 1.66 billion in 2010 to US$ 7.3 billion in 2018.

As the philanthropy sector in Asia swells and matures, it is worth pausing to consider what is its secret sauce — what makes it special, and what makes it effective?
Traveling in Asia with no Baggage

Unlike in the West, where the history of philanthropic giving through foundations stretches back more than a century (the Ford Foundation was established in 1936, The Rockefeller Foundation in 1913, the Carnegie Foundation in 1906), this is a relatively new concept in Asia. With few local role models, philanthropists in Asia are forging their own paths, following innovative and flexible strategies.

Consider the Yidan Prize. Established seemingly overnight by Charles Chen, founder of Tencent, the prize of US$ 3.9m is a vehicle for seeding meaningful cross-sector funding research, events, and multimedia content.


during the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2020, just weeks after the first reports of the virus surfaced, Chinese billionaire and Alibaba founder Jack Ma pledged US$ 14.5m to support the development of a COVID-19 vaccine. As the pandemic spread, Alibaba’s corporate foundation moved quickly to establish the Global MediXchange to help doctors across the world share best practices during the pandemic. Likewise, in the space of a week, the Narada Shah Foundation (see p.87), have donated to their state’s Chief Minister’s COVID-19 fund.

In Sync with Governments

Asian philanthropists tend to work across sectors and their investments often follow the priorities laid out by governments. To achieve impact at scale, they often seek to partner with governments. As a result, we see less funding for advocacy organizations, which tend to focus on changing government policies and priorities, and more funding directly to support and improve government services and programs.

Indonesian entrepreneurs Sukanto Tanoto and his wife Tinah Binti Tanoto have taken this approach with their foundation, which works closely with governments in Indonesia, Singapore, and China to improve public schools and promote good nutrition (see p.85).

Fast, Furious, and Flexible

Asian philanthropists generally value moving quickly.

We saw the remarkable benefits of this in the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic. In January 2020, just weeks after the first reports of the virus surfaced, Chinese billionaire and Alibaba founder Jack Ma pledged US$ 14.5m to support the development of a COVID-19 vaccine. As the pandemic spread, Alibaba’s corporate foundation moved quickly to establish the Global MediXchange to help doctors across the world share best practices during the pandemic. Likewise, in the space of a week, the Narada Shah Foundation, which focuses on education and support for migrant children in China, pivoted to establish, along with about one dozen other partners, the China NGO Consortium for COVID-19. The consortium quickly began the herculean task of coordinating the deployment of tons of disinfectant, millions of masks, and thousands of walkie-talkies and protective gloves to healthcare providers in the most affected areas of China.

COVID-19: Highlighting Asian Philanthropists’ Speedy Response to Crises

COVID-19 demonstrated the critical role Asia’s philanthropists are playing as nimble partners to governments across Asia.

While many philanthropists in the West responded to COVID-19 with donations of masks, ventilators, or financial support to their local hospital or favored local community organization, many of India’s leading philanthropists focused on contributions to the Indian Prime Minister’s COVID-19 fund. They included Savitri Jindal & family, owner of India’s leading producer of steel (pledged US$ 13.3m); Uday Kotak, the founder of Kotak Mahindra Bank (US$ 3.3m); and ports tycoon Gautam Adani (US$ 13.3m). On top of donating US$ 67m, oil and gas magnate Mukesh Ambani established India’s first COVID-19 center with 100 beds, while tech magnate Azim Premji announced that his foundation’s 1,600 employees would collaborate with government and healthcare workers, on top of a US$ 13.4m commitment. Over at Tata Group, Ratan Tata pledged US$ 66.7m alongside the launch of an initiative by the group to manufacture ventilators for use in government and private hospitals. Others, such as the Harish and Bina Shah Foundation (see p.87), have donated to their state’s Chief Minister’s COVID-19 fund.

Across Asia, philanthropists have likewise stepped forward to assist and strengthen governments’ response to the pandemic. In Thailand, Dhanin Chearavanont’s Charoen Pokphand Group, a leading producer of animal feed and livestock, built a US$ 3m factory in Bangkok to produce 100,000 surgical masks per day for healthcare workers. It is also delivering free meals to patients and staff in more than 40 public hospitals across Thailand.

At the time of my writing, the most generous response to the pandemic has come from Chen’s Tencent Holdings, which pledged US$ 216.3m, both directly and through its foundation.

What’s Next for Asian Philanthropy?

The growth of Asian philanthropy shows no sign of slowing. As governments around the region recognize that philanthropists’ investments often align with governments’ goals, they are creating and expanding tax benefits to endorse and promote such activity. These new and more favorable government policies are encouraging ever greater numbers of ultra-high-net-worth Asians to launch their own philanthropic initiatives.

In 2009, Singapore granted a 250% tax deduction for qualifying donations. In 2014, India became the first country in the world to require the largest companies to invest 2% of their after-tax profits to corporate social responsibility activities. In 2016, China adopted a corporate tax deduction for donations to approved charities of up to 12%, higher than the deduction available in the US, which currently stands at 10%. Each of these unlocked greater philanthropic engagement and resources.

What will Asian philanthropy look like in another generation? I have a few predictions: it will be even larger, more impactful, and — in continued partnership with governments — it will help to transform Asia and the planet in ways we can’t even imagine today.

Naina Subberwal Batra joined AVPN as CEO in September 2013 and was appointed Chairperson in May 2018. She has helped quadruple AVPN’s membership and expanded the organization’s focus from venture philanthropy to support the entire ecosystem of social investors, from philanthropists to corporate leaders.
Life-long Commitment to Education

When Sukanto and Tinah Bingei Tanoto officially opened the doors to the new kindergarten they had built in Besitang, on 7 September 1981, it would mark not just the start of a new school in the village, but also the beginning of the couple's life-long commitment to the educational cause. By July 1982, a primary school would follow, as did a junior high school in May 1990 — ensuring that children (including those of the staff who worked at the Tanotos’ plywood mill) in the rural North Sumatra city would have access to a quality education that previously could only be found in more developed cities such as Medan.

Although initially established to facilitate learning, the Tanotos quickly realized that the schools they built could also be used to serve a variety of uses, such as providing spaces for parents and adults in the village to attend social development and skills training programs.

“Eventually, those three schools had the effect of improving the livelihoods of so many families in Besitang, which in turn, improved the general quality of life in the community,” revealed the Tanoto Foundation’s CEO Satrjo Tanudjojo. “Even though Sukanto Tanoto himself became very successful without a formal education, he was always a firm believer in education as the key to improving people’s lives and futures. The transformative impact of those three schools in Besitang only served to prove to him that when properly harnessed, the power of education can accelerate opportunities.”

Working with Government to Achieve Impact

In the decades to follow, the couple — through the Tanoto Foundation — would act firmly on that belief, working tirelessly and committing millions of dollars to improve education and literary standards globally.

To achieve impact at scale, they also made sure to work closely with governments (and continue to do so today). PINTAR, an initiative launched in September 2018 to improve the quality of education in Indonesia is one such example. Since its inception, the program has partnered with some 20 districts/cities in five provinces and trained more than 16,000 teachers, thus benefiting students in over 2,215 schools.

Explained Tanudjojo: “We believe that philanthropy is not here to replace the government. No matter what a philanthropist does, it is minute compared to what the government can achieve. In education, which is our area of focus, if you do not work with the government, the impact cannot be optimum.

“The foundation has always challenged itself to go beyond donations and play a part in creating real transformation but that is only possible if you work with governments. This is why, as of 2017, we’ve only approved programs that partner with governments.”

Philanthropy at Speed

The close relationship that the foundation has built with governments, particularly in Indonesia, is one of the reasons why it is able to respond swiftly to relief efforts when crises take place, even though its primary focus is education. For instance, when the COVID-19 outbreak hit Indonesia, the foundation, with the help of the logistics and procurement expertise provided by the Tanotos’ family business RGE Group, took just 10 days to procure and transport Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) from China to Indonesia.

“Because we have worked closely with the Indonesian government and other stakeholders, we were able to quickly identify what was needed most urgently — in this case PPE — and then we utilized all our resources to find a way to provide them,” said Tanudjojo, adding that the Tanotos gave immediate approval to specially charter a Boeing 737-300 to transport the PPEs to Indonesia at speed. “It helps that as an independent organization with members of the family serving as the Board of Trustees, decisions can be made very quickly when the need arises.”

A Collaborative Future

Moving forward, the foundation will continue to further its mission of “harnessing the transformative power of education to realize people’s full potential” — “The way we work might change in the post-COVID world, but our mission will not,” declared Tanudjojo. And, he believes that even in the aftermath of the pandemic, philanthropy in Asia will continue to grow.

Concluded Tanudjojo: “There is a growing appetite among philanthropists in the region to address social and environmental issues such as climate change and to align with national development agendas to achieve longer-term goals.

“I also believe that because of the collective nature of Asians, we will see an increased number of partnerships among philanthropists for joint resources initiatives. Generosity is an Asian trait, so the question is how can we channel that generosity into philanthropy that makes an impact — that would be our collective challenge moving forward.”
Harish & Bina Shah Foundation: Beauty in Diversity

Every Cause Connects

Unlike many other philanthropic foundations that have core areas of focus, the Harish & Bina Shah Foundation maintains a diversified portfolio — it is agnostic with its grantmaking decisions, and, since its inception in 2010, has supported a myriad of causes from public health to empowering vulnerable communities to governance matters in India. Some of the foundation’s long-standing partners include Maharogi Sewa Samiti, founded by the late Baba Amte in order to help leprosy sufferers, the People’s Archive of Rural India, started by the revered Indian journalist P. Sainath, and other partners such as the Anahad Foundation, Sahaara Charitable Society, and the Committee of Resource Organizations (CORO). Such partners are led by passionate social entrepreneurs working for causes such as artist welfare, rights of undertrial prisoners, and leadership building among India’s growing young population.

Even more surprising is the fact that this strategic direction came about organically, rather than deliberately.

“To be honest, we did not start the foundation with the mindset that we would take an agnostic approach,” admitted Amira Shah, daughter of Harish and Bina Shah and a member of the foundation’s Board of Directors. “The truth is that we did not know where to drop the anchor when we began and so there was that element of not reinventing the wheel and instead learning by observing.”

However, this approach eventually became part of the foundation’s strategy, fueled in part by the family’s realization that no one cause is more important than another. “Reality simply doesn’t allow any foundation to focus on just one area because all aspects of life are interconnected,” explained Shah, who added that the foundation does not feel pressurized to have an identity by cause or geography. “By being agnostic, we are able to be flexible and nimble with our grants and quick to answer to unexpected needs when they arise.”

Staying Close to the Ground

The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, exemplifies how their approach has borne fruit. When the outbreak hit India, the foundation was in the midst of reviewing its existing 15 partnerships and assessing possible new grantees. Recognizing that most (if not all) non-profits would need funding to ride out the storm and that speed was of the essence, the family members rolled up their sleeves, and personally conducted the due diligence needed to confirm disbursement.

Said Shah: “Because we were already exposed to so many causes and types of non-profits, we were able to make decisions on the existing grants quickly (all partners were reassured of funding based on their needs), and approve more than one dozen new ad-hoc funds if the organization was involved in COVID-relief and rehabilitation work. We are also continuing to evaluate short-term grants to ease emerging COVID-pain points such as hunger, livelihoods, migration, mental health and the rise in domestic violence.”

Moving forward, the foundation is due to enter a new phase of growth. Presently, the bulk of the foundation’s work is conducted by 18 members comprising the Board of Directors and volunteers from the family’s business. To ensure sustainability and wider outreach, the foundation is in the midst of defining its mission with more specific articulation of programs, partnerships, systems, and communication.

And while it will look to delve more deeply into defined programs, Shah maintained that a portion of the foundation’s funds will always be dedicated to its agnostic approach. “This has become a signature part of our DNA,” she concluded. “It allows us to stay very close and very connected to what is happening on the ground. This is something that we feel very strongly about and so this part of our giving will never change.”
Philanthropy
Through the Prism of Harmony

Dr. Lui Che-woo shares his personal story of how the traditional Chinese value of harmony guides his approach to giving.

The paramount cultural value in China is harmony — an often misunderstood value that has its roots in Confucianism.

Harmony, in the Confucian sense, does not mean everyone is the same with identical or even similar ideas, backgrounds, and goals. Rather, it is described as “harmony but not sameness,” meaning that all partners, with diverse ideas and ideals, flourish within a partnership.

The pursuit of harmony, as understood by Confucius, guides my philanthropic approach and may help guide other philanthropists as they endeavor to spread good and reduce suffering in the world. Harmony is a powerful and effective guiding principle for social investors for two key reasons.

Breaking Out of the Silo
First, a focus on harmony encourages us to consider multiple points of leverage. How many of us, when we assess our portfolio of giving, see all the same type of organizations working from the same perspective? How likely are we to increase harmony if we are approaching a problem from a single perspective and leverage point again and again?

“With foresight and a broad outlook, one can achieve heartfelt contentment and peace of mind.”

DR. LUI CHE-WOO
Hong Kong, 2015.
Consider instead the likelihood of increasing harmony and achieving scaled impact if we approach the problem from two or even three angles.

For example, the winner of the 2019 LUI Che Woo Sustainability Prize was The Nature Conservancy, a global conservation NGO that brings together individuals, local communities, government departments, and private businesses to collectively tackle the world’s biggest and most important challenges such as climate change, water scarcity, and food shortages. Its strategy — to build a coalition that could effect change in country after country and issue after issue — has been extremely successful precisely because the Conservancy has been able to harness the power of strength in numbers while maintaining harmony among its stakeholders.

How would the organization’s impact change if it instead worked alone in its silo trying to force change? Not only would it likely be less impactful, it would likely sow discord.

Work Upstream
This brings me to the second insight we gain by looking through the Confucian lens of harmony — it presupposes the existence of a system. Of course, if we are working to increase harmony, we are working to attain a balance within a system of institutions and people that is more productive and acceptable to our stated beneficiaries and the other people and institutions within that system. And it is by focusing on this system that we can achieve our greatest impact.

Consider a cause particularly close to my heart: education. To approach philanthropy with a strategy of increasing harmony, we must ask what part of the education system is out of balance? Are employers telling us that they cannot identify qualified candidates? Are teachers telling us that their classrooms are empty with students dropping out of school at a young age, just as I was forced to leave my education?

To increase harmony, we must ask these questions and follow the answers upstream, to work alongside the different stakeholders in the system to achieve a more balanced education system. This solution will be more flexible, durable, and scalable than the simple Band-Aid approach you might arrive at without attention to harmony.

Enough Raindrops Together Form a River
In 2018, the LUI Che Woo Prize was awarded to Pratham for its work in improving literacy. Pratham acts on three levels: 1) directly helping one million children attain basic literacy and numeracy; 2) collaborating with governments to improve systemic effectiveness by training teachers in evidence-based methods; and 3) impacting national and international policy through a unique annual, citizen-led national education survey report.

Through such an approach, all stakeholders in the system are engaged and moving in the same direction to achieve harmony and progress. Moreover, with such an approach we can achieve durable impact — with national government policies and programs serving to magnify, replicate, and institutionalize the impact.

An ancient Chinese proverb says, “the highest goodness is like water, for water is excellent in benefiting all things, and yet it remains humble.” My goal is to engage in philanthropy that is like water — powerful enough to split rocks or create a verdant pasture where there had been only desert, yet humbly focused on working through an array of partners to achieve and nurture harmony at a systems level.

I believe if mutual understanding is achieved, just as rivers join to become an ocean, we can all nourish one another, and create a civilized, peaceful, and harmonious world.

Dr. Lui Che-woo is the Chairman of K. Wah Group, one of Asia’s largest and leading conglomerates encompassing properties, entertainment, leisure, hospitality, and construction materials businesses.

Born in China in 1929, he moved to Hong Kong with his family at the age of five. The adversity and hardship that he experienced and witnessed in his young life during World War II planted in his heart the seeds of compassion and selflessness that shaped his future efforts. A long-time philanthropist, Dr. Lui has been particularly supportive of the development of education, medical care, innovative technology, arts and culture, and environmental stewardship as well as the promotion of harmonious co-existence.

In 2015, he established the LUI Che Woo Prize — Prize for World Civilisation hoping to build a better world for all by properly recognizing people or organizations that have made remarkable contributions to the welfare of mankind, and encouraging them to nurture and enrich world civilization. It is an international accolade promoting sustainability, welfare, betterment and positive energy. It transcends all boundaries of nations and fosters the continuous development of a better and harmonious world.

www.luiprize.org
In this interview, singer and actor Holly Valance explains why she is an avid supporter of Disability Rights International.

Our journey towards championing disability rights began in 2008, after watching an Ann Curry investigation on NBC’s Dateline that shook you to the core. Why did that story resonate so deeply with you and how did it change your life?

I came across the Dateline investigation purely by chance. I just happened to be watching the television when the program came on. In that episode, Ann had traveled to Serbia (formerly a part of Yugoslavia) to visit institutions for mentally disabled children. The conditions were horrific. Gaunt, half-starved children languished in crib after crib. Some children were so starved for attention they had literally stopped growing. Their parents had been told that their disabled children would be better taken care of in specialized institutions. However, the reality was that the institutions were neglecting these children and holding them in dank cells behind crumbling walls.

The story terrified me. My father is Serbian. My sister is disabled. This could have been our story. Rather, in Australia — where I was born — such horrors do not exist as healthcare is free and people are looked after very well. Medicine and physio support are supplied as are caregivers, specialists, therapists, and surgeries. You name it, they provide it. This level of support is truly game changing.

Disability Rights International (DRI) was the organization that led Ann Curry to these institutions. The investigation prompted me to think of the absolute worst thing I could imagine (which is child abuse), and then go even further because these children are also disabled, so life is already pretty confusing and a struggle. I don’t think I could think of a more vulnerable human on earth — a disabled child.

After watching the program, I immediately flew to Washington D.C. to visit the DRI office. I wanted to meet the team face to face and asked to be educated on their mission and the challenges they face. I also requested to join them on a reconnaissance trip, which I have done several times now.

Through these experiences, I deduced that working at an advocacy level with governments and legislators can have a far more powerful effect than, say, volunteering my time at an orphanage or institution to care for these kids because they shouldn’t be in there in the first place. Children need to be with a family, with love and care. Not shoved en masse into dark buildings miles away from anyone.

You have been a supporter of DRI ever since, and became their ambassador. What is the organization’s mission and how do they accomplish it?

To put their work in the simplest terms, DRI physically walks into institutions and orphanages they suspect are abusing human rights, and observes and investigates the children’s living conditions, behaviors, treatments, therapies, medical treatment, and general life. They create extensive reports on their findings and release the reports worldwide. Because the reports often capture shocking mistreatment, they generally get governments’ attention and shine a huge light onto the forgotten people living in these places. This starts a ripple of change.
Usually, DRI’s next steps include helping to place the children back with their families. This is possible because more than 90% of children living in institutions or “orphanages” are not orphans. They are placed there, most often, because they have disabilities or special needs and their parents are ill-equipped or unable to care for them. DRI understands this and works with governments to identify the different kinds of support that can be offered to these families to help care for their own children. DRI also works in society at large to destigmatize children with disabilities.

Few people understand that of the eight million children around the world who live in orphanages, the vast majority have parents and many are children with disabilities. Are orphanages part of the problem, and what is the solution? Sadly, orphanages are rarely a good alternative for raising children. No child can get the care it needs when it is one of so many, being cared for “in bulk.” It’s not how human beings’ brains and bodies thrive. We need family, one-on-one, time, and care with one another. Orphanages at their very worst are buildings of terror, rape, organ harvesting, and abuse. Even at their best, orphanages are often buildings of neglect, boredom, and squalor. We should be wary of businesses and charities offering the opportunity to work in, visit, or help support orphanages. Being informed is important and the responsible thing to do.

Why has DRI taken a systems-change approach to promoting the rights and full participation in society of people with disabilities rather than providing direct services to individual people with disabilities?

By working at the very pinnacle of change, on legislation and destigmatization, DRI can, despite its modest size, have a mind-blowing impact. That’s what more than 30 years of experience has taught it.

They can achieve a monumental shift in conditions for disabled children/people across the world by working country by country. They close down institutions and place children back with their families and provide support. They save lives. Daily.

In pursuing a systems-change approach, how and why does DRI partner or engage with governments or other stakeholders?

Having visited Serbia personally with DRI, the “hell holes” (there is no other way to describe them) we visited are no longer operating. There are programs now in the region to educate people. Health and social care workers can provide support to parents so that they can keep their beloved children. This is better for the child, better for society, and better for government.

Orphanages are more expensive to run than supporting families and they can’t do what families do extremely well — raise a human being with love and dignity.

How has becoming a mother in 2013 impacted your philanthropic interests and activities?

I remember being very teary and tired for the first few weeks after my daughter Luka was born. As I was learning how to be a mother and discovering how utterly reliant and defenseless my baby girl was, it also struck me how horrific life must be for children without a loving family member to hold and kiss them and care for them. This thought still devastes me today.

Because of my acting and singing career, I was traveling the world by the time I was 16. Although I came out of that time unscathed, in hindsight, I was a very brave teenager and I would definitely teach my own children to be way more careful when they get to that vulnerable age. I often say that the last day that I relaxed was the day Luka was born because I don’t think I would ever be able to stop worrying about my children.

However, this also makes me think of just how hopeless the children in these institutions must feel with no tribe to defend or look out for them.

I think becoming a mother has only made me even more committed to the work that DRI does and to supporting their cause. I hope that through DRI, thousands more baby girls and boys will get to stay with their families and receive the love and care that every human deserves.

Finally, what advice do you have for early-stage philanthropists concerning choosing causes and identifying high-impact organizations?

I think it’s great to get behind organizations, but you really need to know what the real problems are, understand the issues, stand where the issues are happening, and view them for yourself. I can speak passionately about the subject because I’ve now stood there and seen the despicable conditions, smelt the hideous filth, listened to the helpless and frightening, gut-wrenching cries.
Theory of Change

DRI’s rights-based model helps to protect and empower children and people with disabilities in ways a charity-based model can never achieve. Here’s why it works.

Context
Segregation caused by stigma, poverty, discrimination, lack of community-based supports

Transformational Step
Document dangers inherent to institutions and risk of gender-based violence, exploitation, trafficking, gateway to life-long segregation

Context
New international law not understood or enforced

Transformational Step
Strategic litigation — file reports and cases to bring international awareness and seek legal enforcement; give voice to children and adults segregated from society

Context
Some orphanages generate profit for staff, businesses, traffickers, and pedophiles

Transformational Step
Expose and stop abuses

Context
Donors support orphanages and promote misguided reforms

Transformational Step
Project a clear message, need to end institutionalization of children. Use DRI reports, op-eds, media coverage to educate the public and policy-makers

Context
Public wrongly assumes orphanages are safe and needed; unaware of community-based alternatives

Transformational Step
Promote improved policies and donor practices informed by disability rights and best practices of community integration for children
Award-winning writer Tina Rosenberg explores the role that good journalism plays in helping to build societal trust.

**Changing the Conversation**

For too long, journalists have defined news as “what’s wrong.” Journalism’s theory of change is “Society will get better when we reveal problems that need fixing.”

Bad news is considered more salable, more dramatic — more newsworthy. A shooting gets coverage. A once-violent neighborhood going a year without a shooting gets none, although that story is important, fresh, and interesting.

Right now, the United States is experiencing a health crisis, an economic crisis, and a racial justice crisis — all at once. Bad news is overwhelming. But with so many places responding to these crises, some of those responses are successful and newsworthy. We need more reporting about what works.

In 2013, we founded the Solutions Journalism Network (SJN) to challenge the idea that only bad news is news. Our goal was to legitimize and spread rigorous coverage of how people are responding to problems and their associated results. Solutions journalism isn’t activism or advocacy or “good news.” It’s plain old covering the news — but the news is about how people are trying to solve problems, what results they’re getting, and what can be learned from it.

We work with hundreds of news organizations in the United States, and increasingly, abroad, to help them understand the value of this coverage and the specifics of how to do it well.

Because journalism is suffering from twin catastrophes — the collapse of the business model, and the collapse of trust — a usually-defensive profession has been remarkably open to these new ideas. It helps that the public demands these stories. By far the biggest reason people disengage from the news is its relentless negativity. In survey after survey, audiences — especially young audiences — say they want media to cover solutions.

And of critical importance here is having confidence that our change in behavior will be welcome, supported, and make a larger difference. This requires trust.

A steady media diet of failure, dysfunction and corruption provides a distorted picture of the world — one that breeds cynicism and erodes trust. Nothing works, so let’s burn it all down.

This diet of failure not only has reduced trust in institutions. Worse, it has reduced our trust in each other. In 1972, 46% of Americans surveyed thought that most people can be trusted. In 2012, that figure was only 32%. And we especially don’t trust people who don’t look like us.

This is a worldwide problem. According to the Edelman Trust Barometer, we are in the midst of a global epidemic of mistrust. Until COVID-19, which produced a spike in trust in government,
three-quarters of governments around the world were distrusted by their citizens, slightly more than half of people surveyed distrusted the media, and slightly less than half of people surveyed distrusted NGOs.

We know about people like us first-hand. But we mainly know people who are different through what we see, hear, and read in the media — which mainly portrays “the other” as predators or victims. No wonder we don’t respect or trust them. Such reporting is about those who are different, but it’s not for them. It robs diverse communities of agency and serves the biases of a white audience. Yet every community works to solve its own problems. We need to cover those responses.

This mistrust infects collaboration across sectors for social change. We see government as broken and corrupt, NGOs as unrealistic dreamers, and the private sector as greedy and untrustworthy.

There’s enough truth to all these labels that they’ve become the stereotypes — and hence, the focus of coverage for journalists.

There are, of course, many dedicated public servants, well-designed and -run government programs, NGOs with impact, and businesses whose bottom line includes the health of their community. But we tend not to know about them, because they’ve rarely been covered.

Because of such stereotypes, we miss opportunities for progress. We might assume that no desirable partners exist. We might assume that there’s no profit in trying to collaborate, because we are unaware of where it has succeeded. And those two assumptions can lead to a third: change is not possible.

For philanthropists involved in — or just contemplating — such collaborations, Solutions Journalism brings two different kinds of value. First, it spreads models that work, and tells how.

In SJN’s Solutions Story Tracker, a searchable database of thousands of solutions stories, looking up the “Cross-sector collaboration” tag yields more than 500 stories. One, for example, is “Inside the Ambitious Campaign to Drive Homicides in Chicago Below 400” from The Trace. That story shows how the state of Illinois, Chicago’s government, foundations, universities, and businesses have joined forces to create massive, evidence-driven programs that take a public health approach to gun violence.

Another example is the partnership between government, the private sector and NGOs in Cleveland to reduce infant mortality. The city had long planned to establish a task force on infant mortality, but it took shape only after a series in the Cleveland Plain Dealer showed how in Baltimore, all these parties collaborated — and achieved a 24% drop in infant mortality over five years.

The other value solutions journalism provides is more subtle: to break down walls of distrust. We in the media bear much of the responsibility for creating these walls. People working for social change often experience (and fume about) the media’s focus on failure. As subjects of journalism, we know that what’s reported doesn’t tell the whole story. But as consumers of journalism, we often forget. We know the media’s biases — but we still allow them to shape our views, creating distrust and inaction.

Fortunately, journalism can also tear down these walls. Reporting that busts stereotypes about government (or NGOs, or philanthropy, or business) creates trust. Covering what works, and how it works, is information society needs and news consumers want. Most important, it’s doing what journalists were always supposed to do: tell the whole story.
Demonstrators call for real democracy in Spain, 2019.

Only a multi-stakeholder approach can improve trust and access to the rule of law worldwide, say World Justice Project’s William H. Neukom and Elizabeth Andersen.

Building a Movement

“When spider webs combine, they can tie up a lion.” This evocative Ethiopian proverb is not simply a rallying cry; it is the guiding principle for our work to improve access to justice and the rule of law worldwide.

Today, an estimated 5.1 billion people — the overwhelming majority of people around the globe — lack access to justice. This includes 1.5 billion who cannot obtain justice for everyday civil, administrative, or criminal problems; 4.5 billion who are excluded from the opportunities law provides, because they lack legal identity, land tenure, or access to the formal employment sector; and more than 250 million people who are living in modern slavery or other extreme conditions of injustice.

Only a multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral response can bring the political, financial, and creative resources required to address a challenge of this scale. At the World Justice Project, the organization we lead, we have put such collaboration at the heart of our identity and work. From our founding ten years ago, we have helped build a broad movement to improve access to justice and advance the rule of law, recognizing this cause is not just a matter for judges and lawyers. Those of us in the legal profession cannot go it alone.

Our research demonstrates the value of a multi-stakeholder approach.

World Justice Project staff recently performed a study of the 90 rule of law programs in 61 countries that we have incubated, inspired, or supported since our founding. Our key finding: programs that employed an intentional and robust multi-disciplinary and collaborative approach were the most successful in diagnosing problems and finding creative solutions that worked, resonated broadly, and were sustainable.

An example that illustrates how partnerships are leading to breakthroughs in bridging the justice gap is an innovative program that uses health resources to improve access to justice for Alaska’s rural indigenous population.
Innovative Medical-Legal Partnership

Much of Alaska’s rural indigenous population lives beyond the road system and far from the lawyers and legal institutions that are concentrated in Alaska’s cities. Working to address this population’s unmet legal needs, the Alaska Supreme Court’s Access to Civil Justice Committee mapped the community resources available across the state and discovered that health clinics were the most prevalent. From that key insight, a ground-breaking collaboration was born. The Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, Alaska Pacific University, Alaska Legal Services Corporation (ALSC), and the state Supreme Court partnered to create a medical-legal partnership to serve rural, indigenous Alaskans. The partnership embeds legal aid providers in the tribal healthcare system and provides legal training and tools to community-based healthcare workers. Together, the legal aid providers and the healthcare workers can more effectively provide a holistic response to the underlying legal issues that affect the profession, such as corruption.

“By teaming up in this way we hope to bring our vision — of a people-centered justice ecosystem that is fully accessible to all Alaskans no matter their means or how far they live from the court house — to reality,” explains ALSC Executive Director Nikole Nelson.

Engineers Collaborate to Reduce Corruption

Another example of the benefits of a collaborative approach to advancing the rule of law is the work of Kamel Ayadi, currently Minister to the Head of the State of Tunisia. A longtime WJP partner and now member of our Board of Directors, Minister Ayadi is an engineer by training. In the early 2000s, as he rose in the leadership of the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO), he became convinced that the organization should have committees to work not just on technical aspects of engineering, but also on broader issues that affect the profession, such as corruption.

Minister Ayadi, then-President of WFEO, helped make that happen. He created a standing Committee Against Corruption to engage the more than 10 million WFEO engineers in the global effort to curb corruption. With support from the World Justice Project, the committee developed standards, guidelines, and best practices; produced training materials and resources to equip engineers with the tools to detect, avoid, and properly report instances of corruption; and undertook “training of trainer” programs for WFEO member organizations in 20 countries, primarily in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, Northern Africa region.

Certainly, collaboration is not without its challenges. It takes time, focused attention, and careful communication. We have learned to start the process with credible, unbiased data about the situation. Grounding such efforts in data helps move the conversation past preconceived ideas about the issue we are examining and focuses everyone on finding solutions. Strong and committed leadership from those with standing across stakeholder groups can also be important for moving effective collaborations forward.

Meeting these challenges takes patience and effort, but experience shows that spinning our webs together yields compelling results.

William H. Neukom is the founder and CEO of WJP. He is a retired partner in the Seattle office of Kirkland & Gates and is a lecturer at Stanford Law School where he teaches a seminar on the rule of law. He was previously the lead lawyer for Microsoft Corporation. He retired from Microsoft as its Executive Vice President of Law and Corporate Affairs in 2002, then returned to his law firm and served as its Chairman from 2003 to 2007. He is a trustee emeritus of Dartmouth College, having served as Chair of the board from 2004 to 2007, and was President of the American Bar Association from 2007 to 2008. He was the Chief Executive Officer of the San Francisco Giants baseball team from 2008 to 2011. He joined the board of directors of Fortunez, Inc. in 2013.

Elizabeth Anderson is Executive Director of WJP. She served previously as Director of the American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiatives and its Europe and Eurasia Division, as Executive Director of the American Society of International Law, and as Executive Director of Human Rights Watch’s Europe and Central Asia Division. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the American Law Institute and the Board of Trustees of Williams College and has won a number of awards including a Williams College Bicentennial Medal and the American Society of International Law Premoiker Woman in International Law Award. Elizabeth received a BA from Williams College, an IHR from Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and a JD from Yale Law School.
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What is the Rule of Law?

The World Justice Project defines the rule of law as a durable system of laws, institutions, norms, and community commitment that delivers:

Accountability

The government as well as private actors are accountable under the law.

Just Laws

The laws are clear, publicized, and stable; are applied evenly; and protect fundamental rights, including the security of persons and contract, property, and human rights.

Open Government

The processes by which the laws are enacted, administered, and enforced are accessible, fair, and efficient.

Accessible & Impartial Dispute Resolution

Justice is delivered in a timely fashion by competent, ethical, and independent representatives and neutrals who are accessible, have adequate resources, and reflect the makeup of the communities they serve.
The Reality of Trust
Trust. It’s a humble word with an unimaginably far-reaching impact. What happens when we stop trusting? And how can we repair social trust when it frays?

A recent study asked Americans to reflect on their trust in leaders, ranging from government officials to the military. Overall, ratings with regard to ethical behavior were low and show Americans’ confidence in crucial societal structures is eroding. But why, and what will this mean for society?

A fascinating, yet troubling downward spiral can be seen globally, not just in the United States. The 2019 Edelman Trust Barometer, which surveyed people across 27 markets worldwide, revealed some disturbing results. Although public trust in NGOs, businesses, governments, and media showed signs of modest improvement overall, only one in five people surveyed believed the system is working for them. Trust is even lower for some groups and there is significant variation by country, gender, and (in the United States) partisan affiliation. The 2020 Edelman Trust Barometer expanded on these findings, showing significant gaps in trust between “informed” and “mass” publics and divisions within and across societies when it comes to evaluating various social institutions such as NGOs, business, government, and media.

The study referenced above was carried out by Pew Research Center. Researchers asked Americans to reflect on their trust in members of Congress, local elected officials, K-12 public school principals, journalists, military leaders, police officers, leaders of technology companies and religious leaders. Overall, Americans gave low ratings to these leaders in terms of behaving ethically and admitting mistakes. At least half of Americans think these leaders behave unethically at least some of the time, with 50% holding this belief about military leaders, 77% holding this belief about technology companies, and 81% holding this belief about members of Congress. According to Pew, these perceptions reflect beliefs about whether people think these groups care about people, handle resources responsibly, and communicate truthfully with the public.

Why Social Trust Matters
Social trust matters. As Harvard Business School professor Tarun Khanna writes, trusted institutions advance societies by simplifying daily life and enabling collaborative solutions. Trust is like grease in the social machine that makes people work well together.

But when trust is lacking, citizens are less likely to comply with laws, pay taxes, tolerate different ways of life, or support their neighbors. For social investors, building trust acts like an accelerator to all other goals. Inadequate trust can be an obstacle.

For maximum effect, therefore, philanthropists and others seeking large-scale social impact should take trust seriously when planning investments. This means choosing partners carefully. Partners who already enjoy public trust are likely to be more successful in whatever they are trying to do than those who do not. Social investors can also embrace building public trust as a goal in itself, as well as a means to an end. That is why initiatives as diverse as the Aspen Institute’s social fabric initiative, Weave, and READ community development centers in rural Asia, put building social trust and cohesion at the center of their work.

Rebuilding trust is hard but it is possible. Take the case of police reform in Camden, New Jersey. In 2012, the city of Camden, with its population of 77,000, was ranked as the most dangerous city in the United States, with a murder rate 18 times the national average. Citizens did not trust the police, according to the former police chief who led the reforms, due to a culture that “sought to dominate criminals with toughness.” The city rebuilt the police force, changed tactics, and focused on building relationships with the community. They focused on building trust. By 2019, homicides had dropped by 63% and crime generally has reached its lowest levels in decades. Citizens now cooperate and share information, helping police to close cases at a much higher rate and provide better services to the public.
Kristin M. Lord is the President and CEO of IREX. She brings more than 20 years of experience in the fields of education, foreign policy, global development, and security and peacebuilding to this role. Prior to joining IREX in 2014, Kristin served in leadership roles at the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), Center for a New American Security (CNAS), Brookings Institution, and George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs. She has also served in a senior advisory role at the US Department of State and currently serves as a board member of the United States Global Leadership Coalition (USGLC) and the American University in Cairo (AUC). She received her MA and PhD from Georgetown University and her BA from American University.

What can social investors do to build social trust?

1. Find the Right Partners
   Research shows, and common sense teaches, that trust does not extend equally across all social groups. Some institutions, some partners, will be more trusted than others. Finding the partners that are trusted by the groups you most want to embrace change will be key. These may not be the groups that are most well-known, most polished, or in your existing network. But it can be easier to raise visibility and build capacity than it is to build trust.

2. Deliver on Promises
   The surest path to trust is for institutions to do their jobs well and provide real value to citizens — what scholar Valerie Braithwaite calls “trust as performance.” This sort of day-in/day-out performance over time rarely earns the spotlight but it is what ultimately matters most.

3. Be Inclusive
   When access to opportunities or public services is blocked because of race, gender, ethnicity, religion, age, disability, or other aspects of identity, public trust erodes. To enjoy the benefits of trust, public-serving institutions must treat their stakeholders fairly and work to extend opportunities to the marginalized.

4. Invest in Ethical Leaders
   Leaders who serve — and are seen as serving others — are among the most important drivers of positive social change. That’s why organizations as diverse as Acumen and the United States Department of State’s Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs invest in programs to cultivate leaders.

5. Demand Transparency and Accountability
   Transparency International’s 2018 index shows that most countries around the world are failing to make serious strides against corruption. Too many institutions meant to serve the public are co-opted to serve the needs of a few or even to extract benefits for their personal gain. The persistence of corruption, according to Transparency International’s Managing Director Patricia Moreira, creates a vicious cycle in which corruption erodes democratic institutions and those weakened institutions are in turn less able to control corruption. Remedies exist. Social investors can support efforts that strengthen institutions, empower citizens to hold government accountable, and protect journalists and press freedoms. They can also demand that the organizations they support uphold the highest standards of transparency, accountability, and fairness.

The above case shows that trust can change when those leading are seen as acting competently and with good intentions. According to analysis by the OECD, these two components, competence and intentions, are the essential building blocks of trust in institutions. These dynamics likely drove a global “trust bump” in the initial weeks of the COVID-19 crisis. Edelman released a special update to its 2020 trust barometer, showing that all institutions gained in trust between January and April 2020. None showed trust gains as much as government, which became the most trusted institution for the first time in the barometer’s history. This is an example of how trust can be gained — or potentially lost — through performance, and it can be turned into lasting relational change if leaders continue to perform at a high level.

Social change leaders confess that partnership itself is not easy. But we can’t ignore this fact: building trust is essential to social progress. Philanthropists and others seeking large-scale social impact have both the opportunity and the leverage to help reverse vicious cycles of distrust. They can select, invest in, and amplify the work of partners who contribute to social trust. Through the power of partnership, they have the ability to build momentum for positive social change.
How did you become involved in anti-corruption work?
I have a science background and earlier in my career was working on environmental issues. Through that work, I helped a small organization set up an undercover sting operation on the smuggling of ozone-damaging chemicals, which led me to become deeply interested in how and why people evade well-meaning laws. I studied for a doctorate in international environmental crime, which got me thinking about what happens if the state is the criminal and why laws often seem set up to deliberately fail. Of course, that led me to study corruption and work with Global Witness, one of the few groups investigating, naming, and shaming corrupt perpetrators. And that, of course, led me to public contracts.

Many readers may have never considered inadequate government contracting as an important development problem. We more typically think of problems framed in terms of poor health, lack of education or the like. Why is open government contracting an issue we should care about?
Our world is built on public contracts. One in every three dollars spent by governments — an astounding US$ 9.5 trillion a year — is on a contract to deliver goods, works, and services to citizens.

That procurement is often a black box, with information disconnected or buried in filing cabinets so that even people within government — never mind companies or citizens — don’t know or can’t access information about what is being purchased, from whom, and for what price. Although vital, public contracting is seen as a risk-averse, compliance-based chore.

The role of procurement has become painfully clear as governments have scrambled to purchase life-saving protective equipment. In the United States, millions of dollars in contracts for masks and ventilators never materialized. Excess costs of inflated food prices in municipalities of Colombia could have fed more than 50,000 families for a month.
We have all heard similar stories about wasteful and corrupt government spending in other areas. What many of us haven’t heard is the solution.

Public contracting can be transformed through open data and better engagement. Open contracting is helping countries obtain better goods, works, and services; save time and money; create a fair and level-playing field including for women- and minority-owned businesses; foster innovation and entrepreneurship; and increase public integrity by detecting and deterring fraud and corruption.

We can break open the black box of procurement to unlock benefits for government, businesses, and communities.

**What activities does Open Contracting Partnership undertake to improve government contracting?**

Open Contracting Partnership (OCP) is a silo-busting collaboration across government, business, and civil society. We work to open the entire public contracting process. We are building a global community to rethink public procurement as a modern, efficient, fair, and transparent digital service that allows the public to serve as watchdogs, and levels the playing field for more suppliers to better serve government needs.

We support our partners to do two key things that, when combined, can be very powerful.

First, we help partners work with businesses, civil society, and governments to develop reforms that create open procurement systems that work for everyone. It is vital to build cross-sector coalitions for change that can help overcome vested interests that block reforms.

Second, we work to ensure that the data related to contracts are published in an open, accessible, structured, and machine-readable format. This makes the contracts much easier to analyze and track.

We support an Open Contracting Data Standard that is being used by 25 cities and governments from Afghanistan to the United Kingdom to publish their data. This global standard is specifically designed to help track information and money across the whole public contracting process — from planning, to tender, to award, to implementation of contracts — using unique IDs to link information across different datasets within government. It enables anyone — government, civil society, journalists, and businesses — to analyze government contracting.

A global standard in open data has a few important benefits. First, it allows us to create tools — for governments, reformers, and watchdogs — that can be used across geographies. A global standard also reduces the hurdle for governments interested in adopting open contracting as everything they need is already available. That accelerates the pace of reform.

Let’s talk more about the connection between corruption and contracts. How deeply are they connected?

Public contracts are where the money, power and discretion collide in government. It is government’s number one corruption risk. About 60% of all the foreign bribery cases prosecuted have involved government contracts.

Corruption can kill. Consider school roofs that fall down on their students, faulty face masks and ventilators, or ghost health clinics that exist only on paper.

Can you describe a success or two from OCP’s activities?

After the 2014 Maidan revolution in Ukraine, government, business, and civil society came together to put open contracting at the heart of a new e-procurement system called ProZorro. It has already saved the country over US$ 2 billion and counting and significantly increased competition with thousands of new suppliers doing business with government for the first time.

In Bogota, Colombia, the city’s education secretary and the national public procurement ministry worked together to develop a new, open contracting process for the provision and delivery of 800,000 meals for school children each day. Opening up the contracting process and taking a data-driven approach turned it into the highest-ranked school meal program in the country and broke a US $22m price-fixing scheme.

Can you tell us any key lessons, principles, or approaches you have learned for successfully engaging with governments?

We’ve learned that reforms have to be built around a demand for greater transparency and accountability. We’ve learned that reforms are only possible when you have a well-trained and well-prepared team at the forefront of public service reforms address procurement. We help them get political support and buy-in, with technical and data work, and public communications. The future is open. And it’s not only great for governments but also for businesses, for citizens, and for innovation.

Gavin Hayman is the Executive Director at the Open Contracting Partnership, working to open up and transform public contracting worldwide. Gavin was previously a director of Global Witness, overseeing their groundbreaking and award-winning investigative and campaigning work to uncover secret deals, corruption, and conflict around the world. He has a PhD on international environmental crime from the University of Reading.

[open-contracting.org](http://open-contracting.org)
Beyond Aid

Staci Warden, Milken Institute’s Executive Director of Global Market Development, explains how social investors can help countries bankroll their own growth and development.

Opportunities for Philanthropists to Support the Development of Capital Markets

Staci Warden, Milken Institute’s Executive Director of Global Market Development, explains how social investors can help countries bankroll their own growth and development.

Beyond Aid

Ghana’s President Nana Akufo-Addo captured global attention last year by expanding on his vision for an Africa Beyond Aid. “I am insisting that we use our resources to build robust economies that will propel us into the likes of the developed nations of the world,” he said. “I am insisting that we stop believing that our deliverance will come from benefactors.” Following his lead in part, the USAID has similarly framed its development assistance agenda around helping countries on a “Journey to Self-Reliance.”

The question facing philanthropists, then, is how to partner effectively with developing countries under a country-led paradigm, and in a way that supports their eventual independence. It starts with an appreciation for the importance of private-sector-led growth as a development strategy and an understanding that in order for the private sector to flourish, it must have reliable access to finance. That is, a country’s successful journey to self-reliance must also entail better financial self-reliance. And I will argue that this requires deep, well-regulated domestic capital markets.

The Plumbing System for Prosperity

Domestic capital markets engender growth because they enable the private sector to directly access the savings of domestic households. If capital markets work well, households can invest their savings in the stock market or other outlets, instead of in low-yielding bank accounts. This way, firms borrow household savings directly, instead of having to rely only on bank loans. Deep capital markets are the plumbing system for prosperity because they prime a virtuous circle whereby household savings finance companies, companies then grow and hire more workers, and more workers earning more income generate more household savings, and the investment cycle continues.

At the Milken Institute a deep belief in the power of capital markets to drive prosperity is in our DNA, and the Global Market Development (GMD) practice that I lead partners with developing countries and emerging markets all over the world to develop strategic roadmaps for this journey. We have worked with low-income countries on sector-specific action plans and we have worked with higher-income countries on the cutting-edge regulation of, for example, new FinTech ecosystems. In Rwanda, we were honored to play an active role in shaping its Capital Markets Master Plan, now legislated as the Capital Market Authority’s official roadmap.
What does building and strengthening capital markets have to do with philanthropy?

I would argue that philanthropists can do few things more impactful for supporting a Beyond Aid world — in Africa or anywhere else — than to support governments as they develop domestic capital markets, because, in short, capital markets enable countries to finance their own development priorities.

Help Countries Bankroll Their Own Economic Growth and Development

Philanthropists can support the development of domestic capital markets in several ways. First, and most importantly, they can make better use of financial-market instruments in their support of government priorities. For example, they can move beyond pure grant-making to take credit or equity investment positions in projects at non-commercial rates of return and with longer, more patient, time-frames. This works well for projects that are critical but not always directly profitable (e.g. by helping to finance pioneering projects in the health or education sector).

Philanthropists can also use blended finance techniques to spark capital market growth. Essentially, this entails providing a guarantee or taking a first-loss position in front of private sector investors in order to reduce the risk of those investments. The idea is that philanthropists can mitigate some of the risk and thereby bring more private investors to the table. Here, drug discovery or infrastructure investments are good examples.

Country-Led and Country-Appropriate Solutions

And this brings me to the question of partnership. Based on our work on several continents on capital market development, I’d like to offer a few observations on partnering with governments more generally. First, and perhaps most importantly, I’ve found that an attitude of genuine partnership is critical, and this means taking the time to foster the dialog required to develop country-led and country-appropriate solutions.

My own “Road to Damascus” moment happened when I was asked by a Minister of Finance to write a consultative report for their capital market development strategy. When I arrived in-country to talk to officials and scope out the work, I unearthed two consultative documents, prepared years earlier. I asked what was missing from these studies and was told that “they weren’t commissioned here, so I don’t know what value they have.” The Minister in question wasn’t rejecting the substance of the reports; he was rejecting the idea of them. I had a kind of epiphany then of what it really meant for a country to drive its own development agenda.

I realized that the best ideas in the world mean nothing if there is no execution, and there will be no execution if public and private stakeholders don’t feel brought in, and stakeholders will not feel brought in unless they believe they have been a meaningful part of the process. Full stop. Country ownership means that policy officials and relevant stakeholders need to be deeply engaged in establishing the contours of the problem, the brainstorming of ideas, and the planning and program design of any solution.

Leave Your Templates at the Door

This realization has formed the basis of GMD’s own consultative approach. We bring senior-level policymakers, private sector leaders, and outside experts together in a structured discussion around the strategic and tactical elements of capital market reform. Rather than prescribing template advice, we try to capture the various lines of argument, the perspectives of participants, and the risks and objections presented. We have found that this approach works well because officials and stakeholders are more likely to buy into a policy if they feel that they have participated in its nascency.

Second, we have found that governments rarely value what is free, and while philanthropists may think that poor countries, by definition, need charity, we have found that they need to have “skin in the game” of some kind, always. GMD also runs a Capital Markets Scholars program in partnership with the International Finance Corporation (IFC) that brings mid-career officials from developing countries to Washington D.C. for nine months of accredited business school coursework in capital markets, followed by internships with market participants. In this program, we insist that even the poorest countries continue to pay salaries and housing during the time that their scholars are resident in the United States.

Partnerships with governments are like marriages. And as with a marriage, it’s good to be in it for the long haul. In our case, for example, we expect that our strategic advisory mandates will come increasingly from the alumni of our Capital Markets Scholars program. In this way we hope to create a virtuous circle of long-term partnerships that can in some small way help countries to finance their own road to economic independence and self-directed prosperity.

Staci Warden is the Executive Director of Global Market Development at the Milken Institute where she leads strategic initiatives on developing capital markets, innovative finance, and access to capital. She previously led JP Morgan’s public sector client franchise in EMEA for six years. Before that, she led the Nasdaq’s two micro-cap markets, ran a United States Treasury international debt restructuring program, helped start the Center for Global Development, and worked as an economist at the Harvard Institute for International Development.

Warden chairs the board of Rwanda’s Capital Markets Authority and sits on the boards of the Energy for Growth Hub and the Global Blockchain Business Council.
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rom Profits to Purpose
For most of the 20th century, by custom and by law, businesses and capital markets have followed a doctrine that maintains that the responsibility of business is, primarily — or solely — to maximize profits. Today, a profound global shift away from that doctrine is under way.

A growing number of private sector leaders are shifting the focus of their businesses to maximize social and environmental benefit. We see evidence of this shift in the diverse and innovative entrepreneurs launching new for-profit businesses, and retrofitting existing ones, to address some of the world’s most complex problems: inequality, access to education and healthcare, ecological collapse, racialized bias, and more. And just last year, many of the largest and most recognized corporate leaders in the United States released a new Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation by the Business Roundtable, pledging to work for the benefit of all stakeholders — customers, employees, suppliers, communities, and shareholders.

Fueling this shift are people across the globe demanding more from the companies they work for, buy from, and do business with. Many of the private sector leaders who are championing this change recognize that to attract and maintain talent, they must offer more than just a paycheck — a purpose beyond profits. Others seek to stand apart and above their competition by making their good work central to their brand.

Harnessing the Power of Business to Drive Social Change
Our non-profit, B Lab, has been a driving force behind this movement to harness the power of business to drive social change. In 2006, after establishing standards to measure social and environmental performance, public transparency, and legal accountability, we began certifying companies that meet these standards. These Certified B Corporations (or “B Corps”) create value not just for shareholders, but for their communities, suppliers, workers, customers, and the environment.

Already investors have established more than 3,300 thriving B Corps in 151 different industries in 70 countries across the globe using business as a force for good. They include long-time impact leaders from Patagonia, Triodos Bank, and Ben & Jerry’s; to pioneering multinationals such as Natura and Danone; to venture-backed innovators including Allbirds and Grove Collaborative. And every day more investors in small businesses and large multinationals reach out to us to explore how they can put their business to work for ideals they believe in.

How can Private Sector Leaders Help Accelerate Change?
This movement of inspired private sector leaders presents a historic opportunity to accelerate change. You can help the movement reach its potential in two important ways. First, you can join the movement as a like-minded investor and consumer. Consider looking at your purchases and investments with a B Corp lens. Customers around the world are increasingly recognizing that cash registers are potent ballot boxes. Meanwhile, activist investors and inspired private sector leaders are looking at their portfolio with the same lens.

Putting Business to Work for Good
By Bart Houlahan, Andrew Kassoy, and Jodeen Olguín-Tayler
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Second, you can join the movement as a philanthropist and non-profit leader. Recognize the private sector leaders building the B Corp movement as kindred spirits and potential allies. Look for ways to leverage the untapped capacity of the private sector to put business to work solving the world’s most pressing challenges alongside your organization.

Consider these cross-sector collaborations that show the potential scale of social change that private enterprise can catalyze:

- Greyston Bakery, a longstanding industrial bakery in New York, pioneered an employment model called “open hiring” to reduce barriers to employment. Not only has the business directly supported thousands of formally incarcerated people to establish an employment history, it now partners with a non-profit to teach other companies how to design employment policies that help to break the cycles of homelessness and recidivism.

- In 2002, Patagonia, a long-time B Corp leader, partnered with other companies to launch the non-profit 1% for the Planet pledge, a collaboration that has awarded over US$ 89m in cash and in-kind donations to domestic and international environmental groups working to preserve and restore the natural environment. As it proudly declares: “We’re in business to save our planet. We aim to use all the resources we have — our business, our investments, and our voice to do it.”

- Just this past December, a partnership between 533 companies and 12 non-profits across the globe led to the largest constituency of business commitment to reduce carbon emissions. Launched at COP25 as “#NZ230,“ this cross-sector collaboration to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 is 20 years ahead of the target set in the Paris Treaty Agreement. The goal of the partnership is much broader than merely achieving important reductions in emissions by private sector leaders. The effort aims to embed governments to commit to similarly ambitious targets by demonstrating that such commitments are welcomed by private sector leaders.

As it proudly declares: “We’re in business to save our planet. We aim to use all the resources we have — our business, our investments, and our voice to do it.”

- In 2002, Patagonia, a long-time B Corp leader, partnered with other companies to launch the non-profit 1% for the Planet pledge, a collaboration that has awarded over US$ 89m in cash and in-kind donations to domestic and international environmental groups working to preserve and restore the natural environment. As it proudly declares: “We’re in business to save our planet. We aim to use all the resources we have — our business, our investments, and our voice to do it.”

- Just this past December, a partnership between 533 companies and 12 non-profits across the globe led to the largest constituency of business commitment to reduce carbon emissions. Launched at COP25 as “#NZ230,“ this cross-sector collaboration to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 is 20 years ahead of the target set in the Paris Treaty Agreement. The goal of the partnership is much broader than merely achieving important reductions in emissions by private sector leaders. The effort aims to embed governments to commit to similarly ambitious targets by demonstrating that such commitments are welcomed by private sector leaders.

The B Corp Movement: An Ambitious Roadmap

The B Corp movement is ambitious. Our goal is building a roadmap to a global economy that is regenerative, inclusive, and equitable for all people and our shared planet.

This requires consumers, investors, philanthropic, non-profit, public, and private sector leaders to join forces as partners in creating a new social contract between business and society.

To do this, we must change our expectations of capitalism, and of each other.

Former US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright once remarked: “In my work, I often wonder to what extent business can help society in its goals to alleviate poverty, preserve ecosystems, and build strong communities and institutions.” She followed by stating, “B Lab has proven that there is a way — the B Corp movement shows us that business, the driving force of our economy, can be an agent of change and live up to society’s standards."

We would go even further to say that we will not achieve our shared goals of system change without the partnership and leadership of the business community — all of us aligned and working towards a vision of a better world.

Let’s put business to work.

At Patagonia, making a profit is not the goal because the 7en master would say profits happen ‘when you do everything else right.’

Yvon Chouinard, United States, 2011.
Philanthropy 2.0: The Golden Age

Matthew Bishop challenges social investors to take their giving to the next level.

In September 2008, Michael Green and I published a book, Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World, in which we made the case that the world was potentially at the dawn of a new Golden Age of Philanthropy — the fifth since the Middle Ages, and the first since Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, and other American gilded age tycoons launched their foundations in the early 20th century. In this vision of a new Golden Age, a generation of purpose-driven businesses and entrepreneur philanthropists with innovative approaches would help drive a productivity revolution in how the world solves its toughest problems.

Twelve years later, that new Golden Age of philanthropy has yet to arrive. Some of the key trends we hoped to see grow have done so much too slowly, if at all — though it is not too late for philanthropists to deliver on this promise.

We have seen an unprecedented rise in the number of billionaires, and with it, as we predicted, a growing commitment to philanthropy. Forbes estimates that there are at least 2,153 billionaires today, up from 798 in 2008. And roughly 10% of these billionaires have signed the Giving Pledge, committing to giving away at least half their wealth. There has been a similar sea change in the espousal of corporate philanthrocapitalism. The Business Roundtable has dumped Milton Friedman’s profit maximization for a stakeholder-friendly version of capitalism. Some 3,300 for-profit companies around the world have joined the B Corp movement. Impact investing focused on achieving specific social or environmental goals as well as a financial return has been growing fast and now exceeds US$ 500 billion, though it is still dwarfed by traditional investing. And since the first Social Impact Bond (SIB) was launched in Britain in 2010, the number of SIBs and their sister Development Impact Bonds has grown to 174 in 32 countries.
Yet all this activity has delivered far too little positive impact on the world’s biggest problems to justify the Golden Age label. With a handful of exceptions, such as the Gates-inspired creation of the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) that is estimated to save the lives of some five million children a year, there have been too few examples of large-scale success by philanthrocapitalists to counter the growing public resentment towards people who are the primary beneficiar is of the widening inequality gap between the 1% and the rest of us. This has made it all too easy for critics such as Anand Giridharadas, author of the best-selling book, *Winners Take All*, to unfairly dismiss philanthrocapitalism as an “elite charade”.

**Show Us the Smart Money**

When the Giving Pledge was being created, it was originally intended to focus on four goals, until Warren Buffett insisted on just one, the commitment to give away a majority of the pledger’s wealth. The other three ideas that were abandoned nearly capture the missing elements needed to bring about a Golden Age of philanthropy: give now, give to inequities.

Although the number of mega-gifts has been growing — last year a record five tycoons made individual gifts of over US$ 1 billion, according to The Chronicle of Philanthropy — after signing, the typical Giving Pledger has seen their wealth grow far more than their giving. Many seem to be keeping until later most of the wealth they promised to donate. (Similarly, it remains to be seen how much real action will result from the recent commitments by business and investors to be more active in meeting the needs of society.) Yet that money is needed now, given the enormity of the problems currently facing the world.

But it is not just about more of their money. Giving more while living would hopefully tap into the philanthropists’ other valuable assets, from their influential networks to the knowledge acquired while making their fortunes about how to get things done at scale.

One reason we hoped that a Golden Age of Giving was coming was potential for this generation of philanthropists to be the “smart capital” driving social progress. Compared to other types of capital (from for-profit to government spending), philanthropic dollars face few constraints in their ability to back risky or controversial ideas, including those that may take decades of complex systems change to make a difference.

Yet in the past 12 years I have seen too few examples of bold risk-taking or out-of-the-box thinking by philanthropists, or a willingness to do what it takes to make large-scale change.

In venture capital, as a start-up succeeds, original investors usually want to stay on board and other investors want to add their money to the success story. Though there are some promising initiatives to encourage collaboration by philanthropists (such as Co-Impact, Audacious, and Blue Meridian), in philanthropy’s dysfunctional capital curve, as a social entrepreneur starts to succeed, their non-profit’s original backers too often seem happy to grab the credit and leave, whilst other philanthropists are reluctant to step in to something already associated with a rival donor. This creates a “valley of death” that I have seen too many growing non-profits struggle to cross. While becoming a for-profit social entrepreneur is emerging as a way to avoid this, that is not yet an option when tackling many kinds of social problems, so other fixes are needed to improve how philanthropic capital is allocated.

The chapter of our book that has turned out to be the most over-optimistic was titled “Virtue’s intermediaries.” We saw signs of the emergence of an ecosystem of high-performance philanthropy, in which new intermediaries would displace the traditional “blowing smoke” feedback loops to donors with proper research and data-based analysis of what is working and what is not — and, as a result, money would go to where it can achieve the most impact. In the past 12 years, data-driven philanthropy has increased, especially within the “effective altruism” movement, but it seems to me that a culture of high-performance remains the exception, not the rule, in philanthropy today. There is too little rigor around defining success and being accountable for achieving it. That must change if the Golden Age is to become a reality.

Philanthropists have also done far too little to engage with the broader public’s legitimate concerns about the role of wealth and importance in society. In our book, we highlighted the need for philanthropists to respond to public fears of plutocracy by initiating a public debate about what should be in a new social contract between the rich and the rest of us. We even set out a three-pronged Good Billionaire Guide that we thought should be a crucial part of that new social contract: make your fortune fairly; do significant, effective philanthropy; and pay a higher rate of tax than people less well-off. So far, philanthropists have mostly avoided this debate, or entered it ineptly. Yet with populist anti-business, anti-rich sentiment surging around the world, the time has surely come to engage.

The world’s most successful wealth creators certainly have the potential to spark a renaissance in bold, strategic giving that can help remake our planet. But to do that they must take their giving to the next level — bigger, riskier, more collaborative, more focused on systemic change — and they need to do it now.

Barack Obama awarding the 2010 Presidential Medal of Freedom to investor and philanthropist Warren Buffett, who has pledged that all of his shares in Berkshire Hathaway (nearly 99% of his net worth) will be given to philanthropic endeavors, Washington D.C., United States, 2011.

Matthew Bishop is a journalist and practitioner who wrote some of the earliest articles about both philanthropy and impact investing in *The Economist*, where he spent 25 years as a writer and editor. He is the co-author of *Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World*, which Michael Bloomberg described as the “definitive guide to a new generation of philanthropists who understand innovation and risk-taking.”
Climate Philanthropy Matters

Cash to spend to fight climate change? Laurie Goering, Thomson Reuters Foundation’s Climate Change Editor, gives some ideas on how best to spend your money.

In January, the World Economic Forum put climate change and related risks at the top of its long-term threat list, displacing old worries from cyberattacks to economic instability.

Then a small virus outbreak in a Chinese market roaring into a global pandemic that has taken more than 400,000 lives, flattened economies and swept away the illusion that any country — even the richest — is adequately prepared for the unexpected.

We’ve learned some hard lessons that apply to climate change risks too, among them that we’re all more vulnerable than we thought and our systems aren’t nearly resilient enough to respond to large-scale threats.

As a tiny virus forces us to reconsider everything about the way we live and do business, there’s an opportunity to think big about what we want life to look like afterward, and prepare now for the next looming global threat: climate change.

Philanthropic spending on climate change has been slowly growing in recent years, as more individuals, foundations, businesses, and charities recognize the risks and opportunities around it. But the prominent rise of a global climate protest movement last year — and a surge in climate-related disasters — have recently helped spur some big donations, including a US$ 10 billion commitment from Amazon’s Jeff Bezos in February, as well as a decision by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to include climate change as one of its key issues.

Where would money, well-spent, make a difference in fighting climate change? We asked 10 of the world’s leading climate change thinkers for their top ideas:

Resilient Cities
Since its COVID-19 lockdown began and its traffic jams dried up, New Delhi has seen its black, smog-choked skies turn blue. What would it take to keep them clean? Ambitious clean public transport systems, said Sunitha Narain, director of the Delhi-based Centre for Science and Environment.

“I’m talking about reinventing mobility at a scale we’ve never seen before, connecting the hinterlands to the main cities,” she said. Government spending on COVID-19 economic recovery, combined with other investment, could drive “a new kind of mobility” that could make life better for everyone and slash climate-changing emissions.
In fast-growing sub-Saharan Africa, where cities such as Lagos and Kinshasa face being overwhelmed by migrants as farmers succumb to more extreme weather, smart money could go into building climate-resilient secondary cities prepared for growth and migration, said Maarten van Aalst, a climate scientist and head of the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre.

Right now, with new arrivals flooding into slums without adequate water, sewers, transport or green spaces, “we are basically constructing the risks for a devastating future,” he said.

But spending to create cities with well-insulated dense housing, clean transport that allows people to get to work, new kinds of climate-smart jobs and green spaces to curb surging heatwaves could save lives, and demonstrate that climate-smart development is possible, he said.

Disruptive Companies

Electric cars are on their way to becoming the norm — but it wasn’t traditional carmakers that started the trend. The idea was on the table for a long time, and the classic car companies had no interest at all in developing it. It needed someone else with money and a long time horizon to take it forward,” said Niklas Höhne, founder of the NewClimate Institute in Germany.

Now similar companies are needed to pioneer things like solar-powered blast furnaces capable of producing the high temperatures needed to melt steel, he and other scientists said.

Investing strategically in new companies “that can show the world these new technologies are better than the existing ones could really move the ball forward significantly,” Höhne said.

Sam Fankhauser, director of London’s Grantham Research Institute for Climate Change and the Environment, would specifically support commercial-scale demonstrations of a not-new but crucial technology: carbon capture and storage, or the ability to bury climate-changing emissions underground.

Such technology could be used, for instance, to produce zero-emissions hydrogen, to power air transport and home heating, or to grow and burn trees and other biomass for energy, effectively sucking carbon out of the atmosphere to produce “negative” emissions.
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Investing strategically in new companies “that can show the world these new technologies are better than the existing ones could really move the ball forward significantly,” Höhne said.

Sam Fankhauser, director of London’s Grantham Research Institute for Climate Change and the Environment, would specifically support commercial-scale demonstrations of a not-new but crucial technology: carbon capture and storage, or the ability to bury climate-changing emissions underground.

Such technology could be used, for instance, to produce zero-emissions hydrogen, to power air transport and home heating, or to grow and burn trees and other biomass for energy, effectively sucking carbon out of the atmosphere to produce “negative” emissions.

Next-Generation Leaders

Last September, more than six million young climate strikers took to the streets from Bangkok to Nairobi to demand faster action to curb climate change.

Many of them could become the next generation of leaders driving climate policy — like Greta Thunberg, a former college fossil fuel divestment organizer now pushing climate legislation as a Wisconsin state assembly member, said May Boeve, the head of environmental group 350.org.

What do the budding climate leaders need? Training in leadership skills and ongoing mentoring, as well as some seed money to back local climate-smart initiatives they’re pushing around the world, she said.

“If they are invested in, they could be the ones helping make the decisions in the next 10, 20, 30 years,” she said. “What would it look like if they got the support now to be the policymakers of the future, all over the world?”

A Price on Carbon Pollution

Right now, in most of the world, fossil fuel power plants, factories or even those of us driving cars pay nothing to emit climate pollutants. But those emissions have a huge social cost, in everything from more asthmatics hospital admissions to more extreme hurricanes and floods.

Establishing a global carbon price would include those costs in decision-making, make clean renewable energy cheaper, and reward those who opt for climate-smart choices, said Katharine Hayhoe, a climate and political scientist at Texas Tech University.

“Every economist in the world agrees the fastest way to cut emissions is a price on carbon. And every major oil company, on paper, says they support it,” she said. In the United States, “it has bi-partisan support and the money (you collect) can be returned to households each year.”

So how do you get a carbon price? Contribute cash to political campaigns aimed at voting out key politicians that block the measure “and then so many ducks will fall into a row” on battling climate change, she said.

Changing Minds – and Policies

Faced with the COVID-19 pandemic, “we’re in such a moment of disruption that radical ideas people formally may have thought as absolutely impossible are now coming into the mix,” said Jennifer Morgan, the head of Greenpeace International.

But which climate-smart ideas — such as moving away from GDP growth as an indicator of success — might people now be ready to support? Public opinion polling could show us.

“We need to know where we will have public support to push ahead,” she said. Testing some ideas and finding what resonates might indicate where it’s possible to push ahead fast — and prove to policymakers there’s a groundswell of support.

Hayhoe, of Texas Tech, thinks another key is scaling up training programs to help people who care about global warming — particularly climate scientists — change minds in their own social circles, whether it’s the Rotary Club, the gardening society, the skiers association or, in her case, the evangelical Christian community.
Studies show people put their trust in friends and family first — and scientists come second, she said. To truly change minds about the need for climate action — a prerequisite for policy change — people need to hear the news from people they know.

**Climate-Smart Development**

About one in three people in sub-Saharan Africa lacks access to electricity. Getting clean power to those who need it could both hold down emissions on the fast-growing continent and spur economies, said Mohamed Adow, founding director of Power Shift Africa, a Nairobi think tank.

He would invest in decentralized, community-run solar and wind power systems at a scale sufficient to run energy-hungry businesses, not just lights.

“Those decentralized models create more jobs, generate more growth,” Adow said. “It’s how we end up with a paradigm shift for Africa.”

To help communities from Afghanistan to Tanzania already struggling to adapt to deadly climate change threats, Saleemul Huq, of the Bangladesh-based International Centre for Climate Change and Development, would put his money into BRAC, the world’s largest NGO.

Famed for initiatives such as installing millions of home rainwater harvesting systems around the world and pushing hard for education for girls, the Bangladesh-based charity is now trying to make sure all the development it supports is climate-smart — making it possible to enormously scale up efforts to cut climate risks for the world’s poorest.

“If you want to help tens of millions, maybe hundreds of millions, they can do it,” Huq said.

**Climate-Proof Infrastructure**

Just as many of the world’s systems, from healthcare to supply chains, haven’t proved resilient to a pandemic, so most of the world’s key infrastructure is hugely vulnerable to climate change impacts.

Francesco Femia, co-founder of the Center for Climate and Security, sees a need to invest in climate-proofing everything from ports to hospitals to military bases, and making sure anything new is built low-carbon and designed to withstand risks from sea level rise to water shortages.

“What this coronavirus moment is telling us is there’s a need for massive investments in resilience. Our systems are much more fragile than most people thought. We’re facing unprecedented risks — but we also have unprecedented tools to deal with those risks, if we choose to invest in them,” he said.

What’s the smartest place to invest? A lot depends on your interests, climate experts say. But it’s worth keeping in mind that fighting the next big crisis is as much about changing minds as changing tech.

“A lot has to go into political awareness, changing behaviour, keeping up the public pressure — even persuading people electric cars are fun to drive,” said Fankhauser of the Grantham Institute.

Laurie Goering is the Climate Change Editor at the Thompson Reuters Foundation. As part of her work, she developed and mentors a network of more than 100 developing world climate change journalists in an effort to improve reporting on climate change around the globe.

She previously worked as a foreign correspondent for the “Chicago Tribune” newspaper for 15 years based in New Delhi, Kuwait, Johannesburg, Rio de Janeiro, Havana, Mexico City and London and has reported from about 80 countries, including covering the second Gulf War in Iraq and conflict in Colombia, and opening the first post-revolution US newspaper bureau in Cuba.
If you’re in the luckiest 1% of humanity, you owe it to the rest of humanity to think about the other 99%.
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