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A NEW WORLD BANK REPORT PREDICTS THAT OUR global economy will shrink this year for the first time since the 1940s, and only 25 percent of developing nations are capable of launching their own stimulus programs. In these trying times, the world relies on the international relief and development community to help stem the impact of the economic crisis on the world’s most vulnerable.

As we anxiously watch the crisis unfold and hope for some consensus from the G20 summit on how to reconstruct a solid economy, I am reassured to see that President Obama has begun to rebuild America’s development capabilities. His proposed budgetary investments in international development and humanitarian assistance for the remainder of this year and 2010 illustrate his commitment to making a world that is more prosperous, stable and secure. His support demonstrates his understanding of the fact that failing to adequately support programs that work with the world’s poorest people to reduce global poverty and promote economic growth would undermine America’s national interests.

In this month’s issue of Monday Developments you will read about the financial crisis and its impact on NGOs, the push to convince the Obama administration to officially embrace the Millennium Development Goals, the G8 and its commitments to Africa, continued work to improve the effectiveness of development assistance, efforts to combat the food crisis in India, and more. This issue also marks the beginning of the official countdown to InterAction’s 25th Anniversary Forum, “The Next 25 Years Start Today.”

For a quarter of a century, the annual InterAction Forum has provided a forum for those committed to serving the world’s poorest to come together to address issues of critical importance to our community and to shine a spotlight on the important work we do. This year’s silver anniversary Forum is occurring at an important juncture as we confront some of the greatest challenges our nation has ever encountered at home and abroad, while the needs of the world’s most vulnerable people remain acute. To be held in July (midway through the Obama administration’s first year), this year’s event promises to be one of the most important ever and one in which your participation is vital.

We also welcome a new partner for this year’s Forum. The 2009 International Aid & Trade Conference helps build partnerships for effective humanitarian relief, with a focus on procurement and logistics: getting the needed supplies, services, and personnel to the right place at the right time. A natural partner to the Forum, this conference will be held just after the Forum and will feature practical solutions and discussions to increase the effectiveness of procurement and logistics processes for disaster relief.

Fostering creative, effective partnerships will be critical for efficient international relief and development programs going forward. To survive the global financial crisis and continue delivering critical assistance to the world’s poorest people, we must do a better job of managing our own organizational resources, helping others who share similar goals but lack capacity, and boosting the morale of colleagues struggling through a very uncertain time in our history. InterAction is committed to providing a forum for the needed conversation about the impact of the crisis on our community and we encourage you to share your feedback and suggestions at letters@interaction.org.

Sam Worthington
President and CEO
InterAction
Selecting Your Issue and Setting Your Goal

BY JOHN RUTHRAUFF
SENIOR MANAGER OF MEMBER ADVOCACY, INTERACTION

Note: This is the second installment in a series of articles on developing an effective advocacy strategy. Part one appeared in the March 2009 edition of Monday Developments.

A DVOCACY CONSISTS OF A SERIES OF PLANNED activities that organizations undertake to press for policy changes related to a specific issue (based on an assessment of which actors have the power to bring about those changes). An advocacy campaign can focus on change in an organization, a government, a multinational institution (e.g., the World Bank), or a corporation. Advocacy also increases the power available to organizations and alliances by winning measurable victories. Campaigning organizations find they get only as much change as they have the power to compel.

This article focuses on the critical early steps of selecting your issue and setting your goal. The steps below are covered in an order in which they commonly occur. But keep in mind that every campaign is unique and you always need to tailor your plan to meet your specific situation. Moreover, campaigns take place in fluid environments, so implementing plans is not always linear and you must remain flexible; sometimes you even need to repeat steps you already completed.

Selecting your issue

The first critical step is to carefully select the issue that will be the focus of your campaign. Chances are that there are many problems you want to see addressed, but the reality is that only some of them can be effectively tackled through the type of targeted advocacy discussed in this article. To be effective, a targeted advocacy campaign must focus on a discreet, concrete issue. This means that if your long-term goal is to address a broad problem such as reducing poverty, improving health care, or fighting racism, you will need to divide the problem into more manageable issues that can be addressed in individual advocacy campaigns. For example, as part of the larger goal of reducing poverty, NGOs have run successful advocacy campaigns to encourage the cancelation of the international debt owed by heavily indebted poor countries.

The following questions can help you determine if a particular issue would be a good focus for an advocacy campaign:

- Can NGOs influence how the issue is addressed?
- Do you and your potential allies have enough interest in the issue to make it possible to develop an alliance to address it?
- Do you and your potential allies share sufficient consensus about the issue and potential solutions to hold an alliance together?
- Do your potential allies have sufficient information and skills to address the issue?
- If not, can they develop the skills and locate the information using a reasonable amount of time and resources?
- Would addressing the issue potentially put in danger the organizations and individuals involved?

Defining your goal

The goal is a statement of the change you want to occur to address your issue. It is important that participants clearly determine and agree on the fundamental issue and goal. It is useful to establish the goal by open, participative brainstorming with leaders, followed by debate and a process of refining and prioritizing the resulting ideas. The goal should be clear, understandable and limited. The goal must be achievable, because the purpose of an advocacy campaign is to bring about real changes. In setting your goal, ask yourself the following questions:

- Is the goal specific, focused and attainable?
- Is the goal clear and precise, or is it subject to a variety of interpretations?
- Is the goal of sufficient interest to mobilize potential allies that have the power needed to achieve the goal?
- Do you and other members of the alliance have the technical knowledge you need to achieve the goal?
- What is your timeframe for achieving the goal and do you and your allies have available the resources (financial and human) necessary to achieve the goal?

If you are considering several possible goals, organizing the answers to these questions in a chart can make it easier to identify the goal you are best placed to achieve.

The overarching goal is usually broken down into a number of “asks” that, when met, can collectively result in achieving your goal. Each ask is a specific action that you want a government or institution to take. Each ask, when met, should be a step forward toward realizing your goal. Here is an example of goal and asks from the debt cancellation effort:

Goal: Ensure that the United States and other industrialized countries implement multilateral debt cancellation
Standard Bank is delighted to announce that Maureen Harrington has joined the firm as a Director in the Corporate and Investment Banking Group in New York. Ms. Harrington will be responsible for broadening Standard Bank's solutions for international organizations and other partners involved in African development.

Ms. Harrington most recently served as the Vice President for Policy and International Relations at the Millennium Challenge Corporation and was MCC's first Managing Director for African operations. She brings over 15 years of experience in African development related issues to Standard Bank.
Pact Announces New CEO

Pact is delighted to announce the appointment of Mark Viso as its next Chief Executive Officer. Pact, an international NGO with staff in 25 countries, works on such issues as HIV/AIDS, orphans and vulnerable children, anti-corruption, person-to-person peace-building, and natural resource management.

“Mark has the ethical fiber, the bold imagination, and the broad management bandwidth which will make him a great fit for Pact,” said Sarah Newhall, current President and CEO of Pact. “He is deeply grounded in practical field realities and a capacity builder at his core. He has all the energy, optimism, and savvy needed to lead Pact through these turbulent times.”

Viso will be succeeding Newhall, who has been with Pact for 17 years, with nine at the helm. During her tenure Pact has seen rapid and sustained growth. Newhall and her husband David Pyle, a longtime global health expert with John Snow, Inc., are planning a move to Portland, Oregon where they will continue global and community activism. Viso’s tenure will begin officially on April 15.

National Conference on African Refugees and Immigrants

The Ethiopian Community Development Council’s 15th National Conference on African Refugees and Immigrants will be held May 4-6, 2009 at the Holiday Inn Arlington in Arlington, VA.

This year’s conference theme is The Future of African Refugees and Immigrants: A Time for New Thinking. The theme represents a past year of progress and concern about African newcomers to the U.S. and overseas. Only 8,935 African refugees were resettled in FY 2008 due primarily to DNA testing. Today, family reunion for thousands of African refugees is in jeopardy. With the U.S. economy in recession, employment for newcomers to the country will take on new challenges to help them become and remain self-sufficient.

The May 2009 conference will look at new strategies for working with the African refugee and immigrant community. Sessions will include discussions on the crises in Africa; policy updates from government officials; workshops on health and human services; and new ways of approaching community partnerships.

The conference typically attracts over 250 people from African community-based organizations; federal, state, and local government agencies; refugee service providers; think tanks; academia; and African newcomers.

Registration is available at http://www.ecdc-cari.org/events.asp

Night of Nets—A Camp-out to End Malaria

Youth across the U.S. are mobilizing a creative camping experience to reduce the more than 2,000 preventable child deaths a day from malaria. This month, students will gather to spend a night under bed nets, drawing attention to a disease that robs the lives of almost a million children a year, despite being preventable and treatable.

The Night of Nets to End Malaria, set on April 24-25 to coincide with World Malaria Day, will launch a new advocacy initiative by international relief and development organization World Vision. At campus quads, soccer fields or gyms, these campers aim to increase public awareness of malaria, advocate for improved U.S. support of anti-malaria initiatives and generate additional funds to combat the disease.

The effort will promote use of long-lasting insecticidal mosquito nets, which have proven to be an effective, low-cost intervention against malaria in the countries that need it most. Funds raised by the effort will benefit communities in sub-Saharan Africa where World Vision implements anti-malaria programs.

For additional information about the Night of Nets to End Malaria event on World Malaria Day 2009 and future dates, visit www.nightofnets.org or contact James Pedrick at jpedrick@worldvision.org.

International Housing Coalition and Rockefeller Foundation Announce Partnership

The International Housing Coalition (IHC) has been awarded a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to produce a White Paper on housing and urban development in the developing world. The Paper will be completed this spring and will be followed by a series of events to disseminate the Paper’s findings. With this grant, the IHC aims to promote policy solutions that address the global challenges associated with urbanization.

Currently more than a billion people live in slums in sub-standard shelter without access to clean water and sanitation. “The development agencies are struggling to get their hands around the fact that nearly half the people in the countries served now live in cities. In fact, all net growth in population in the decades ahead is expected to be accommodated in urban areas,” said Peter Kimm, Chairman of International Housing Coalition.

The Rockefeller Foundation grant will help strengthen IHC’s efforts to build new constituencies and to engage the U.S. public and policymakers on urban development issues.

For more information, visit www.intlhc.org.
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InterAction Staff in Malaysia and India

Two InterAction staff members traveled to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and India (New Delhi and Hyderabad) in January.

In Kuala Lumpur, InterAction staff worked with peers from around the world to finalize the planning process for the development of an internationally-owned framework for CSO development effectiveness under the Open Forum on Aid Effectiveness. The meeting was attended by representatives of NGO platforms, networks and INGOs from North America, Australia, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. InterAction, as one of the six lead organizations responsible for moving this initiative forward globally, will be reaching out to its members and beyond to incorporate the thinking and practices of our community into this process.

In New Delhi, InterAction staff visited the leadership of Indian NGOs to explore the opportunities and challenges facing the Indian NGO community. They met with Paresh Tewary, CEO of the Indian NGO platform VANI (Voluntary Action Network of India), the Board chair of VANI and President of PRIA, Dr. Rajesh Tandon, and Ajay Mehta, Executive Director of the National Foundation for India. The various issues explored included: NGO space and NGO-government relations; the resource base of Indian NGOs as well as the level and implications of foreign support; and the ability of NGOs in general to honestly reflect on and share their experiences (both failures and successes) as a way of advancing the effectiveness and credibility of NGO work.

In Hyderabad, InterAction staff visited the innovative work of the Centre for Environment Concerns (CEC) in the town of Zaheerabad in the Medak District. The head of CEC, Mr. K.S. Gopal, works closely with VANI, representing VANI on occasion, in addition to running the very agile initiatives of CEC. Mr. Gopal manages a small team that is given rein to work creatively on various aspects of rural development (including agriculture and the environment) aimed at ending hunger in the dry land areas of the state of Andhra Pradesh.

InterAction Partners with 3ie

InterAction and the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) are pleased to announce a new partnership dedicated to generating and disseminating knowledge that contributes to the effectiveness of the development community. InterAction’s member-based strength combined with 3ie’s concentration on theme-based learning from focused evaluation designs will offer compelling opportunities to critically examine practice, as well as methods used to assess impact.

InterAction and 3ie share a commitment to improving development effectiveness. Our partnership will help InterAction members understand and conduct impact evaluations and benefit—through better program design and policy arguments—from other impact evaluation findings.

3ie is a new initiative that grew out of the Center for Global Development’s research and advocacy for development effectiveness. In 3ie’s own words, it “seeks to improve the lives of poor people in low- and middle-income countries by providing, and summarizing, evidence of what works, when, why and for how much.” 3ie’s direction comes from its member organizations, which include bilateral, multilateral, NGOs and foundations.

As the partnership launches, we are exploring a range of activities. We encourage members to get involved as the specifics unfold.

For more details, contact Hilary Nalven, Sr. Program Associate, Strategic Impact/InterAction, at hnalven@interaction.org
Weighing In
When It Matters Most

Your voice is more important than ever in setting the community agenda.

BY BARBARA WALLACE, VICE PRESIDENT, MEMBERSHIP & STANDARDS, INTERACTION

We are operating in some of the most challenging times we can remember. With a global economy in various stages of decline, those committed to ensuring safe, stable and productive lives for the world’s poorest face new and increasingly complicated global forces that affect their work and the lives of those they serve. Even as the need for the essential services that NGOs provide for poor communities around the world is increasing in these hard economic times, the resources that fund that work are decreasing as donors find themselves with diminished assets of their own. How will we deal with these challenges and forge ahead in acting on our deep-held commitment to saving lives and improving the human condition?

From July 6-9, InterAction will host its annual Forum in the Washington, DC area. The Forum provides a venue for InterAction members and the broader community with which they interact to come together to discuss the major issues of our times, get pertinent training and development, advocate on the Hill, and work with peers to expand and improve development and humanitarian relief. This year is InterAction’s 25th anniversary and even as we celebrate the advances made during that time, we also look to build on that work and face the new challenges of our times with the best minds addressing these issues. Sessions planned for this year’s Forum include addressing the effect of the economy on our community and the opportunity to engage with leadership in the Obama administration.

Because this year’s Forum will convene an essential dialogue of critical issues facing our community at this time, participation is especially important. Recognizing the economic challenges our member organizations face and to support full participation, we are offering a $50 discount from the normal member registration fee this year and an additional $50 discount for any member organization staff whose office is more than 300 miles from Washington, DC.

For more information and to register for the Forum, see www.interaction.org/forum, or email forum@interaction.org.

Budget Calls for Strong Increases in International Affairs Funding

The budget and appropriations picture got clearer during February. First, the House passed the remaining Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 appropriations bills in an omnibus appropriations bill on February 25. As of press time, Senate consideration was expected the week of March 2, as Congress tries to get FY2009 wrapped up so they can move on to the long list of other urgent matters awaiting their attention. As passed by the House, the State, Foreign Operations section of the omnibus had more good news than bad for our community, with some accounts getting healthy increases. The largest cut, as expected, was to the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), reflecting Senate appropriators’ feeling that a pause in MCC funding is needed. The final MCC number did come up significantly from the level in the Senate bill, reflecting the House’s strong support for the MCC.

Second, on February 26, President Obama released an initial outline of his FY2010 budget request, which included a request for $51.7 billion for international affairs funding (excluding food aid). This is a solid increase over the $47.2 billion expected to be the final total (after the expected spring supplemental bill) for FY2009, and is characterized by the outline as putting the U.S. “on a path to double U.S. foreign assistance” as promised by the President during the campaign. Just as important as the increase, the administration is taking as its base for comparison the total of both regular and supplemental funding, and it pledges to include humanitarian funding in the regular request going forward. This is a step our community has long called for, and it will help humanitarian groups save more lives and use taxpayer dollars more efficiently. The budget request also includes a number of other positive measures, and InterAction has released a statement applauding the President’s vision and calling on Congress to match it. Because this is a brand new administration, the full details of the President’s budget request are still being worked out, and will be released in late April.

More detailed discussions of all these developments are posted on our website, at http://interaction.org/budget/index.html.

Secretary Gates Testifies On Military Challenges

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates testified in front of both the Senate and House Armed Services committees on the Pentagon’s priorities and challenges. In their questioning of the Secretary, Committee members focused on the military’s strategy in Afghanistan, with Secretary Gates emphasizing that additional troops would not be effective without significant increases in U.S. diplomatic, development and governance resources. When questioned about the status of AFRICOM (the new U.S. regional military command for Africa), he said that it was not a priority to have it headquartered on the continent and that it has resources adequate to fulfilling its mission of building African security capacity and training peacekeepers.

continued on page 35
Tackling Hunger: The Way Forward

THE MIDTERM REVIEW IS UNDERWAY ON PROGRESS towards the Millennium Development Goals.

The MDGs target major development challenges in the world today. The very first MDG sets the goal of halving, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. There has been only limited progress towards meeting that goal. However, it can be met. India, a rising world power but which also has a third of its population living with food insecurity and half of it malnourished, could be a model of success in meeting this goal with little or no additional cost to its government.

India can do this through judicious use of its investments and making its safety nets sustainable. A key breakthrough is the recent enactment of legislation guaranteeing 100 days of employment to rural households (which effectively provides such households with an annual income of US$ 250). The expectation is that this measure on its own can tackle distress, migration and hunger. But additional steps are actually needed to succeed. As Gandhiji said, “To a people famished and idle, the only acceptable form God can dare to appear in is work with promise of food and wages.”

The key issue in household food insecurity is uncertainty as to the ongoing availability of food and the timing receipt of the money needed to buy it. For example, if wages are paid late, people may be forced to buy food on credit, meaning they may rely on money-lenders and pay far more for the food than they would have if the wages had been paid on time. This can mean that the family continues to face food shortages. This in turn reduces their ability to work—especially the hard, physical labor of manual work; and that can mean they cannot to take advantage of manual labor employment opportunities. This vicious cycle leads to the poor being hungry despite a massive $7 billion investment in employment.

The simple way fix this is to assure food supply to the households. Each household is entitled to about $250 per year under the new employment mechanism. Half that amount would suffice to provide a household with adequate, nutritious food. Building on decades of relevant experience, we at the Centre for Environment Concerns have pioneered a model to turn that concept of “Food Assurance” into reality. In that model, each household receives on a pre-set date each month 50 kilos of rice, wheat or sorghum, and eight kilos of legumes. This would allow recipient households to cook enough nutritious food to ensure that none starve. In this way, labor, the only asset of the poor, is made a bankable asset with the employment guarantee serving as the collateral.

This Food Assurance model produces additional benefits: (1) a rise in the self image of the household, especially of its women; (2) improvement in the ability of the poor to negotiate for better compensation since they are no longer bargaining under the threat of hunger; and (3) increased incentive to make household investment in food a high priority and reduced household vulnerability to loan sharks and others who prey on the poor.
What are the risks involved in grain lending? Our experience is that a well-managed Food Assurance scheme has no risk because the poor would do anything to ensure it works. In fact, the problem is the other way around. While initially the grain is a loan to the worker, soon it is the other way around. This is because they would soon complete their total employment quota of hundred days and a part of this income is earmarked for future monthly supplies. Thus in the beginning the food assurance scheme provides a loan, but soon it ends up with a situation in which money is retained as an advance instead for future food supplies, as the grains are given each month even after full employment entitlement is used.

The key issue in household food insecurity is uncertainty as to the ongoing availability of food and the timing receipt of the money needed to buy it.

Our model is an important innovation on the pre-existing concept of work for food. In our model, rather than focusing simply on how much food is delivered, we tackle the critical underlying issue of uncertainty as to timing and price by providing predictable and adequate food supplies at regular intervals and creating a mechanism for grain lending that avoids usurious loans. In short, the key to tackling hunger is not simply the amount of grain delivered, but instead the assurance of having adequate food every day. The model also is a logical outgrowth of a previously developed and highly successful grain credit line for poor households in drought-prone areas that the World Bank adopted in its poverty alleviation project in Andhra Pradesh.

So what does the Indian government need to do? It is simple. The government must recognize that the promise of an annual income does not automatically defeat hunger. It must understand that poor people are under constant pressure to repay debts, and food expenditure must be made a household priority using lending as an instrument. To make the scheme to work efficiently, government must bear risks in market price fluctuations through prefixed prices for the commodities. To entice the poor to participate, the government must price the grains at slightly lower than market prices. It must also make use of existing procurement, transport and storage infrastructure, and develop software to track transactions, food deliveries and grain loans. Grain quality must be assured and participants must be treated as customers not beneficiaries. At the same time to leverage the benefits of competition, the mechanics of the daily implementation of the scheme should be handled by independent entities.

Implementing this model would also address an underlying problem in food production in India. While Indian cereal production is rising, the production of low-cost cereals consumed by the poor is drastically falling. With assured and stable demand, the production of the low cost cereals will pick up, which in turn would benefit the market for the coarse nutritious grains grown in agriculturally backward rain-fed areas, which is where the bulk of the rural poor live. The increase in available capital can then be used to create endowments and assets that enable rain farming to withstand drought stress, and encourage environmentally preferable use of local food sources over the current system in which grain is often shipped thousands of miles to market. It could also support the development of locally-produced green fertilizers that could wean us away from high-cost, imported fertilizers.

Ensuring food security for the poor in this way would trigger a chain reaction. It would strengthen the ability of poor to not only negotiate their wages but also to plan for their family welfare in other areas key to ending poverty such as health and education.

These goals can be met. India must show its moral commitment and make use of this plan to eliminate hunger, while in the U.S. the new administration and civil society must encourage global cooperation to support these efforts to banish hunger from the planet in the very near term.

Questions and comments can be sent to the author at cechyd@eth.net and ceccopal@yahoo.com.
THE NEW AND THE OLD POOR

WHY IT’S CRITICAL TO SERVE BOTH

GEOFFREY CANADA STATES IT PLAINLY: PEOPLE ARE GOING TO DIE.

“In an economic crisis, we tend to think about … how many jobs are we going to lose, what will happen to Wall Street. I know people are going to die. We cannot allow ourselves to get focused on one part of citizens and not the other,” the CEO and president of a major New York nonprofit said at a recent forum on the impact of the struggling economy on meeting community needs.

The message was clear: Those who struggle the most even during good economic times will suffer the most in the worst of times. Yet, much of the attention we are seeing is on what we could call the “new poor.”

With some projecting that six million jobs will be lost in the United States alone by the time the economy begins to recover, not counting other recessions around the globe, it is easy to understand the attention.

Due to the crisis, we are already seeing greater demand on nonprofits to provide emergency services, fewer funding resources with which to keep pace with the increased demand let alone maintain existing levels of programming, and the very real likelihood that many nonprofits will not survive.

Paul C. Light, a professor of public service at New York University, predicted at the same forum referenced above that in the next two years 100,000 nonprofits will close their doors, including at least a few large, well-known organizations. Many more will freeze hiring and salary increases.

The question remains: How will the influx of the new poor and their need for short-term assistance impact giving for long-term sustainability programs across the world?

In writing his foreword for the 2008 U.N. report on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), set in 2000 to end poverty by 2015 along with other social and environmental goals, United Nation Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon observed: “These tasks have now become more challenging because the largely benign development environment that has prevailed since the early years of this decade, and that has contributed to the successes to date, is now threatened.

“We face a global economic slowdown and a food security crisis, both of uncertain magnitude and duration. Global warming has become more apparent. These developments will directly affect our efforts to reduce poverty: the economic slowdown will diminish the incomes of the poor; the food crisis will raise the number of hungry people in the world and push millions more into poverty; climate change will have a disproportionate impact on the poor.

“The need to address these concerns, pressing as they are, must not be allowed to detract from our long-term efforts to achieve the MDGs. On the contrary, our strategy must be to keep the focus on the MDGs as we confront these new challenges.”
A balance, then, must be struck between help for the new poor and the old. Now is not the time to retreat from the MDGs but to recognize that those who suffer during good economic times will suffer more during the bad times unless efforts among the giving community are redoubled to keep attention on their plight.

As reported in the January 24 issue of The New York Times, a new University of Chicago study found that nearly three-quarters of nonprofits in the United States receive some type of government support and about half of those count on that funding for at least half their budgets.

And one of the first places state and local governments across the U.S. are targeting for budget cuts, as they contend with their own impossible fiscal decisions, are social and public service programs.

Banks have received their bailout. Automakers have received theirs. A new federal economic stimulus plan specifically for job creation is expected to be approved soon.

About the only group not asking are nonprofits, whose business it is to ask and who probably need to ask the most. “Nonprofit enterprises have 9.4 million employees and 4.7 million volunteers nationwide—together that’s 10 percent of the American work force, more than the auto and financial industries combined. Yet nonprofit groups have been almost completely overlooked during the economic debate,” wrote Bruce Reed and John Bridgeland in a January 23 New York Times op-ed.

“That’s a mistake,” Reed and Bridgeland added. Reed, president of the Democratic Leadership Council, was President Bill Clinton’s domestic policy adviser. Bridgeland held the same position under President George W. Bush and is the chief executive of a public policy firm.

While it is the nonprofit community that is being asked to pick up the slack, the funding is not keeping pace with the increase in demand, forcing many nonprofits to turn away clients, some of whom used to donate to those same organizations.

Aside from government funding, the economic crunch has shifted the focus of the philanthropy community as well, which will focus more of its giving this year on domestic programs, and will ask for greater accountability and stronger organizational capacity to show sustainability over the long term.

Although U.S. foundation giving for international purposes reached a record level in 2007 and 2008 is projected to be even stronger, according to the Foundation Center’s International Grantmaking report, more than four out of 10 foundations surveyed agreed that U.S. foundations are likely to turn their focus to domestic rather than international issues because of the declining economy.

Though in the report the Center points to confidence in international giving, the economic crisis is drawing attention from some foundations while others are tightening the purse strings to protect their assets.

In a separate report, the Foundation Center in January announced it has tracked nearly 50 foundations and corporations that have already announced more than $100 million in grants and program-related investments for efforts ranging from reducing the number of foreclosures to shoring up food banks and services for the homeless to providing financial counseling.

Here, then, we see that the new poor are indeed making an impact on sustainability programs both domestically and internationally. The focus has shifted as a result of the economy, reducing the pot of money for long-term solutions and forcing many nonprofits to re-evaluate how they do business just to survive.

That is not to say there is not help out there for nonprofit sustainability. Recently, one leader of a major foundation told more than 200 attendees of a roundtable discussion on nonprofit survivability that his organization is suspending traditional grant making in favor of capacity building initiatives among nonprofits to strengthen their core operations.

To ensure an equal focus on alleviating critical short-term needs and on long-term, sustainable solutions that advance the MDGs, nonprofits must capitalize on the core operating and capacity-building resources now being proffered in order to become better at:

• Raising the visibility of the nonprofit sector—particularly its role in serving those hardest hit by the global economic crisis;
• Investing in infrastructure that enhances our ability to deliver measurable and meaningful outcomes for increased accountability and impact;
• Collaborating more broadly and strategically, while showing how we each are distinct and needed; and
• Strengthening our united front through alliances and coalitions such as InterAction to advocate on behalf of nonprofits—both in terms of partnership with other sectors, as well as policy change on the issues so important to our work.

Working with organizations such as InterAction, and working together, we can achieve a greater presence to maintain and build upon our successes for lasting change.

It goes without saying that the attention on the global economy, from job losses to home foreclosures to budget cuts, is warranted. But as we realize the magnitude of the impact on us all as a society, we cannot ignore those who are always suffering despite the economy.

Doing so would be to undo what progress we have made. Doing so would be to abandon people in need. Doing so would be to allow people to die.

INMED Partnerships for Children is an international children’s nonprofit dedicated to ensuring that children have access to healthcare, education and safe communities from before they are born through adolescence to ensure a continuum of care for all generations.
With the onset of a worldwide economic downturn, organizations—for-profit and nonprofit alike—must face the realities of a marketplace where revenue/funding is diminished or under pressure, whether due to decreased sales, a slowdown in donations, smaller grants or contracts, or poor endowment investment performance.

Further, companies must adjust to a labor market that is in one sense flush with talent (because of extensive layoffs) but where the challenge to attract and retain key talent is still as difficult—if not more so—than ever because of the strains on resources available for compensation and benefits.

Importantly, a number of factors distinguish nonprofit from for-profit organizations and affect nonprofits’ actions concerning compensation and rewards in this environment. The most distinguishing characteristic of nonprofits is their mission-centric nature combined with their sense of obligation to continue to serve their constituencies. The need for the services that most nonprofits provide does not diminish in a recession; in fact, the need increases. To be able to meet those needs, it is my experience, borne out by data from two recent surveys conducted by ORC Worldwide, that not-for-profits are acting more flexibly and aggressively in taking action to strategically manage compensation and benefit costs than are for-profits.

In the quest to remain financially stable and to maintain their ability to meet program goals, nonprofit organizations have reviewed or are reviewing their projected budgets for 2009 and making changes in their reward programs, where necessary. Others are commissioning benchmarking to find out what their peers and competitors are doing, or conducting “flash surveys” to guide decisions about what actions they may yet take in 2009.

**Not-for-Profits respond to economic challenge**

In general, nonprofits are adopting an interesting variety of approaches tailored to their specific strategies and circumstances:

- Mandating widespread pay cuts in lieu of layoffs;
- Halting new hiring;
- Freezing salaries;
- Reducing increases;
- Granting furloughs without pay;
- Reorganizing/reviewing/restructuring existing compensation programs; and/or
- Revising their reward structures taking into account the decline in the value of their invested assets in funded benefit programs.

The aim of these nonprofits is to act responsibly by conserving their financial and human resources and retaining key staff and maintaining quality programs. Their goal is to implement early changes to avoid having to make drastic changes later in the event that the effects of the recession are long lasting.

Nonprofits may have greater capabilities than for-profits to take such

---

**Setting Policy for Compensation**

Not-for-profit and for-profit organizations are taking different approaches to the financial crisis.

BY CURTIS B. GRUND, VICE PRESIDENT, GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT SECTOR CONSULTING ORC WORLDWIDE
actions for a variety of reasons related to their organizational cultures and operating environments, including the following:

**Good stewardship.** Nonprofits are accustomed to operating as stewards of donated resources, and to being accountable for good stewardship to a range of constituencies such as the media, donors, watchdog groups, boards and beneficiaries.

**Financial accountability.** Increased government scrutiny regarding executive compensation (e.g., requirements under the Final Regulations implementing Section 4598 of the IRC Code relative to the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2, and more extensive reporting requirements for the annual IRS 990 form) have underscored the need for conservative, market-based pay decisions at the executive level and accountability for pay levels and related decision-making processes.

**Structured salary increases.** Nonprofit pay has risen at a somewhat higher rate than for-profit pay in recent years, meaning that reductions or slowed increases may be more easily received and implemented now than they might have been a few years ago. (A large, national survey that includes both not-for-profit and for-profit organizations shows that in a sampling of seven jobs from human resources assistant to CEO, from 2004—2008 pay increased 19.4 percent in the not-for-profit jobs as compared with 7.7 percent in the for-profit jobs.)

**Mission-focused staff.** Broadly speaking, employees in the nonprofit sector are accustomed to less-than-market pay and increases, and are attracted by the mission and working environment of the sector. These remain attractive elements of the employee “value proposition” even in the light of what might be a period of “flat” pay.

**Capturing trends**


---

**One nonprofit’s response:**

“The uncharted waters that this new global economy is presenting are causing us to continually assess our financial situation. The fact that it is so difficult to predict the future is causing us to be even more conservative in the actions that we take today. We potentially will be faced with taking a nontraditional approach to compensation and reserving our limited financial resources for our top performers.”

*Rosemary Abbott, Senior Director, Compensation and Benefits International Rescue Committee*
of funding resources, the average number of employees was 558, with the median at 350. The for-profit results come from a similar survey among approximately 300 U.S.-based firms in December 2008.

Program changes
The survey found that in those nonprofits implementing changes, the most common change (68 percent) is to restrict travel, and the second most common (39 percent) is putting a hiring freeze into effect. Profit-making companies also most commonly restrict travel (only 37 percent, however); but second most common is to restructure their merit increase budgets (33 percent).

Almost across the board, in terms of program change options, the results indicate that nonprofits are making changes either equally or more aggressively than for-profits. The only exception is in regard to adjustments to merit increase structures, where 33 percent of for-profits report reducing budgets (versus only 19 percent of not-for-profits). (Note: not-for-profits typically have much “flatter” merit increase budgets and so may start with less room for decrease.)

There is even greater contrast between for-profits and not-for-profits in their decisions about which programs are not being changed. The majority of for-profit companies are not freezing salaries (85 percent) or delaying effective dates of salary increases (83 percent), while nearly half of nonprofits are doing both.

Changes being considered
Not-for-profits are also more actively considering additional changes than for-profits. Adjusting or freezing salary structures are the two changes that the majority of nonprofits (50 percent for both) are considering (versus 25 percent and 17 percent, respectively among for-profits). The number one option for-profits are still considering is revision of their merit increase budget (26 percent), versus 46 percent of not-for-profits still considering this option. While a smaller percentage of nonprofits than for-profits are planning to reduce their merit increase budgets (15 percent versus 31 percent), the nonprofits are being more aggressive than for-profits (reducing budgets by an average of 1.7 percent versus 1.1 percent among for-profits).

Conclusion
Nonprofits, relative to their for-profit peers, seem to be positioning themselves as well as possible for long-term viability in an economic downturn, by:

• Reducing costs;
• Focusing on capability to achieve their ongoing mission and to engage key talent in pursuing the mission (rather than individual economic reward); and
• Maintaining credibility as good stewards of both donated funds and committed staff.

Questions and comments can be emailed to the author at curtis.grund@orcww.com.
A recent article by Caroleline Preston in The Chronicle of Philanthropy reported that, just like newspapers, college libraries and Wall Street investment firms, nonprofits are being forced to make heart-wrenching staff cuts. We’ve watched as clients have had to lay off staff and reduce, postpone or eliminate critical programs because of funding shortfalls. The timing is especially cruel since the people who benefit most from these services need them now more than ever.

Nonprofit leaders are being forced to ask themselves tough questions: How can an organization slashing budgets and cutting staff maintain a robust fundraising program? When individuals are struggling to pay bills, hold onto their homes and put their kids through college, why would they—why should they—keep up their charitable donations?

Despite the heartache and fear that inevitably accompany layoffs and program cuts, we are urging our clients to remember that strengthening online grassroots fundraising programs is doubly important in these times. There are three good reasons why this is true and why they need to remain hopeful.

First, although foundations and major donors are highly vulnerable to the whims of the market (and to the fallout from corrupt money managers like Bernard Madoff), low-dollar donors are unlikely to be as severely affected. Although some may have direct exposure to the market, they are rarely as dependent on market performance to provide immediate income. Online supporters, in particular, tend to be younger, more affluent and have less money tied up in retirement portfolios. And, as they see economic hardship spread across the globe, they may be more willing than ever to give a portion of their disposable income to an organization doing important work that they trust and identify with.

Second, online fundraising has always been extremely cost-effective. It costs far less to recruit new donors and raise money online than to do so through direct mail. Not that we discourage direct mail—our research shows that direct mail and online fundraising boost each other’s return rates. However, online fundraising enables nonprofits do more with less: less staff, less overhead, less investment in production, less time. In this tough economic environment, prudently investing in your online fundraising program might be the difference between being in the red or being in the black next fiscal year.

Third, a proactive approach might well be enough to stave off the recession. Consider our recent experience with an end-of-year online fundraising campaign for Oxfam America. In November 2008, the economy was in shambles and getting worse by the day, and the downturn was having a dramatic effect on Oxfam’s online fundraising results. By mid-month, it was clear that the organization’s early-bird end-of-year fundraising appeal was failing. The 2008 appeal was generating only half of 2007’s total, even though Oxfam’s audience, many of whom were loyal supporters, had grown by 50 percent.

Instead of panicking or giving in, we worked with Oxfam to answer the question that I suspect many readers are asking themselves today: What more can we do? A lot, as it turned out. By enhancing Oxfam’s approach through a few critical new elements, monitoring their results carefully, and making needed adjustments quickly, we were now is the time to strengthen online grassroots fundraising.

BY DONALD K. ROSS, CEO, M+R STRATEGIC SERVICES

For more on how to make the most of your online fundraising, see “Weak Economy, Strong Campaign” at http://www.mrss.com/oxfam-eoy-2008-fundraising.pdf (PDF).

To see how other nonprofits’ online giving is faring in this economy, check out http://www.mrss.com/m-r-online-fundraising-and-the-economy-article-amended-02-04-09.pdf (PDF).
It costs far less to recruit new donors and raise money online than to do so through direct mail.

Set a deadline and goal. Though it may seem simplistic, goals and deadlines are motivational to potential donors. They also offer a clear rationale for repeated requests to participate in a campaign. And some mild guilt-mongering can also help to make the case: “There’s not much time left to give, and we haven’t heard from you.”

Made a short, powerful online video. The video doesn’t have to be high-tech or cost a lot of money—our video for Oxfam was simple text animation with powerful music. Embed it in donation pages, and if it moves people emotionally, they will donate in higher numbers.

Capitalized on web traffic. A “lightbox” popped up above the Oxfam homepage with an end-of-year giving promotion during the month of December. The lightbox featured strong text, a thermometer graphic and a mini-form where donors chose their desired contribution amount before clicking “submit” and landing on the donation page. This element helped to maximize the conversion of web visitors to donors.

If we have learned anything from President Obama’s election, it is that people want to be part of the solution, but they need to be asked in the right ways. In an economy that shows no sign of improving in the near future, nonprofits have even more reason to invest in a grassroots marketing program—a cost-effective stream of support that is less vulnerable to the ups and downs of the economy. Nonprofits that can make the most of this resource may find themselves beating the odds and doing better, if not well, in difficult times.

For questions and comments, you can reach the author at dkross@donaldkross.net.

FUNDRAISING

able to increase end-of-year online giving by almost $200,000 over the 2007 total, bringing in over 3,500 more donations, and beating our goals set before the recession hit.

These results demonstrate that small adjustments in strategy and tactics can make a big difference in this economy.

Here’s what worked for Oxfam:

Focused on one distinct problem. Instead of asking supporters to give to Oxfam America because it is a great organization (although true), we got much more specific. We asked supporters to give in order to help solve one problem—that 100 million more people went hungry in 2008. And we gave it a name: the Global Hunger Epidemic.

Ignored the elephant in the room. We tested two versions of an email appeal. One mentioned the fiscal crisis as an important reason that Oxfam’s programs needed support. The other made no mention of the crisis. The latter outperformed the former substantially (though we would encourage organizations to test this on their own lists).
NGOs are increasingly put under a microscope regarding their financial data and accountability. As ratings of NGOs proliferate, an increasing number of funders look to business models to evaluate NGO efficiency and effectiveness, which tend to emphasize relative program spending instead of organizational impact. A few prominent observers of the NGO sector have challenged this shift, following Michael Edwards’ Just Another Emperor in which he warns against a growing influence of market principles in the not-for-profit sector. Based on a comprehensive interview study of international NGOs, we argue that the not-for-profit sector needs to raise its collective voice in developing an impact-driven understanding of their activities, or else succumb to the pitfalls of financially-oriented evaluation systems.

While self-appointed rating agencies defend the adoption of financial metrics as a mechanism for improving NGO effectiveness, the results of our study suggest a broad agreement among NGO leaders that rejects a single-minded focus on output defined as relative program spending. This study is one of the first to offer evidence based on a representative sample of U.S.-based international NGOs. The selection criteria of this study ensured the inclusion of NGOs across five major areas of activities (human rights, humanitarian relief, conflict resolution, sustainable development and environmental protection) as well as variation in size, efficiency and geographic location.

There are four major reasons to question the increasing use of financial metrics as a way of evaluating NGOs and increasing their effectiveness. First, such a business-driven framework equates the role of donors with shareholders and the role of NGO leaders with company executives. This view underestimates the importance of the mission and of other stakeholders in NGOs’ daily activities. In our study, NGO leaders felt accountable not only to their donors, but also to their boards, beneficiaries, partners, staff and organizational missions. Effectively translating the demands of local communities into fundable programs is a core goal of many NGOs and such programmatic success is poorly reflected in financial ratings focused solely on the ratio between program spending and other expenses. Increasing impact in a multi-stakeholder environment means effectively participat-
InterAction’s 7th ANNUAL PHOTO CONTEST

Each year, InterAction’s photography contest focuses on the incredible work done by our members in the field. The amazing images we receive help us to raise awareness of our members’ efforts and to introduce the American public to the lives we help to transform throughout the world.

As InterAction celebrates its 25th anniversary, we are seeking submissions that capture the impact our community has made during the past quarter century.

We encourage you to capture the essence of innovative, effective, and inspiring programs (or program recipients) by sending us provocative pictures that offer a glimpse into NGO activities in international relief and development. All images should be of work in the field, outside the U.S.

Entries are limited to 3 photos per person. Submissions will be judged by an independent panel of professional photographers and media experts.

One Grand Prize Winner will receive round-trip airfare to Washington, DC (flights originating in the U.S. only), where they will receive their award at the Gala Banquet of InterAction’s 2009 Forum (July 6-9). The winner will also receive a complimentary one-year subscription to Monday Developments Magazine and one free half-page advertisement. The Grand Prize Winner’s photograph will also run as the cover of the special Forum recap issue of Monday Developments.

Five Outstanding Winners will receive a complimentary copy of an InterAction publication of their choice, as well as a quarter-page advertisement in Monday Developments. All winning photographs will be displayed throughout the special Forum recap issue of Monday Developments, in addition to an online gallery at www.interaction.org.

- Submit online: www.interaction.org/media
- Submit up to three photographs
- DEADLINE: April 30, 2009
Because charitable giving often tracks the economy and media attention to public issues, NGOs should adjust fundraising efforts from year to year in response to volatility in the donor environment.

...ing program costs, but the former makes a lot more sense. Respondents in our study agreed. We asked NGO leaders how they defined the concept of effectiveness, and respondents overwhelmingly reported that being effective involved evaluation and achieving organizational goals. Managing financial resources was a distant third.

Third, it is not always prudent for an organization to spend 75 to 80 percent of its budget on programs. If an NGO is trying to maximize long-term sustainable impact, not just short-term program costs, then it makes sense to reallocate funds from programs to fundraising when donors are more generous and to reduce fundraising expenditures when donors are less forthcoming. Because charitable giving often tracks the economy and media attention to public issues, NGOs should adjust fundraising efforts from year to year in response to volatility in the donor environment. This, of course, should not be taken to either extreme, which suggests that building organizational endowments, or at least stabilization funds, offers a still vastly underutilized strategy for NGOs weathering turbulent financial cycles.

Finally, while a strong emphasis on program spending may be appropriate for larger and more mature organizations, it unfairly punishes smaller, growth-oriented organizations seeking to expand their capabilities. The focus on financial efficiency may limit the ability of NGOs to pursue growth strategies as a part of their efforts to create sustainable impact. As Alnoor Ebrahim explained in a November 2005 article in *Monday Developments*, “In instances of myopic accountability, where donor demands for information are satisfied at the expense of attention to longer-term processes of organizational learning, ‘too much’ accountability can hinder NGOs in achieving their missions.” The issue here is not just that too much time may be spent on satisfying reporting requirements, but that these demands shape how NGOs choose programs and define their missions. If NGOs are punished for investing in organizational growth, they are less likely to take on challenging causes and their long-term sustainability and learning will suffer.

Although most NGOs understand better than ever that sustainable impact requires long-term engagement based on building effective partnerships and coalitions, they have yet to find a common response to external pressures reducing effectiveness and impact to output measures. For individual organizations it may be rational to adapt to changing circumstances, but this may leave the sector weakened overall. Ironically, larger organizations with more resources to lead a collective response to those pressures are also likely to have the least incentives to do so because their economies of scale already secure favorable ratings on financial metrics. One solution to this dilemma is using umbrella organizations such as InterAction to develop a shared framework for defining impact related to qualitative goals such as local empowerment, capacity-building, and the effective exercise of rights claims. Without such an alternative system, individual and institutional donors will continue to flock to websites directing them to organizations with high relative program spending, but not necessarily a maximum of impact.

To receive additional information on this research, please contact George E. Mitchell (gemitche@maxwell.syr.edu) or Hans Peter Schmitz (hpschmit@maxwell.syr.edu).
RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT organizations often confront the conundrum of the “relief to development gap” when a disaster hits an area where development activities were being undertaken: relief assistance costs more than development assistance, and development programs are difficult to start up again after costly relief work is over. As development and relief organizations learn more about the increase in the severity and frequency of rainfalls, floods, droughts and heat waves (which will, according to experts, impact the poorest populations in the world the most), we have to ask how to better prepare communities to survive, return to their lives and livelihoods more quickly, and lessen the impact of predictable hardships.

A drought in Ethiopia in 2008 led Christian Children’s Fund (CCF) to initiate a small program in two areas that attempted to save lives during the drought, and then aimed to shorten the time these communities needed to regain some sense of normalcy immediately afterwards.

The two districts were enduring a year of no rain, and, as a result, had two failed harvests. Many of the poorest families in these communities were unable to keep their children from becoming malnourished. The year-long drought eventually claimed the lives of more than a hundred of their children. Over the summer, local stocks of grain had already been consumed or sold, and because of the lack of rain, thousands of livestock also perished.

While the initial response was a traditional package of nutritional feeding programs for children and some emergency food handed out to the most vulnerable families, the communities started to ask larger picture questions related to how they could better prepare for such disasters in future.

Thanks to sister ChildFund Alliance members that funded the emergency response, the initial emergency food aid program was able to quickly shift to address the longer-term goals of a transitional program. CCF-Ethiopia adapted its efforts so that it could assist community members in both recovering their livelihoods and reducing their risk in the event of another drought. In 2006, the organization had worked in a few communities in Ethiopia on water harvesting and on fostering a culture of saving, but conditions and sense of urgency felt in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 drought created a unique opportunity to reinforce the importance of working together as a community to literally ensure the survival of their children.

After a successful harvest in November 2008, community members were eager to get together to plan ways to strengthen their survival skills to prevent the effects of future droughts and recover more quickly from the current one. One farmer told staff, “This area is repeatedly affected by drought. Out of projects CCF has done, the cistern is the best.” (A water cistern provides catchment and storage for rainwater, and the organization had contributed to an in-ground cistern building program during better times.)

The child well-being committees that the communities formed as part of their efforts, confirmed what this farmer told.
Many of the poorest families were unable to keep their children from becoming malnourished. The year-long drought eventually claimed the lives of more than a hundred of their children.
IN THE MIDST OF THE FINANCIAL crisis and the resulting global economic slowdown, the new U.S. Administration faces a host of global challenges such as the energy and food crises, climate change, global health emergencies, and security threats. These crises threaten to wipe away much of the progress made in developing counties toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), a framework agreed upon by world leaders in 2000 that commits rich and poor countries to end poverty, improve health and education, protect the environment and create a global partnership for development by 2015.

For the moment—at least verbally—governments remain committed, and the Obama Administration has voiced strong support for the goals. However, in light of dwindling resources and economic woes at home, domestic support for pro-MDG programs might wane, encouraging the Administration and Congress to pass smaller budgets, engage in protectionist trade policies, and focus on domestic issues or narrowly defined national security programs. Reduced demand for exports, tightened credit, less investment, and fewer remittances, all point to slowed or negative global growth; a deadly prognosis for achieving the MDGs.

In spite of these challenges, or perhaps because of them, the United States has an unprecedented opportunity to truly enact global solutions to global challenges, to build domestic support to end global poverty, and to lead by example by employing a new approach to international cooperation. The election of Barack Obama and the likelihood of policy reforms, a reinvigorated and determined civil society, and the positive return of the United States to the global stage provide a favorable platform to achieve the goal of improving U.S. policy toward the MDGs. Recognizing that it is in our moral, economic and security interests to encourage a world that is healthy, stable and prosperous, the U.S. can and should embrace the MDGs.

The MDGs, with its target date of 2015,
are unique for a variety of reasons.

• The Millennium Development Goals are people-focused, time-bound and measurable;
• Are based on a global partnership, stressing the responsibilities of developing countries to improve governance, reform policies and focus on development priorities. Developed countries would support these efforts by delivering more and more effective aid, faster and deeper debt relief, and fairer trade rules;
• Have unprecedented political support, embraced at the highest levels by developed and developing countries, civil society, the private sector, and major development institutions alike;
• Are not only goals, but also represent a movement; and
• Finally, and despite the increasing challenges, they are achievable.

The MDGs provide an excellent frame of reference to understand the achievements and challenges of development. Since the 2000 Millennium Summit, progress has been made—HIV/AIDS deaths have reduced by one million, school-enrolment increased by 40 million, and some 1.6 billion people now have access to safe drinking-water. Still, debilitating poverty persists: more than 1.4 billion people barely survive on $1.25 a day, 50 million people die each day of preventable causes, half the population of the developing world lacks access to decent sanitation, and more than half a million women die each year from treatable and preventable complications of pregnancy and childbirth.

The role of the United States in meeting the MDGs globally is critical and a renewed effort by the Obama Administration could not be timelier. The U.S. government should be congratulated for increasing assistance in recent years through the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and Malaria Initiative.

However, to some degree these bilateral programs have been financed at the expense of core development programs and are not well coordinated with international efforts. In volume, the U.S. is the world’s largest bilateral donor, but ranks near last among developed countries when taken in per capita GDP. It can play a more critical role in the area of official development assistance (ODA) by increasing poverty-focused foreign assistance in its 2010 fiscal year by at least $4 billion, and taking the first step toward keeping President Obama’s pledge to double assistance to $50 billion by 2012. At the same time the U.S. should improve its aid quality by reducing the amount of aid actually spent at home and coordinating better with other donors. The United States has been a leader in efforts to cancel 100 percent of debt owed by heavily indebted poor countries to major financial institutions. However trade subsidies (in particular agriculture) and the failure to... continued on page 34
WHAT WOULD YOU DO?
You are organizing a distribution of relief items for a village that is recovering from an earthquake. You discover that the majority of the casualties are women. Although household duties and child care are traditionally roles for women, single males are now struggling to care for their families. It is these men that are trying to respond to your assessment of what supplies are urgently needed for these households.

You are working in a conflict zone where you are in charge of organizing food distribution. You discover that only male leaders from the community show up for meetings since men and women do not congregate together in this culture and the announcements about meeting times were only relayed through your male staff members.

Your team is working with women on early recovery health issues in a community and you learn that many girls were sexually assaulted during the conflict. Although you are trying to respond to their health needs, you discover that the adult women are unwilling to discuss the trauma of their young girls due to the social stigma associated with rape and sexual contact outside of marriage.

Why should you care about gender?
“It is more dangerous to be a woman than to be a soldier right now in Eastern DRC.”

Major General Patrick Cammaert, former Deputy Force Commander of MONUC

What is your vision for excellence in the delivery of humanitarian assistance? Does that standard include serving all individuals equally or in proportion to their unique needs?

Aid work has been criticized for conforming to three misguided presumptions: “all aid is good, one size fits all, and we know what’s best.”

Physical survival is regarded as a humanitarian imperative and all other concerns are relegated to a subordinate status. The implication is that if precious time and resources were diverted to less immediate tasks—like determining the gender profile of a community—more people would die. These assumptions and certain paternalistic attitudes common in the field, mean that gender-sensitivity is often treated as a lower-tier priority or a luxury.

Yet in the majority of today’s protracted conflict situations, people are not dying at unusually high rates. Despite the folklore of our work, these crises are more often not life or death situations. Rather, the predominant experience of war-affected communities is a hopeless misunderstanding of their unique needs by their service providers. And the failure to grasp and address the reality can have unfortunate effects on women, girls, boys, and men.

Yet gender structures are a part of all communities and understanding the existing structure is vital to effective aid delivery. In disaster or conflict situations, new gender issues often emerge and can have a tremendous impact on...
Partnerships for Change
By Chelsea Cooper, Participatory Communication Program Coordinator, and Leora Ward, GBV Global Coordinator, American Refugee Committee

Too often in humanitarian settings, international organizations working on gender-based violence (GBV) operate without a vision for increasing local capacity, building partnerships, and providing opportunities for communities to guide and sustain programming. With many countries dealing with protracted emergencies and the complexities of transitioning from emergency relief to a longer-term recovery setting, partnerships with local organizations must become a higher priority in humanitarian efforts.

The American Refugee Committee (ARC) has implemented two projects in conflict-affected countries that have demonstrated how services can be transitioned to local partners using appropriate tools and techniques. In September 2008, ARC completed the first year of the GBV Local Partnership Project, a State Department, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration-funded pilot project to implement sustainable, community-driven GBV response in six countries. ARC GBV staff identified and worked with local organizations to increase their organizational and technical capacity by combining training, evaluation, networking and small amounts of funding. The project uses tools to measure a baseline and charts both organizational and technical growth, thus allowing skills and funds to filter back to local efforts.

Complementing this project is a grant from USAID’s Office of Women in Development to implement Through Our Eyes, a project addressing GBV and harmful traditional practices (HTP) within communities in five countries. The objective is to amplify voices for change from within communities through participatory communication technology. With the long-term goal of strengthening the ability of communities to prevent GBV and HTP through targeted behavior change strategies, ARC provides video production training and mentoring to local groups to produce videos that are screened in small and focused playback sessions. These playback sessions allow for open discussions of issues and possible solutions to violence that may not otherwise be addressed.

Building partnerships with local organizations will enable them to be more active in GBV interventions from the early stages and to continue that work well into the future. In order to promote smoother transitions from relief to development settings, it is important to design and implement programs that are most responsive to local needs and driven by communities to ensure that survivors of GBV are receiving appropriate and sustainable care and support.

Adapt and act: Putting gender in your work

In order to be effective in humanitarian work, we have to be alert to various social and cultural environments and to understand that spending time on this is a necessity not a luxury for effective aid delivery. We must be committed to the goal of reaching all of the population in need, and that means becoming rapidly aware of the different needs of women, boys, girls, and men. That is what it means to put gender in humanitarian action.

As we all know too well, crisis means we don’t always have time to brief up on every nuance of a community’s structure before we deploy. So it is crucial to adopt simple methods of gender sensitivity as we plan everything from outreach and mobilization to staffing structure before we deploy.

Help is on the way!

The IASC Gender Sub Working Group, in collaboration with InterAction, is finalizing an interactive E-Learning course to help UN and NGO staff mainstream gender into their work.

Based on the IASC Gender Handbook, this online course will provide practical approaches to each specific sector and ensure that aid beneficiaries participate in humanitarian programming at all levels.

The online course (or DVD version) will provide an active learning situation with high-impact and visually interesting scenarios. The course gives immediate feedback and even prints out a certificate upon completion. And it will be widely available in July 2009. Participate in two special events on gender and humanitarian response at InterAction’s Annual Forum in Washington DC, and you will be able to learn more about this exciting course!
Imagine you have just been deployed to the country of Hatuk in which massive flooding has affected thousands of people. How do you respond?

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Sub Working Group on Gender and Humanitarian Action, spearheaded by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and in collaboration with InterAction, is developing an e-learning course to help humanitarian workers place themselves in a virtual emergency that teaches you how to effectively mainstream gender strategies into humanitarian action. In this e-learning course, the learner is positioned in the role of a humanitarian worker dispatched to Hatuk, a fictitious emergency/crisis site in need of immediate response. The learner receives a briefing on the situation, and then begins to encounter virtual characters and interactive situations to respond to and learn from.

The certificate-based e-course will provide illustrative examples to help humanitarian workers learn how to develop programming that ensures the needs and capacities of women, girls, boys and men are met in humanitarian situations.

The IASC Gender E-learning Initiative is co-chaired by the International Rescue Committee and the World Health Organization. It is composed of an Advisory Committee and a dedicated group of technical focal points from a wide variety of humanitarian agencies. InterAction members serving on the Advisory Committee include the American Red Cross, the American Refugee Committee, CARE, Christian Children’s Fund, International Medical Corps, the International Rescue Committee, Relief International, and Winrock International.

This course can be used as training for an individual or presented in a “Learn-in-a-Group” setting. With printable job aids and online resources, the course can also be used as an in-the-field, on-the-job resource. The course will be available for free online and on DVD in July 2009.

For more information on this course, contact Julie Montgomery, jmontgom@interaction.org

**New from Kumarian Press**

**Freedom from Want**

*The Remarkable Success Story of BRAC, the Global Grassroots Organization That’s Winning the Fight Against Poverty*

*Paper, $24.95*

“Ian Smillie insightfully chronicles the work of BRAC and its founder, Fazle Hasan Abed, whom I was proud to present with a Clinton Global Citizen Award. BRAC’s enormous contributions to health, education, and economic development have improved the lives of over 100 million people across the globe. Dr. Abed’s story proves just how much people with vision and commitment can change the world.”

—BILL CLINTON, Former President of the United States of America

**Rights-Based Approaches to Development**

*Exploring the Potential and Pitfalls*

*Edited by Sam Hickey and Diana Mitlin*

*Paper, $27.50*

Rights-Based Approaches to Development reflects on the effect of the development community’s major shift in focus from market-based frameworks to a rights-based one. Contributors, both academics and practitioners, reflect on their experience with rights-based development activities. They draw out the current debates, theoretical and practical concerns and achievements, and larger implications about poverty and the relationship between citizens and the state. With powerful insights into where the development community has been and where it needs to go, Rights-Based Approaches to Development is critical to understanding the role of social justice in the context of development.
Neglected Emergencies

Tactics to hook the media on your story.

By Margaret Christoph, Senior Administrative Associate for Policy & Communications, Interaction, and Tawana Jacobs, Senior Public Relations Manager, Interaction

Humanitarian and development organizations face a number of obstacles when trying to interest media in stories about humanitarian crises that have fallen off the front pages of newspapers and out of broadcast news. Time constraints on typically overstretched communications staff, along with limited budgets and staffing resources often mean that program staff without formal communications training are frequently called upon to “pinch hit” as professional communicators and vie for difficult-to-secure media coverage. To assist organizations facing this challenge, InterAction and Reuters’ AlertNet News Wire cosponsored a training session in February on “Neglected Emergencies.”

Well attended by communications, fundraising, policy and program staff from various organizations, the event started with panel of journalists sharing their expertise and offering feedback on sample media pitches. Reuters Editor Howard Goller, Burness Communications Vice President and former Boston Globe journalist John Donnelly, and The Kojo Nnamdi Show producer Tara Boyle gave detailed feedback to the three agencies pitching story ideas.

As a community, NGO staff without extensive communications experience sometimes develop almost tunnel vision around their work and try to sell generic press releases distributed broadly in the hopes of getting a “bite” from some media source. The panel emphasized the need to combat this tendency by crafting something more carefully targeted to a specific audience. In other words, know who you are pitching it to. The media hook for your story should differ if you are pitching a story idea to a national newspaper, a specialty magazine, television, a radio show, a Web news vehicle (blog) or a local news outlet. Journalists are feeling the economic downturn just as much as everyone else and are now often covering more than one subject. People pitching journalists now have to work even harder to get their idea accepted.

In the second part of the workshop attendees divided into smaller groups. Each had around half an hour to review a different scenario or story idea and draft a pitch, with particular attention to the issues of audience, type of media outlet, and strength of the media hook. The groups then shared their work and offered suggestions to each other. In the final segment of the day participants joined one of three groups to discuss thorny ethical issues (such as using celebrities or paying for journalists to go on trips), original content and new media, and the particular challenges encountered by faith-based organizations.

The crux of the workshop boiled down to what we all know: the current economic crisis has affected everyone, including the media. Humanitarian and development organizations will have to work harder than ever to convince journalists that news stories about the world’s poorest and most vulnerable deserve coverage, especially at a time when everyone is worrying about their own survival.

If you have any questions, please contact Margaret Christoph at mchristoph@interaction.org. A tip sheet on Finding Your Story from the event is available at http://members.alertnet.org/thefacts/imagerpository/TIPSHEETScenarios.pdf.
Updated numbers still indicate the G8 is failing to meet its commitments.

BY JOSH LOZMAN, DEPUTY POLICY DIRECTOR, ONE, AND ERIN THORNTON, GLOBAL POLICY DIRECTOR, ONE

In June 2008, ONE released the 2008 DATA Report to monitor progress on keeping the promises that the G8 countries made to sub-Saharan Africa back in 2005 at their meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland. The DATA Report is published in June each year to make the data available before the G8 Summit that usually happens in early July. Although this helps us achieve maximum impact with the report, there is a disadvantage. The OECD’s DAC (Development Assistance Committee), which collects the data from governments, publishes only preliminary figures in April; we don’t get the final, and more thoroughly reviewed data, until December. This year’s final review uncovered some significant differences in country progress on official development assistance (ODA) to sub-Saharan Africa. This article updates figures from the DATA Report and from an earlier MONDAY DEVELOPMENTS article published last summer.

The final figures reveal that in total, donors provided $83.05 billion in development assistance in 2007, of which $27.5 billion (33.1 percent) was directed to sub-Saharan Africa. The preliminary data released in April revealed a collective G7+ increase of $837 million for sub-Saharan Africa from G7 donors between 2006 and 2007. When totaled with previous annual increases, this resulted in a total G7 increase in ODA for sub-Saharan Africa of $3.04 billion since 2004; this meant that the G7 had delivered 13.7 percent of the total increase to which it has committed itself. However, the finalized data reveal that the 2006-2007 increase was slightly higher at $1.04 billion; thus the three-year cumulative total increase was $3.16 billion. This total represents 14.5 percent of the total increase committed, slightly better than preliminary estimates showed, but still far off the track needed to deliver the full amount by 2010.

The small net G7 change between the preliminary and final figure of $29 million masks more significant country-by-country fluctuations. Reductions in the final figures for Japan and the United Kingdom were tempered by higher final figures from France, the United States, and small increases from the other G7 donors. The 2008 DATA Report, using the preliminary data available at the time it was written, reported that Japan had met its rather weak commitment to double bilateral ODA by 2007. However, Japan’s 2007 final figures for ODA to sub-Saharan Africa were $495 million less than preliminary estimates. Final figures for the UK declined $70 million from preliminary figures. Despite this, the UK has still delivered a higher percentage of its commitment than has any other G7 donor (excluding Japan whose commitment was limited to bilateral ODA) and ONE’s pipeline projections continue to predict that the UK will meet its commitment to Africa.

Final figures for France showed that its ODA to sub-Saharan Africa was in fact $442 million more than the preliminary figures reported, with substantial increases in both bilateral and multilateral assistance. The 2008 DATA Report reported that France had delivered 6.7 percent of its Gleneagles commitment. The new figures raise that significantly to 15.6 percent, but still leaves France far off track to reach its commitment in full by 2010. The United States’ ODA increased to sub-Saharan Africa by $122 million more than preliminary numbers showed, bringing the overall increase between 2006 and 2007 to $556 million.

The other G7 donors (Canada, Germany, and Italy) posted changes in ODA to sub-Saharan Africa of less than $60 million between the preliminary and final figures. Assuming the timeline remains similar to past years, the DAC will release preliminary figures for 2008 ODA in late March or early April. ONE will publish its 2009 DATA Report in June 2009 to report on progress towards the G8 commitments for total ODA to sub-Saharan Africa and for specific sectors (health, education, water, trade, and debt).

If you want to read more background on the G8 commitments, the methodology behind the calculation of these numbers and the sectoral commitments, the full DATA Report is available at www. one.org/report.

*Though the G8 meet together, ONE does not hold Russia accountable to the promise to double ODA to sub-Saharan Africa by 2010. Therefore, progress towards the ODA commitments is reported as G7 totals.
The Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness

Recent developments mean enhanced opportunities to weigh in on the global debate on aid effectiveness.

BY SYLVAIN BROWA, DIRECTOR OF GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, INTERACTION

THE SCOPE OF THE AID EFFECTIVENESS debate has expanded significantly since the Accra High Level Forum-III (HLF-III), thanks to the efforts of the now-dissolved Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness, and the Better Aid Platform, a network of civil society organizations (CSOs) under the leadership of the CSO International Steering Group (ISG). These efforts consolidated CSOs’ voices in the debate and subsequently helped achieve the broader perspectives on aid effectiveness reflected in the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA), the outcome document of the HLF-III. As a result of the recommendations in the AAA and in particular paragraph #20, CSOs now have two concurrent lines of separate but complementary work around the aid effectiveness agenda:

• A policy and advocacy process led by the Better Aid Platform to ensure a CSO voice in the implementation of the AAA as well as discussions in the lead-up to the fourth High-Level Forum on aid effectiveness in 2011. In order to facilitate this, CSOs have been granted full membership in the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) of the OECD-DAC (Development Assistance Committee).
• The Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness led by the Global Facilitation Group to define and promote a development effectiveness framework for CSOs. This process will involve dialogue with donors, governments and other development stakeholders because they shape the environment that fosters or constrains the ability of CSOs to reach their full potential as development actors in their own right.

The Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness is an open and inclusive process, owned and managed by CSOs around the world. The proposal to launch an independent CSO-driven process for establishing principles and tools to frame and promote their effectiveness was made during the International Forum on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness in Ottawa in February 2008. In June 2008, the agreement to launch this process was reached in a meeting of over 70 representatives from networks, platforms and individual CSOs from around the world in Paris. A Global Facilitation Group (GFG) was subsequently formed, composed of 25 mandated representatives to provide leadership, oversight, and visibility to the Open Forum.

A consortium of support organizations—referred to as the Consortium—composed of six organizations is charged with designing, implementing and/or coordinating the key activities of the Open Forum, in addition to raising and managing the necessary resources. The Consortium is composed of:

• AACC (All African Conference of Churches);
• ALOP (Asociación Latino-Americana de Organizaciones de Promoción al Desarrollo);
• APRN (Asia Pacific Research Network);
• CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation);
• CONCORD (European NGO Confederation for Relief and Development);
• InterAction (American Council for Voluntary International Action)

The Open Forum’s three-year workplan (2009-2011) was finalized at the last GFG meeting in Kuala Lumpur in January. It consists of a series of consultations at the country, regional and international level to develop a framework of effectiveness as illustrated in the following chart.

Critical Elements of Development Effectiveness for CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework: CSO Development Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 principles capturing CSO’s development vision, programmatic approaches, relationships, and impact of actions (including outputs/outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To focus on both the objective (good development) and the actors (CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To integrate human rights, gender equality, and environmental sustainability—the three pillars of any sustainable development undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 dynamic indicators per principle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance on Applications (guidelines)

- self assessment, peer review
- integration into existing NGO platform standards and codes
- third party independent assessment, donor evaluation, and other similar measures

Critical Elements of an Enabling Environment for CSO effectiveness (minimum enabling standards)

- government regulations and engagement in developed and developing countries
- donor funding models and engagement in developed and developing countries
- North/South CSO relationships

More information on the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness can be found at www.cso-effectiveness.org.
**MARCH**

26-Mar  
**OFTA/PRM/InterAction Monthly Meeting**  
National Press Club 7th Floor  
Washington, DC  
Contact: ebellardo@interaction.org

27-Mar  
**Gender, Politics and Poverty**  
John's Hopkins SAIS  
Washington, DC  
RSVP: 202.663.5943 or developmentroundtable@jhu.edu.

27-Mar  
**Global Playground—A Night Under the Stars: Celebrating a New School in Cambodia and a Library in Thailand**  
The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
Washington, DC  
www.theglobalplayground.org

27-Mar  
**OCHA/InterAction Monthly Meeting**  
UN Secretariat Building  
New York, NY  
Contact: lpoteat@interaction.org

30-Mar  
**New Member Orientation**  
InterAction Offices  
Washington, DC  
Contact: dheiberg@interaction.org

30-Mar  
**Russian State Corporations: A Stabilizing Economic Force or a Drag on Growth?**  
6th Floor Conference Room, Woodrow Wilson Center, at the Ronald Reagan Building  
Washington, DC  
www.wilsoncenter.org

31-Mar  
**Inaugural UNDP-USA Leadership Award Ceremony and Reception**  
Meridian International Center  
Washington DC  
RSVP: www.leadershipawards.org

**APRIL**

1-2-Apr  
**Conflict Resolution Policy Days, Alliance for Peacebuilding and 3D Security**  
The Charles Stewart Mott House  
Washington, DC  
Contact: eric@3dsecurity.org

02-Apr  
**The London Summit 2009—G20**  
London, UK  
http://www.londonsummit.gov.uk/en/

02-Apr  
**Evaluation and Program Effectiveness Working Group (EPEWG) Virtual Meeting**  
RSVP: hnalven@interaction.org

02-Apr  
**Yugoslavia: Oblique Insights and Observations**  
5th Floor Conference Room, Woodrow Wilson Center, at the Ronald Reagan Building  
Washington, DC  
www.wilsoncenter.org

07-Apr  
**World Health Day**

08-Apr  
**The Cuba Wars: The Future of United States-Cuba Relations After Fidel**  
John's Hopkins SAIS  
Washington, DC  
RSVP: 202.663.5734 or jzurek@jhu.edu.

22-Apr  
**Earth Day**

22-24-Apr  
**The Global Philanthropy Forum**  
Washington, DC  
www.philanthropyforum.org

24-Apr  
**OCHA/InterAction Monthly Meeting**  
UN Secretariat Building  
New York, NY  
Contact: lpoteat@interaction.org

25-26-Apr  
**World Bank Spring Meeting**  
Washington, DC  
www.worldbank.org

28-30-Apr  
**Humanitarian Pandemic Preparedness Conference (East Africa Region)**  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Contact: gpappas@interaction.org

30-Apr  
**OFTA/PRM/InterAction Monthly Meeting**  
National Press Club 7th Floor  
Washington, DC  
Contact: ebellardo@interaction.org

**MAY**

4-6-May  
**Ethiopian Community Development Council's 15th National Conference on African Refugees and Immigrants**  
Holiday Inn Ballston  
Arlington, VA  
www.ecdc-cari.org/events.asp

07-May  
**Refugee's International 30th Anniversary Dinner**  
The Embassy of Italy  
Washington, DC  
Contact: (202) 828-0110 ext. 227  
www.refugeesinternational.org/anniversary-dinner

18-May  
**Congress's Role in Foreign Policymaking**  
5th Floor Conference Room, Woodrow Wilson Center, at the Ronald Reagan Building  
Washington, DC  
www.wilsoncenter.org

**JULY**

6-9-July  
**InterAction Annual Forum: 25th Anniversary**  
Crystal Gateway Marriott, Crystal City, VA  
Contact: Sivaram Ramachandran  
sramachandran@interaction.org

---

Promote your upcoming events!  
Send event details to:  
publications@interaction.org
to complete the development trade round, remain the largest implementation gap in MDG Goal 8, the global partnership for development. Opening up global markets to the exports of poor producers in developing countries has exponential effects by generating jobs and income for the poor, while providing poor countries with resources to finance poverty programs and reduce aid dependency. Although fair trade might be the most difficult commitment to achieve, it doesn’t have to cost much. Indeed, a review of public spending would find that such wasteful agricultural policies generally subsidize the richest farmers at the expense of poor farmers everywhere.

So what needs to change to help make this happen? The U.S. international development community remains vertically aligned on single issues (a reflection of U.S. foreign assistance); the MDGs could unify groups dealing with related issues and working towards connected ideals. One way to do this is to embark on a major initiative to build a constituency of people who care about the MDGs and develop common messaging and advocacy. Such a group would strengthen bonds between diverse groups including environment, trade and development organizations, and engage constituencies outside the Beltway, particularly among youth groups, faith organizations, and the private sector to fuel the growing global anti-poverty movement.

The effects of the global food, fuel, financial and climate crises provide a strong rallying cry for the MDGs. We have a unique opportunity for bold action that could draw on success stories, best practices, new partnerships, and harness high-level engagement in an effort to build the political will to actually make the Millennium Development Goals, America’s goals.

Specific asks to achieve that goal:
1. 100 percent debt cancellation for HIPC and other poor countries.
2. Do not impose harmful economic conditions as part of the cancellation agreements.
3. Do not decrease official development assistance when canceling debt
4. Use the sale of some of the International Monetary Fund’s extensive gold reserves to reimburse the Fund for its their costs related to debt cancelation.

Part three of this series will address power analysis and will appear in the May edition of Monday Developments.
SENIOR HEALTH ADVISOR
Portland, Oregon
Medical Teams International, a nonprofit Christian Relief and Development Organization is seeking a senior level Health Advisor who will be responsible for guiding, managing, representing and facilitating the program development. The portfolio covers four regions and disaster response collaboration and includes private and public donor funded projects. This person liaises directly with institutional donors and supervises the HQ Child Survival Specialist and Regional Health Advisors in Asia and E. Africa. Candidate must have MPH with strong health international program experience. MD, RN or PA highly preferred with five years experience in health program management of large programs. Proven experience with Child Survival and emergency health programming a plus. Strong skills in designing, monitoring and evaluating health interventions in the field and in a HQ advisory position.
To submit an application or for a full job description visit our website at www.medicalteams.org

WASHINGTON UPDATE
continued from page 9

New Legislation
On, February 13, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, introduced H.R. 1062, which is an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It would establish and implement a system to ensure that no U.S. foreign assistance inadvertently supports terrorist organizations. InterAction and its members, like Congress and USAID, have long been committed to ensuring that no foreign assistance resources are diverted to terrorists or terrorist organizations, and already have strong systems in place to ensure that funds are not misappropriated. InterAction members would likely be deeply concerned with the creation of a new vetting system (like USAID’s proposed Partner Vetting System) that would compromise the effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance programs and put NGO staff at risk for increased violence. Either outcome would undermine U.S. foreign policy objectives in places like Afghanistan and Pakistan. We will monitor H.R. 1062 closely and keep you updated on new developments.

*For the U.S. government, the fiscal year begins on October 1. So, for example, FY2009 refers to the one-year period beginning on October 1, 2008. “Omnibus” refers to an appropriations bill that contains appropriations for multiple parts of the federal government that are normally covered in separate bills.

**In the recent past, significant amounts of total humanitarian funding for a given year were often included in supplemental funding bills rather than the regular budget request.

If you have any questions, or would like to be added to the email list for the weekly public policy update, please contact Margaret Christoph at mchristoph@interaction.org.
InterAction is the largest alliance of U.S.-based international development and humanitarian nongovernmental organizations. With more than 170 members operating in every developing country, we work to overcome poverty, exclusion and suffering by advancing social justice and basic dignity for all.