

[Music]

Voiceover: *A Deeper Look. Exploring what works and what doesn't in development and the changes we can take to turn our ideas into action.*

[Music]

Patrick Fine: Welcome, listeners. I'm Patrick Fine, CEO of FHI 360, and thank you for tuning in to *A Deeper Look* podcast. Today I'm joined by Tom Hart, North America Executive Director for the ONE Campaign. Tom, welcome to *A Deeper Look*.

Tom Hart: Thanks, Patrick. It's great to be here.

Patrick Fine: As our returning listeners know, this year we've been exploring the darker side of development. So, we've been having conversations throughout the year about the paradoxes, some of the unintended consequences of development efforts, issues that are often not ones that we want to highlight in the development community but which we believe are really important for us to understand and to inform our action in the future.

Today, Tom and I are going to explore the topic of the unintended consequences around global health successes and achievements. And, to start I want to ask you, Tom, can you tell us how you came to ONE and what drew you to international development?

Tom Hart: So, I got my start in Washington right after school working in the U.S. Senate, and then I went over and represented the Episcopal Church, where I got very involved in issues confronting, um, Africa, particularly Jubilee 2000 and debt relief, and then HIV/AIDS, and through some of that work got to know Bono, who asked me to come and help start the ONE Campaign.

So, as North America Executive Director, I'm responsible for the advocacy work here in the United States and in Canada. I also serve roles in our global offices. For example, I just led our effort around the world around the Global Fund replenishment or pledging conference.

I was drawn to development because it felt that our voice, particularly coming from the faith community where I got my start in advocacy, had a place at the table and we could make a difference for those who had no representatives in Washington. I

was always sort of intrigued by the idea that we could bring a voice to those who didn't have one here and that the very same sort of systems that help get tax breaks for corporations or other issues could be used for some of the issues that I cared passionately about. I've always been a fan of advocacy. I've seen how advocacy can leverage big change.

Patrick Fine: So, I imagine most folks who work in international development have heard of ONE. Some may know exactly what you all do, but I think a lot of people – they know about ONE, but they don't know its origins. They may associate it with Bono ...

Tom Hart: Yep, that happens a lot.

Patrick Fine: And that might be as – as far as they go. So, can you tell us a little bit about ONE?

Tom Hart: Sure. So, the ONE Campaign was founded by Bono, the lead singer and activist – uh, the lead singer of U2. And a couple of us got together with him in the early days working on Jubilee 2000 or debt cancellation, dealing with decades of unpayable debts in the poorest parts of the world. And, uh, from that we created this organization, which was badly named DATA, stood for Debt, AIDS, Trade, Africa. Everyone thought we were a tech company.

Patrick Fine: *[Laughter]* That would be popular these days.

Tom Hart: It would be, yeah. It was just confusing then. *[Laughter]* But we – what we did was try to amplify his voice and the relationships that he created through the debt campaign to work on issues like particularly HIV/AIDS and other global health matters. We eventually changed the name to the ONE Campaign and we have broadened our remit to focus on the SDGs – first the MDGs, now the SDGs, the fight against extreme poverty and preventable disease. Our concentration has always been in Africa, but not exclusively. The policies that we support in the U.S. government, for example PEPFAR, primarily focus in sub-Saharan Africa, but not exclusively.

But importantly, we are not implementers. We are not trying to duplicate the great work that so many organizations do around the world in terms of actually working on the ground. We found our niche in public policy advocacy. So, we're set up very much like other public policy groups in Washington. We have policy. We have good, you know, bipartisan relationships on the Hill. We have

communications. We have a grassroots. So, we bring all these tools to bear to help shape public policy in D.C. You know, we try to pressure the government here in the U.S., but also in Canada, the U.K., France, Germany, also the European Commission, and increasingly across Africa, which is sort of fun and I can say more about at some point.

Patrick Fine: Yeah. So, I remember the Jubilee campaign, and I was at USAID at the time and saw it as a really powerful force for good, because I was working on social issues, health and education, that were being starved of resources. Countries couldn't generate the domestic resources ...

Tom Hart: Exactly.

Patrick Fine: ... to finance their education and health systems, and yet they were sending out tens of millions of dollars in debt payment.

Tom Hart: Yeah. They were – many countries were spending more in debt payments to rich institutions and countries than they were spending in health and education combined.

Patrick Fine: Exactly.

Tom Hart: That was the big motivator. It was just, uh, this imbalance that needed to be fixed.

Patrick Fine: And, when the debt relief program was agreed to by the countries that held the debt, which was around '99, is my recollection ...

Tom Hart: Mm-hmm, that's right. That was the first round.

Patrick Fine: ... I was in Senegal. And it made a huge difference in terms of the financing that became available for education in particular. So, I remember that as a really positive international effort and a good example of where advocacy made a real difference.

Now, let me just ask, at that time you had countries spending more on debt servicing than they were spending on social programs in their own countries ...

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: ... so, it was an obvious unsustainable and unjust situation.

Tom Hart: I wish it were obvious to more at the time. *[Laughter]*

Patrick Fine: Right.

Tom Hart: It wasn't as obvious as it seems now.

Patrick Fine: Well, it was obvious to me at the time ...

Tom Hart: Yep, good.

Patrick Fine: ... and I think to many folks who were working on development and – and living in African countries. What we're seeing now is the reemergence of concerns about countries that are overleveraged or that have too much debt.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: And, a lot of that debt is to new actors who were not part of the scene in the 1990s and 1980s ...

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: Like China in particular. And, now they're overextended. Is that something that ONE is looking at internationally?

Tom Hart: So, we are looking at it. The solutions are far more complicated because the – this is not government-held debt, so there isn't an obvious policy or advocacy solution. So, back in 1999 and 2000, you know, most of the debt held by the poorest countries was official debt, from France or Germany or the World Bank.

Patrick Fine: Or the U.S.

Tom Hart: Well, yes, the U.S. – although interestingly it was quite a small holder of – we did – we didn't do many loans, which is interesting. They're – loans were far more pre-prevalent among some of our European allies. But yes, you're right, we did have some loans and we did need to forgive them.

So, when it's official debt, government to government debt, there's a policy solution that you can come up with. When it's the Chinese government or, you know, sovereign wealth funds or private-sector debt, the solutions are far more complicated. The effort at the moment is to design a series of principles around sustainable debt, both, you know, giving and receiving, really just sort of set a gold

standard out there for what makes sense. It feels a little bit like a Band-Aid because there's still a problem that needs to be addressed. It – it speaks to one of the challenges we have, which is too often governments are seeing debt as a substitute for assistance.

Patrick Fine: Right.

Tom Hart: It's just easier to go, you know, give loans, or some actors are filling a gap when we are retreating from our official development, uh, role.

Patrick Fine: Right.

Tom Hart: So, it's a – it's a real problem, a real challenge.

Patrick Fine: I think that's a great observation. As countries, like the U.S. that has played a leadership role for a long time, start to draw back, you have other countries or other institutions or even private actors, as you've pointed out, who step in and – because there is demand. There's need and there's demand.

Tom Hart: If you need to get roads built to get goods from the farm to the market, you're gonna look for financing wherever you can get it. And, if we're not at the table offering assistance that is of high quality and transparent and not loans, that financing – you know, they will go to look for financing ever – and that is not to excuse poor borrowing decisions by some developing countries. But also, it's understandable that you're gonna look for money to finance your development needs wherever you can get it.

Patrick Fine: You know, it raises a question in my mind about advocacy strategies that I'd like to ask you about. So, in the 1990s, uh, in some ways it was a simpler world. There were fewer big actors – well, you can – you can tell me if I'm mistaken.

But, my impression is that you could focus your efforts on a smaller set of institutions or political actors, whether it's a parliament or a congress or an administration. Maybe it was easier to shame public institutions into taking responsible action. But now, we're in an environment that – where there are a lot more actors. Many of them are private; not all of them are even known.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: You have private equity funds whose ownership is not disclosed. What does that mean in terms of advocacy efforts still focused at responsible action that protects the needs of the poor?

Tom Hart: Yeah. Well, it didn't feel simple at the time, but you're entirely right. The advocacy went toward governments. Most of those governments were at least marginally responsive to advocacy, whether it was public or media or, you know, pressure, and now that's not the case.

A lot of these actors are not responsive and are not beholden to citizens or, you know – or even, as you said, even to shame. So, the – the levers of – of trying to deal with this debt burden is really much more complicated. I don't unfortunately have a good answer for you to how to solve it, but it's – it's a real challenge.

Patrick Fine: Well, is that something that at the ONE Campaign that you're – that you work on, to try to figure out, how has the ecosystem changed and what does that mean in terms of us changing our tactics?

Tom Hart: Yeah, it is something that we look at. We have not answered the questions satisfactorily on debt right now. We do still see our advocacy toward governments and toward more and better aid, toward leveraging private-sector assistance in – for development – all of that we believe is still very, very important and very, very effective. The debt issue is quite a complicated and tricky one, though.

Patrick Fine: Right. So, let me just ask, picking up on that issue of more and better aid. I'd like to explore both of those dimensions.

Tom Hart: Yeah.

Patrick Fine: So, on the more aid, we're in a – a period right now in the U.S. where there are concerted efforts to reduce the amount of foreign assistance. Is that an issue that you all engage on?

Tom Hart: Yeah, we've been heavily engaged. I'll be frank. The Trump administration has proposed three budgets in a row, 30 percent-plus cuts to State and AID. And, if you look at specific development programs, 50 percent cuts in some instances. We've been vigorously opposed to that. When the Trump administration first came, we didn't know if that would move forward and the Republican Congress would agree with that proposal. Fortunately

15, 20 years of relationship building and good progress, and I would say really effective development programs, Congress completely rejected that proposal, and every year since. So, it's been really heartening to see both Democrats and Republicans say no to these proposed cuts.

Patrick Fine: Do you see that consensus holding up as we look into 2020 and 2021?

Tom Hart: Yeah, I really do, and I – I'll – I'll tell you why. People think I might be a bit naïve on that, but first of all, we have seen the evidence that Republicans, who are allied with the Trump administration on many or most issues, completely reject the, uh, cuts that have been proposed on development assistance, State and USAID. Secondly, I can't overstate the importance of how these programs delivering results provide the fodder for support on Capitol Hill.

When you look at programs – everyone talks about PEPFAR and the, you know, global health programs, and maybe those are overused examples, but they illustrate the point really well, which is Congress sees the money they invest and they see the results that come from them. They can count them. They can see them. They can read the stories. It isn't easy to tell these stories and to get these results to them, but these programs really do work very well. Certainly room for improvement – show me a federal government program that doesn't need some improvement. *[Laughter]*

Patrick Fine: Or any – you know, any effort within society.

Tom Hart: Exactly, nothing – nothing – I don't want to be, you know, rose-colored glasses about it. There are certainly challenges, and we should be challenging ourselves to make sure that every dollar is the most effective it can be. But the point is, is that these programs really do work, and that evidence is clear to the key people in Congress who write these laws and write the checks. So, I think I'm feeling pretty confident that that will be maintained.

One of the challenges that we're seeing is there are so many new members of Congress over in the last several cycles. It's just a big education process. No one runs for office on foreign aid. Very few people come with much experience on what our aid programs do.

Patrick Fine: Is that where you spend a lot of your time?

Tom Hart: We spend a lot of time and a lot of shoe leather just educating about here's what you're investing in, here are the results from it, here are the impacts abroad, here's where we think the gaps are. So, it's a lot of that education.

Patrick Fine: Right. Just as an aside, as an international development organization I think the thing that keeps us going at FHI 360 is the inspirational nature of the impact that our programs have.

Tom Hart: Yep.

Patrick Fine: We were in a community in Yemen, and we had a doctor there who was a diphtheria specialist who happened to be there right when a diphtheria outbreak occurred, was able to train all the health personnel in a region how to identify and treat diphtheria, and just stop that outbreak in its tracks.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: And it was being there and having the right kind of expertise ...

Tom Hart: The local relationships.

Patrick Fine: ... the local relationships, that's right, the trust. It's all based on trust, so you can't do it without the trust.

Tom Hart: Yep.

Patrick Fine: But those kinds of stories, and we have dozens of them, are inspiring. And, my experience working with policymakers and just members of the public is that when they see those kinds of results, especially if they are able to visit and see things with their own eyes, it just has a transformative impact on their understanding of the value of American involvement and engagement.

Tom Hart: There's no question that being able to see it in person is just transformative. I've seen it with so many members of Congress that we've taken to the continent of Africa. And, when you get the right people there and they become not just converted but they become champions – the best advocates in the Congress are the champions in Congress.

Patrick Fine: Right.

Tom Hart: They go and talk to their colleagues and they say, "Hey, I saw this, and I saw what taxpayer money was – how it was being used." And to be frank, the dedication and effectiveness of our personnel on the ground who are working with communities, there's no substitute for that kind of experience.

Patrick Fine: Okay, so that's one dimension. The second dimension was improving the effectiveness, and we certainly agree that there is always room for improvement. What aspects do you all focus in on?

Tom Hart: So, a couple of different elements, really focusing on clear results, not just a percentage increase in whatever line item, um, but really are our programs driving toward a particular result, a number of people with bed nets or a number of girls making it through basic education? Transparency – are our aid programs, both on this side of the equation transparent as well as on the recipient's side? Is it clear where that money is going and how it's being spent? This clearly needs to be improvement, but I do think that development programs have undergone a bit of a revolution in the last 15 or 20 years. The-there's a far greater emphasis on that: the dashboards that USAID uses – and this is true across the development spectrum. It's not just the United States.

Patrick Fine: Yeah, I see a real material difference in the ability of our partner governments and community-based institutions in the countries where we're working to collect data, high-quality data for everybody who's working on the issue, whether it's HIV/AIDS or whether it's educational quality or whether it's civil society strengthening. To use that data both to understand where the problems are, where are the weaknesses, what are the issues that need to be addressed – and then to make decisions around that, including allocation of resources.

Tom Hart: Exactly.

Patrick Fine: There is such a difference between our ability as the international development community, both the international actors and the local actors, to do that now compared to ten years ago.

Tom Hart: Yeah, absolutely.

Patrick Fine: And, part of that I think is just the advance of technology.

Tom Hart: Yep.

Patrick Fine: It's the increase of capacity at the local level to use technology, and then it's a change in mindset.

Tom Hart: It's also prioritizing it. I mean, it does take an investment of resources. I mean, I was just at a DREAMS project, one of PEPFAR's focus on adolescent girls, and every one of these small, rural DREAMS centers, you know, they're walking around with little iPads. And they had up-to-date, real-time information about people who were coming to the centers, their HIV status, whether they were working or not, in school or not, at what level, and that was then being transmitted back to headquarters. I was flabbergasted when Ambassador Birx told me that she has better HIV data from Malawi than we have in southeast D.C.

Patrick Fine: Yeah, that doesn't surprise me, and I think that Ambassador Birx, to give credit where credit is due, is one of the real leaders and heroes of getting at least the U.S.-based organizations and many local-based organizations to use data in a much more rigorous, much more comprehensive way, and to understand how to do it ...

Tom Hart: Yep.

Patrick Fine: ... and to put the resources into doing it. She deserves credit for transforming the use of data for decision-making in terms of the HIV/AIDS response. What I would like to see is similar robust use of data and commitment or the drive to do it in other sectors, 'cause I don't see it as ...

Tom Hart: But you can't starve those other sectors of resources. You just can't get the data and prioritize the technology and the training that goes with it. You know, I mean, the AIDS programs, because of great programs, great leadership, and I would say great advocacy and support from Capitol Hill have got the resources in order to do that.

Patrick Fine: Correct.

Tom Hart: So, you know, our education and our agricultural and our – name the program, we – you know, we just can't starve them of resources and expect them to come up with better data. *[Laughter]*

Patrick Fine: I – you're absolutely right, because one of the things that enables the PEPFAR program to have this sophisticated approach to

management based on facility-level data is that they are facility-level data collectors.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: There are people at the facility who are keeping track of the data, validating it, inputting it, and transmitting it. And you talked about people, you know, going around with tablets, and you're absolutely right. Other sectors don't have the financing to finance that kind of data collection system and data use. It's not just collection but the use of it.

Tom Hart: Yep, and I get it. If I had a hundred dollars, do I spend it on a tablet, or do I spend it on bed nets for ten families? Those are tough choices I'm glad I don't have to make.

Patrick Fine: Yeah, there are always tradeoffs in terms of resource allocation. We're very familiar with that here at FHI 360.

Tom Hart: Yep.

Patrick Fine: In that respect, do you all do anything around domestic resource mobilization? Essentially, I'm talking about the countries that we're partnering with raising taxes, raising their own resources to meet their social needs, and then using the donor funds to either fill gaps or make kind of strategic investments.

Tom Hart: Yep, great question. I don't think we do enough, but ONE's big evolution or next phase is building out our advocacy in Africa itself to individual African governments, because there is money to be had, money to be prioritized for people's development, transparency, corruption-fighting policies that need to be pushed.

We're finding that in functioning democracies across the continent that our form of advocacy – smart policy with good politics, mobilizing the public, using the media – is very effective, and we're very encouraged by our early progress in terms of engaging with several governments. Probably our most robust office is, or our largest office is in Nigeria, and helping push through a policy related to dedicating a percentage of a special fund to health. And it was worth hundreds of millions of dollars. It was very, very exciting, which we did in partnership with so many. It's not just ONE, but we're – we're really excited about – about the potential there,

Patrick Fine: So, that makes perfect sense, and when I think about just the – the level of development, the economic growth, the rise in living standards, the rise in capacity in terms of the output of universities and – and other training institutions, it makes perfect sense that these advocacy efforts should be localized.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: And that sounds like that's what you're talking about.

Tom Hart: Exactly, exactly.

Patrick Fine: How many countries in Africa ...

Tom Hart: We're in about four or five countries now, small – some are one-person shops; others are five, six, seven people. What we're finding really exciting is that we're giving local advocates and actors the tools to do advocacy that they aren't either used to or haven't had, and they are just running with it.

And of course, you don't have to explain to the public why it's important. It is their own lives.

Patrick Fine: Right.

Tom Hart: So, whereas here in the United States and across Europe you have to say, "Well, we want to help the people – we want to partner with people abroad." There it's you give them the tools and they are ready to go.

Patrick Fine: I can imagine that there is a really deep, rich reservoir of talent for these kinds of efforts across Africa.

Tom Hart: Yeah. And you have just an incredible entrepreneurial, young activist base there. I mean, it's a young continent to begin with. Virtually everyone has a phone in their pocket, and they've got a voice and they want to use it.

Patrick Fine: To what extent do you all use social media?

Tom Hart: It's a critical part of the way we communicate, both here and across the world. The lines between traditional and social media are blurring even, you know, more every day, and so it's – it's really a critical way of getting our message out. We like everyone suffer from the disaggregated media, and you know, eh, everyone has

their own little niche that they listen to or – or that – where they learn something, but we are trying to continue to get the message out to as many audiences as we can.

Patrick Fine: One of the things that I found when I was working overseas and trying to advocate for policy change, and I was working in the health and education sectors so I'd be working with education ministries and health ministries and advocating for specific approaches. And, no matter how much evidence that I or the education community or the health community would provide, it's not that it was ignored; it just didn't have a lot of weight, because it didn't have political weight behind it. It was technocratic.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: What I learned is if we – instead of taking that to the ministers or to the president, if we took it to the media and we got that same information now in stories in newspapers, that that then started to have a real impression. I can remember getting calls where a minister was calling to talk about resources for a specific action that we'd been advocating for for a long time. And he was quoting the data from the newspaper articles. It was data we had given him months before.

Tom Hart: Right, right. It wasn't real until he read it in the newspaper.
[Laughter]

Patrick Fine: R-right, right, and then it has political weight, and it ...

Tom Hart: Yeah, for sure.

Patrick Fine: ... it's an illustration of how our work is so political.

Tom Hart: Yeah. Well, I have to say, I've experience that here, too, so maybe not unique to developing country settings. *[Laughter]*

Patrick Fine: No, no, I think it's just a – it's the way societies work, especially democratic societies, where public opinion counts.

Tom Hart: Yeah, no doubt.

Patrick Fine: So, we've talked about advocacy. We've talked about some specific sectoral issues. One of the things that I understand ONE is particularly looking at is the health sector.

Tom Hart: Yeah.

Patrick Fine: What are your priorities there?

Tom Hart: So, we've – over the last couple of years we've been playing a lot of defense and – and some offense. So, we talked earlier about the budget cuts that have been proposed, a billion dollar cut to HIV/AIDS programs, and similarly high percentage cuts to other health programs. So, we've really pushed back against those and had a really receptive audience in the Congress to restore those cuts.

Last year we were part of an effort to get PEPFAR reauthorized for another five years. It was an entirely inside, below-the-radar-screen strategy because we didn't want to open up the bill for partisan fight. One of the things that has made PEPFAR so strong and I believe that has benefited other programs in the development sector as well is that it has enjoyed bipartisan support. But in this environment, we knew a big public row between the Republicans and Democrats over PEPFAR reauthorization wouldn't have helped anyone, so it was done very quietly among the key staff.

Then this year, we've just come through a really exciting campaign related to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, Malaria, which is a Geneva-based foundation that funds all three and of which the United States provides one-third of the spending. We had a really aggressive campaign effort to increase its funding envelope by 15 percent. And, you know, in an era of flat budgets and rising populism – I mean, half of the governments we were talking to weren't even sure they could make a pledge because they – going into an election or hadn't formed a government.

And, every major donor pledged 15 percent, and we reached the \$14 billion goal. It was an extraordinary achievement. And the U.S., despite a request from the public to cut the Global Fund by a billion dollars, Congress came through with one-third of that funding. We're pretty encouraged by what we're seeing, the continued support for these sorts of programs.

Patrick Fine: That's great. And, the fact that you were able to play a role in mobilizing support for an increase to the Global Fund, which is one of the key public health institutions, international institutions, really speaks to the value of the ONE Campaign as an actor within the international community.

Tom Hart: Well, we certainly didn't do it alone. It was really fun for us to be part of, at a moment of great division, countries came together, cooperated, and did more for the world's most needy. Pretty great.

Patrick Fine: A victory for taking actions that are in everybody's interests in a time when those victories can be few and far between.

Tom Hart: I know one of the themes of this program is the darker side, and I guess I wanted to say one of the big challenges that we faced in this campaign is some of the complacency that we've seen around global health. Let me unpack that a little bit.

Fifteen years ago with HIV killing 5,000 people every day, it was viewed as an emergency – the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief. It was really a "we've got to do something quickly, urgently, probably messily, and – and attack this problem," and Global Fund was set up around the same time. And, you know, 15 years on, there's been incredible progress, and groups like the ONE Campaign have touted that progress. We've been very, very forward-leaning on "look at the amazing results that have come of these programs. Look at the – your generosity is saving lives." And – and we're actually facing a bit of a tension now with that message coming through almost too well. There's complacency settling in. People think these problems have been solved.

Patrick Fine: We also in our work in the HIV/AIDS response, and we're active in 60 countries working on HIV/AIDS, and we also encounter that view that, well, the program's essentially succeeded, so what more do you need to do? And the – the part of the story that's missing is that HIV/AIDS is a disease that can rebound ...

Tom Hart: Oh, yeah.

Patrick Fine: Extremely quickly, and that we have come nowhere near to eliminating the reservoirs of the virus.

Tom Hart: Right, right.

Patrick Fine: So, it still poses a clear and present risk.

Tom Hart: Absolutely. I mean, 2,000 people will die from the disease today and tomorrow. I think if we hadn't made so much progress, that would be headline news every day.

Patrick Fine: It would be, yeah.

Tom Hart: 850 adolescent girls are catching the disease every day, and that ...

Patrick Fine: Well, and they're the most at-risk group.

Tom Hart: ... and they're the most at-risk group. I mean, these are horrifying realities, people, you know, who are impacted by this preventable and treatable disease. It's almost more galling 'cause we have the solutions. We know what the tools are. The epidemiology is clear.

Patrick Fine: And that has made a huge difference. So, I see a lot more progress in the last five years than in the years before that, both on the epidemiologic and biomedical side in terms of developing new therapies, so on the pharmaceutical side, but there are parts of this that we haven't cracked. We would've expected with the tools that we have to see the rate of new infections fall far lower and quicker than we've seen.

And, we were involved in a study in southern Africa that reported out earlier this year where even in communities where at-risk women were given very intensive counseling and were given free supplies and had mentors or coaches who they could talk to, so it was a very intensive effort around education, that there was still a high prevalence rate. The prevalence rate didn't fall as one would have expected based on our confidence in those approaches, which to me was a wake-up call that at least in some contexts there are new approaches that we need to develop.

Tom Hart: I'm curious. Were men involved in that educational effort, too, because ...

Patrick Fine: No, they weren't.

Tom Hart: The power disparity. And unfortunately, too many of these adolescent girls who are now the most vulnerable aren't in control of their own bodies, of what happens. And so education can't just be restricted to the women and girls, it's just – it's really tough. We are at the hardest part of the marathon. There's no doubt.

Patrick Fine: That's a good way to put it.

Tom Hart: In other words – I mean, the first half of this marathon was – I wouldn't call it low-hanging fruit because medicines were expensive and epidemiology was less clear. It was very hard to get where we are today, but boy, the second half is gonna be tough.

Patrick Fine: Are there any other big items, priorities that ONE Campaign has?

Tom Hart: Well, so looking to 2020, we have a big focus on the replenishment of Gavi, which is the Vaccine Alliance, vaccines being one of the best buys in public health.

Patrick Fine: Let me raise a point about Gavi. So, this vaccine initiative allows poor countries whose national income is below a certain threshold to purchase vaccines at very affordable prices, much cheaper than the commercial cost.

Tom Hart: Right. It creates a market and shapes so that there's a reasonable and lower level of cost for the vaccines.

Patrick Fine: I've been concerned about countries that have incomes that put them just over the threshold for eligibility for Gavi prices so they don't qualify for Gavi, but they don't have the income to afford the vaccines, so they get left out. If they try to mount an initiative, they're not able to do it because the commercial cost of the vaccine is too high.

Tom Hart: Right.

Patrick Fine: And it's frustrating because right next door the same vaccine is available at maybe a tenth of the price. So, are you looking at that issue?

Tom Hart: We are looking at that issue. I think it's one of those difficult tensions of you've got to draw the line somewhere in order to focus your resources. If Gavi had unlimited resources, I'm sure the problem you just described would [*laughter*] – would be far less. But no, it's a – it's a real phenomenon.

Patrick Fine: Well, maybe you need to up the replenishment. But, I would put a plug in for ONE Campaign and for others – listeners, I hope you're paying attention. For anybody out there who can help influence these decisions to increase the threshold so that the countries who are poor but above the threshold, that have the political will to vaccinate their populations but they don't have, uh, financial resources to purchase the vaccines at a commercial cost, are somehow allowed into Gavi.

Tom Hart: Yep, yep, that makes sense, good suggestion.

[Music]

Patrick Fine: All right, Tom, what a terrific conversation. This year on *Deeper Look*, we've been ending our conversations with a couple of questions. So, I'd like to ask you the first question, which is what is something almost no one agrees with you on?

Tom Hart: Wow, that's a great question. Well, in my household no one likes to go camping. My girls are definitely opposed, so I – I – I'm clear on that one.

But, I will assume that your listeners are most interested in a broader comment, so I'll try to make that. I don't know if most everyone would disagree with me, but I have been pretty ferocious advocate of bipartisanship in our area. When I first started working on these issues, development was pretty much the domain of the Democrats; Republicans generally not so much. That has really changed in the last 15 or 20 years.

I would say the support for bipartisanship in our community is very strong, but I do think that many people get frustrated and think at some point you just need to let go of that and go with the right policy, just go with the – the team that's really gonna push your particular agenda forward. And I – I would wave a red flag of caution about that, because I have – the federal policies that I've seen adopted on a partisan basis are always very fragile. The federal policies that I've seen adopted in a strong bipartisan fashion have been durable over long periods of time, PEPFAR we've talked about.

So, I guess I – maybe this an area that shades of – shades of grey, but I do think that I've got a higher tolerance for pain on that, and it – and it is a – it's a painful time for bipartisanship. It's really hard to get members of both sides to work together. They don't trust each other. There are so many other issues going on. But, uh, that discipline, I've – I think I've – I still would vote for it each day.

Patrick Fine: So, there are probably a lot of people who would agree with you. I certainly agree with you. But probably fewer and fewer as the months tick by.

Second question I'd like to ask you is what's one lesson you've learned that you'd like to share with our listeners?

Tom Hart: Well, it will probably sound self-serving to say this, but I – I guess I have had reinforced during my career the importance of advocacy.

There's no substitute for good implementation, for good policymaking, but I do think we undervalue and appreciate the effectiveness of – of advocacy in development. Many members of Congress have told me they came to Washington to do the right thing, to make a difference, to be engaged, but they – they do need cover. I mean, we need to say it plainly. No one's getting elected supporting foreign aid programs in the United States. The advocacy we can provide doesn't mean changing U.S. public opinion; it means having enough people say, "Yes, you have permission to do this."

We've been tremendously encouraged by members of Congress and Senators who were skeptics who have changed their mind because their constituents said, "No, we really think these programs work. We really – we – we're giving you permission to go and do the right thing." It doesn't work all the time, but it has worked and I think really provided the sort of foundation of success that we've seen.

Patrick Fine: And when you're talking about the power of advocacy, is that essentially the power of storytelling?

Tom Hart: Oh, that's interesting. I think powerful storytelling is essential. What is the phrase, you never remember what people say or what they do; you remember how they made you feel?

Patrick Fine: Uh-huh.

Tom Hart: Storytelling is about expressing an emotion and a connection to real human beings, and we are always more powerful when we do that in development. I think good advocacy also is giving people political cover. It is often a tailored approach, um, and it is building those networks of support that give people the cover to do the right thing. I think that's the art and what I love about advocacy.

Patrick Fine: Tom, thanks for that. I know it's gonna be of great interest to our listeners to hear your description of the nuts and bolts of advocacy, and I really appreciate the candor with which you're sharing not just the work and priorities of the ONE Campaign, but also how at

the nitty-gritty level, the shoe leather aspects of it, as you described it. So, thanks very much for being here.

Tom Hart: Thanks, Patrick. It was – it was a real pleasure.

Patrick Fine: Listeners, once again I want to invite you to share comments. I've had some terrific comments recently.

These are evergreen episodes, and I encourage you to comment on today's episode with the ONE Campaign, where we've talked about advocacy and some of the challenges that advocates are confronting, some of the issues that we need to advocate for, as well as take a look at our library because there are lots of good episodes.

Stay tuned for the final episode of the 2019 season, where we're going to wrap up the theme of, uh, darker side of development, and we'll reveal what the theme for 2020 will be. Thank you.

[Music]

[End of audio]