Maximizing the Value of Philanthropic Efforts Through Planned Partnerships Between the U.S. Government and Private Foundations

November 5, 2009
Presentation at the
Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management
Debra A. Strong
Introduction to the Study

- Requested by the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. DHHS
- Motivated by a desire to explore the potential for collaboration to address health crises in the developing world and other needs
- Written by Ann E. Person, Debra A. Strong, Joshua Furgeson, and Jillian A. Berk
For the study, we defined “philanthropy” as “An active effort over time involving the contribution of money, goods, or other resources to promote human welfare”

- May have charitable or public policy purposes
- May involve private donations or taxpayer funds
The study focused on the largest independent foundations, and influential public foundations.
U. S. Government (USG) Initiatives and Innovations

It focused on USG agencies and programs most comparable to foundation efforts

- USAID
- Millennium Challenge Corporation
- Federal Assistance Awards
- Domestic
- International
- USG
For the Study, Mathematica:

- Reviewed literature on USG and foundation initiative planning and interaction to understand relative strengths and roles
- Examined the distribution of philanthropic spending for both sectors (2002, 2004, 2006) to compare priorities
- Conducted brief case studies to identify existing operations and partnerships
We Conducted Nine Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>USG</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation, Global Health Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations (GAVI)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka Fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation, Accelerating Innovation for Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Expected Return Metric</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each Sector Has Relative Strengths

**Foundations:**
- Independence, agility, and willingness to take risks
- Can engage in "cutting-edge" work
- Insufficient resources for scale-up

**USG:**
- Greater resources and longer time horizons
- More stringent accountability structures
- Typically implements more proven strategies

Both can play a convening role, though foundations may be advantaged by perceived neutrality
Initiative Life Cycles

Formulate → Plan → Implement → Evaluate → Renew or Terminate

Foundation-USG Interaction Typology

- Supplementary Action
- Complementary Action (Communication, Coordination, Collaboration)
- Adversarial or Advocacy Action

Characteristics of Decision Making, Implementation, and Interaction

- Communication
- Resources
- Priorities
- Decision Making

Source: Sandefort 2008 and Benedict 2003
In 2006 foundations spent about $28B, USG $720B, on health, education, human services, environment, development, and relief.

Both sectors focus mainly on domestic initiatives (75% for foundations, 97% for USG).

International priorities are more similar than domestic, emphasizing health and development, particularly in Africa and the Middle East.
International Spending by Need Area (2006)

Sources:
Foundation Center, 2008, Custom search of grants database for Mathematica
International Spending by Region (2006)

Percentage of Spending

- East Asia & Pacific
- Latin America
- Middle East & North Africa
- South Asia
- Sub-Saharan Africa

Sources:
Foundation Center, 2008, Custom search of grants database for Mathematica
Domestic Spending by Need Area (2006)

Sources:
Interactions Occur, with No “Best” Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Alignment of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Overlap</td>
<td>MCA* Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Action</td>
<td>Ashoka Fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Nurse-Funder Collaborative (Sponsored by RWJF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>The President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Millennium Challenge Account
Several Factors Influence the Feasibility of Foundation-USG Partnerships

- Narrowly defined problems may hold more potential for partnerships than ambiguous or complex ones.

- Partnership costs can be substantial:
  - Engaging partners, maintaining communications, executing and monitoring agreements, governance.

- Convening is a potential partnership strategy.

- Certain USG leadership strategies may facilitate partnerships.
Partnership Strategies Are Needed Through the Initiative Life Cycle

- **Implementation**
  - Shared funding may not be feasible
  - Differences in accountability and reporting structures must be recognized
  - Dedicated resources for governance may be needed

- **Evaluation**
  - Partners must agree on what constitutes acceptable evidence, and how to obtain it

- **Partners may play different roles in sustainability**
Innovations Are Emerging in Both Sectors

- **Metrics and measurement**
  - Expected return metric (Hewlett Foundation)
  - Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (Gates Foundation)
  - Performance indicators (MCC)

- **Funding mechanisms**
  - Prize philanthropy (Rockefeller Foundation)
  - International Finance Facility for Immunization (GAVI)

- **Administration and governance**
  - Central coordinators (PMI, PEPFAR)
  - Independent secretariat (GAVI)
Next Steps: USG Options

- Increase awareness of foundation-USG interactions
- Support dialogue with the foundation sector
- Conduct additional research:
  - Conduct in-depth case studies
  - Expand research to other sectors (foreign governments, NGOs, populations served by initiatives)
  - Examine interactions more systematically
The Study Is Available On Line


- From Mathematica at: http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/health/Philanthropic_efforts.pdf