



USAID Alumni Association Annual General Meeting

REPORT ON THE USAID ALUMNI ASSOCIATION 2021 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The 2021 USAID Alumni Association Annual General Meeting was held on October 29, 2021, via Zoom Webinar. Due to the continuing impact of the coronavirus pandemic, the meeting was conducted virtually for the second year. All members missed getting together in person with friends and colleagues from USAID but were pleased that the virtual meeting enabled UAA alumni across the United States and in other countries to participate. The meeting was attended by 169 USAID Alumni, and 33 guests and speakers. This report summarizes the presentations and discussions conducted during the meeting. A video of the entire AGM can be viewed by clicking on this [link](#). In addition, the UAA 2021 Annual Progress Report can be viewed by clicking [here](#).

UAA's Annual General Meeting was held a few days before the 60th anniversary of the establishment of USAID, an occasion to celebrate. UAA has been actively engaged with USAID and with AFSA to plan various the celebration activities.

The following were the meeting's principal agenda items:

- UAA Co-chair report
- Conversation with USAID Administrator Samantha Power
- Panel discussion on Development Cooperation on Covid – Health System Strengthening and Resilience
- Interview with John Norris, author of the USAID history *The Enduring Struggle*
- UAA Alumni of the Year awards presented to Jonathan Addleton and Neil Levine.

The following will summarize what transpired under each of these agenda items.

UAA Co-chair Report



Anne Aarnes and Margaret Neuse

UAA Co-chairs Anne Aarnes and Margaret Neuse reported on the Association's accomplishments over the past year. Anne Aarnes began this session by announcing the results of this year's Board of Director's election. She congratulated Denise Rollins and Roberta Mahoney, who will serve their first terms on the Board. Margaret

Neuse, Carol Dabbs and Jim Bever were confirmed in their second two-year terms, so they will continue on the Board for this coming year along with Terry Brown, and Anne Aarnes.

Nancy Tumavick and Chris Crowley are finishing their second terms and are leaving the Board. Anne recognized Nancy and Chris for their outstanding service on the UAA Board for the past four years. Each of them served as a Co-Chair of the Board, Nancy for three years and Chris for two years. For the Board, Anne thanked them both for their wise leadership and their commitment to UAA and to development, as well as their tireless work overseeing UAA's activities.

Anne stated that the Board thanks the approximately 40 UAA members who responded to an urgent request from USAID to provide support to the Afghan FSNs recently evacuated to the U.S. More will be arriving and hopefully that support will continue.

Finally, Anne noted that the UAA Board and the Executive Committee are currently rethinking and revising the UAA Strategic Plan to better reflect where UAA is going and how we will get there. They will share the results by the end of this year.

Margaret Neuse stated that 2021 was a very good year for UAA and thanked members for their contributions. She then summarized the accomplishments of the standing committees.

The Strengthening USAID Committee's mentoring program, managed by Rose Rakas and Roberta Mahoney, is one of UAA's biggest success stories. There were over 80 new matches between mentors and mentees, and there is a growing demand for USAID retirees to be mentors to young FSOs who are seeking the kind of counsel that only experienced former officers can give. This will yield dividends for USAID for many years. Please contact Rose Rakas or the new Co-Chair Alicia Dinerstein to become a mentor.

The Development Issues Committee, led by Steve Giddings and Steve Hayken, organized exceptional presentations and discussions on issues and trends in international development. Alex Shakow also provided masterful guidance to the eight Development Dialogues that UAA jointly sponsored with DACOR at DACOR House or virtually. In addition, Stu Callison, energized the UAA Book Club, especially with selections in the field of economics. These presentations and dialogues were well-attended, and these virtual professional events attracted many more participants as UAA members attended from all over the U.S.

The Membership Committee also had a successful year. With the leadership of Bette Cook and Tom Nicastro, the number of USAID alumni registered with UAA increased by some 6%. The Membership Committee also covers other services for members, including the monthly newsletter, the annual Alumni Achievement awards, and UAA's major social events. A special thank you to Barbara Bennett for organizing and editing all of the Profiles for the Newsletter,

which is one of the most popular features.

UAA's Public Outreach committee, under the leadership of Beth Hogan and David McCloud, along with the Membership committee, developed a Charter for regional UAA chapters. Three representatives were recruited: Susan Fine in the Northeast, Miles Toder in Florida and Alexi Panehal in the Midwest. Together they will work with groups of alumni located outside the D.C. area to encourage both social and public outreach activities. In addition, the committee held discussions with AFSA, USGLC (US Global Leadership Coalition) and USAID's own LPA for joint outreach efforts. The committee needs help with these activities, so please volunteer now!

Margaret highlighted two major UAA success stories this year. First, the USAID History that UAA sponsored, *The Enduring Struggle*, was published on July 1. The author, John Norris, has held multiple well-attended webinar discussions and will participate later in the AGM. Margaret also thanked Alex Shakow for his leadership on that project.

Secondly, with skillful writing assistance from Carol Peasley, the ADST received an additional grant from USAID. The funding will allow for the ADST transcripts of some 70 oral histories of USAID retirees, with the actual interviews conducted by UAA volunteers.

The foundation of all UAA's operations is the Finance and Administration Committee, which handles finances, contracting, tax submissions, insurance, curating the website and monitoring the mail. Our UAA treasurer, Carol Dabbs, has transformed UAA's financial systems to a professional level. Margaret commented that, as always, we owe thanks to Tish Butler for maintaining our website and to our Systems Manager, Ven Suresh, who keeps it all running.

Finally, Margaret thanked the AGM committee and its leaders, Nancy Pielemeier and Joy Riggs-Perla, for creating and expertly managing this year's Annual General Meeting yet again.

Conversation with USAID Administrator Samantha Power



Administrator Samantha Power

UAA Co-chairs Anne Aarnes and Margaret Neuse introduced **USAID Administrator Samantha Power**, who offered brief opening remarks before proceeding to the "fire-side chat" format for a discussion with the Co-chairs and then questions from AGM attendees.

Ms. Power expressed broad gratitude to the UAA for all of its work but focused specifically on a few particulars. These included the UAA's work to support Afghan Foreign Service Nationals (FSNs), noting that 18 FSNs were being mentored by UAA members. She described USAID's response that included up to 350 people working on an Agency task force during the Afghanistan evacuation. She thanked the UAA for its work in supporting the new book on the history of USAID, the oral history program, and the mentoring

program with Agency personnel. She described this, collectively, as you are “memorializing the past, mentoring the future and helping steer our present as well”.

More broadly, Ms. Power commented on an overall imbalance of Agency program resources to personnel. This will be somewhat alleviated by new personnel coming into the Agency, but to improve further will still require continuing dialogue with Congress. In this context, she suggested that USAID retirees might somehow “return to the service in some way” as yet undefined. She admitted that this could be difficult to “operationalize”.

Ms. Power was then asked about her observations of the Agency and its work so far, not only from Washington but also based on her initial travels. She commented on the situation in Haiti following the recent earthquake, noting that it had not taken such a high toll on lives compared to the earthquake in 2010 because its center was more remote, but the challenges of getting assistance to the remote areas were significant with the government lacking control of the roads. She lauded the response of the DART in delivering assistance under the circumstances, calling it “breathtaking”, particularly the coordination of the Fairfax Virginia Search and Rescue Squad with the Air Force and South Com. She credited former Administrator Mark Green with his work in creating the excellent coordination process. Unfortunately, even in areas not directly impacted by the earthquake, many people are not getting food and medicine due to the deteriorating political and security situation in Haiti.

Ms. Power lamented the situation in Sudan where USAID had been prepared to provide \$700 million in new resources to support the new government before the recent coup. USAID was expanding its presence until then. She particularly complimented the work of OTI in Sudan with its ability to respond quickly in a crisis, noting that this should be a model for other Agency work.

Ms. Power commented positively about both the Dominican Republic (from which she had recently returned) and Moldova (where she will soon go). She said that both countries are interested in working on anti-corruption issues, which she later described as a major focus of new DG programming.

The second question to Ms. Power concerned the role of USAID in the NSC, now that the USAID Administrator has been formally designated as a member. She commented that it is very good that the role of USAID in the NSC has been formalized, but that USAID has always had a role in interagency forums, including the NSC. She again credited Mark Greene with strengthening interagency coordination in this regard. She said that being in the NSC facilitates the introduction of the core work of the Agency into the foreign policy formulation process from the outset. She remarked that USAID staff who may not have had much contact with the process at the highest interagency level are now gaining more experience in that regard including people in the field who can now participate more effectively, and remotely, through new technologies.

The final question from the Co-chairs was what the Administrator's priorities for USAID are for the next four years. On the management side, she listed workforce reform as a primary objective. While noting that newly approved employee levels of 1850 FS and 1600 CS are welcome, she said that USAID was still too much reliant on large contractors and grantees. The workforce needed to be more diverse, inclusive, and nimble, "needing to be tailored for the challenges now". She noted there is good progress on this in the latest recruitment of foreign service officers. And that the new structure of having two deputy administrators will help in ensuring the "nimbleness" she spoke about.

On the program side, the Administrator noted the dual impact of COVID and climate change and how these two calamities have wiped out past development gains. "Build Back Better" is an Administration motto that will also apply to the work of USAID. Finally, repeating what she alluded to earlier, she said that there will be a new emphasis on anti-corruption in the DG portfolio. Anti-corruption, she said, is a "national security priority".

A series of questions came from the listening audience. Summarizing questions and answers:

1. In response to a question about the fragmentation of foreign assistance that can impede coordinated programming, the Administrator emphasized the importance of strong Ambassadors and country teams that are oriented towards "mission, not turf". The fact that 99% of foreign assistance is earmarked complicates the issue to begin with.
2. In response to a question about whether senior FSNs can be given the authority to supervise more junior FSOs, the Administrator called it "a great question with no great answer". While she is sympathetic with the idea itself, she noted that there are restrictions with no easy fix. However, Deputy Administrator Paloma Adams will have it as a priority.
3. With respect to the issue of localization, the Administrator noted that only 5.6% of foreign assistance goes to local organizations and that "gravity pulls contracting and grant making towards large contractors and grantees". In that regard, she is looking for help in mentoring local organizations to become stronger. This was mentioned as one of the ways retirees might become engaged but there was no discussion of how this might be done. She did note that the HIV/AIDS and Malaria programs have demonstrated good outcomes with local organizations in the delivery of assistance.
4. Returning to the issue of staffing, the Administrator called the ratio of program resources to staff "wildly out of whack", with BHA facing a particular burden. The FY 2022 budget request includes a request for more staff.
5. The Administrator expressed concern that PSCs do not get sufficient support and that there needs to be better ways to get people into the Agency as career personnel.
6. Responding to a question of whether there will be an "overarching" review of foreign policy and foreign assistance, the Administrator said there might be such a review, but that it is premature until after Senate confirmation of numerous appointees takes place.

Finally, the Administrator urged that all questions following up on the issue of localization be sent to Don Steinberg, who is working as a special assistant in her office.

Panel discussion on Development Cooperation on Covid – Health System Strengthening and Resilience



Amanda Glassman Jeremy Konyndyk Sara Bennett Mukesh Chawla Irene Koek Madhumita Gupta

The panel was moderated by **Amanda Glassman**, Executive Vice President and Senior Fellow at the Center for Global Development. Panelists were **Jeremy Konyndyk**, Executive Director of the USAID Covid-19 Task Force and Senior Advisor to the USAID Administrator; Dr. **Sara Bennett**, Professor of International Health and Director of the Health Systems Program at Johns Hopkins University; **Mukesh Chawla**, Advisor on Health, Nutrition, and Population at the World Bank; and **Irene Koek**, Associate Vice-President for Global Health at Save the Children, USA.

The session was intended to begin with a short video from **Madhumita Gupta**, a former senior FSN at USAID/India and current UAA member, with observations on the Covid-19 situation in India, but technical problems arose. Madhumita subsequently joined the panel to offer her observations live. The video is available via this [link](#).

Amanda Glassman began the session with a quick summary of main themes to be covered by the panelists, including the serious economic impact of the pandemic on lower- and middle-income countries and the lesser ability of these countries to provide stimulus funding (e.g., in comparison to the U.S. that provided 8% of GNP as stimulus over the past 18 months); the negative effects on health systems and health security systems and the complex interplay between these two systems; and the roles of donors.

Dr. Bennett began the session by laying out some of the fundamental challenges in looking at strengthening health systems, including that different communities are working on primary health care, universal health care systems (health service delivery and other preventive health efforts), and health security systems (disease surveillance, outbreak investigation, pandemic preparedness, laboratory services, etc.). A pandemic disease outbreak can do grave damage to the maintenance of basic health services especially at the primary care level, as has been the case with Covid-19. She argued for stronger integrated health service delivery platforms that are closer to communities; for a more robust and better trained and motivated health workforce; and for better information systems and a more adaptable health system that can respond more efficiently to crises. She stated that more needs to be done to connect the

primary health care and health security communities to make health systems more resilient to shocks such as pandemics.

Irene Koek picked up on this theme, noting that those working on health security often do not do enough outreach to local communities. She also argued that the public health system in most lower income countries is not just the public sector, that it is rather a network of public, private, and NGO systems.

Jeremy Konyndyk spoke about how USAID has repurposed other health interventions to respond to the Covid-19 crisis, e.g., in building on PEPFAR systems in Southern Africa. Since it is hard to envision the U.S. moving away from its current vertical disease efforts, (for example separate efforts aimed at HIV/AIDS, malaria, etc.) more needs to be done to make them more versatile to meet multiple purposes. He noted that Liberia was more successful than Sierra Leone in countering the Ebola epidemic because of its stronger Ministry of Health and its ability to repurpose its already strong surveillance system. National capacity is key; donors cannot simply rely upon NGOs.

He went on to discuss the global vaccine rollout, acknowledging that supply is somewhat of an issue, but also recognizing that many countries cannot handle more vaccines. Countries that have strong health systems, like Sri Lanka and Pakistan, can do so, but most are too weak. Others on the panel suggested a larger role for NGOs. Mr. Konyndyk agreed with expanding use of NGO platforms (such as through PEPFAR programs), but there is no substitute for national capacity. Absorptive capacity is an issue, so USAID is providing training and helping to create early response teams.

In response to a question about the USAID Covid Task Force, he noted that they are taking a different approach than the previous Administration, which had created a large 200-person task force at the center. The current Administration opted for a more de-centralized approach with only 30-40 people in the task force, most working through existing bureaus. Since Covid is touching all aspects of USAID's work, almost everyone is working on the issue in one way or another.

Mr. Chawla spoke about the economic costs of the pandemic and the slower economic recovery by low- and middle-income countries -- e.g., the global economy is projected to increase by 5.6% in 2022 while low-income countries will be less than 3%. Low-income country economies will most likely not stabilize at pre-Covid levels until 2024. These economic issues will seriously affect domestic investments in health systems, most particularly in preparedness and in scaling up efforts to deploy vaccines.

In response to a question about donor coordination, Mr. Chawla noted that it was the best he had seen in his career. He noted the multiple coordination efforts, including for funding, vaccine delivery, vaccine production, etc. He hopes to see the coordination sustained, including for strengthening of health systems.

This prompted a broader discussion of donor coordination and a less positive view than expressed by Mr. Chawla. Mr. Konyndyk noted that the UN “has been a mess” and that coordination has been much weaker than for the “humanitarian relief system.” Trust in the global health architecture has taken a great hit over the past 18 months. GAVI did a good job leading on vaccine supply, but there has been no lead on application. Ms. Koek noted the critical importance of country-level coordination, that those coordination mechanisms needed to also include civil society representatives and others critical to the Covid response. There was concern about lack of coordination on funding for vaccine rollout -- estimated cost is \$8-10 billion. Greater coordination is needed to determine how these costs will be covered. There was an interesting debate about the speed of funding from the IMF and World Bank. Mr. Chawla noted that the Bank had allocated and sanctioned the largest amount of money in the fastest time ever. Others felt it should have been available more quickly, although they did acknowledge that delays were in part inevitable -- e.g., Parliamentary approval of Bank loans in receiving countries and the need for funds to go through host country systems.

More generally, since the pandemic was truly global, it also threw donor countries off balance and led to more insular decision-making. The political pressure on vaccine producing countries to favor domestic needs over exports was not limited to high income countries; India is now setting similar limits on exports. Any future global architecture to deal with vaccine production and distribution will need to take this political reality into account. It also means that production needs to be diversified, including to smaller countries where domestic demand would be less and therefore less pressure on export levels.

The panel briefly discussed the huge agenda on “preparedness for the future” and changes needed to make the global infrastructure more fit for its purpose. This includes reform of WHO. There is also discussion of a possible Global Health Threats Council, although there is not consensus on where and how such an entity would work. There is also discussion of better early warning systems. The existing system is “an on-off switch” -- for example, when Ebola struck in two countries, the system worked well. It didn’t work for a threat that hit every country. There needs to be a better system that can provide the appropriate level of warning to political leaders, such as for the hurricane warning system.

Madhumita Gupta then entered the panel to offer some real-life field perspective from New Delhi. She raised several issues that seriously impeded India’s response to the pandemic. First, there was confusion about responsibilities between the federal government and the states, for example responsibility for oxygen supplies, and inconsistent data collection among the states that made it difficult to assess comparative data and thus make decisions about resource allocations. These fundamental governance issues cannot be dealt with by assistance; they must be dealt with by India and similar federally governed countries by themselves. She also noted the importance of building macroeconomic analysis into the decision-making process. The country-wide lockdown did not work in India. They had simply followed the practice used in other countries rather than following more specific and targeted practices India had

successfully used during other health emergencies. Responses need to be better tailored to the country's economic level.

Building on Ms. Gupta's comments, each of the panelists then offered their concluding remarks.

Mr. Chawla noted the need (1) to devise affordable preparedness mechanisms for lower- and middle-income countries, that this is a core function that needs to be part of the basic health infrastructure; (2) to institute simulations and to test country emergency systems every six months; and (3) to diversify the global supply chain for vaccines and other critical medical supplies.

Dr. Bennett noted the need (1) to improve governance and collaboration across different levels of government and between sectors; (2) to strengthen primary health care platforms -- and thus invest less in disease-specific diagnostic and lab facilities and improve the use of integrated services; and (3) to take steps to reduce the high stress levels within the global health workforce -- the pandemic has led to significant burnout.

Ms. Koek noted (1) the impact of Covid, conflict, and climate change on populations globally and the consequent increases in poverty, malnutrition, and school dropouts (especially girls); (2) the recent reduced attention to other critical maternal and child health issues which remain critically important; and (3) the need to strengthen primary health care, building stronger networks of public sector, private sector, and NGO providers.

Mr. Konyndyk called for changes in the global architecture that can lead to faster responses; we need to build systems that can operate as we do in disaster response. This is true for the international organizations and for USAID itself. We need fewer hoops to jump through; it is not enough to simply go through the existing hoops more quickly.

Interview with John Norris, author of the USAID history: *The Enduring Struggle*



John Norris

With support from UAA, **John Norris**, Deputy Director of Policy and Strategic Insight, Gates Foundation, wrote *The Enduring Struggle: The History of the U.S. Agency for International Development and America's Uneasy Transformation of the World*. The book is a comprehensive history of USAID beginning with its founding in 1961 and describes its evolution over sixty years. It is a remarkable account of the interplay between USAID's strategic, technical, and programmatic focus on development issues and the Executive and Congressional priorities during eleven Presidential administrations

(Kennedy to Trump). During the AGM, Mr. Norris was interviewed by Alex Shakow. After asking a few initial questions himself, Alex turned to questions submitted by the alumni. The following describes some of the interesting questions and responses from this discussion.

Alex asked how, in a 300-page book covering 60 years, Mr. Norris decided to concentrate on a few selected countries, out of the 120 or more countries where USAID has worked. He responded that he tried to pick countries and development sectors that would give balance to the analysis, both positive and negative. He also needed to include all the principal development sectors and regions where USAID had programs. He was influenced by where there were compelling stories that would make the text “sing,” making the projects understandable and of interest to readers. He later commented that he found it particularly interesting to select important topics where he had multiple sources of information, based on oral histories or documents about a specific development program. Finally, he noted that those issues that warranted Presidential involvement had more historical weight.

Alex next asked about participant training, which Mr. Norris in the book cited as having been a key investment in the past but has dropped off USAID’s current agenda. Mr. Norris responded that in their oral histories, USAID alumni give universal support to participant training, whose impact is reflected in institutional capacity in developing countries. However, investment in such training takes years to have an impact, and there is a natural tendency to support short-term investments. It is harder to measure the results of these long-term efforts, and Congress focuses on short-term indicators of success. Also, USAID staff tend to choose activities that can produce results directly tied to their efforts, rather than those that occur after they have long departed. There have been a few problems with the participant training programs, as some trainees end up staying in the U.S. or taking other jobs in their countries rather than the ones for which they were trained. But historically participant training had a very positive impact.

Several questions were submitted by alumni about the impact of outside pressure on USAID programming, and Alex noted Administrator Power’s comment that 99% of USAID’s budget is earmarked by Congress. Mr. Norris responded that there were two issues: USAID’s loss of discretion in selecting what investments in a country will be transformative, and the conflict between development and diplomacy. USAID initially was empowered to view a country holistically and identify what investments would have the greatest impact on its development. When Congress began earmarking resources for specific sectors and pet projects, USAID was less able to have a transformative impact. Today the vast majority of USAID’s budget is targeted at health and humanitarian assistance. This partly reflects that these activities are easiest to defend in Congress and where impact is most easily quantifiable. But this crowds out investment in activities that could help make a country more likely to develop economically and politically. USAID is also constrained in countries like Egypt, where transactional priorities of U.S. foreign policy inhibit USAID from conditioning assistance on purely development criteria. President Kennedy saw development as a separate objective, but he soon yielded to the influence of political pressure to reward anti-communist regimes.

Alex asked why Mr. Norris was so very critical of the changes to USAID in the 1970s, when the “New Directions” set by Congress and the Nixon and Carter Administration were adopted. Mr. Norris responded that during that period there were several popular books claiming that USAID programs had failed, although later analyses showed that they had been successful. He stated he understood that the redirection of USAID may have saved the Agency. However, he argued

that USAID programs were then “atomized,” meaning that USAID had to show impacts at the village level and was discouraged from investing in national reforms that could have a longer-term transformative impact. He argued that USAID Missions did best when they were free to direct resources where they could have the greatest impact. Unfortunately, he said, the new directions emphases still remain dominant in USAID’s programs.

An AGM participant asked about the fragmentation of foreign assistance across many U.S. Government agencies, and whether after sixty years it was time to merge USAID into State, the MCC, or elsewhere. While making clear he did not support such a merger of USAID into State, Mr. Norris responded that past efforts to create a higher-level organization, like IDCA, had failed, and there is no political support for that option. He said that one solution would be for USAID to work in fewer places, concentrating its resources where they could have greater impact. He criticized the pressure within State and USAID to work everywhere, spreading the program “a mile wide and an inch thin.” A more disciplined geographic focus could increase the Agency’s ability to guide a U.S. Government-wide focus on development.

Alex ended the interview by thanking Mr. Norris for his hard work writing an excellent history of USAID. Mr. Norris responded by thanking the USAID alumni who provided important input into the book and for their commitment to development. He commented that USAID has had a great impact, making historic differences in the world, and it is continuing to do so.

UAA Alumni of the Year Awards

Bette Cook, chair of the UAA Awards Committee, again managed and hosted the annual Alumni of the Year Awards. This has been an annual UAA event since its inception in 2014. It recognizes USAID Alumni who continue their efforts to provide significant assistance to others, both internationally and domestically, after they retire from their careers with USAID.

Ms. Cook began by thanking the members of the Awards Committee for their help in reviewing the nominations, and to the many people who submitted the meritorious nominations. This year’s winners are **Jonathan Addleton** and **Neil Levine**, both for their international and domestic service.

JONATHAN ADDLETON



Jonathan Addleton

Last year Jonathan became the Rector and President of Forman Christian College in Lahore, Pakistan. It is a 157 year-old institution that has educated many of the leaders of Pakistan, past and present. He was born, raised, and educated in Pakistan, and began his career there as an IDI in 1985. He returned as the USAID Mission Director in 2006, and also served as Mission Director in Mongolia. In his latest book *The Dust of Kandahar: A Diplomat Among Warriors in Afghanistan*, Jonathan chronicled his Kandahar experience as Senior Civilian Representative to southern Afghanistan, for which he was

awarded the Christian Herter Award for intellectual courage and constructive dissent by AFSA. This book followed several other books he wrote as a USAID officer. After retiring from the Foreign Service in January 2017, Jonathan gave dozens of lectures and presentations in a variety of public settings across several states, ranging from service clubs to universities, think tanks to literary festivals, universities to world affairs councils.

NEIL LEVINE



Neil Levine

Neil is acclaimed for his sustained and selfless commitment to strengthening, expanding, and professionalizing the Mentoring Program in both UAA and USAID, and for its impact on UAA, USAID, and countries abroad. The UAA program has provided mentors to some 160 mentees – nearly 10 percent of USAID’s Foreign Service labor force – over the last three years. At least 100 UAA members have participated as mentors. The combined impact of Neil’s efforts on the UAA, on USAID, and through the families and communities of mentors and mentees, both in the United States and overseas, is significant.

Neil has enabled a fourfold increase in mentees over the last few years. He brings together his personal experience as a USAID officer and his post-USAID career as a professional coach to significantly improve the effectiveness and desirability of the program among both mentors and mentees and to enhance the program’s reputation and popularity among UAA members, USAID staff, and others around the world.

MEETING WRAP-UP

The two co-chairs of the UAA Annual General Meeting Committee, Nancy Pielemeier and Joy Riggs-Perla, concluded this year’s virtual Annual General Meeting by thanking the participants and the UAA membership for their support.