

RELEASE IN FULL

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2010 5:53 AM
To: H
Subject: Fw: The Other 3Ds: Decapitate, Demote, and Deny USAID?

Fyi - we are going to be meeting to discuss.

Scroll all the way down for the text of the huff post blog.

Cdm

From: Shah, Rajiv (AID/A) <rshah@usaid.gov>
To: Mills, Cheryl D; Reines, Philippe I; Sullivan, Jacob J
Cc: Klevatorick, Caitlin B
Sent: Tue May 11 23:56:09 2010
Subject: FW: The Other 3Ds: Decapitate, Demote, and Deny USAID?

I forward this to you as I think I have discussed my concern that the overall narrative of "strengthen USAID" may not play credibly to an external audience. This is just a blog entry but I expect more of this in coming weeks and would appreciate the chance to rethink our strategy for communicating our approach (and also in some cases pushing the policy envelope a little harder so we have a strong case to make).

Thx
Raj

From:
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 6:20 PM
To: Shah, Rajiv (AID/A)
Subject: The Other 3Ds: Decapitate, Demote, and Deny USAID?

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/todd-moss/the-other-3ds-decapitate_b_572193.html

Todd Moss

Todd Moss is vice president for corporate affairs at the Center for Global Development.

Posted: May 11, 2010 04:11 PM
[BIO](#) [Become a Fan](#)
[Get Email Alerts](#) [Bloggers' Index](#)

The Other 3Ds: Decapitate, Demote, and Deny USAID?

[digg](#) [facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [stumble](#) [reddit](#) [del.icio.us](#)

Read More: [Presidential Study Directive](#) , [Quadrennial Diplomacy And Development Review](#) , [U.S Foreign Assistance](#) , [Usaid](#) , [World News](#)

Like many U.S. policy watchers, I have been reserving judgment on the administration's development policy while they staffed up and worked through the [PSD](#) and QDDR. The [rhetoric](#) and the [overall budget](#) have so far been positive signs that development issues will get more attention and the key agencies more of a role in the interagency process.

But, at sixteen months and counting, I have a nagging question that I suspect I share with many others: Since when does "elevating development" mean further eroding USAID's leadership, status, and mandates? Despite all the promises, the much ballyhooed "3D" strategy so far seems to be

- **Decapitate.** It took nearly a full year to finally appoint a USAID administrator. The eventual pick, Raj Shah, seems sharp and highly capable, but an extra four months later, he is still [0 for 12](#) on filling senior management positions. Yes, the vetting process is brutal and dysfunctional, but is any other federal agency still this empty at the top?
- **Demote.** The USAID administrator still technically holds the rank of deputy secretary, but the position has been downgraded. Unlike his predecessor, Shah's post is no longer dual-hatted as "director of foreign assistance" (so called F) within State. The lines of authority also seem less direct. Although I'm told Shah reports directly to the Secretary, the new second deputy secretary (filled by Jack Lew) is an extra layer between USAID and the State Department's 7th floor that didn't exist before.
- **Deny budget authority.** The previous F/USAID dual-hatting arrangement was far from perfect, but gave USAID tremendous de facto influence and authority over the budget. By splitting those two roles, USAID is now, in both form and practice, almost completely out of the budget game.

These early signs should be warnings rather than comfort for those who were expecting so much more. If USAID continues to be [stuck between an ambivalent White House and a turf-assertive State Department](#), it will continue its long decline. If the administration is serious about rebuilding USAID into the "premier development agency," is it too much to ask that Shah be given a management team, clear and direct authorities, and some formal budget function?