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# President’s letter

For the Rockefeller Foundation, 2005 was a year of reflection and evaluation, a time when some long- standing commitments approached the end of their planned life cycle and others were ripe for reassessment or revision. There was nothing unprecedented about this; most foundations face the need, from time to time, to rethink the way they use their resources and to take fresh stock of the ways the world has changed. We have had many such moments of transition over the past nine decades.

Still, the pace of change in the world is much faster today than when John D. Rockefeller, Sr., established the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913. The velocity of information and capital flows, the gaps in the distribution of economic and political influence around the world, and the number of institutions addressing global problems are all much greater today than at the start of the last century. For foundations—in fact, for all institutions seeking to make the most of their resources—the need for these moments of self-scrutiny and adjustment may now arise more often, and require more flexibility, than ever before.

By the time this annual report is published, the results of our deliberation and planning will be emerging. This report is necessarily retrospective in nature. It presents an ambitious body of work in a few areas of long-standing interest: agriculture and health in developing parts of the world, human and community development in low-income communities of the United States, and creative expression and exchange across continents and cultures. It takes particular note of our concentrated regional efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and in the Greater Mekong Sub-region of Southeast Asia. Such work is of lasting importance, and will require allies, funders and attentive policymakers in coming years. Drawing the interest and commitment of those additional supporters has been a fundamental purpose of much of our grantmaking, a purpose on which the remainder of this annual report will elaborate.

An even more fundamental purpose—one that traces from our earliest years and has remained at the core of our approach ever since—has been combating the root causes of the world’s most serious problems. The work of this Foundation is to move resources, people and policies toward our program goals: to innovate, to influence people and events, to have a meaningful impact on human affairs. In particular, it is our aim to expand opportunities for poor and vulnerable people and to help ensure that the benefits of globalization are shared more equitably.

This evolving challenge will lead to a tighter focusing of our priorities in 2006 and beyond. What will not change are the values, concerns and institutional strengths that underlie the work we report on here. Those are, for us, the legacy of 93 years of philanthropy, and are our most important assets. They will guide and enrich endeavors we pursue in the months and years ahead, just as they have governed the work we are pleased to present in this annual report.

# This year in review

Well before disaster struck New Orleans and the Mississippi Gulf Coast in the last days of August 2005, the Rockefeller Foundation had begun a series of internal discussions on how the nature of poverty has changed in a fast-moving global economy. As the pace of economic change quickens, we noted, poverty is increasingly not just a status, a chronic condition with clear boundaries, definitions, and consequences. It is also a hovering and shifting threat, a risk

that shadows billions of people worldwide who, though momentarily outside the official demarcations and poverty thresholds, live at more or less constant peril of confronting devastating need.

Economic downturns produce ever more precipitous losses of income and wealth; the poorer

the society, the more sheer the statistical cliff. In better times, the benefits are likewise swift and unequal: growth in wealthier societies tends to raise incomes more steeply than in poorer

ones. Since 1981, the poorest three-fifths of countries have seen income per person either stagnate or fall; the richest 0 percent have had aggregate increases. Yet within these wealthier societies, inequalities have widened; even amid over- all prosperity, poorer populations have faced greater risks and diminished opportunity. As economic windspeeds rise across the globe, sweeping whole industries, paths of opportunity, and labor-market assumptions before them, philanthropy has to reckon, more and more, not just with static, observable hardships, but with the dynamics of vulnerability and resilience: the proximity and risk of calamity, and the odds and means of recovery.

## Threats and Their Aftermaths

As our discussions began, the first unwelcome case study of these dynamics hit the world with gargantuan force, in the form of the Indian Ocean tsunami at the end of 00. Scenes of incalculable destruction, injury and death in already poor and isolated locales naturally riveted the world’s attention, including our own, on the profound vulnerability of less-developed societies. The ideas with which we were grappling, about poverty and risk, about economic and social upheaval, had always had important implications for Americans and other residents of industrial countries. But their applications and consequences were most apparent in the developing world, including in the shocking images arriving from Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka and elsewhere, and before that, from the firsthand experience of our regional programs in sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia.

Our immediate response to the tsunami, organized through our office in Thailand, included support for the creation of community-based trauma clinics in three of the hardest-hit districts of Indonesia’s Aceh province. Efforts like these grew naturally from the Foundation’s intertwining interest in health and community leadership in developing countries, though such interests of course became all the more urgent in the face of sudden catastrophe. Thus for various reasons, both before and after the tsunami, the prevailing images and language of our discussions had been rooted, at least in large part, in the special preoccupations of global poverty and international development.

And then in late summer 00, all at once, the global became local. Here once again, in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, were overwhelming privation, brutal physical conditions, miserable governmental collapse, heartbreaking colonies of stranded refugees. And they were in the world’s richest nation, centered on one of its most iconic cities. Horrific vulnerabilities lay exposed: struggling-but-working families left homeless and penniless; segregated-but-functioning communities suddenly demolished and dispersed; a vibrant-if-fragile regional economy stripped of jobs, workers, customers, even basic infrastructure. While the suffering struck every class and subgroup, it was low-income and minority communities—in this case, overwhelmingly African-American—that were hit hardest, had the scantest means of self-protection and faced the most uncertain prospects of recovery.

In one sense, this was not exactly the kind of vulnerability most economic models tend to contemplate. Katrina was initially a natural disaster, not a side effect of market forces (though, it must be said, unbridled forces in the real estate market helped deepen the Gulf Coast’s environmental risks). Yet the storm’s aftermath, and the grim economic, social and environmental conditions it revealed, increasingly became a story of markets, public policy and structural vulnerability. Once the flood waters had been pumped from the streets of New Orleans, the next questions became surprisingly like those that follow catastrophes of all sorts in all kinds of places:

* Would the most disadvantaged communities come back to life at all, much less come back stronger and less susceptible to the next great danger?
* Would the recovery process provide ways of remedying the longstanding neglect and inequalities that the storm had laid bare?
* Would the rebuilding effort create opportunities for the uprooted and dispossessed—a chance to help plan a better community and to share in the enterprise of reconstruction—or would it just be a replay of the pre-storm disparities, in which opportunity remained closely correlated with wealth?

To help answer these questions, the Rockefeller Foundation made a series of grants aimed primarily at longer-term planning and rebuilding. For the shorter term, we supported the Urban League of Greater New Orleans and the Greater New Orleans Foundation’s Katrina Disaster Relief Fund, to help local organizations provide basic services for displaced residents. But most of our support was aimed not at immediate relief, for which contributions were pouring in from

all over the world in amounts that dwarfed anything foundations like ours could contribute.

Instead, we concentrated mainly on the long-term challenges, addressing needs that we knew, from experience in developing communities at home and abroad, would soon become pre-eminent.

We directed support to three proven community development and housing intermediaries: the

Local Initiatives Support Corporation, the Enterprise Foundation and Habitat for Humanity. In

different ways, these organizations are pursuing innovative strategies for rebuilding housing and businesses, approaches that forge partnerships between low-income residents and private industry, ensure affordability, and channel investment and opportunity into the communities that had been most susceptible to hostile forces, whether economic, natural or political. These are activities for which, we were fairly sure, resources would be chronically scarce, especially in the early months. And they are fields of work in which these three organizations are deeply expert and widely respected.

From the perspective of a whole year of Foundation activity—aimed at worldwide vulnerabilities due to hunger and disease, poverty and market failures, cultural exclusion and intellectual isolation—our response to Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath describes merely one moment of hard learning and quick response. Amid our domestic grantmaking in the United States, concentrated on employment, housing, education and urban redevelopment, the response to Katrina was an important element, but only an element, of a much broader picture. Still, it lingers in our year-end thoughts, and provides a point of departure for this annual report, partly because it offered such a close-up portrait of some of the great themes that have been preoccupying us in recent years:

the deepening risks confronting huge populations around the world, the steep challenge of recovery for those who lack the safeguards of surplus economic, social and human capital, and the imperative to systematically direct innovation in a direction that benefits the poor and the vulnerable.

## Ideas as Infrastructure

In the post-hurricane Gulf, as in most places of scarcity and hardship, the immediately obvious

capital shortages have tended to be literal: a lack of cash, equipment, buildings, roads and market mechanisms that might have lessened suffering and could now speed recovery. Many of our investments worldwide, like those in the Gulf, address such material needs head-on: support for more durable crops and higher yields for poor farmers in Africa and Southeast Asia; development of more robust commercial, housing and job markets in low-income American neighborhoods; investments in medicines, hospitals and clinics to prevent and treat diseases that destroy lives and undermine economies. In each of these cases, our support aims, either short or long term, at material improvements in the lives and opportunities of vulnerable populations.

But more and more, as global markets come to trade as much in ideas as in material wealth, one of the scarcer forms of capital in the world’s most vulnerable places is intellectual: the indigenous power of a well-educated work force, vibrant channels of cultural and scholarly exchange, and expertly trained private and public leadership. In places where education is rare, expensive, reserved only for the privileged, or (commonly) all three, infusions of even large amounts of material capital tend to be less effective, and the consequences of any setback tend to be graver and longer-lasting.

Investments in basic education—a mainstay of international development funding in the past few decades—need to be accompanied by opportunity for promising students, including low-income graduates of remote, rural schools, to pursue advanced studies in well-equipped, well-run universities. Even beyond the classroom, developing societies need ways of encouraging their most educated citizens to stay and work in their home societies, preventing the kind of intellectual capital flight that has stymied growth in many parts of the developing world.

This year we and five other large U.S. foundations renewed our commitment to the Partnership

for Higher Education in Africa for another five years. This $00 million fund, following an earlier five-year effort of $10 million, will support the continued progress of universities in seven African nations to improve their curricula, broaden enrollment, and expand opportunity for talented graduates to remain in Africa and contribute to further intellectual, cultural and material development there.

Among many other things, the partnership has invested some $ million in vastly increasing the Internet bandwidth available to a group of participating universities. In an arrangement with the satellite operator Intelsat, the universities will increase their available bandwidth by a factor of at least eight—at a cost less than one-third the rate most African universities normally pay. The result will be a level of connection with the rest of the world that universities in wealthier places take for granted, but without which even the most learned faculty operates at an insuperable disadvantage. Here, too, is an essential infrastructure that is measurable not in square feet, tonnage or kilometers, but in waves of thought and communication: the ability to obtain and share information, join networks, and participate in the collective inquiry of an intellectual sphere largely indifferent to time and place.

Yet even today, some forms of inquiry remain tightly bound up with the particularities of individual places, even as they draw from the worldwide exchange of information and learning. On one hand, knowledge and expertise are more mobile than ever, quickly transferable from more-developed to less-developed countries. But such transfers succeed only when expertise, leadership and capable institutions are simultaneously built and strengthened in the developing society. Scientific breakthroughs in the industrialized world have sometimes led to historic advances for developing countries—for example, in the Green Revolution of the 190s, ’0s and ’0s. In those years, plant breeders drawn partly from the United States (prominently including scientists working within the Rockefeller Foundation) helped launch a historic improvement in crop yields across many parts of Latin America and Asia. But in that case, as in nearly all such cases, much of the success was due to diligent recruitment, training and deployment of local expertise—plant breeders, agronomists, farmers themselves—in adapting, advancing and using the new technology.

Some places, notably sub-Saharan Africa, were mostly untouched by that great wave of agricultural innovation. One important reason was that local soil and water conditions, microclimates, and gaps in infrastructure posed obstacles that were too varied and particular to be overcome by a single body of imported technology. In such circumstances, there is no substitute for resident expertise, locally trained, working closely with farmers and other participants in agricultural markets, and committed to improving life in their own societies and regions.

For example, one recent grant by the Rockefeller Foundation helped create the new African Centre for Crop Improvement at South Africa’s University of KwaZulu-Natal. Among the roughly 0 doctoral candidates from a dozen African countries who have enrolled in the program so far is Chrispus Oduori, a Kenyan who has become the first person to develop hybrid varieties of finger millet. That seemingly technical achievement is significant not only because finger millet is a highly nutritious crop native to Africa, but because until now it had been of little interest to scientists anywhere else. It is a small but telling example of what happens when local minds are equipped to tackle local problems.

## Joining Forces Against Disease

Among the most dire and unrelenting threats in much of the developing world, and a massive obstacle to recovery and growth, is the devastation wrought from readily preventable or curable diseases. Just a decade ago, the needless suffering from treatable diseases such as malaria, tuberculosis and dengue fever, and the unbridled spread of HIV/AIDS, seemed an all but inescapable trap for poor societies. Medical and pharmaceutical companies that had the wealth and technology to tackle these problems found no way of recouping the costs of developing and supplying drugs and supplies to poor countries. Governments lacked both the resources and the skilled personnel to mount an effective response on their own. Meanwhile, the catastrophic toll of infection, suffering and death ruined families, stranded children, and produced crippling labor shortages that overwhelmed communities, governments, markets and social structures.

In 199, the Rockefeller Foundation convened a group of experts in HIV/AIDS to explore whether it would be possible for industry, philanthropy, and various development and public health agencies to collaborate in finding an AIDS vaccine—one that, if successful, would be made affordable and widely available in the developing world. Among other things, the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), which resulted from those discussions, would pursue avenues of research that until then had not been well-explored by existing public and private efforts. Today, though IAVI has progressed much farther than most observers would have dreamed a decade ago, the partners are still seeking the elusive vaccine—as are many other researchers in private industry and publicly funded laboratories. IAVI’s work has led to considerable enthusiasm and occasional bursts of optimism, even if its success is still far from assured.

The remarkable progress of that once-tentative idea has led, in the ensuing years, to the formation of four other Foundation-sponsored partnerships. They seek effective, affordable, easily administered treatments for malaria, tuberculosis and dengue fever and—in an especially far-reaching and promising effort—a microbicide that women could administer on their own to ward off sexually transmitted diseases. All of these partnerships have attracted far more financial and technical support than at first seemed likely. Industry partners including Bayer Healthcare, Merck & Co., and Glaxo-SmithKline Biologicals have committed major resources,

including access to some of their valuable intellectual property—resources that would likely have been unavailable to other kinds of initiatives.

By now, the idea of collaborative work on diseases affecting the poor has ceased to be an eccentric, speculative prospect. In fact, the idea has become the norm for tackling diseases that require expensive research and development but where sales of the drugs would be unlikely to repay the R&D effort. A study this past year by a group at the London School of Economics showed not only the remarkable spread of this approach (the group examined collaborative

projects representing percent of all drug-development efforts for neglected diseases), but their formidable potential: these partnerships are developing products far faster, and at much lower cost, than comparable private-sector efforts.

The work of these partnerships has far exceeded expectations, yet none of them has yet been able to test its full potential. To do that would require several times more investment, especially from government and multinational sources, than the partnerships have received thus far. The next test for these initiatives will be to determine whether their rapid progress and demonstrated promise are enough to attract the large-scale investment, well beyond the resources of foundations alone, which could carry them all the way to the finish line.

## Assembling Solutions From Multiple Parts

It is no coincidence that much of this essay has been taken up with discussions of partnerships—within the nonprofit sector; among industry, government and philanthropy; and between international and local sources of expertise. The problems we confront increasingly defy traditional delineations of responsibility and expertise, and often overwhelm the resources of any one institution or even any single sector. In many such cases, the challenge is not only to bring together many disparate organizations and missions into a single endeavor, but to find the right use of each kind of resource and the most productive role for each participant.

That is a particular challenge for foundations, whose resources are rarely more than a tiny fraction of the amount needed to grapple effectively with major public problems. Yet the flexibility of those resources—unconstrained by the demands of either profit or politics—can sometimes compensate for their relatively small size. That was the lesson of a partnership we helped to form this past year to support New York City’s effort to develop affordable housing in the midst of one of the world’s most expensive real estate markets.

In the fall of 00, we and five other foundations joined with the City of New York in launching a $00 million New York Acquisition Fund. The fund will combine grants and guarantees from foundations and government with below-market financing from private lenders to help small and nonprofit developers build or preserve affordable housing in the city’s poorer neighborhoods. Some 0,000 homes and apartments will be created or preserved this way. But the significance of the fund goes beyond the number of housing units involved. Just as important, it focuses the attention of many disparate players on fundamental needs: acquiring land for new affordable housing and securing financing to preserve existing affordable housing in a market where other kinds of development usually have far easier access to capital and public support.

Here, as in the improvement of African farming or the treatment of tropical disease, the challenge is to aim diverse, large-scale resources at particular, place-specific tasks. Confronting the varied constraints and opportunities place by place, and forging the right relationships among sources of capital and centers of public authority, is one important mission of foundations. Though we are best known for our grants, it is not so much our assets that test our

value as the way we use them—specifically the extent to which we can help find more effective solutions to chronic problems, build interest and involvement in those solutions, and draw further investment from others.

## A Global Mission

This essay clearly isn’t meant as a survey of the whole span of the Rockefeller Foundation’s philanthropy in 2005. At best, it offers a sampling of some of the broad ideas with which we’ve been wrestling in the past year, and some examples of how those ideas have influenced our work. The full scope of our grantmaking—in the arts and humanities, in health and agriculture, in low-income U.S. neighborhoods and immigrant communities spanning the U.S.-Mexico border, and in regional development across Southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa—is laid out in the list of grants that constitutes the annual report.

That list includes scores of grants that could individually justify an essay many times this length. This year, for example, our regional program in Southeast Asia included several related

efforts to cope with the migration of populations across national borders in the Greater Mekong

Sub-region. In this area, as in many parts of the world, large numbers of people move across borders or live in communities that straddle national boundaries, without ever being recognized as citizens of these countries or receiving even rudimentary public services. From its base in Bangkok, our program helped form networks and centers of activity to address such issues as cross-border transmission of disease, trade and the regional integration of peoples.

In the arts and humanities, the Foundation this year completed funding of a 10-year body of work on cultural policy that examines the effects of creative activity on communities, the creation and use of cultural indicators as tools for community economic development, and connections between the arts and public policy. We also supported a network of legal and policy resource centers that work collaboratively to support artists facing an increasingly restrictive regime of intellectual property rights.

The international rules governing such rights—not only in the arts, but in sciences, engineering and practically every area of emerging technology—are still being negotiated. These deliberations tend to be dominated by wealthier societies, whose superior staffing and technical expertise tend to overwhelm those of poorer countries. The result often is agreements that severely limit the ability of poor countries to promote infant domestic industries, protect small farmers, and gain access to essential and affordable technologies. This past year, a group of grantees has worked with these countries to undertake sophisticated economic modeling, analyses of developed countries’ subsidies and hidden barriers to trade, and assessments of the trade effects of developing countries’ own policies.

In North America, alongside our grants in community development and employment, the Foundation has supported several organizations in tracking the consequences of a growing migrant population with homes, families and civic ties in both the United States and Latin America. Their participation in both their new and original communities, including the financial support they send back to their countries of origin, is different from that of earlier waves of immigrants. Foundation grantees are adding significantly to our understanding of how these patterns might affect social, political and economic life on both sides of the U.S. border.

In one way or another, all of these efforts address the fragility of life in a fast-changing world—especially for poor people and communities, but also for those living just beyond the boundaries of official poverty and need. Amid the vast opportunities that technology and globalization have created, there have also come greater risks for those whose resources cover only current needs, without the ability to store up reserves against unexpected change and sudden adversity. When hardship strikes, whether in the form of natural, economic, environmental or political upheaval, the lack of such emergency provisions can mean an abrupt descent into severe need and lasting crisis. As global change accelerates, these risks inevitably grow steeper and wider, affecting more and more people and societies.

For many years, the Rockefeller Foundation has followed these trends in search of ways to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience in the midst of sweeping global change. We have spent much of the past year scrutinizing this work intensively, seeking out opportunities to adjust course, re-examining our assumptions, and contemplating new avenues of exploration and possible intervention. By the time this annual report is published, some of the Foundation’s priorities may have changed, new programs begun and current ones concluded. In the meantime, however, the work detailed in the following pages represents our best assessment, through the tumultuous months of 2005, of how a foundation’s limited resources could be applied to a few areas of critical need, devising new methods and building networks of investment and leadership that can, in turn, accomplish things no one of us could have dreamt of on our own.

# The Rockefeller Foundation in brief

The Rockefeller Foundation was established in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., to “promote the well-being” of humanity by addressing the root causes of serious problems. With assets of more than $3 billion, it is one of the nation’s largest private foundations. The Foundation works around the world to expand opportunities for poor and vulnerable people and to help ensure that the benefits of globalization are shared more equitably.

The work of the Foundation is managed by its president and a staff drawn from professional and scholarly disciplines, and is overseen by an independent board of trustees.

DATA

* $3.4 billion endowment (December 31, 2005).
* $109 million in grants, fellowships and programmatic investments in 2005.
* 174 employees worldwide (June 1, 2006).

HISTORIC WORK

* Developed the vaccine to prevent yellow fever.
* Funded the modernization of agriculture in the developing world, known as the Green Revolution.
* Provided early support in the United States for education “without distinction of sex, race or creed.”
* Established the first schools of public health.
* Supported the establishment of international cultural institutions, including Lincoln Center in New York City.

OFFICES

Headquarters in New York City (United States), regional offices in Bangkok (Thailand) and Nairobi (Kenya), and a conference and study center in Bellagio (Italy).

The best philanthropy is constantly in search of the finalities—a search for a cause, an attempt to cure evils at their source.”

# How We Develop Programs and Make Grants

The Rockefeller Foundation develops its programs —strategies and approaches designed to have an impact on a particular set of issues or challenges— through a consultative and collaborative process. We engage a variety of groups, including subject-matter experts, policymakers and representatives of local communities to fully understand a given challenge or opportunity, including the economic, political or social context in which it resides.

In the course of program development, the Foundation identifies and considers organizations that we believe are best positioned to implement defined components of a program. This process helps determine the organizations that the Foundation will provide grants to, and we will then request project proposals from those organizations.

In order to focus and maximize the impact of our grantmaking, we rarely provide funding in response to unsolicited proposals.

It is important to note that this annual report summarizes the programs and grants of the Foundation in 2005, many of which will change in 2006.

Grants P.33

## Food Security

Goal: To improve the lives of the rural poor through the generation of agricultural technologies, and support for institutions and policies that improve agricultural production in areas of sub-Saharan Africa and Asia bypassed by the Green Revolution.

### Enhanced Soil Productivity

Supporting work to assess the fertility of poor farmers’ soils and promote innovative and efficient farming practices that can increase soil nutrients and farmers’ yields.

### improved crop varieties

Working to increase poor farmers’ productivity and income through the cultivation of improved crop varieties that have high-quality traits, including enhanced nutritional value and

resistance to pests, diseases and environmental stresses such as drought.

### international Public GoodS For Poor Farmers

Ensuring that national scientists and others working on behalf of poor farmers in developing countries have access to the best knowledge, scientific tools and scientific networks available

worldwide.

### markets to raise incomes of Poor Farmers

Supporting the development of policies and approaches to create functional and accessible markets that can help supply African farmers with the inputs they need, and offer greater opportunities to generate income from their productivity.

P.38

## Health Equity

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $9,502,000.

>Goal: To reduce avoidable and unfair differences in the health status of populations within

and among countries.

Developing better health Products For Poor People

Working to accelerate the development of, and eventual access to affordable drugs and vaccines against diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, through support for public/private partnerships that combine business models with a social mission.

Strengthening developing-country health Systems

Addressing the severe shortage of health care workers in developing countries by advancing initiatives on training, employment and retention so that health systems can better address the needs of poor people.

### rising to the challenge of aids

Addressing inequities based on gender and social or economic status in the spread of and the response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic and to strengthen long-term clinical care in subSaharan Africa.

P.41 Working communities

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $28,469,000.

>Goal: To enhance economic opportunity, resilience and security in areas of the United

States where poverty is most concentrated.

### >adequate School Finance

Supporting research that illuminates disparities in educational quality, as well as efforts to engage the public and policymakers on strategies and models that can help address those disparities.

### >building mixed income communities

Working to increase the supply of affordable housing through investments in nonprofit community development corporations, and through research, advocacy and public/private partnerships.

### >California Works For better health

A joint initiative of the California Endowment and the Rockefeller Foundation that is working to improve the health of California residents living in low-income communities.

### >Encouraging Economic resilience

Supporting research and policy engagement to better understand the challenges faced by low-wage workers, and to identify approaches at the state and national levels that can assist them in entering the economic mainstream.

## P. 46 Creativity & culture

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $14,114,000.

>Goal: To support the creative work of cultural organizations, artists and humanists that contribute to a diverse cultural landscape and help people and their communities cope in an increasingly global world.

### >Support For individual artists

Supporting American artists in the performing and media arts fields.

### >the role of creativity in Society

Supporting research and other explorations that examine and foster increased understanding of the role of artistic and creative activity within societies.

### >regional Programming

Supporting arts and humanities programs in Africa and South-east Asia that reflect the interests and perspectives of poor or marginalized groups, and promote greater appreciation for and

tolerance of cultural diversity.

## Global inclusion

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $6,635,000.

>Goal: To help broaden the benefits and reduce the negative impacts of globalization on vulnerable communities, families and individuals.

### >building Support For Global and regional Policies to benefit the Poor

Working to enable developing countries and nongovernmental organizations representing the interests of poor people to more effectively participate in global and regional debates on trade,

technology and intellectual property.

### >research on Global trends

Helping to strengthen the effectiveness of development work, including the Foundation’s, by enhancing understanding of and responsiveness to global trends and their impacts on poor people.

P.49

## Regional Programs

### Africa Regional Program

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $11,311,000.

>Goal: To contribute to the revitalization of sub-Saharan Africa by strengthening the capacity

of people and institutions to advance Africa’s development, and increasing critical information and knowledge that will promote effective approaches to the challenges facing poor communities.

### >transforming African universities

Strengthening African universities’ contributions to economic and social progress in their nations, by investing in their efforts to train leadership, foster new knowledge and innovation, and improve public service delivery and governance.

### >improving access to and quality of Primary Education

Working to increase literacy and reduce the barriers to access and retention of female students, through improved teaching methods and more effective classroom materials within African primary school education.

### >information For development

Helping to improve the efficiency and quality of public services and policies addressing agriculture, health and education by generating more and better data on which policy and budgetary decisions are made.

### >Explorations and other

Foundation-administered project: $111,9 toward the costs of commissioned papers, meetings and publications aimed at developing a better understanding of the drivers and emerging problems, opportunities and implications of urbanization in Africa.
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## North America Regional Program

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $2,952,000.

>Goal: To inform public policies and private initiatives in sending and receiving communities

in the United States and Mexico in ways that improve understanding of the various dimensions

of migration, and that can offer poor migrants and their families better livelihood choices.

### >north America transnational communities

Supporting research and dialogue to better understand the effects of new cultural, social and economic relationships effecting families and communities with lives on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border.

P.52

## Southeast Asia Regional Program

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $7,457,000.

>Goal: To contribute to more equitable development in the Greater Mekong Sub-region of Southeast Asia by addressing the impacts of rapid regional integration on society, culture and

vulnerable groups.

### >learning across boundaries

Helping nations and organizations anticipate and respond to challenges arising from regional integration by strengthening educational and training institutions and supporting organizations representing vulnerable and ethnic communities.

### >bridging diversity

To enhance recognition and appreciation for the region’s religious and ethnic diversity, while aiming to blunt discrimination and exclusion that often emerge during the process of regional integration.

### >cross border health

To stem the cross-border flow of diseases, especially AIDS, TB, malaria, dengue fever and, more recently, SARS and avian flu, while enabling protection of vulnerable mobile and ethnic

populations.

### >advancing agricultural Production in upland communities

To increase agricultural production in upland, ethnic communities to improve their livelihoods and foster access to regional markets.
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## Other Programs

Grants, fellowships and other philanthropic investments in 2005: $5,129,000.

Includes the Bellagio Study and Conference Center, PROVENEX (Program Related Investments in Companies and Organizations), and support for Philanthropic Organizations and Other Initiatives.