I'm honored and humbled to be with such esteemed company here today. I'd like to offer my sincere appreciation to the organizers for including me. Thank you.

In reviewing the 113 points of 'agreed conclusions and recommendations' from the Financing for Development Forum' in April - it became clear that there are not technical particulars for me to add to this robust conversation.

Rather, if I have any value to add, it may come from the potentially diverse perspective I'm able to share, which I hope might be a minor contribution to this work.

I've been lucky to have my perspective shaped via impact finance work in disparate seats - creating pay-go financing options for household solar on the ground at a tiny social enterprise in Haiti, working on impact investment strategy at the world's largest asset manager in New York, and now creating a specialist blended finance firm getting more impact capital to work for Nature.

From these different seats, whether raising, structuring or deploying impact capital - the same three design principles have been useful tools in figuring out how to unlock and crowd in capital otherwise stuck on the sidelines. I hope taking a moment to focus on Creativity, Pragmatism and Incentive Alignment - can be useful as we consider how to best accelerate our ability to finance the SDGs.

Creativity
Is our approach to designing solutions being led with a truly creative spirit or are we defaulting to general, internal norms?

'Internal Innovation' is an easy two word concept to spell, but a harder one to enact. At a time when we acknowledge our concern over 'the marked increase of the estimated SDG financing gap', does sticking with our normal, comfortable, approaches seem prudent?

Pragmatism
In considering elements of program design, the types of capital we need, the grants, guarantees and structures we're taking to market, are we being dogmatic or pragmatic? Are we designing for what we hope market actors will do, or what they've shown themselves capable of? Are we being unapologetic about our own roles and goals as catalytic actors?

Are we leading with transparency? Are the particulars of the models of every investment deal utilizing catalytic impact capital from a development bank as open and clear as possible? If we make the effort to both better understand the needs of market actors, and to open our playbooks on existing transactions, can we influence and accelerate more capital deployment?

Incentive Alignment

A prominent investor recently reminded me that as much as we'd like it to be, 'Capital is not distributed logically, it's distributed emotionally.' and - it is his firm belief - that there are only two emotions that affect this distribution, 'fear and greed'.

If we take this at face value we can be disappointed in his assessment of a failing within investors human nature, or optimistic about the straightforward approach this indicates we take with investors. (I choose the latter)

Can we cut the magical thinking and be honest with ourselves about what our capital partners truly need in order to invest in our work? Not what we hope they do, or what we think they should do, but can we rather understand and accept their actual constraints and incentives - in order to design our work optimally to unlock them? Can we spend less of our time being forced to focus on mitigating their risks, if we spend more of it playing to their incentives?

Can this enable us to worry less about the benefits investors may accrue, and focus more on the opportunities their capital can help us unlock?

I hope so.

Thank you for having me, I look forward to this conversation.