

Leadership Team Meeting

3 June 2020

Participants

Leadership team members and guests

- Bill Simmons (Chair), President & CEO, American Leprosy Missions
- Geoff Warne, CEO, International Federation of Anti-Leprosy Associations (ILEP)
- Jan van Berkel, Chair, Executive Group, Leprosy Research Initiative
- Mauricio Lisboa Nobre, Consultant to Brazilian Leprosy Program
- Mathias Duck, Chair of ILEP Panel of Persons Affected by Leprosy (guest)
- VRR Pemmaraju, Technical Officer, WHO Global Leprosy Programme (observer)
- Takahiro Nanri, Executive Director, Sasakawa Health Foundation
- W. Cairns Smith, Emeritus Professor of Public Health, University of Aberdeen
- Alice Cruz, UN Special Rapporteur (observer)
- Erwin Cooreman, Team Leader, WHO Global Leprosy Programme (observer)
- Maarten van Cleeff, Former Director of Challenge TB project, KNCV (guest)
- Arielle Cavaliero, Global Franchise Lead, Leprosy, Novartis Pharmaceutical
- Rekha Shukla, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, India
- Mark Alexander Rogers, Senior Global Program Head Neglected Tropical Diseases, Novartis (guest)

Secretariat

- Courtenay Dusenbury, Secretariat Director, Global Partnership for Zero Leprosy
- Christine Fenenga, Director of Country Programmes, Global Partnership for Zero Leprosy
- Andie Tucker, Project Manager, Global Partnership for Zero Leprosy

Invited but unable to attend

- Roch Christian Johnson, President, International Leprosy Association (ILA)
- José Ramirez, President, International Association for Integration, Dignity and Economic Advancement (IDEA)
- Amar Timalisina, President, IDEA Nepal (guest)
- Benedict Quao, Program Manager, National Leprosy Elimination Program of Ghana

I. Overview of evaluation: Bill Simmons

- In the conclusion section of the evaluation report it's clear that there's a lot more positive perception and perspective than there are gaps that arise, or are discussed in the evaluation. People feel valued, and feel like their contributions are important, there were comments that people are satisfied with the Partnership, and it's work to date. They're satisfied with the strengths of the Partnership and its ability to align people around the world in the leprosy community. Those are all things we're familiar with. There were some gaps identified, particularly in the area of governance. As we think about this evaluation, it occurred to me that the biggest question is, are we being successful and are we accomplishing our goals? Are we going through the motions on anything? Can we get where we're headed with or without it? Governance is important, but our current governance and organizational structure has successfully delivered us to this point. Your participation in this group has been what's helped to insure the Partnership has succeeded. We want to improve ourselves, but we don't want to over examine ourselves, at the expense of reaching the goals we have for the Partnership. The evaluation showed that the strengths that we have are in the areas where we need to be strong and that our weaknesses are few and can be honed. The focus should be on strengthening our strengths- not ignoring our weaknesses, but focusing our energy on the things we're clearly strong in. Those are my comments, and I'll turn it over to Courtenay for the Secretariat's feedback.

II. Secretariat feedback: Courtenay Dusenbury

- I think it's great to see that the majority of people think we are heading in the right direction, and that you're all valuing the work you're undertaking together. I sent around notes to people that will not be on today's call, and we'll compile their comments to make sure we have everyone's input. From the perspective of the Secretariat, we felt that the evaluation was comprehensive and fair. A few team members were concerned that the evaluation grouped people that agreed into the majority, and then highlighted the comments of the outliers that disagreed. Another area of discomfort for the team was the discussion about WHO and where the global leprosy programme is based. This point was made by 7 or 8 interviewees, and we want to include this in the review but we had comments from WHO about the way the information was presented. It may need to be presented in a different way to be information that can be used for productive conversation. We would like to shape the language on this point. We will keep the basic comment in place, but change the presentation to make it easier to discuss. Does anyone have any comments on this?
 - Erwin: We are concerned about the way the information is currently phrased. We respect the opinions of the interviewees, but the decision has been taken that we will stay here [in New Delhi]. Moving to Geneva is ruled out, so we need

to make the best of it, and be careful to phrase the issue in a positive way. It's a challenge that we will work with, rather than trying to un-do it.

- Courtenay: We will have a discussion with Erwin and Dr. Pemmaraju about this section and come back to everyone with slightly revised language.

III. Questions for the leadership team

- Our first question is: What most surprised you in the evaluation?
 - Arielle: One thing that surprised me was the absence of language about the NTD roadmap. I consider the NTD roadmap, particularly the section on actions required to meet 2030 targets, a very important tool, and I was surprised that it wasn't referenced in the evaluation. The importance of having leprosy framed in a more strategic way within the sphere of NTDs was discussed, but the roadmap and the way it can guide us on moving forward was not discussed. I think we could benefit from leaning into the roadmap more closely.
 - Geoff: There wasn't much that was very surprising, but something that puzzled me was the section on the working groups. The report and the replies quoted implied that GPZL has three functioning working groups: research, operational excellence, and resource mobilization, but the research agenda group ended a year ago, the operational excellence group is inactive at the moment, and the resource mobilization group hasn't met in a few months.
 - Mauricio: It surprised me to read that some partners think the Partnership lacks a strong governance model. I think the Partnership receives more contribution from everyone than an organization with a strong governance structure. The other thing that surprised me was the idea that it's possible to reset the strategies to reach zero leprosy. The challenge is huge, and the strategies are few. I don't think it's a question of resetting strategies, but is a question of finding a good way to employ many strategies the Partnership has been discussing. We are in the middle of a process where we have achieved positive steps ahead, and now we are looking to the future. The challenge is for the future. I don't think that we have a problem with our strategies. The strategies are few and we have explored most of them.
- Was there anything in the evaluation that you strongly disagree with?
 - Erwin: I'd like to add something to what I said before, about the way WHO was described by the interviewees. Since the evaluation took place, things have changed at headquarters. There has been a restructuring. They have done away with all of the vertical programmes. Everything has been horizontalized, including the NTD department. There is no more LF programme, or trachoma programme, or focal points. Maybe it's a blessing that we were not included in

that restructuring. We are included in all the horizontal approaches, like training, advocacy, monitoring, AMR research, but we're still here with a vertical structure. We still have a core unit focused on leprosy. This could be an advantage for us.

- Maarten: There was a remark about the approach of the Partnership being too medicalized. What was meant by the comment about a 'human focused lens'? I think we are very much focused on a human perspective at the moment.
- Erwin: Often in the report it quotes one person, or a few people, and we don't know what the majority said. It's hard to tell if some comments are a majority view point, or if they are exceptional.
- Geoff: I found myself reading one person's opinion, or another's, that I didn't agree with, but those divergent views didn't come through as the main recommendations of the report. There isn't anything I fundamentally disagree with in the formal recommendations and conclusions of the report. But there are individual comments that I disagreed with, and I'm sure people disagreed with my comments as well.
- Mauricio: I didn't make the comment about the Partnership being too medicalized, but I understand that we are usually talking about strategies to control leprosy from a medical point of view: MDT, PEP, SDR, etc. We may have a strong focus on the medical issues of leprosy. This comment says we should listen more to the patients' point of view. There is a proposal to include more persons affected in the leadership team, linked to this issue. I think many times we don't listen to the patients themselves about the best strategies to control leprosy. I understand this conclusion and think it's valuable to have this point of view included in the report.
- Taka: I assume that the person that made the comment about the Partnership being medicalized was trying to stress the importance of achieving zero discrimination. If our goal is zero leprosy, we have spent a lot of time trying to achieve zero disease and zero disability, but we don't discuss zero discrimination as much.
- Jan: The role of the Task Force in hosting the Partnership and employing its staff is not clear to me in the evaluation. That's an aspect of governance issues that I don't fully understand, and the report doesn't say anything about it. What is the role of the leadership of the Task Force? Just facilitating? Or is there a role in guidance, or budgeting, or annual planning?

III. Challenges to begin discussing and resolving: Courtenay Dusenbury

- The report mentioned a few long-term and immediate challenges. The long-term challenges include sustaining partner energy and funding, and the location of the Secretariat. Some people said that they would like to explore whether there is a benefit to forming a 501-C3 NGO organization in terms of fundraising. These are issues we should explore in the longer-term, perhaps beginning in 2021. There are also immediate topics that we would like to try to resolve as the new director joins. One issue is governance. We feel that governance is a challenge for the Partnership. When the Partnership was started, donor commitments were intended to last one year. Then, it was extended to a two-year partnership, but most donor partners were not committing to a longer term. The governance structure in the beginning was ambiguous to allow everyone coming together to be comfortable with coming to the table. Now that we have agreed that we want to continue working together in the long term we need to take a look at the governance issues and make sure we have correctly addressed everyone's concerns. We will do this in a revised charter. I invite you to talk about governance, and I want to say that the Secretariat will make this a priority over the next few months. I will consult with each of you individually and together as a group to make sure we're making the improvements we need.
 - Jan: In the first two years of the Partnership the process for annual planning and developing the budget was not clear, the role of the leadership team was not clear. I appreciate the work of the Secretariat in this area, but I wonder what the role of the leadership team should be in the planning process and monitoring progress. There is a lot of communications, but is the leadership team taking responsibility for guiding the Secretariat, or is this guidance coming from the Task Force? I think we need to clarify that as we're starting a longer commitment. It would be good to think about donor coordination. The donors should take joint responsibility for the programming and challenges of the Partnership. My other question is related to the leadership team. I enjoy the monthly meetings, but not everyone can attend every time, so there may be a lot of changes in the composition of those who are directly involved, and those who are occasionally able to attend.
 - Geoff: We need to keep in tension the desire of some interviewees to expand the leadership team, so it's more representative, with the need to keep the board functioning as a governing board that directs the Secretariat. I don't think those are compatible by altering the leadership team. I think a different structure will be necessary to balance those two priorities. The issue of the governance structure related to the Task Force also needs to be considered, to prevent the new director from being in a difficult position of not knowing who they're accountable to. It also calls into question the issue of whether GPZL should be a separate legal entity. All of these issues interconnect and need to be

dealt with together. We need a working group from the Leadership Team to tackle these interrelated questions.

- Arielle: The question of who should be part of the leadership team rests in being precise in the role of the Leadership Team. When we're clear on that, we can be clear on the composition of the group. We have an opportunity to reexamine the working groups and consider the role of those groups and their inclusivity. We're shifting to focus on country implementation, which will require us to rethink who is involved internationally and on a national scale, when we've set up national level partnerships. We need to be clear about where we're discussing certain issues and then insure we have the diversity necessary to examine those topics.
- Maarten: It's importance to consider where the Partnership is housed and where it's on the payroll. Those can be different things. The Stop TB Partnership was on the WHO payroll and housed there, but now are housed in the same building as the Global Fund and on payroll at UNOPS. You can be completely independent, like the TB Alliance, but it's something to consider. The role of the GPZL Leadership Team is not that of a traditional board. There are no committees. It looks like leadership team members can attend GPZL Leadership Team meetings, or not, but if you're in a board structure, you have to have a reason not to attend meetings because the roles are so important.
- Cairns: This doesn't feel like a leadership group at all, because most of what we do is pretty passive and reactionary. We are not actually pushing ahead with leadership. We say we have three working groups on the website, but you don't get the impression that these groups are active in any way. They aren't reporting to the leadership team at all. The research group is dysfunctional, considering the person who is supposed to chair it is no longer active. There are a number of areas in governance that we need to tighten up.
- Courtenay: The role of the Task Force is as a convening entity for the Partnership. The budget, the work plan, the action framework, the milestones, are created by the Secretariat based on the guidance we receive from you, and they are reviewed by you. The leadership at the Task Force has no say in any of those documents or decisions. We will pass them on as part of our reporting, but they are not engaged in any strategic planning. Our guidance is coming from you. The role of the Task Force is to administrate the funds, report on the funds, handle hiring, and to host the Secretariat team. The Task Force has contributed \$25,000 for a consultant, allowing us to travel for free using miles, and borrowing staff, but I don't think the Task Force sees itself as running the Partnership in any way. I want to respond to Cairns' comment about the website and the working groups. We've provided regular updates to the leadership team

on the group that's now moving toward implementation and the smaller research groups, some of which are moving, and some are not. On our website we still continue to say that we have these larger groups, but those have been disbanded and we're moving in a different direction. We will look at the website and make sure it's reflecting our work accurately.

- Bill: When we talk about typical governance structures we think of boards, and typically a board has fiduciary responsibilities. The absence of some of those fiduciary responsibilities is part of the tension in our governance structure, and part of the confusion, especially around the role of the Task Force, because the board of the Task Force has the fiduciary responsibility for what happens financially and with HR. We can discuss over the next few months if the Leadership Team needs to hold fiduciary responsibility. But that brings me back to my opening comments- what governance structure best serves us to reach our goals and objectives? That continues to be, to me, what should drive how we structure ourselves. We need to ask, what does it mean to lead this Partnership as a group? How do we do that? And then governance can situate itself around how we want to lead. If we lean too heavily on developing a governance structure with fiduciary responsibilities we miss the point, which is to lead the Partnership. It needs governance, but we don't want the tail to wag the dog.
- Alice: I want to focus on the issue of representation. The independency of the Secretariat came out of the evaluation, and this independency has allowed us to have a balanced path forward. We've discussed that more importance has been given to the first two 'zeros', instead of to discrimination. I believe that the Secretariat has been sensitive to the importance of including discrimination issues in discussions. I would like to emphasize the importance of having an independent Secretariat. I would also like to mention that there should be a way to engage with the global health and human rights communities that are based in Geneva. I understand Erwin's comments, but at some of the meetings I've held with WHO they were so surprised to hear my messages about leprosy, which was surprising to me. I strongly recommend for action to be taken with WHO and the human rights community in Geneva. I thought Geoff's suggestion about working groups might be important for balancing a way forward for strategy and implementation.
- Partner perceived commitments and alignment: We saw in the report and we asked the consultants that created the evaluation to give us more information about this. There is a feeling that not all partners are fully aligned and that there continues to be a hope that partners could become aligned behind the major objectives of the action framework: partnerships in countries, priorities for the research agenda, and joint work

in resource mobilization. Do you feel that some partners are still not aligned? How can we create space for alignment discussion? We recognize this is challenging to talk about.

- Dr. Pemmaraju: I think the Partnership has to spend more time and resources on continued dialogue with the partners. We need to understand who is included in the partners: are we including national programmes? That's a much larger task, getting them on the same page about the action framework and implementation plans.
- Geoff: I thought the report said that alignment was pretty good, but maybe there are other parts of the report that suggest otherwise. Maybe there is individual deviation, but generally speaking it seems that while there was a dispersed response to leprosy before the Partnership, that the creation of the Partnership had increased alignment significantly.
- Courtenay: We hear from all partners in various ways. It was mentioned in the report that most people didn't think there was conflict in the Partnership, or they didn't see it. They assumed that it was being handled by the Secretariat. This was true. We have absorbed issues and tried to mend many of the personal or organizational challenges between members of the Partnership. We have done this to grow this group into one organization, but now we're moving into a new phase where we are working together, but some doubts are lingering. My experience has been that these issues come up in discussions about resources. If we have existing or new resources, how should they be used? And what is the right proportion of investment in various priorities? What are partners doing to put their resources into the work, globally and on the national level? These questions need to be discussed. We need to find a way to talk about this more openly. We need to move beyond the Secretariat smoothing problems and into having these conversations and resolving issues together.
- Mark: My comments are more general because I need to leave soon. The report is mostly positive and we should celebrate all the strengths that are outlined. It's important to discuss the little issues, we should be careful not to draw the discussions toward the few things that a few people feel do not work and away from all the things that are working. There are three things that stood out as areas where we could be doing more. The first is implementation. We're in a good place with our strategy, but I sometimes feel that we're not as decisive in acting. This touches on governance, because maybe this group is not the group to get the action rolling, and maybe we should review the work streams that get the work moving and put more emphasis there. The second point is evaluation. We need to be mindful to ensure that everything we do has clear metrics that we can track. The last is about fresh approaches. Most stakeholders involved in

leprosy have been doing this work for a while, and I feel that introducing new ideas could benefit the whole group.

- Representation on the Leadership Team: A few people interviewed felt that it would be good to include more persons affected and national programme managers in the Leadership Team. We want to ask if you all agree and we can talk about this today and explore it further in the coming weeks.
 - Geoff: This question gets back to the governance model. If we move to an executive board model alongside the LT, then it would be great to increase the size of the team to make it more representative, but I don't know that it would help us in all areas of governance already explored in this meeting. Aspirationally yes, but to answer the question well we need to think about the whole governance picture.
 - Alice: It is important to include more national programme managers, but also national experts. One of the challenges in leprosy is that decision making is taken in the global north, while leprosy is impacting the global south. If the Partnership could be more intercultural and have more representation from countries where leprosy is still a problem, this would be better. We need to discuss barriers to representation. One is language. Not everyone can engage if discussions are only conducted in English. Another barrier is financial resources. The discussion on governance needs to include the point of barriers to participation for people from the global south. It's also important to consider the leadership team to work on a rotative basis, to increase diversity, and to ensure the people making decisions are not only the people circulating in international leprosy work, but are the people working at the national level. They have grounded knowledge that is important to bring to the Partnership if our next step is implementation. I agree with Mark on the importance of expanding the scope of expertise to include people from other fields. We have a lot to learn from other fields like digital health, TB, AIDS, or disability. This could also be done on a rotative basis. There's no gender balance on the leadership team. I think this should be addressed. I don't think we will be able to achieve the goal of zero discrimination without more representation from persons affected on the Leadership Team. Our work with Working Group 2 proves how knowledgeable the national and local organizations of persons affected are. They are the ones who are finding innovative strategies to ensure information about COVID-19 is accessible to a population that struggles with obtaining information. This is beyond guaranteeing their right to participation- we have much to learn from them. We need to open our minds to the possibility of learning from people that have a knowledge based on practice. I suggest to have one national organization of

persons affected having a voice on the leadership team on a rotative basis. This could be for 6 months, with one organization, then another the next 6 months. Some criteria could be established, and perhaps we could issue a call for organizations to apply to be on the leadership team. My final comment is that the Partnership has not been very successful in advocacy work. This is important to ensure the future of the community and for fundraising. It's important to have a way for GPZL to have a way to engage with the global health and human rights communities based in Geneva. It's important to bring the persons affected organizations to play an important part in advocacy. There is nothing more powerful than testimonies in the first person, and I think we need to find ways to deepen our advocacy work.

- Bill: Maybe instead of rotation, you could have a group of those organizations who meet and have a representative that joins the leadership team, to create continuity and represent consistent feedback.
- Alice: If we are really going to move forward with reduction of discrimination we need to support persons affected organizations, and one way to support their work is to support the formation of a coalition of persons affected organizations. That implies more resources, but I agree with you.
- Erwin: I don't think we should aim to expand the Leadership Team very much. We can include a few more disciplines, like disability, but I think it should remain a lean team. We should clearly define the role of the Leadership Team. In my view, it should be oversight. I think the implementation should be handled by the Secretariat. I think the Secretariat should be expanded to ensure they have enough capacity for executing and implementing. The Leadership Team should be for oversight and for giving broad direction. We should be giving more delegation and more responsibility to the Secretariat. I think the Leadership Team is a bit too involved in direct implementation and we may be tying the hands of the Secretariat. Regarding the team members, I like the idea of rotating members, but I think we should use a model like the UN Security Council with permanent members because we need the main actors, but we could have rotating members to get also inputs from smaller actors.
- Mauricio: The GPZL has achieved a point where we need reach real leprosy work. The Leadership Team is mainly a discussion group. I don't know if it's important to increase the discussion group, but we need to have practical experiences from the field. In the field, at the local level, we need to bring different experiences together, different people that work in different places, but not on the leadership team. Increasing the leadership team will not be enough. We need to reach the field, and we need to listen to different perspectives in that specific

reality. We're missing a lot of local problems at this level. The sustainability of the Partnership will come from good results in the field. For that we need different perspectives and experiences in the field.

- Taka: I agree that we should increase participation from the global south, but I think we should be concerned with the language barrier. English should not be the barrier to attending the leadership team. We should not miss talented people because they don't speak English. A strength of the Partnership is diversity. I don't want to make anyone feel disadvantaged because they are not fluent in English.
- Bill: Our current perspective is prior to country roadmap implementation. The action framework leads us to working in country and country partnerships and roadmaps for zero leprosy, and if there were a substantial number of countries that had worked with the Partnership and developed their own national partnerships, we might have a stronger connection and increased input from the global south. Where is representation best placed? The local context is most important for people in the field, so I wonder if we will sense a stronger connection to the global south once implementation begins. The leadership team is not the only place that zero leprosy will happen, it will happen in countries.
- Summarization and next steps: We celebrate what this group has achieved and the positive things we've created working together. We will rephrase the section on the Global Leprosy Programme and send a draft to everyone. We will follow up on governance. We will open a conversation about resources, balancing across priorities, and opening conversation about that moving forward. We want to talk about the composition of the leadership team including: gender, persons affected by leprosy, persons from the global south, National Leprosy Programme Managers, experts working in countries. We want to consider building our advocacy now that we've selected our countries. We're moving as a Partnership from theory to implementation, toward country work in support of National Leprosy Programmes. We want to thank everyone for their contributions to this work.

IV. Concluding Remarks and Observations from Leadership Team Members

- Arielle: Thank you to the work of the Secretariat for the evaluation. It's been a journey for the Partnership, and it's been humbling to see what we've accomplished. I want to better understand what the implications of the shifts we're making based on this evaluation will have for our milestones and for our planning. We see the NTD roadmap as a powerful tool, and better understanding how that document is expressed through the Partnership is another area I'd like to explore.

- Erwin: In two years we have achieved quite a lot and our work is being gradually and increasingly picked up at the country level and by donors. I'm happy we can be observers in it. I want to flag the open letter signed by persons affected to an Italian minister who used a metaphor about 'leper colonies'. I agree with the content of the letter, but I think the open letter may not have been the right way of approaching it. The minister made a comment out of ignorance, not because he wanted to attack the leprosy community, and by writing an open letter it looks like we're trying to shame him publicly. Italy is in a difficult situation and they need support. A similar letter was written by Mr. Sasakawa. It was addressed privately, which was probably the more correct way of doing it, than writing a public letter. I would recommend removing it from the website.
- Alice: I respect Erwin's views and I sympathize with the Italian people, but I think we need to keep two priorities in mind: the first is that if we are sincere about zero discrimination, the first thing we need to do is respect the voices of persons affected. This letter was from all the organizations of persons affected. It's not up to us to decide whether they write a letter or make it public. If GPZL is sincere about giving a voice to persons affected, they have a right to publish this letter on the website, as the rest of us have a right to ask GPZL to share our work. This is their work. Secondly, I understand that public discourse that uses leprosy as a metaphor usually does not have a goal of harming persons affected, they are spoken out of ignorance. This is challenging because it shows that we need to do more, and it shows that we need to work more on advocacy. We do not wish to see anyone being shamed, so why should we accept that persons affected continued to be shamed by political leaders? With regards to Italy, this is the second time this has happened. I support the letter and if GPZL is sincere about the zero-discrimination goal it must respect the people's voices.
- Bill: I think it's appropriate for the Partnership as a place for the voices of people affected, and we should not stand in the way of their voices.
- Mathias: I appreciate Erwin's suggestions and the main point was not to shame the minister, but this has happened several times. I understand that Mr. Sasakawa has a pretty sure way of making sure his letter reaches the minister of Italy, but we as people affected don't have that. We have to send public letters to try to reach him. We hope this letter reaches him and that he does not say the same thing again. This community has tried low-key approaches for a number of years, and how has it worked for us? Have we made an impact in reducing stigma and discrimination? We need to raise our voices. From persons affected there was no question about the action taken, just support. We were able to organize and act quickly. The letter was released the same day he issued the statement. The ILEP panel has submitted a formal complaint to the special rapporteur. I try to stay true to the wishes and intentions of people affected.

- Taka: I respect initiatives coming from persons affected because raising voices is very important. Ignorance is a fundamental problem- the minister used these statements, so normal people must still have this kind of ignorance. Mr. Sasakawa has been doing this kind of advocacy, and we don't get responses, but we continue. This kind of initiative should be done by many people in many different ways. As for the evaluation, I feel positive about the result. People don't pay very much attention to leprosy, but we're all here with the same goal, to make changes. I agree that the important thing is to grow our strengths, and one of these strengths is the diversity of the Partnership. But this diversity is challenging to handle sometimes. You need to hold differences in the backgrounds people involved, but I admire the work of Bill and Courtenay and Andie. I want to share two points related to implementation: we are now shifting to the implementation stage, and governance is important, but we need to consider what we do now. We need to consider both together. We were supposed to start supporting countries earlier this year, and we've had to modify our activities. In country activities will be very important. We need to demonstrate our effectiveness so we are able to expand our stakeholder group and attract new donors. I hope we can come up with a practical action plan for the country work soon. My second point is about zero discrimination. We should consider what we can do to achieve zero discrimination. Our organization is convincing the Japanese government to spearhead expanding Alice's mandate. If it is expanded, her position will continue for the next three years. While she is in her position, we should try to maximize her presence. If her mandate is extended soon we should have a conversation about GPZL's plans to achieve zero discrimination.
- Bill: I appreciate you all making time for this conversation. We're thankful you are engaged and continue to be engaged. By next Friday we will have interviewed the final four candidates for the director of the Secretariat position.