Dialogue with International Experts on Human Rights

Time: 26 June, 11:30-12:30

Venue: Taiwan Women's Center

Note taker: Sua Yu

Summary record

Ping Lee (moderator): Maybe we can give each participant one minute to introduce yourself and also tell the experts how you got involved in CEDAW and CEDAW work in your own organization or in your community?

Mei-nu Yu (legislator): I am a legislator now, and before I was a lawyer devoted to women's movement for over 30 years. I am concerned about women and human rights. I think this CEDAW Country Report Review is more progressive than the first time, because the first time was just a try. And because we have the experience of ICCPR and ICESCR, this review is better than the last time. I have a question: How to implement the experts' recommendations or suggestions? We see the ICCPR experience -- the government has the experts and people to examine the recommendations, but the government always…The problem is that the government has its own concept of gender. Although the experts give the concluding recommendations, the government officials have their sense. When they do something, it's just "something wrong". How can we actually implement the experts' concept through the recommendation? I think it's more important. This time, there is a lack of Judicial Yuan, Control Yuan, Examination Yuan, and Legislative Yuan. It is also difficult for me in the Legislative Yuan because the congressmen or congresswomen lack the gender concept. So maybe the education is more important. Is there any effective measure or answer that you can give in implementing the recommendations?

Shuang-shuang Keng (Taipei Women's Rescue Foundation): Our foundation has been involved in CEDAW for many years, and especially since last year, we and YWCA have been drafting our NGO Alternative Report for about one year, just to prepare our Alternative Report centered on violence against women. We are pretty happy that, today, the CEDAW Review Committee has adopted many of our suggestions into the recommendations. My question also echoes with Legislator Yu's question. We want to know how we can monitor the government into implementing the recommendations, and what kind of actions we can do from the civil society perspective.

Victoria Hsu (Taiwan Alliance to Promote Civil Partnership Rights): Our organization advocates for LGBT rights, especially focusing on the legal reform regarding the family rights. We are quite happy about Point 33 of the recommendations made by the Review Committee, and I have two questions. The first question is quite like the previous remark or statement by the two ladies, about the implementation of the suggestions. How to encourage or urge our government to implement the suggestions? How to introduce the efficient mechanism to urge them to do so? Especially, I think they are lacking the political intention to do that. They just keep holding several meetings without any real result or outcome. My second remark is that I notice that perhaps our independent experts didn't have enough time to get a whole picture of our legal system. For example, I notice that our experts have some misunderstandings about our marriage system or the civil partnership. Actually we don't have civil partnership system, but maybe there are some misleading information provided by somebody. That's another question – how to improve the communication to ensure the information provided to the experts is exact?

Shu-huan Wang (Taiwan Senior Citizen Leaders' Association): I was a police officer for more than 28 years and was retired from the police office. Our organization is concerned about elders or senior citizen issues, and we found that the country report didn't mention about the older women. We are very sorry for that. We are also concerned about the violence against women, especially for older women, so I came here to learn something about this issue.

Shu-wen Liao (Taiwan Coalition Against Violence): My interest is about the gender-based violence. Today, I am really appreciative and want to listen more about your opinions and your ideas. For the last 3 days, I did not have the opportunity to attend your program, so I just want to save the time and give you more time to speak. And also the question is mentioned before – I want to know how you do the impact assessment of training in your country to the government officials, particularly those law-enforcement officers? Do you have any good suggestions that can help us? We have a problem that the training result is probably not as profound as we really want to deal with those stereotype issues. Do you have any suggestions or ideas? Or what can we do more profound or efficiently?

Sophie L.C. Liang (National Alliance of Taiwan Women's Associations): My major is always in cooperative economics, so my question is that is there any reports about the cooperative economics in other countries, and were the experts concerned about it?

Jau-hwa Chen (Covenants Watch): How I got involved in CEDAW is a long story. The Legislative Yuan and we suggested the ratification of CEDAW and established the CEDAW National Report Review Procedure in Taiwan in 2009. For me, it's a very hard to accept the procedure without an independent secretariat, and for me, the UN spirit of human right monitoring system is very important to Taiwan. Because we cannot submit the report to the UN, I think we can bring the UN procedure to Taiwan. I think the executive department don't really know the spirit, for example, if the whole review system is independent, why was the invitation from the Prime Minister, not from some NGO or neutral group? It is hard to accept that! If the Party submitted the report and organized the review procedure, how can it be independent and fair, and really evaluate the whole procedure as good or bad? For me, the preparation and the whole procedure is not following the international standard of monitoring systems somehow. This is why I would like to hear from you how we can fix this procedure more to make it look more like the UN procedure, and how the secretariat can play this role of the secretariat of the CEDAW committee.

The last country reports review of ICCPR and the ICESCR, after the 81 recommendations, even after the over 50 times of negotiations, the state party did not provide any action plan for that. So it's useless, even the whole day negotiation, the state party cannot promise anything or cannot have any concrete step for that. So I guess there will be a similar procedure this time: negotiate and negotiate, and what is the concrete step? Even after the last review procedure, just one or two days, and the Committee member already made some forced eviction happen. Eviction is not far from here, the Hwa-guang Community. Some residents lived for over 20 years were not allowed to live there anymore. This directly belongs to the Ministry of Justice, and the Minister and Prime Minister claimed that they don't have some property right, so they have to go away. But it is really problematic, if they really want to follow the recommendations, they will not do things like that. The question is whether the state really has the will, whether they are really willing to follow the recommendations or to follow the international standard. I think I am very skeptical. That's why the Legislator Yu has the question.

Sunny L. H. Huang (Foundation for Women's Rights Promotion and Development): This morning, I joined the press meeting, and the Review Committee suggests that the Taiwanese government try to establish a national human rights institution, and we have been talking this issue for a very long time. So what is your suggestions and how to make it work in Taiwan? The second question is: what is the next step for the NGOs after this review procedure? If we try to develop some following CEDAW training, what should we do? And how should we evaluate the outcome of the training?

Marsha A. Freeman (Senior Fellow, University of Minnesota Human Rights Center)**:**
I have to say that among the thing we are saying, certain questions keep coming back, and these are the same questions we have seen everywhere in the world. That is, no. 1, are any human rights experts who are evaluating a government's performance getting all the information that is actually correct that they need to do a proper evaluation? This whole question of the inputs is critical, because the experts can only review what is on the record, so it becomes critical to have the record be clear, and you were saying there wasn't enough information about the legal system for them to have a clear statement to come back with. I had the good fortune to be here six months ago for a symposium that was produced by the academy for the judiciary and for that, I had to do research about the government, the system here, because I knew nothing about it. I am in a very good law school, and as soon as I sent a note to our librarian saying "I'm going to Taiwan", he immediately sent me a book that was done recently about the legal system in Taiwan in English. But I still did not have enough information that I would like to have about the specifics of the law, and I think in order to have the impact you want with any reviewing body, you need to give them that. They will not have independent research capacity to go find out what exactly the family laws say or do not say, so it's just a technical issue of making sure. It's technical, but it's really important. They need to have exactly the language in front of them that is a problem for you, in order for them to make a comment on it that actually makes sense. So I know there was this problem. I was sitting in the room and about the partnerships, unmarried people living together, same sex, open sex, three sexes, intersex, it doesn't matter – people who are living together who are not married according to the marriage law. And the official said "we don't know how many de-facto unions there are because we don't allow them to be registered". Does that sound circular to you? This was not an answer! But it does give us a real perspective on how far we have to go, and I think that we need to have… I don't know if the experts said much of what you hoped to say, but probably not everything that you hope to see, because they were working with whatever information they had. They did not have time to go and research every single legal provision either, so it's really up to the people who care and know to tell the experts, so it's a technical issue.
There are two other things I hear: one issue is impact assessment, and we hear that over and over again, and it's important to know that for any review process, under all the treaties, the treaty experts always want to know what is the impact, and the failure of the government to report on impact of training or impact of laws or impact of some policies. The Geneva Process will say, "yeah, you have a program, you have a policy, tell us how it worked for people". It's in the system to ask this question, but it doesn't seem to be in the system to have a good answer.
And this brings me to item 3, which is political will, and we can sit here thinking about

political will. There is a failure of political will throughout government systems everywhere, I mean I come from the US, and you want to talk about failures… aside from not ratifying CEDAW, we went to wreck Iraq, we've done all kinds of things that a lot of people did not agree with, and we are the world's biggest democracy that isn't quite as chaotic, but it is a big democracy, over 300 million people. We can all know how to make our voices heard, and it's such a huge country, right? So people in Washington or in our state capitals need to hear directly from the people who are affected, and US, with all our wealth and our education and our freedom to organize, we still have problems making our voices heard. It is fundamentally a political issue. Human right is a political issue, not a legal issue, and the only way political will developed is organizing the voices of the people. That's what it needs. Nobody wakes up one morning and says "I think today I'll abolish apartheid." Didn't quite happen. It looks like a lot of work that went into that, and many voices had to go into that, so organizing the voices to speak with an indication that there is power behind the voices can mean a great deal in any place that calls itself a democracy. Sometimes you win, and sometimes you lose, you can't always get what you want but you can sometimes get what you need. It is largely because people organize enough and demonstrate that in fact, if we don't get what we need, we will vote against you. That is the democratic process. I think there is a tremendous amount of political energy here from everything I know about demonstrations. The critical question is to organize that political energy, to demonstrate that in fact the voices from the street need to be heard because if they're not, the government will go down. You don't always get that result, but I think from what we've seen from the last few days, there are many voices with political energy, not necessarily demonstrating to the government that there is a real power of organization behind them, and that people are on the same page, that everybody wants certain things, whether they are from different organizations, there are certain things everybody raise on, and all these organizations speaking with one voice represent many more people behind them. That's how political will is built – basic democratic exercise, and Taiwan is fortunate that it's not Mainland. One of the things I've realized over all these years working with women is that even governments that are afraid of dissent and might put people in jail who are dissenters, usually will not get entangled with putting women in jail who are pushing for women human rights. It's not as threatening to the state, so there is a little less risk of going onto the streets or organizing. They don't think you are trying to bring down the government, they think you are looking for something that is more benign than that, and we can use that to our strength. That is a strength because they want to be able to say they are doing the right thing, so doing the right thing with respect to women is something they can do without necessarily giving up huge amounts of power or the government coming down, it's less threatening than some other kinds of human rights work, so we can use that to our advantage as well, but it is a political exercise, and it is

hard for all of us to agree on 6 words that we all agree on, and that's what we need to do. 10 words we can agree on, 2 paragraphs that we can agree on, and then there is all that power behind the agreement, that's really the key to political will. Showing that we all agree.

Marie-Claude Julsaint (Global Programme Manager for Violence against Women, World YWCA)**:** One thing that I want to reiterate from what Marsha said is that Taiwan is not different from other countries around the world. When we look at the CEDAW process, and the challenges and struggles that NGO around the world have in monitoring the implementation of CEDAW, in challenging the government to do what they have promised to do, we see this all over. And whether it's on the Millennium Development Goals, or whether it's the commitment on other treaties and other conventions, just in terms of human rights in general, women rights, it's the same. So don't feel too discouraged by the challenges you face here. You are part of the global women movement and human rights movement trying to accomplish the same things.

Some of the questions that keep coming from NGOs is: how do we monitor the implementation of these specific recommendations that have come out? And it's great that we now know what the recommendations are, we have copies, just want to suggest that while the experts have recommended that the government establish a national action plan, I think that one thing you might consider doing yourselves together is to have your own action plan, to sort of give you direction and some objectives, very concrete, with timelines, indicators of what it is you want to accomplish in the next 3 to 4 years. I feel that will be very helpful.

And in terms of how to push the government to do what it's supposed to do, what is recommended here, I think one of the ways to do that is to collaborate with them on certain things, certain actions. The example I want to share is the situation in Palestine, in terms of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325, this is something that many countries around the world have adopted, committed themselves to it. They are, or have, developed national action plans to implement this resolution which calls for women's participation in all the different peace processes, whether it's the prevention of conflict, whether it's peace-building, etc. Because Palestine is not a full member of the United Nations and have not their own national action plan, but they have the will to have one. There are Ministry of Woman Affairs have approached the YWCA of Palestine along with the younger national groups, women organizations working on violence against women, and also there is a national forum on 1325 to come together with the government this September to invite other women groups, academic institutions, groups around the world to come to Palestine to share experiences, learning and together to see how they can come up with at least a framework of a draft strategy towards a national action plan. I think that's an example of where government is collaborating with civil society, with NGOs, to do something that

should be government action. For example, here in the recommendations, the government is encouraged to establish the independent national human rights institution, but also to set some specific timeframe to establish the national action plan for the promotion and protection of human rights. So this is something that you might consider. Approach whichever part of the government would be responsible for the establishment of this institution and national action plan and say well, "Can we work together? Can we see how we collaborate to actually implement this recommendation?" And I think if you put this as part of your own action plan, it will be easier to monitor what you have been able to accomplish in the next 3-4 years, and also what the government is supposed to do according to these recommendations. This is just one example of how you can collaborate. There are of course things that you would like to do on your own as a part of civil society, but I think there are some things based on these recommendations that you might want to do together, to push them to implement these recommendations.

Jau-hwa Chen (Covenants Watch)**:** The first draft of the national human rights institution of the office under the President is already done, but also the draft from the Covenants Watch has been already given to the Ministry of Justice. They can compare these two drafts and see what happened. We already have such cooperation, and also we know this is a compromising process. The government proposes such kinds of recommendations, they discuss, and they really want to have such an institution. But the more problematic part is: the talk is always not really constitutive because one proposes for this kind of institution and the other will say more or less. Somehow it wastes a lot of time just for this negotiating process. Of course, it is normal… But I think the key point is the international standard, for example the Paris Principle, I think the government do not really accept all, or really understand in which level or what kind of standard they should follow. So if we talk about the training course, and you know the government sometimes react like that. But Taiwan is very special. The crucial point is: if this is international standard, why do you reject that and why do you follow your own principle? Why do you want ratify this international document? So it is a critical point. If you don't really understand what kind of spirit this convention means, or why they have such a wording, or why they prescribe such a standard, then you can't really use it. The key issue is that they have the will but they don't have the knowledge, or don't really understand the standard.

Marie-Claude Julsaint (Global Programme Manager for Violence against Women, World YWCA)**:** I think this is where there might be a role for you here because if they don't really understand the spirit, the principles, some of these trainings you might be able to conduct them to educate the different government officials. As we said, this is everywhere, government will use or say certain things to their interests, and they will show the

political will, and other times when it's not so convenient, they will say this is a special case, and we are in a different situation so we can't really…

Jau-hwa Chen (Covenants Watch)**:** Maybe other countries have many channels for international communication, and their officers have official relationship with different countries. However, Taiwan's officers don't really have a chance to communicate with international community, so they don't really have the training for the human rights standard. Maybe they want to learn something, but the international community excludes them, or they don't want to have some international conferences or human rights mechanism. Maybe because of China, I'm not sure.

Marie-Claude Julsaint (Global Programme Manager for Violence against Women, World YWCA)**:** Also thinking in terms of these connectors with the international community, in terms of groups. I know the international network for the protection of the elderly people, and this is a contact that I can share with you. Just to make those connections, to share information and to get the information out there that the international community.

The last point I want to make is part of the YWCA, where we put so much emphasis on young women leadership and the need for young women to participate. I would just like to stress how important it is that you involve young women as much as possible in these processes. Because this is an ongoing process, it is a journey, this is the second review, there will be a third, a fourth… this goes on. You don't want the memory to get lost, you don't want all these work that you have done to get lost at some point, so I think it's very important to continue to involve young women in this process. It's both the transfer of knowledge, of expertise, but it's also a mentoring opportunity. Young women will learn from your experience because there are many professors and experts who have been in this field for 20 years, 30 years. It's really important to pass this knowledge and expertise on to the younger generation.

Shih-i Yen (Foundation for Women's Rights Promotion and Development): We have two questions regarding the action plans. As you mentioned, the action plan is the efficient strategy to push the government to implement the recommendations. The first question is about the government's national action plan. We notice that different ministries of our government cannot work together. A single ministry may has its own action plan, but different ministries don't have the comprehensive picture of one issue. The second question is about the content of NGO action plan. We wonder whether NGO should have action plan to monitor the government's work, or we should formulate our own agenda to do some jobs NGO can do. What kind of action plan is more efficient?

Lesley Ann Foster (Board of Directors, International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia

Pacific)**:** The government department works in silos, they don't really speak to each other, and your role is to constantly ask for that cross-exchange between departments, and after a while, one of the things we did was to call for a government coordinating body, for instance to deal with violence against women. We got two things: we got an inter-ministerial committee in the executive of the government; all the ministers are responsible for reducing violence against women at the highest level. The second thing we got was a national council of violence against women; it took us 18 years to get that. So everything you're looking for now is not a quick fix, there is no quick fix to this. It is a slow process of constantly working at these issues, and be mindful of that.

The role you have to play, first of all, for most of the NGOs here, is to improve your coordination, because if you are strong and coordinated movement, then you have a stronger voice. That's being said repeatedly. One of the things we did was to establish a network in order to give us that political power. Your political power comes from having a cohesive voice, so you need to work around those issues and build that cohesive voice and that political voice.

The other thing to do is to increase your evidence statistics. If you can show your statistics if you are sending reports to them, if you are showing your statistics to them about what is happening to groups within the overall. So if you are looking at the elderly, what is the impact of government policies and you are documenting that. Documentation of women experiences is critical to change, it's critical. And anecdotal evidence goes a small way, but if you can get stronger evidence based on research, the different mechanisms, and there are many mechanisms – you can do photographs, you can do photographic exhibitions, do a whole lot of things, you need to increase your visibility as a women's movement.

Some of you have spoken about a national association. Are you national enough? Are you representative enough? Have you got all of the women across the country in that national association dealing with that particular issue? So part of what you need to do is some self-reflection. We all need that at some point, to ask ourselves the difficult questions about ourselves. Look at what are the things we can do to change that. Sometimes the energy that we have is strong, but it's stuck. How do you shift that? How do your shift your thinking around this? See yourself as political entities and a political force that can bring out the change. You showed it to us over these last days! You showed it to us with your shadow reports, with your presentations, your statements, your coming together, your attendance, your engagement with experts, you are a political force! So how do you use that political force, that energy, that knowledge that you've got to increase that accountability?

The other thing that I think is critical conceptual clarity. In this recommendation, you were talking about the judiciary saying this issue of a six year old having the consent. Are you all clear about what that actually means? And can you then maybe argue that this is an

incorrect interpretation. So it's that kind of things, because it's difficult to go to your state and say we want X, Y and Z, if one group is saying one thing. We are still, years later, having discussions about that. In this week, in this process, we had a whole political discussion around equality versus equity, and that whole world, I mean it's something think up by Shanti Dairiam during one of the breaks in the session, if it went out across the world and everybody started debating this, because we see how people are interpreting it in different ways, and how the state is using it against us. Our state is using it against us, so it is important that we constantly grapple with these concepts to deepen our own knowledge and understanding, and how we use that when we talk to the state, because it makes a huge difference, because I think right now the problem is they don't know that they don't know. And that's the most interesting thing because they think like that. I also wanted to add to this, that one of the ways that you can shift the energy and shift the understanding of the work you're doing is through exchanges. It is exchange in your country, going to different areas and looking at situations, but also trying to get these exchanges done internationally, because that helps to give your different perspectives. And I've discovered yesterday when we had a lunch date with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that they actually have an international NGO exchange program. How much have you used that? Because it is an opportunity to go to look at different systems in different parts of the world.

The other thing to do is to bring expertise into your country for the training you are asking for. We can't tell you here how to do that national action plan, if you arrange the training for 20 women groups, and you brought in an expert to do that, we will facilitate you developing that yourself. There is no blueprint for it. Every context is different. Every situation is different. So you bring somebody in, you raise the money… there is something else I wanted to ask you was: who funds you? Where do you get your money from? That's everybody's problem, right? It is difficult. There is the question about how you can do that.

The other thing you need to do is to get allies in the government. You need to break down that "us and them" divide, so you don't need many allies, you had a legislator here earlier on. That's one manner. Where do you find other allies that in health or education or something? And once you build those allies up, massage them, "you are doing such a great job, and we really appreciate X, Y and Z, would you come to us and have a seminar with us and talk about something?", and sometimes in that seminar, you can change the way they think, you can expand the understanding of what it is you want. So it takes a little bit of thinking, a little bit of work, a little bit of strategizing, but you need those allies from the government. If they're over there and you are here, and there is a bigger distance, you can't bring about that change. How do you bring people closer to you in order to do that? It's difficult in our country. Do you know our politicians have changed? In the beginning, they all knew each other. It was wonderful! You could talk to people, there were an openness, and an interest, and then things changed, and people leave, people were chucked out of

the government, people stormed off furiously because of their losses, and so slowly you lose that, and you have to rebuild it constantly. This work is a constant movement. I think you've done amazingly well, and I think what you're grappling is how do we take this to the next level. We all reach some kind of plateau, or we come up against resistance, and then we have to re-strategize, and so what I'm saying is you need time out to reflect, debrief, look back on what's worked, what was the good that came out of this, and if there's any good that came out of this. And for me, the question is: your state is ratifying this, and they poured a lot of money into this process of having these experts, of having this 400-page report, having 28 NGO reports, of bringing us here together with the experts – there is a lot that has gone into it, which shows some political strategizing. I'm not saying it's a political move, but strategizing. Are you clear about it? And I think you're saying not, I'm also saying not, what is it? Because under that is something that they want, clearly that they want, how do you hone in on that and leverage that to your own advantage? I think that's something worth grappling. And I'm leave here unclear about it, but intrigued and interested and as time goes by… to many questions, we don't have clear-cut answers, we grapple with this in our country as well, and it's something that happens all over the world… what the hell are they up to now? And then we don't know. So we start looking around, opening our ears more, reading, trying to get that, but I think you are in a very exciting place. It's such an exciting time, and you've got a lot that you've accomplished, and that you can look at it and say "this is an achievement". It is an achievement for the women movement that you've got this far, where to next, and how to get to that next stage?

Marsha A. Freeman (Senior Fellow, University of Minnesota Human Rights Center)**:** One is you talk about building alliances with people inside government, it's not just elected officials, sometimes the most effective people are the ones who run… whom we think of as the bureaucrats, the people who are there from one election to another election, they stay, they're always there, and those people frequently… if you can build alliances with them, they have access to information that they'll be willing to tell you that is not going to be published. If you want to see something, get the ear of somebody, they'll know who to talk to, and I will say for the women's movement in the US, the person who started my program is now 88 years old. Her name is Lavon Frasier. She was the first woman to become a director at USAID. She ran Jimmy Carter's campaign, and when he won, he said "What job do you want? Where do you want to go?" She said "We have to something about women at USAID", and what she did was develop this whole conversation about insiders and outsiders, and the way we were able to make some progress within the administration. Unfortunately, Jimmy Carter lost, and so she was only there for 4 years, but at that time, she commissioned articles and research by feminist academics. This was the 1970s, and we thought women and development, to push it along the avenue of thinking of it as a

rights issue, and not as a development issue. She was a pioneer, and brought the conversation so that people inside government, people outside government, could talk to each other. They're divided between insiders and outsiders, in fact, is was an enormously productive thinking time in the US as to the international aspects of women movement in the same time as many things were happening. Recently in the US, people move in and out of government all the time, depending on who is elected, we look at who's currently ambassador to the US – he's a former academic. Obama has brought a lot of academics in, so they have connections from their prior lives, and they'll be there for a while, and maintaining those connections is critical in having a real hand in what's going on.

The other thing I wanted to say is with respect to this issue of being organized and staying organized, building on what you have done so far. We have among us, and also in discussing with the other experts, we have pretty much come to the same point of suggesting that if you're looking for mechanisms to monitor, what you really are doing is to planning for the next report. The monitoring starts now, and goes on to the next report. And in order to have that system in place, part of it be effective, we need not only a plan now for how we push the government, but also a plan for 2 years from now, 3 years from now, that will be a time to bring in people from outside who have experience in the recording process, to help shape this discussion clearly. We were fortunate to be here, we really didn't have the opportunity to work with people when the reports were being done, and we just saw this after the fact. You have to think about writing these reports earlier in the process, and work with people from outside who hadn't, so that you can shape that over a period of time and you are developing your coalitions at the same time, you are developing your monitoring and evaluation at the same time, starting now, not starting in 2 and a half years from today. This is a process, it's not a onetime thing. We got to think of this as a process, and you can get a great deal out of the process just by doing work, regardless of what might happen to the review.

Marie-Claude Julsaint (Global Programme Manager for Violence against Women, World YWCA)**:** Just one of the things I want to suggest because we can feel your passion in the last 3 days, and I think there is a momentum right now. You don't want to lose that, because many times what happens is that it sort of dies in the months following the review until it's time to begin the next one. So you might want to plan… for example a one-day debrief, conversation among yourselves to really talk with each other, you want the experience about what you learnt, about how you can improve it, and then your next step on how to go forward, and really brainstorming and studying this NGO action plan for the next 3 to 4 months. So not to wait too long to have your debrief discussion.