



**Women's Foreign Policy Group
United Nations Study Visit
New York, NY
May 1, 2009**

Session III: Ending Violence against Women in Conflict Zones

Joanne Sandler

Deputy Executive Director of UNIFEM

Gillian Sorensen: Our next speaker, Joanne Sandler, is the Deputy Executive Director of UNIFEM, the UN's organization for women, and the topic is *Ending Violence against Women in Conflict Zones*. She has been Deputy Director for some time; she has worked with international organizations and women's groups for virtually all her career. She worked at the Ms. Foundation for Women, the Global Foundation for Women, the National Council for Research on Women, and International Planned Parenthood – you can see where her deep interests and commitments lie. We welcome you to this podium, and she will also be glad to take your questions after her remarks.

Joanne Sandler: Thank you, Gillian, and thank you so much to Patricia Ellis and the Women's Foreign Policy Group for inviting UNIFEM to add our views to this important session. As many of you know, in late March, a law was signed in Afghanistan that severely restricts women's rights within marriage, or has the potential to. Women's groups and women parliamentarians protested, at great risk to their lives, citing the country's constitutional guarantees of women's rights. Several weeks later, Sitara Achakzai, a women's rights activist, was gunned down in the streets of Kandahar. Before Mrs. Achakzai was gunned down, we had already seen the assassination of the country's most senior female police officer, and of Safia Ama Jan, the head of the Kandahar Women's Affairs department.

These attacks occur in many conflict situations, from Zimbabwe, where over the past 18 months women who are associated with the political opposition to the regime have been beaten and raped in custody, to Myanmar, where women of particular ethnicities have been targeted. Too often, we see that the international community – and I mean the donor countries and the mainstream of the UN – fail to stand up alongside these women. They're concerned about being charged with imposing Western values. They advise us to go slowly, and give men the time to do the right thing. They're concerned about being distracted from the war on terror and security. As one State Department official said when we brought a group of Afghan women to Washington, DC, this past March, and I quote, "Why should we delay security in Afghanistan for women's equality?"

This is a false dichotomy. If the rights and safety of more than 10,000 women who came out onto the streets in towns throughout Afghanistan on March 8, wearing these blue scarves and calling for peace, are not seen as an essential part of achieving security, what meaning does Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace, and security and Resolution 1820 on sexual violence really have?

My main point today is that there can be no security without women's security. There is no peace if negotiations trade impunity for crimes against women for an end to conflict. In agreeing to Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820, the Council is affirming that promoting and protecting women's rights is actually a matter of national and international security. But these resolutions are not even as good as the paper they're written on if they're not implemented, and they're far from being implemented.

So over the next ten minutes, I want to share with you what we see, from UNIFEM's vantage point, as four key challenges for breathing life into the hard-won Security Council commitments, particularly through the lens of Afghanistan, Sudan, and DRC [Democratic Republic of the Congo]. And I want to highlight how the UN is responding, and how your advocacy could create new options and opportunities for many millions of women in conflict and post-conflict situations.

The first challenge is ending impunity for rape in peace processes and negotiations. You all know that attacks on women's bodies and rights have become one means of pursuing military and political objectives. In Eastern Congo and Darfur, rape is taking place on a massive scale. Since early this year, there have been 350 reported rapes a month in North Kivu. These are likely to be just a fraction of what is really happening, as the chance of judicial process is close to nil, so there's no incentive for reporting. In Sudan, rape has been used on all war fronts as a means of intimidating populations and forcing displacement. In parts of Liberia, 90% of all females above the age of 3 have experienced sexual violence, as did up to 50% of women and girls in Sierra Leone during the conflict.

Rape has emerged as one of the defining characteristics of conflict, a cheap yet highly effective method of terror. "It is more dangerous to be a woman than a soldier in war today." This statement was made in 2008 by an ex-force commander for the UN in eastern DRC, and it signals how the nature of conflict is changing. The conduct of conflict today makes everyone a participant, not just soldiers or militants. Some say there's nothing new about this, but we are seeing changes in the intent behind and the extent of rape. It is organized; it is targeted. We saw in the rape camps in Bosnia a highly systematic approach to sexual violence. Rape is used to terrorize communities, to shred the social fabric. It forces communities to flee areas that commanders want to isolate for trade or extractive industrial production.

Only four peace agreements have mentioned the need to address and provide redress for sexual violence – those are DRC, Burundi, the Darfur Abuja Accord of 2002, and the Uganda Juba Peace Agreement that has never been signed. Women are not at the talks in numbers, and those affected stay silent for fear of stigmatization. Indeed, to quote Don Steinberg of the International Crisis Group, "The treatment of this issue in peace talks

usually involves men forgiving men for the violence that men have done to women. The result is a climate of impunity that leads to the socially generalized rape that we see today in so many conflict countries.”

That’s why UNIFEM is collaborating with DPKO, DPO, UNDP, and OCHA, and with the Center for Humanitarian Dialogue, to work with conflict mediators on the challenges of addressing sexual violence in peace processes. We recognize that the UN and other mediators have no specific training on how to address this issue, or what would be the right way to bring it into a cease-fire monitoring arrangement. In June, we’ll be taking a first step by bringing mediators from different peace negotiations together to identify the impediments negotiators face and capacities and support that they need to start a new generation of negotiations.

The second challenge is institutionalizing standard operating procedures to prevent sexual violence through implementation and monitoring of 1820. Security Council Resolution 1820, unanimously agreed on last June, represents a great advance in the understanding of this problem. The Secretary-General said, “In no other area is our collective failure to ensure effective protection for civilians more apparent than in terms of the masses of women and girls, and also men and boys, whose lives are destroyed each year by sexual violence perpetrated in conflict.”

Because of the international community’s response, which has been desperately inadequate, 12 UN entities formed ‘UN Action against Sexual Violence in Conflict’ to strengthen coordinated UN action in support of 1820. UN Action, of which UNIFEM is a founding member, marks a concerted effort by the UN system to improve accountability, amplify advocacy, and strengthen national efforts to prevent sexual violence and support survivors. In DRC, UN Action for instance is bringing together all UN entities to develop the first ever comprehensive strategy to combat sexual violence, which was endorsed by the government of DRC on April 1.

Resolution 1820 has particularly important implications for how the UN approaches peacekeeping. UNIFEM worked last year with DPKO and UN Action to develop military tactics to protect and prevent widespread and systematic sexual violence. Working with Major General Patrick Cammaert, we assembled an inventory of existing promising practices to engage women in generating intelligence about impending attacks, and to patrol in areas likely to be threatened by organized rape. For instance, instead of patrolling on arterial roads in the middle of the day, soldiers might have to patrol in pre-dawn hours between the village and water points, which is where women are attacked. This list of good practices has been field-tested in Liberia and DRC, and is currently being transformed into materials for training troops and police prior to deployments.

The third challenge is monitor, monitor, monitor. Nine years after the agreement by the Security Council to 1325, mechanisms to monitor and implement its provisions remain woefully inadequate. We left, I believe, at the back of the room our flagship publication, *Progress of the World’s Women*. When you read it, which we hope you will, if you turn to page 98, you will see a chart that compares the monitoring mechanisms that the

Security Council agreed to for Resolution 1612 on children in armed conflict and 1325 on women in armed conflict. For the former, there is robust monitoring, regular reporting on violations, and a strong agency, UNICEF, to speak out for children on the ground. For 1325, there is voluntary reporting, virtually no monitoring, and the notion that women's rights is [sic] everyone's business, which means it's nobody's business.

Just two days ago, the Security Council agreed to consider over the next three months adding rape and other grave sexual violence to its triggers for Council attention to the situation of children in armed conflict. In the absence of a monitoring mechanism for 1325 or 1820, this is a useful development, but it also shows just how sorely the women, peace, and security agenda needs to be monitored, and until we have a formal mechanism, we have to do it ourselves. Take peace talks – UNIFEM's recent research shows that the UN has to date never appointed a woman chief mediator, though the African Union has done so in the context of the Kenyan political crisis. Fewer than 2% of signatories of peace deals since 2000 have been women, and only 7% of negotiators. These numbers have not changed much since 2000, even though 1325 explicitly asks for an increase in number of women in peace talks.

Take also funding for post-conflict reconstruction. Our analysis is revealing a pattern of serious under-funding of women's recovery and livelihood needs. Our analysis of emergency and post-conflict spending patterns shows that just 2% of post-conflict budgets target women's empowerment or gender equality or addresses sexual violence. And just 8% of the proposed budgets in eight post-conflict needs assessments have an indicator on women's issues or gender equality concerns.

Finally, take post-conflict reconstruction donor conferences. Women's rights and priorities, and women themselves, are largely invisible in these conferences. UNIFEM organized with the government of Norway and Inclusive Security at the 2005 and 2008 donor conferences for Sudan a delegation of women who were initially excluded from the room, eventually allowed into the room, but not without a huge amount of pushback from the conveners of the conference. We have to regularize the participation of women leaders at these donor conferences if we are ever to ensure some element of equity in the allocation of resources.

Challenge four is supporting women to lead in spearheading change. Over the past ten years, UNIFEM has worked with the UN system in more than 30 conflict or post-conflict countries. We are seeing or developing a range of strategies that are promising and that come from close links and partnerships with women's groups. Some of the most promising strategies include first investing in transitional justice measures. In Peru, Colombia, Sierra Leone, Morocco, and Liberia, UNIFEM supported truth commissions that enable women to speak out about the atrocities they suffer without fear of reprisal. We need a surge capacity in the UN to enable countries to deliver justice for women.

Secondly, providing safe spaces that advance women's human rights and economic security. The two things that women almost always want and need during and after conflict are safe spaces and livelihoods. We need to systematize how we provide these. In

Afghanistan, UNIFEM is supporting referral centers for women who were subject to violence, where they can seek legal aid and pursue justice without fear of rough treatment they might receive in police stations. Ironically, these centers serve as a viable option to imprisonment, as in Afghanistan and other countries, a woman who has been raped is often charged with adultery, branded as a prostitute, and sentenced to jail. UNIFEM has negotiated an agreement with the Ministry of Interior, where in the provinces no woman who has been raped is sent to prison, and all rape victims receive legal and counseling services.

Thirdly, bringing coalitions of women together across lines of conflict to build sustainable constituencies for peace. We're supporting Palestinian and Israeli women, Serbian and Kosovar women, and Afghan and Pakistani women to build working partnerships and to articulate a common agenda for conflict resolution and sustainable peace. The International Women's Commission for a Just and Sustainable Palestinian-Israeli Peace is based on a 3-way partnership: Israelis, Palestinians, and international women leaders who generate common principles and solutions and advocate together in one voice.

Fourthly, ensuring that resources flow to women's rights and empowerment. As an example, we've established a multi-donor fund to end violence against women in Afghanistan and we're also launching what we call an urgent action fund to provide immediate assistance to women's human rights defenders who are targeted with death threats, where \$500 can mean the difference between life and death. Given the dearth of funding for women in post-conflict reconstruction budgets, these funds are a necessity.

And finally, high-level leadership is key. The 'Say No to Violence' campaign that UNIFEM launched last year with Nicole Kidman as the main spokesperson is an example of reaching out for high-level political support for addressing this pandemic. Over five million individuals from around the world signed on, but as important, representatives from 70 governments, including 30 heads of state and some 600 parliamentarians. This campaign feeds into the ongoing 'Unite to End Violence' campaign of the UN Secretary-General, where he is inviting male leaders to join with him to express their outrage and refusal to accept violence against women as inevitable and to take meaningful action to end it.

In conclusion, if war is changing, then the UN's response must change. We have to change our early warning systems, how we resolve and mediate conflicts, how we approach peace talks. We have to change funding priorities and make sure that we invest in social groups and social cohesion to build peace and sustainable recovery. We cannot keep fighting a rear-guard action and clean up the mess afterwards. Let me end by quoting from a letter from 71 women's organizations in the DRC, which was sent immediately prior to the adoption of Resolution 1820. They called for an end to impunity, services for survivors of violence in their families, and finally, they reminded us, and I quote, "We applaud your recent condemnation of the sexual violence we suffer. We remind you that we have suffered for decades without any notable action on your part. You must ensure that this situation never repeats itself; not in Congo, and not in any other

country. The Security Council cannot be quiet while thousands of women suffer indescribable sexual violence.”

The Security Council’s silence has been deafening. The silence from leaders around the world has been deafening. But we know that groups like this, the Women’s Foreign Policy Group, can make a huge difference in calling on leaders to no longer and never again be silent. We hope that you will not hesitate to call on UNIFEM and the entire UN system for support and partnership. Thank you.

Question: Thank you very much for this very interesting presentation. You compare, and rightly so, the handling by the Security Council of the issue of children in armed conflict compared to the issue of women. We certainly have a model with a working group in the Council on children in armed conflict and we have none on the women and we have this monitoring mechanism for the children and we have none really for the women. So my question to you is, what would you suggest, and what are the recommendations you could make to try to – it’s certainly not the data which are missing; we know that one third of Congo has been raped, in eastern Congo, and the members of the Council are perfectly aware of this. So what measures do you think could be taken by you, by other organizations, by the membership at large, what kind of strategy by the Secretary-General to really mobilize the Security Council on this issue?

Question: I’m from the American Bar Association, and we currently have a program in the DRC that provides direct legal aid to rape victims and also works to build capacity in the justice sector of the DRC. I was just wondering – our basis for these programs is the idea that in the overall long term, the domestic justice sectors have to be able to provide justice for their own individuals, and we can’t have NGOs and different governments trying to protect women’s rights all around the world, not in a necessarily sustainable manner. So I was wondering, in your opinion, what do you think is the future for developing domestic justice sectors and how much emphasis do you think the UN will put on that avenue?

Question: Within the context of what you spoke about and the challenges, I’m wondering if you could give examples of programs or organizations that you’ve come across that are also using male-to-male or boy-to-male strategies to address the attitudes and behaviors in the community, that are also working with the women-led groups. Any thoughts on that or things that you’ve come across, organizations?

Question: I recently heard Eve Ensler speak about the Congo, and I know she has a very strong role going now. She mentioned inviting Ban Ki-moon to visit a hospital in the Congo to actually see firsthand a doctor’s work with these women who are suffering from the after-effects of rape. Have you had an effort to take other leaders to see firsthand some of this, and I wanted to know, what impact do you think that might have? I don’t even know what the feedback from that trip was.

Joanne Sandler: Those are great questions. As far as the monitoring mechanism goes, we want a monitoring mechanism. We think we need a monitoring mechanism that does

for women what 1612 does for children. There is a lot of resistance to a monitoring mechanism, and some of the resistance is interesting. We had a discussion, for instance, with an Ambassador about this monitoring mechanism, and she said, 'We know we have a problem in our country – she was from a conflict country – but our experience with monitoring mechanisms is that all that happens is that lists come out of all the bad things that are happening, but we get no assistance to address them.' We would much rather have the assistance to address than the lists of violations.

So I guess in answer to your question, the thing is that we have to basically deal with the resistance on the Security Council to monitoring mechanisms, but make the case, as I think many have been doing, at the level of the different governments that are on the Security Council. So a group like this, I think, has a very strong role to play, and I would be interested in the next address, when Radhika comes, since Radhika Coomaraswamy has been a Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women and now is working on children, to hear what her views on this are. We feel that a monitoring mechanism is absolutely essential to ensure that these resolutions are taken seriously. You can't have just voluntary implementation because we see that it's just moving too slowly; it's been ten years. I think the Secretary-General is of course somewhat limited because it is the decision of the member states, so the member states have got to be convinced that this is in the interest of them as well as of their citizens, and we have strong cases that we need to make.

On the question on the future of the domestic justice sector – that's why I said I think we really need some kind of surge capacity in relation to the justice sector. Without a functioning justice sector, the climate of impunity pervades and of course helping a destroyed justice sector to actually start functioning again is a huge task, and the investments have been inadequate. In many countries – I'm thinking of Liberia, where President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf is desperate to have a functioning justice sector – we have political will, there's no resistance. The only impediment is inadequate attention, inadequate funding, and inadequate coordination by the international community to help that government have a justice system that is functional.

I do think the UN is going to put a lot of emphasis on this, particularly in its focus on rule of law. But will it put focus on justice systems that respond to the issues of women's rights and gender equality, I think is still a question mark, because it seems to be too often last in line. Without gender considerations, we can have a functioning justice system that frankly doesn't deliver much justice for women, particularly in places with sexual violence, because even in developed countries the justice systems don't deliver great justice for women when it comes to sexual violence.

The male-to-male and boy-to-boy networks – I think there's a lot of good news in that regard. We're seeing a huge surge in men working on ending violence against women, particularly in so-called stable countries. There's the Men Engage network, there's the White Ribbon Campaign, there are many national initiatives where men's groups are getting together to speak out against violence against women. That was one of the reasons that the Secretary-General was so committed to launching the Unite campaign,

because we really need to pick up on this trend and create spaces for more men and more boys.

There are hundreds of examples from all over the world, from boy's soccer teams who get together to talk about ending violence against women and do community-based projects, to other men who are launching caravans, public service announcements, etc. So this is a trend that we need to grow, we need to support, but I would say never at the expense of women's ability to organize. So what we need to see are men and boys, women and girls, working together, and that's what UNIFEM and many others are trying to support.

And then finally, the question about bringing people to see, which I think Eve and others have done a great job on. There is absolutely no substitute for seeing firsthand what is going on, and it frankly mystifies me why, for instance, we have Dr. Mukwege at Panzi Hospital, which I think is that hospital you're talking about, which has received a huge amount of press; it was covered on *60 Minutes* and all over the place, and still, why do we only have one Panzi Hospital? The need is so enormous, and I think the will to help around the world is also enormous. But I think the mechanisms to enable that to happen just don't exist.

I remember when the first discussions happened on 1325, and the Aria Formula prior to the discussions took place, and we brought women activists from five or six conflict countries to essentially testify about what was happening. The Security Council members were blown away, they were looking at the floor or they were shuffling papers, and that really created the momentum. It's very important to have people like Eve and Nicole, but really to open the door for women from those countries to make their cases, because there is nothing more compelling than hearing from them directly. We don't have enough opportunities for that.

We are proposing, in the context of the ten year anniversary of 1325 – and again, if you could promote this, we think it would be very useful – we are promoting that there should be one, if not more, Security Council missions in the next couple of months that are specifically on 1325, on women's rights in the context of conflict and post-conflict, and we think that if the Security Council would go to look specifically at that, that it might also help the Security Council to have more informed deliberations on the issue.

Question: You just mentioned that women have to make their case for themselves. My question is: where do you suggest that they should make it? Because in these countries, there were quite a number of films – there was about the East Congo, *Lumo*, at the Human Rights Watch festival. People who attended probably already were the ones who were convinced and know about the situation if they are at the Human Rights Watch festival. There was another one of which excerpts were shown at the UK Mission recently, *The Great Silence*, made by an American woman filmmaker. And there is Eve Ensler. And people feel quite helpless, at least it's my situation, and I'm sure it's also the situation of others. So as you suggested that they make their case, women from all these

countries, where could they make it? It's a practical question, how to convince the Security Council and others?

Question: My question is to you, in your wish list for the next 24 months, realistically, what would you like to accomplish?

Question: I'm just wondering, number one, what do you think it's going to take to really get these women more engaged in the peace negotiations, and if you could have women in certain leadership positions inside the UN where you think they could make a difference, where would you want them to be?

Question: I was wondering if you could briefly identify the efforts that are being made to address the ongoing crisis of female genital mutilation in western and central Africa.

Joanne Sandler: The first question is, 'Where should women be making the case?' I mean, our focus is the Security Council because the Security Council has teeth, it can make a difference. I think that you're right that certainly the case has been made over and over again about the violations, about the atrocities. And what we all need to focus on is: What are the solutions? We were quite encouraged and astounded when we brought military commanders together in Wilton Park last year. They had enormous willingness to do something, but as one of them said, they'd never been ordered to do it. So I think the real challenge we face now is: What are the practical, concrete actions that militaries can take to prevent and protect women from sexual violence?

And again, the Security Council plays a huge role. We need more research, we need more data, we need understanding, and we need to listen to women because they know what they need for prevention and protection. So I think the focus has to be less on the atrocities, although it's certainly important to keep documenting the atrocities, and more on: What are the solutions, and then how do we have standard operating procedures to make sure that they get applied in every conflict situation? What we right now have is ad hoc responses based on the will of good individuals, as opposed to a standardized response.

That would also frankly be my wish list: that we now move forward robustly on what we already know works. We know that women, for instance, get raped as they are searching for fuel and water, etc., outside camps. There's no excuse for why there aren't robust military patrols to protect women as they search for water and fuel. It's simply a function of funding and mandates, and I'm sure there are other complexities as well. But at least if we could get the funding, the mandates, and the commitment that no mandate will fail – to include that as a mandate – that would be part of my wish list.

The other, of course, is really to build on this work of peace processes. We need to have more women at the table, and they need to be the right women. They need to be women who understand what's going on, who can negotiate, and who have the voice and the political space to make their views known, and this is in every single conflict. Right now, for instance, we know that in Egypt there are negotiations taking place between Hamas

and the Palestinian authority. Are women at the table? We know, or we believe let's say, that negotiations are taking place with the Taliban. There are no women there. So a big wish list is that the UN itself – and I think there is a great deal of agreement within the UN that we have to do this – and the international community, and of course the countries themselves, create those spaces so that women are no longer outside the room. They're at the negotiation, but they're outside the room, as observers, and this is untenable after so many years of advocacy to get women to the table.

And then the third part of my wish list is funding. It's about the funding on the ground in conflict situations and in post-conflict reconstruction, that we stop thinking that women's rights come on the cheap, that we stop thinking that in the context of gender mainstreaming, that we mainstream gender equality and women's rights into all the other sectors, and then there is absolutely no sector that pays attention to women's rights and gender equality, and we've seen the horrible results of that in so many conflict countries. We're given guarantees that it's there, it will be paid attention to, but it's not. And part of the reason it's not is that the expertise is not on those teams – the post-conflict needs assessments, the post-conflict reconstruction, donor conferences: they don't have expertise on women's rights usually on those teams, and we need to have that expertise and there has to be money to back it up. And that, frankly, is about the donors making it clear that they will provide the funds. And I think most countries would certainly accept that.

How to involve women in peace negotiations in leadership positions – we certainly do need a lot more training for women, powerful women, women who are leaders, in Track II diplomacy and in many other elements. But we always ask: the men who get to the table, what do they have? There's always the question that comes up, can you give us names of women, we're looking for women, and no, that woman doesn't have the right experience, and that woman doesn't have the right experience – do the men have the right experience? How are they getting to the table? The framework that we all know that doesn't work is that who gets to the table are the people who have been making war. Now, the women have not been making war, but our question is, why wouldn't you be bringing to the table the people who are interested in peace? That should qualify them to be sitting at the table. So it's not just a matter of training and capacity-building, it's also a matter of changing the mindset of how peace negotiations take place so that we in fact have a different outcome.

And finally, on your question on FGM, I'm not sure that I can answer it fully. There is a lot of activity within the UN; there's a partnership with 10 UN organizations to address the issue of female genital mutilation together in a coordinated manner, and I think if there are opportunities to talk about how to join up these various initiatives, that would be very good because I think there is, again, a lot of political will to address this, and we're already seeing progress. But we could see much more progress.

Question: If I could just make 2 comments – Ambassador Rice is insisting on the upcoming trip to Africa that the Security Council go to Liberia and to the Eastern Congo, and we'll make sure that they go to see a hospital. And also, in answer to the question

about has the Secretary-General been, he and his wife did go to a hospital in Goma, and she came back and was so outraged at what she saw that she is trying to come up with a project herself on violence against women and she hopes to involve Michelle Obama.

Question: I'd like to know if you could give some specific examples of the advancements that have been made in developing education opportunities for women; whether you've seen progress and economic stability for women's independence in different countries such as Afghanistan and any other countries that you have information on, and what organizations exist that promote that type of thing.

Joanne Sandler: Thank you for making that comment, and let me say that since the passage of 1325, I think we have seen a change in the way the Security Council operates. Certainly we know that Security Council members will call UNIFEM and call others to find out who are the women's groups in the country, who is working on women's rights, and they have made a proactive effort to meet with women's groups. In some cases, our concern has been that they do that at night, they do that kind of off-schedule; it's not covered by the media. And so we want women's groups that are organizing for peace and for reconciliation to be a main part of the Security Council's missions and visits, and we hope to be seeing more of that.

As far as economic independence, it's a very tough question. There are many organizations that are working on it. Within the UN, ILO is certainly working on it, UNIFEM is working on it, UNDP, many [organizations]. One of the really interesting initiatives that we've been asked to support over the past couple of years is called Be Peace – it's women who are entrepreneurs, leaders in corporations, who are trying to make a link with women in conflict countries to use business as a way of building sustainable peace. They did a very interesting thing; they went to Rwanda and identified groups of women who were infected with HIV as a result of the conflict who make these beautiful baskets, which they call peace baskets. And they worked out an arrangement with Macy's so that Macy's would buy the peace baskets. Macy's buys them in bulk and sells them at one time of the year, and they've been able to generate a significant amount of money through this initiative so that these women have been able to really transform their communities – to build schools, to buy school uniforms – and the way Macy's has worked on this I think is a real model for how you actually inject an infusion of cash to economies, to women directly, who are working on building peace, and who can really contribute to the economic security of their country. So thank you for that question.