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**The Problem**

When funding for global health began increasing exponentially in the early 2000s, a question immediately arose: how much would go to human-rights based programming that meets the needs of socially excluded and criminalized groups prioritized by the Public Health Program (PHP)?

As one of the only private funders applying a distinctly human rights lens to health, the PHP saw it as important to undertake efforts to ensure more funds from other sources would flow to such programming.

PHP began its work in this area with a focus on the preeminent funding mechanism for the HIV response: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria (the Global Fund), which was created in 2002. This has remained an important area of the portfolio to this day. However, over time, a second strategic thrust was added to our work: supporting advocacy in favor of establishing a Financial Transactions Tax (FTT). Finally, more recently, as reflected in PHP’s strategy, a third approach was added: operational work to shore up new private resources to support health-related human rights interventions for socially excluded groups.

One of the main entry points across all of our grant-making in this portfolio has been a bottom-up approach. Our theory of change has been that civil society activism has the power to shape the trend of large donors in the global health response. Accordingly, we have sought to build capacity for civil society mobilization targeting the Global Fund, whose governing policies include opportunities for civil society engagement in decision-making.

This portfolio review will examine the three approaches we have undertaken; test assumptions about our theory of change; look back on important strategic decisions; and draw out challenges and lessons learned.

**Defining the Portfolio Parameters**

Although the Global Fund was founded in 2002, PHP did not begin planning a dedicated portfolio in this area until about 2007 when we hired a Global Fund Program Officer. In order to narrow the scope of this review, we will limit our examination to grants made from 2008-2014, with an emphasis on two distinct approaches:

(a) Influencing the funding decisions by the Global Fund, and

(b) Supporting the Robin Hood Tax campaign in favor of establishing a financial transactions tax.

Grants in this portfolio have not been classified along geographic lines, as the majority of our grantees were and are focused on influencing global-level policies that have impact in a wide variety of countries. One-off and short-term grants have been excluded from this portfolio review in order to focus on longer-term strategic partners.

From an operational perspective, we will dedicate specific attention to:

(c) Expansion into Private Philanthropy & Beyond

**Focus Area 1: The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria**

Rationale and setting the larger context

After a call to action by then-Secretary General Kofi Annan for the establishment of a “war chest” of funds to fight three of the deadliest infectious diseases the world has ever known, The Global Fund was established in 2002. The board approved US$900 million in grants to 72 countries in 2003, and by 2007, donor countries had pledged US$9.7 billion in grants for the 2008-2010 period.

The PHP’s strategic decision to engage with the Global Fund was not just due to the billions of potential dollars that could be leveraged for health and rights – in fact, another important health financing mechanism was established around the same time: In 2003, President George W. Bush announced the U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), which initially set aside $15 billion over 5 years for the global HIV response, and in 2008, authorized up to $48 billion for another 5 year period. PHP chose to invest our grant-making dollars and allocate operational staff time toward the Global Fund, for a number of reasons, including: the unique founding vision of ‘country ownership’ that gave recipient countries the power to define their own priorities; a global mandate; an Executive Director (Dr Michel Kazatchkine) with whom PHP was closely aligned, particularly on human rights and drug policy issues, and to whom PHP had direct access; and decision-making power for civil society through three distinct delegations to the Global Fund Board, each with voting power (the Communities Delegation, made up of individuals living with the three diseases; the Northern NGO Delegation; and the Southern NGO Delegation).

Theory of Change

Our theory of change on the Global Fund was that a combination of board pressure and country-level engagement would result in greater funds flowing to neglected interventions for socially excluded groups. Specifically, we hypothesized that by combining (1) operational engagement to leverage OSF’s (including George Soros’) influence at the board level and with key donor governments; (2) efforts to strengthen engagement of affected communities at both the board and country levels (initially, this work was centered on country-level engagement during the process of drafting grant applications to the Global Fund, while more recently the focus has been on supporting delegations of people living with the three diseases and other civil society actors to “claim their space” in decision-making mechanisms at a board level), and; (3) support to national and international organizations to press key donor governments to commit robust pledges to the Global Fund, would lead to a Global Fund that has progressive policies, reflects the needs of the most marginalized, and is adequately resourced.

PHP considered civil society to be main entry point for our grant-making on this body of work. Since the Global Fund is a highly complex and fast-moving mechanism, institutional knowledge was a key factor for the effectiveness and impact of any NGOs or advocates seeking to shape the Global Fund at either a national, international or board level. In addition to analyzing new policy proposals, advocates needed to understand how to create relationships with other board Delegations; how to negotiate in informal spaces (the corridors of the meeting during coffee breaks being a critical entry point for actually creating change); how to propose new language; and how to get their priority issues taken up. Only a small number of groups has the right combination of experience at a board level, and linkages to communities to make them appropriate partners for PHP support.

For that reason, PHP has supported virtually the same core stable of grantees since 2008 (see attached grants list), despite changes in PHP’s strategic approach to the Global Fund. The experience of shifting strategy while maintaining the same stable of grantees has yielded some important lessons we hope to explore in this portfolio review.

Strategic Shifts in approach

Several important milestones and external factors have led to PHP decisions to shift our approach to the Global Fund over the years. In retrospect, at least three phases can be discerned.

*Public Cheerleader: Mobilizing Resources for the Global Fund*

PHP had many reasons to support the Global Fund in its original incarnation, as noted above. These qualities set the Global Fund apart from virtually every other development mechanism, and PHP had a vested interest in seeing the Fund’s model succeed. Accordingly, PHP and OSF more broadly undertook a concerted effort to encourage donor nations to make robust pledges to the Global Fund. This ranged from George Soros himself making phone calls to key decision-makers, to direct advocacy with country delegations by PHP and DC-office staff, to grant-making to civil society groups to conduct national and global advocacy efforts. By supporting a robust replenishment, we theorized that there would be a larger pot of central funding through which countries could apply for health and human rights programs. Grantees whose core mission supported (and continues to support) replenishment of the Global Fund’s coffers included Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE) and Friends of the Global Fund US. They mainly operate in their national capitals, conducting education and advocacy with decision-makers who determine foreign aid funding priorities.

*Promoting Human Rights in the Global Fund’s 2012-2016 strategy*

In 2010, we identified the drafting and negotiation process to develop a new Strategic Plan for the Global Fund as a key advocacy opportunity to formally establish the promotion and protection of human rights as a core objective of the Global Fund’s work. An implicit assumption behind this work was that the Fund’s written strategy would shape funding allocations. This led to an intense effort over two years, both operational and grant-making in nature, to insert human rights as a major strategic objective of the Global Fund’s 2012-2016 strategy. We sought to strengthen civil society voices in the negotiations processes, supported publications and discussion papers on the Global Fund and human rights; convened, together with UNDP and UNAIDS, civil society, Global Fund staff and others, to discuss how the Global Fund could increasingly fund HIV and human rights programs, and supported Stichting International Civil Society Support (ICSS) to create the “Global Fund Advocates’ Network,” a virtual platform that would share information about Global Fund policies and priorities with a global audience of civil society activists. Our efforts were successful in that the “promotion and protection of human rights” was adopted as one of the Global Fund’s core strategic objectives in the 2012-2016 strategy. However, at this writing, this commitment on paper is not yet translating into greater funding for human rights programming at country level, for a number of reasons ranging from the fact that the current leadership is less committed to human rights programming, to the fact that many countries themselves either reject such programming outside and don’t include it in their proposals to the Global Fund or, in the context of overall reduced funding allocations, use scarcer resources primarily for bio-medical interventions.

*Critical Friend: Monitoring the New Funding Model*

The 2008 economic crisis profoundly changed the global landscape of development assistance for health. The “golden era” of health financing confronted a new reality, and the old model - in which wealthy northern donor nations give aid to poorer Southern partners, and in which HIV is perceived as an ‘exceptional’ emergency – was no longer the order of the day. The Global Fund was the hallmark of the previous era, and traditional donors began scaling back their commitments. This, in addition to other external factors triggered a crisis at the Global Fund: the Round 11 replenishment cycle was cancelled due to a dearth of funding commitments; the long-serving Executive Director (with whom PHP had been closely aligned on human rights and drug policy issues in particular) was forced out; an interim director was brought in, and a rapid re-structuring process took place. A new Executive Director was brought on board (Mark Dybul, the previous US Global AIDS Ambassador in charge of PEPFAR) and a rapid planning process took place to approve a New Funding Model (NFM) that fundamentally changed the manner in which the Global Fund allocates its monies. Among the elements of the New Funding Model were: a new “allocation formula” predicated on a country’s disease burden and GNP, obfuscating the needs of countries with concentrated epidemics; a movement away from Middle-Income Countries; and a greater role for the Global Fund Secretariat in shaping country-driven application processes, shifting back to a more traditional donor/recipient relationship.

All of this led the PHP to again re-position its approach to the Global Fund, moving away from vocal support for Global Fund replenishment (“public cheerleader”) toward a stronger emphasis on monitoring the implementation of the NFM (“critical friend”). Staff time within PHP was reallocated to bring the lessons of our accountability and monitoring team to bear on our work at the Global Fund. From a grant-making perspective, this resulted in a clear shift away from *replenishment*, toward emphasis on *monitoring* the impact of the Global Fund’s New Funding Model, including more attention to the impact of policy decisions at a country level. For the most part, the same grantees (ICSS, Friends of the Global Fund US, the Communities Delegation to the Board of the Global Fund) continued to receive PHP support, but for different work.

Geographical Re-positioning

PHP’s grant-making work on the Global Fund traditionally centered on civil society advocates operating at a board level in Geneva. Following the adoption of the new PHP Strategy, we began seeking to determine if the policy wins achieved in Geneva were actually playing out at country level. Our deepest effort in this direction is currently taking place in Kenya, where we are working with organizations representing key populations (sex workers, people who use drugs, and men who have sex with men) and seek to build their capacity to engage with the Global Fund Country Dialogue processes, to monitor to which extent funds are actually mobilized for human rights programming, and maximizing allocation of financial resources accordingly.

**Reflection:**

* With more than $11 billion for allocation between 2014 and 2017, and a core strategic goal on human rights, the Global Fund was and remains a promising financing mechanism to support the groups and issues that align with PHP’s strategy. However, beginning in 2012, the Global Fund is dramatically pivoting away from middle-income countries, in which concentrated epidemics affect many of the populations on which PHP focuses live, and where governments continue to be uncommitted to the wellbeing of these populations and refuse to support programs for them (e.g. Russia, Romania). In short, the Global Fund does have significant overall resources, but it is abandoning some of our regions and not yet fully realizing the promise of the commitment to

human rights.

* Our work to shift the Global Fund’s policy priorities was successful – the inclusion of human rights as a core strategic priority was an important achievement. However, translating the promise of the policy into increased funding for health and human rights on the ground remains a challenge. In the next three year period, only $15 million (out of more than $11 billion in the total coffer) has been specifically allocated to “community, rights and gender” issues, of which human rights is a core component. Though countries can also technically apply for funding to implement programs on health and human rights, the overall amount of money that they can expect to receive from the Global Fund has been shrinking – and it is hard for human rights programs to win the day when existing programs are facing reduced financial support. This same dynamic is generating renewed tensions in the “prevention vs. treatment” debate, as increasingly scarce resources are prioritized for medication.
* Operationally, the expansion of the health financing portfolio into new areas (innovative financing, and engagement on private philanthropy in particular) necessarily led to trade-offs. Once we expanded, we were able to engage in a less robust manner at the Global Fund board than in previous years.
* The strategic shifts in focus, while maintaining the same core stable of grantees, has been challenging – some have adapted more quickly to the new reality than others, and have come to share PHP’s realigned vision. Others – particularly those focused on replenishment issues – may not be the right partners for our work going forward.

**Focus Area 2: Innovative Financing for Health through the Robin Hood Tax Campaign**

The 2008 financial crisis led many nations to focus inward on domestic policy, and support to external initiatives (including to the Global Fund) began to weaken. As a complement to our existing work on the Global Fund, PHP made a strategic decision to look at health and rights investments more globally, and to explore whether there would be other possible vehicles we should try to leverage for health and rights.

PHP chose to support advocacy in favor of establishing a Financial Transactions Tax (FTT). An FTT is a tax of less than 1% applied to transactions of shares, bonds, currency, or derivatives. Unlike foreign aid, which is dependent on the whims of decision-makers in wealthy countries, the FTT was attractive to PHP precisely because it has the potential to raise billions of dollars annually simply as a result of regular, on-going financial transactions (see the attached OSF blog explaining the FTT).

PHP was attracted by the identification of a financing mechanism that is sustainable, predictable, and additional. Also, the ethical frame of this financing approach, in which large financial institutions that to some extent had been responsible for the fiscal crises that increased vulnerability among poor and socially excluded groups would become the engine for generating new funds for global public good.

Another reason that drove the PHP to select this approach was our trust in David Hillman, the Executive Director of Stamp Out Poverty. A tiny NGO operating on a shoestring budget, we immediately saw in Mr. Hillman a compelling advocate and brilliant strategist who could make a strong case for the FTT as a sustainable solution for financing development and global public goods, even in an era of belt tightening. With a clear vision of establishing an FTT, he has built important champions and advocacy hubs over the last decade (including as co-founder of the Robin Hood Tax Campaign, which has been the public face of the FTT movement; and the Leading Group on Innovative Financing for Development, a body that has been credited as an important incubator for the stakeholders responsible for founding the French FTT and UNITAID, among other mechanisms).

Theory of Change

For this focus area, our theory of change was that by supporting civil society mobilization to raise the profile of the FTT through a highly visible advocacy campaign (the Robin Hood Tax campaign) that was inclusive of AIDS and other health activists, it would be possible to build momentum to shift decision-makers (a) in favor of implementing the FTT, and (b) calling for a meaningful portion of FTT-derived resources to be allocated to health and human rights. We also saw the Global Fund as a natural candidate for FTT revenues, and indeed some grantees were eager to be active on both issues (e.g. HealthGAP, Coalition Plus).

Strategic Shifts in approach

PHP began with moderate grant-making support to Stamp Out Poverty (in the role of thought leader) and support for advocacy in a few campaigns in strategic nations (France, the U.S.) In an effort to seed this work on a more global scale, PHP then partnered with Mr. Hillman to convene health and rights advocates from around the world to enhance their literacy on the FTT as a financial mechanism. Afterwards, PHP solicited applications for further advocacy campaigns from meeting participants, and began supporting work in a variety of countries, including Brazil (through GESTOS) and Japan (through Africa Japan Forum). For the most part, however, the applications from Western Europe were the strongest, and also had the advantage of a rapidly developing political momentum toward the FTT in Europe.

Increasing visibility and attention to the Robin Hood Tax Campaign in Europe also meant that a number of other issues (climate change; job creation; debt reduction) were being put forward as worthy endeavors for any eventual FTT-derived funds. To help hedge against the possibility that health and rights would fall off the list of priorities, PHP made deliberate efforts to support health and human rights advocates in strategic European countries: Coalition Plus (France); Oxfam Deutschland (Germany), and Salud Por Derecho (Spain).

In 2013, a coalition of EU countries reached an important milestone: an “enhanced cooperation agreement” to move forward with implementing an FTT in the Eurozone. Today, 10 countries are still active (including Germany, France, Italy, and Spain) and are currently negotiating the parameters for the introduction of an FTT that when approved, has the potential to raise more than 10 billion euros per year. On the current timeline, FTT-derived funds are expected to come in by January 2016, and will flow into (and be administered by) each of the 10 cooperating governments.

Though the UK was not one of the European countries that agreed to move ahead with the tax, Stamp Out Poverty remained a core partner, and Mr. Hillman’s thought leadership an essential component of the broader campaign, as manifested by his many roles (leader of the Robin Hood Tax UK coalition; policy analyst for the global FTT campaign; civil society representative to the Leading Group on Innovative Financing for development). We thus continued to support SOP and still do.

**Reflection:**

* In hindsight, it is clearer than ever that our investment in the FTT represented a very deep dive into a very specific campaign, perhaps at the expense of exploring other innovative financing mechanisms. PHP has learned a lot about what it means to go “all in” on a single health financing idea. Most strikingly, this is indeed a “high risk, high reward” strategy. There is enormous potential return, but also a very real risk that no additional funds will go to health and human rights at all. Though the Robin Hood Tax campaign itself has had a tremendously impressive arc – going from what was essentially a ‘fringe’ movement to Brussels-level negotiations to establish a wide-ranging FTT – this has come at a cost. PHP has potentially locked up some of our resources in this specific campaign for a long period, assuming that we choose to see the campaign through to its completion. In this case, it is a trade-off that we are willing to make because it is such a potentially promising mechanism. However, this experience will likely make us weigh our options even more carefully in future when we are faced with a decision to go “all in” on another long-term campaign. (See bullet #3 for an alternative idea).
* The largest and most persistent question in this body of work has been the possibility that even if the FTT is secured, passed, and implemented, none of the eventual FTT-derived funds will go toward health and rights. This has been a measured calculation on the part of PHP, and we have hedged our bet by supporting advocates to elevate health and rights in all of the major countries most likely to implement the FTT. The Global Fund has been put forward, particularly in France, as a worthy and appropriate recipient of FTT-derived funds, which is complementary to our other grant-making in this body of work. A related risk is that any new funds generated for health and rights will not be additional, but rather, they will be used to meet existing health and rights donor commitments and free up new funding for other issues (i.e. debt reduction). Again, we have hedged this risk through supporting civil society advocates to monitor and hold governments accountable for *additionality* of new funding.
* Innovative financing for health has seen a lot of attention in the last few years, and many new ideas have been proposed. Instead of choosing a single one of these ideas from amongst the expanding list, as we did with the Robin Hood Tax Campaign, PHP might have considered building the capacity of grantees to conduct their own analysis of new financing mechanisms. The range of ideas (AIDS Trust funds; Social Impact Bonds; etc.) is vast; could our grant-making contribution perhaps have been best spent on helping civil society to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each, and to be able to take an informed position in discussions with country governments, financial intermediaries, and other powerful stakeholders? Addressing these power dynamics is especially relevant to the socially excluded groups prioritized by PHP (sex workers, people who use drugs, trans\* people, Roma). Though we are now exploring these avenues, we might have been better off starting this strategy sooner.

**Focus Area 3: Expansion into Private Philanthropy & Beyond**

Rationale and setting the larger context

With many changes occurring at the Global Fund, and any possible dollars generated by the Robin Hood Tax Campaign still most likely years away (any by no means guaranteed to support health and rights) PHP most recently expanded into new areas in health financing.

This expansion was driven by the reality of decreasing bilateral and multilateral funds for health and rights. While our work on the Global Fund and the FTT has the potential to open up large streams of funding for health and rights, such work occurs at a global level, and does not meet the immediate needs of small health and rights NGOs who are currently facing funding crises. As donor trends increasingly prioritize integration of HIV into a broader global health mandate (focusing on reproductive and primary health care), the organizations that were founded to address the human rights response to the HIV crisis have been put at risk. The Zambia AIDS Law Research and Advocacy Network (ZARAN), an important HIV and human rights organizations and long-time PHP grantee, folded last year due to lack of funding. South Africa’s Treatment Action Campaign (TAC), considered the most effective treatment access group in the history of the AIDS movement in the global south, may soon shut its doors.

In recognition of this landscape, PHP’s 2014-2017 strategy supports exploration of a number of entry points on health financing: possibly looking at other large health donors (including PEPFAR and the World Bank); scaling up engagement with donors that we may not have fully leveraged (such as the European Union Structural Funds, on which PHP has done regional work for the de-institutionalization of people with mental disabilities and Roma); and engaging with other private donors. With regard to the latter, PHP already had a variety of long-standing relationships with other like-minded foundations such as the Levi-Strauss Foundation and M.A.C. AIDS Fund, who over the years have increased their support of PHP priority issues such as harm reduction, and to whom we have successfully referred our grantees for increased support. The next frontier in leveraging the support of other private donors involves building connections with foundations whose strategic areas may overlap with ours but who have not traditionally focused on HIV or health. This could include foundations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation whose current areas do not overlap with ours, but whose capacity for significant growth mean it may be worth pursuing this in light of anticipated potential outcomes.

Theory of Change

For this focus area, our theory of change was that OSF’s strong reputation on health and human rights and stable of grantees could be leveraged into actual dollar commitments from other private funders through introductions to successful PHP bodies of work, and to grantees whose work demonstrates success, innovation and impact in our core priority areas.

PHP’s work has always centered on many difficult and politically loaded issues (including sex work; harm reduction and affordable access to essential medicines). We saw private donors as often the only source of funds for small but innovative pilot programs (so often funded by PHP), as well as the bridge funding necessary for a small program to make the leap toward accessing the major sums of bilateral and multilateral donor money needed for national scale-up.

Operational Approach

Until now, PHP’s engagement in this area has been largely operational.

First, we have increased our engagement with and in some cases secured membership on the boards of various health financing mechanisms and donor affinity groups (the Private Foundations Delegation to the Global Fund; Funders Concerned About AIDS (FCAA) and the Red Umbrella Fund) with a view to staying connected to existing private donors in our arenas; making connections to new donors in relevant fields, and to elevating health and human rights in the larger discussion about priority areas for private funding. In these contexts we are considered the experts on health and human rights and our input is sought on how to ensure key human rights issues are integrated into strategic plans, meeting agendas, and other framing documents. For instance, due in significant part to our influence, Funders Concerned About AIDS evolved from an affinity group with a domestic focus that initially engaged donors working on HIV services, to one with a global focus and a strong human rights agenda that has addressed the needs of people who use drugs and sex workers.

Second, we held a series of donor convenings as an opportunity to educate other like-minded donors about our work, and ideally secure their funding support (e.g. Access to Justice in Nairobi, Kenya - October 2013; Supporting the Global Trans\* Movement in Berlin, Germany - December 2013; Police collaborations with Sex Workers and People who use Drugs in Melbourne, Australia - July 2014).

Third, we engaged with central OSF processes, through participation on the World Bank Working Group and, lastly, we capitalized on meetings and conferences to push PEPFAR for greater financial support to health and rights, most recently beginning to engage the U.S. Global AIDS Ambassador Deborah Birx, the new head of PEPFAR on these issues.

**Reflection:**

* PHP has in several occasions in the past managed to leverage funding from other donors for PHP priority issues, including European Structural Funds and Norwegian bilateral assistance to Bulgaria to support the Roma Health Scholarship Program. On another occasion, a PHP Project Director managed to raise $300,000 in a single day from other private donors with whom he had a close relationship toward urgent support for a PHP grantee who was threatened with a temporary but dire financial circumstance. The Red Umbrella Fund, the only global funding mechanism for the rights of sex workers, was established as a result of a series of PHP-convened discussions on the topic. Our successes have often been opportunistic. Systematizing and sustaining these efforts, and bringing them to bear on some of our most unpopular issues remains a challenge
* One big lesson we have learned is that many private donors have tightly programmed their funding, making multi-year commitments to an existing body of work. This leaves them little flexibility to invest in new bodies of work (even if they agree that such investments would be valuable), at least for the foreseeable future. Hence, the most important moment for speaking with other private funders is when they are in the process of discussing a new strategy and/or considering expansion into a new area. (e.g. Most recently, contacts at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundations sought out background information on PHP’s work on Access to Justice, as a body of work they might be interested to support with their funds).
* A lesson we took away from our Access to Justice donor convening in Nairobi was the need to experiment with new tactics for donor engagement. In this case, our convening brought together a large group of donors and successful PHP grantees for a wide-ranging discussion that highlighted the work of successful grantees – and while we did educate new donors on our issues, it did not immediately translate into new money for access to justice work. Moving forward, PHP is considering a more targeted approach – for instance, pairing an interested donor with a PHP initiative for a field visit to learn about the work in a first-hand, on-the-ground manner.
* Board memberships have brought PHP in closer contact with potential funding partners, but have also had a transaction cost for time spent on board work. PHP has mapped its priorities out the most clearly for work on the Global Fund, but less so on other boards (FCAA, RUF) and more could be done here to articulate a strategic vision for what we hope to achieve.
* PHP continues to reflect on how we balance our efforts to leverage funds for a field of work (e.g. access to essential medicines) with efforts to interest donor colleagues in funding our specific grantees. We are often out in front on human rights issues in the context of health (e.g. the rights of sex workers and people who use drugs) and there is value in high level, high visibility meetings on the importance of this work. However, these can be expensive and time-consuming and do not always lead to immediate increases in funds to the groups working on these issues. Staff-driven efforts to share information with colleagues at other foundations about their star grantees can lead to new resources for our bodies of work, but these efforts are ad hoc and more difficult to document and systematize.