STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

TRANSPORTATION OF DETAINED PERSONS

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
TUESDAY, 29 MARCH 2011

SESSION TWO

Members

Hon Brian Ellis (Chairman)
Hon Kate Doust (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Phil Edman
Hon Colin Holt
Hon Lynn MacLaren

Hearing commenced at 12.13 pm

JOHNSON, MR MICHAEL
Director, Magistrates Court and Tribunals, Department of the Attorney General, sworn and examined:

MARSHALL, MR ANDREW
Manager, Research and Analysis, Department of the Attorney General, sworn and examined:

WARNES, MR RAYMOND
Executive Director, Court and Tribunal Services, Department of the Attorney General, sworn and examined:

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, on behalf of the committee I would like to welcome you to the hearing. Before we begin, I ask you to take either the oath or the affirmation.

[Witnesses took the oath.]

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You will have signed a document titled "Information for Witnesses". Have you read and understood that document?

The Witnesses: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: These proceedings are being recorded by Hansard. A transcript of your evidence will be provided to you. To assist the committee and Hansard, please quote the full title of any document you refer to during the course of this hearing for the record. Please be aware of the microphones and try to speak into them. Ensure that you do not cover them with papers or make noises near them. As we have more than one witness, can you speak individually so that you do not speak over each other? I remind you that the transcript will become a matter for public record. If for some reason you wish to make a confidential statement during today's proceedings, you should request the evidence be taken in closed session. If the committee grants your request, any public and media in attendance will be excluded from the hearing. Please note that until such time as the transcript of your public evidence is finalised it should not be made public. I advise you that publication or disclosure of the uncorrected transcript of evidence may constitute contempt of Parliament and may mean that the material published or disclosed is not subject to parliamentary privilege. Before I invite you to make a statement to the committee, if you wish, I would like to introduce the members of the committee: Hon Phil Edman; Hon Lynn MacLaren; Hon Kate Doust, the Deputy Chair; and me, Brian Ellis, the Chair. If you wish to make an opening statement to the committee, I invite you now to make that.

Mr Warnes: Thank you, Mr Chair, for that opportunity. I do not think we will be making an opening statement. We got the questions beforehand, and we are quite happy to take those questions or any other questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay. In relation to recommendation 1, the Attorney General has advised the committee that legislation will progress to give the Inspector of Custodial Services the power to issue a show cause notice. Are you aware of the progress of this legislation?

Mr Marshall: I can answer that one for you. Yes, a cabinet submission for approval to print, which, as you are aware, is nearly the final stage of the process of introduction to Parliament, has been completed and it includes the two features in the coroner's report—that is, an audit ability to track the passage of individual offenders through the correctional system and the ability to issue a show

cause notice to DCS where the inspector has reasonable cause to suspect the existence of either a serious risk to life, personal safety, welfare, security or control, or treatment which could be shown to be cruel, inhumane or degrading. The office of the inspector has received a budget allocation to effect these changes, and the Minister for Corrective Services has the responsibility of the passage of this through the Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Has your review of the Bail Act 1982 been finalised?

Mr Marshall: Yes, the review has been completed, and again it is in its last stages of consideration—that is, it is with our director general and with the Attorney General. It is quite an extensive review with something like 57-odd recommendations. I know you have asked some questions about the police. The police made an extensive submission to the review, as you would expect, and have subsequently been consulted in relation to the preparation of the report and the final recommendations. Once the outcome of the review obviously is known, the department will commence discussions with the police in relation to training implications, of which I understand there are a number.

The CHAIRMAN: So you do not know at this moment whether there has been an update of the police training manual.

Mr Marshall: I suspect not, because they will probably be awaiting the outcome of this review.

The CHAIRMAN: What involvement did the Western Australia Police have in that review?

Mr Marshall: As a key stakeholder in the issue of bail—obviously magistrates and judges are the key stakeholders, and legal aid organisations—they were asked to put in a submission, and they did a substantial one.

The CHAIRMAN: Has that recommendation 3 been fully implemented, in your view?

[12.20 pm]

Mr Marshall: I would have to admit it is not until the review recommendations are out and we are beginning the process of implementing them, including any relating to police training.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I go on, just so that I do not forget at the end, I note you have some written answers there; are you able to make them available to the committee at the end of the hearing?

Mr Marshall: Mine are just rough notes.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought if you did have them there, we would request them.

Mr Warnes: I am happy to leave my answers if they are of assistance.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you outline the findings of the justice of the peace survey and action taken in response to that survey?

Mr Warnes: You will recall the survey that we provided a draft version of. Little has changed from the version that we provided last time we appeared before you. The major aim of that JP survey, it is important to bear in mind, was to update the JP contact details, because we have kept largely manual records of the JPs as they have been processed. The survey was an attempt to update our details and information on JPs, and to gauge the level of activity of JPs and to provide an indication of their current responsibilities—what they are performing currently in the community. Our findings were that 82 per cent of respondents witnessed and certified documents at least once a week; seven per cent of respondents authorised warrants at least once a week; 23 per cent said that they did so once a month; four per cent assessed bail surety on a weekly basis, while 50 per cent indicated they did so on a monthly basis; two per cent of respondents presided in court on a weekly basis and 12 per cent said they did so on a monthly basis. I tabled some statistics. We will talk about them later to give you more context around the numbers involved. Forty-two per cent of respondents indicated they had completed the initial training approved by the department. This was

the training that commenced in 2002. A large cohort of JPs had been appointed as JPs before that training became a mandate, as we talked about last time. Twenty-seven per cent had not completed the training—again representing those beforehand; a large number of people did not actually tick a box on that one; 24 per cent of those who had not completed the training indicated that they would be interested in doing so. That was useful information for us when we got the personal details because that has helped us to target and encourage participation in training as we have gone out. We will talk about the training calendar shortly.

Action taken: we have removed 248 JPs from the active list—our manual registry. We found a number of them had either passed away or were living interstate as far away as our eastern coast. One or two were even in Papua New Guinea. Clearly, they cannot be active JPs in Western Australia, so we have removed them from the list. A total of 79 new JPs have been appointed since the survey and, of those, 29 are in regional areas. They are the major findings and the major action—cleaning up the database. That was important because we had been moving the manual database more into, as we spoke about last time, an electronic form, and that is still under way.

The CHAIRMAN: You said you had removed a number for all sorts of reasons, and they are obvious reasons. Were any removed because of their performance?

Mr Warnes: Not that I am aware of.

The CHAIRMAN: Or their refusal to be trained?

Mr Warnes: No. I think after the incident that has given the focus for the committee, from memory, there were three individuals—I will have to verify the numbers—who for some reason or other had not gone through training. We targeted those individuals and said, "You need to train or you can't be a JP." I think one or two of those resigned. If it is appropriate, when the transcript comes back, I can provide more accurate detail.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you could. Following on from that, what checks and balances are in place to make sure that JPs are doing their training and appropriately performing their duties?

Mr Johnson: Since 1 July we have instituted a training calendar. We now publish that on the website and we have advised all justices of the peace that it is available on the website, so they can look to see when they are able to attend. When it is in the location, all the JPs are contacted by their local clerk of court or their regional manager to advise when a conference is coming up, and they are encouraged to attend. We have information for you. The enhanced targeted training program is being developed so that they receive the appropriate training. A training committee headed by the deputy chief magistrate has been formed. That committee approves the calendar and training materials that are provided for the training. They are also heavily involved in approving any material that is provided by the Central Institute of Technology, which provides the initial training for justices of the peace. They also oversee any new amendments to the JP handbook if there are any amendments to legislation et cetera.

Since 1 July last year, 18 seminars have been conducted and 517 JPs have attended. Of those 517, some 199 were court-rostered JPs. Of the 199, 155 were for regional locations and 13 of the 18 seminars were held in regional areas. A further 29 seminars are scheduled for the remainder of this calendar year. Of the 29 seminars to be held, 18 will be held in regional WA. In these sessions it is planned to encourage the attendance of those JPs who are required to preside in remote areas. To assist those JPs who have been unable to or cannot attend seminars, in conjunction with the Central Institute of Technology, we have developed two on-line training modules in relation to bail surety and violence restraining orders. These modules will be made available to those JPs so that they can complete them online. I think we might have mentioned at the last hearing that eventually we want to get to a stage where we say that if they do not attend updated training within the 12 months, we will not court roster them. We are working through that process to target all those people. It is very difficult when, for a range of reasons, justices of the peace cannot attend seminars, particularly in

the Wheatbelt and other areas because of their businesses, which they have to take care of. So we have recently targeted the justices of the peace in the Kimberley, Pilbara, Murchison and Gascoyne areas. From the survey results, we have their email particulars, so we are now emailing them directly saying, "These online training modules are available for you", and we are starting to get expressions of interest back now. As of this morning, we have received 14. They will be enrolled in those online training modules. Once we have completed the list of email addresses and made more contact with those JPs, we will contact those who do not have email addresses by mail to see what we can do to encourage them to either attend seminars or get access to a computer to do the online training. They are the checks and balances we are putting in place and to encourage JPs to attend those training sessions. At the moment 395 JPs preside in court. They are the ones we have to target to ensure they receive the updated training.

Mr Warnes: We tabled the monthly report on targeting.

The CHAIRMAN: We do not have that one. If you wish to table it, can you state the name of the document for Hansard?

Mr Warnes: It is titled "Justice of the Peace Branch: Monthly Report: February 2011". It details applications for new appointments to JPs, registration removals—some of the administration we do. It also provides details about total active JPs across the state, percentage of JPs who are Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, and percentage of JPs who are female. The part I draw attention to is that part—it is being tabled now—about JP sitting times. They are on pages 5, 6 and 7. The following page refers to sitting days.

[12. 30 pm]

That gives us some intelligence about the use of JPs in our regional areas. Knowing who is going to those areas gives us the intelligence at the local court level, say, in Kalgoorlie or in Broome, about which JPs are being used in our courts or are being used in those courts where there are police stations. Collecting this intelligence is important for us, and then we can target them with the training. As Mr Johnson said, there are 395 JPs active in the courts across the state. We would correlate that with the manual database we are collecting on training participation to say that Ray Warnes has not attended training and we need to either offer him training from the magistrate, if it helps, by sitting up on the bench, or we need to target the electronic training option, if it is difficult to get into a major centre from a remote area, or to find out reasons so that we can try to overcome them.

Hon KATE DOUST: These stats you have for the JPs that are used in a situation, particularly in regional areas, are they the same JPs being called in to do that work on a number of occasions or is it a variety of different JPs on each occasion?

Mr Johnson: It depends on the location. Sometimes we find it difficult to attract people to be justices of the peace, so you will find in the smaller, more remote locations you have probably got two, three or four that you rely on all the time to come in. In the larger centres—we have a very active justice of the peace branch in the South West—they have got quite a number to be able to choose from, but if you go east of Kalgoorlie or north into the Kimberley, it is very difficult to attract JPs because they have their own businesses and their own lives as well, and to be called upon to come in on a regular basis can be a problem. But if you have a look at the stats that we have given you, over the last 12 months the use of justices of the peace has declined. In the figures that we do have, over the last five years there has been a substantial drop in the use of justices of the peace.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Is it a concern that you do not have much of an interest from that under-30 years of age group in becoming a JP? That is pretty bad; I mean, six people for the whole state.

Mr Johnson: That is an interesting one, because the criteria for appointment of a justice of the peace requires quite an experience—and being experienced. I know a number have come through

that have been appointed, but there have been some under 30 years whom, after being interviewed, it has been suggested should not be appointed at this time because of life experience et cetera. The whole idea of the justice of the peace is because of their experience in the community et cetera that you rely on that experience in the court setting.

Hon KATE DOUST: I suppose for a number of people taking on this role it is one thing for them to have the capacity and understanding of what is required to sign a stat dec, but a whole different skill set is required to actually sit on the bench; is it not?

Mr Warnes: Very much so.

Mr Johnson: Yes, and that is the targeted training that we are implementing.

Mr Warnes: And very difficult, I guess, in some of these smaller communities, too, where you know everybody and everybody knows you and you are presiding over and making decisions.

Hon KATE DOUST: Now that you have done this review and obviously have made quite significant changes about who is a JP and quite a number have been removed, is this something that you will be doing on an annual basis perhaps?

Mr Johnson: This will be ongoing. Because we have to schedule JP seminars that fit in with the magistrate in the local area, this will not be a one-off; it will be a continuous process. As we will say to the question you asked, "Have recommendations 5 and 6 been fully implemented", it is ongoing. These two recommendations will be ongoing.

Hon KATE DOUST: I am interested that you have got some stats in here about the removal of JPs—I think it is earlier in the document. I am just curious, a little bit of it is self-serving, if you like, as to how that can occur, other than your going through lists and finding that some people have passed away or moved on. What other matters would cause you to remove a JP other than death or relocation? I only raise this from an experience that I had recently in having to find a JP—we have quite a number—who was actually prepared to engage with a member of the public to perform a very minor duty. In fact, one particular JP has been very reluctant. I am just wondering what processes are in place for members of the public to perhaps advance a cause not to have that person in that role any longer because they are simply not providing the service. This is a bit of a sideline to what we are dealing with.

Mr Johnson: That person could write and complain to the justice of the peace branch, which I am responsible for, and we would then investigate the circumstances of why that JP was not performing the service that is required of them, because when they take up the appointment, they are supposed to undertake the role. If we did not get a satisfactory answer, we may then write to the Attorney General recommending removal or some other action, but it is usually to either encourage the JP to undertake the role or, if they refuse to do so—not that we have had to do that very often, I would suggest—we would recommend that they be removed from the register.

Mr Warnes: We have had very few occasions—I stress very few—where JPs have conducted themselves inappropriately in the community and got a record against themselves, and we would also seek removal on those occasions.

Mr Johnson: Although the number that Mr Warnes has mentioned is 248, there was one other we did not put in because it was not a result of the survey; it was because of some other reason.

Mr Warnes: We have interesting further stats on that. As Mr Johnson said, over the last five years there has been a decline in sitting times, I think it is, for JPs of about 30 per cent. It is interesting to look at locations and at some of the reasons. The Kimberley, where we now have two magistrates—we have had for a number of years now—has had a substantive drop. In Broome, it is to the tune of about 62 per cent; and in Kununurra, where we have the other magistrate, it is about 66 per cent in a 12-month period. But over five years, there has been about a 78 per cent decline in the use of JPs; that is where we have had two magistrates in that particular area.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: I just have a question on page 8, which you have given us—obviously because I am a South Metropolitan member. You have no sittings from August right up till February—there has been nobody. Am I reading that correctly?

Mr Johnson: Are you referring to Fremantle–Peel?

Hon PHIL EDMAN: Yes.

Mr Johnson: What has happened is that there was a list—what I think we called a traffic list—in Fremantle that justices of the peace used to do, but with the change of magistrates to that location, they have said they will do that list so they do not require the justices of the peace.

Hon PHIL EDMAN: That is why: they do not require the justices of the peace? Good!

Mr Warnes: Some other observations on page 8 relate to JP sitting days for the Goldfields area. You can see for some of those areas—like Laverton, Leinster, Leonora—a lot of space where JPs have not been used. Largely, that is because of the audiovisual equipment that we have been putting out there and the propensity for the three magistrates in Kalgoorlie to use that audiovisual link, and they have been doing that a fair bit. It is reflected here, but we see it in many other ways.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have a view on why there is such a decline in sitting times by the JPs?

Mr Johnson: I think it is because of the audiovisual link. When you say a sitting day, a JP may be called into a court in a remote location to deal with one matter that may take five minutes, but you have to deal with it because it might be an overnight arrest. Now, for example, like the Goldfields, if the magistrates are available during working hours, they will deal with it either by AV or audio. That is the reason magistrates are dealing with more and more of the matters; it is only where a magistrate is not available—I can quote from the Goldfields because I have spoken to the magistrates about this—that they can then convene a court, but only in that circumstance. Generally, the majority of the sittings may be a Saturday morning when the magistrates will not sit.

[12.40 pm]

The CHAIRMAN: In relation to the video links that we were starting to refer to, what progress has been made on the use of videoconferencing? You gave us some information before you came in; perhaps you might like to explain the information you have provided in relation to that question.

Mr Warnes: I refer to the document "Video Facilities — Recent Developments". In there we outline the developments we have done largely since 14 June 2010, and the first part of that outlines those courts—a large number of them country courts—where we have put simultaneous functionality out there. What I mean by that is that in Wiluna, for instance—I was out there on circuit with the magistrate—one of the frustrations the magistrate had was that they could get a direct link to a prison or a particular location, but when they needed to link with a lawyer who may not be in court or may not be in the prison, they were walking around with mobile phones or landline phones with conferencing facilities, which is really quite inadequate. Having seen and heard that complaint, we have gone back and updated the software to allow multisite conferencing in those remote locations, from a lawyer in a prison to the court in Wiluna. The sites I have outlined are the ones where we have done that. All the other sites had that facility, but these ones were missing that.

Not all the circuiting courts of the Department of Mines and Petroleum and the police have audiovisual facilities. We have gone into some of those facilities and said that they are highly used by us, and that we have committed our resources to the police and mining courts. Laverton is one of those; Blackstone multifunctional police station is another one. The Central Law Courts are allowing greater flexibility to connect up with the lands if they need to be brought into the audiovisual links as well.

I have only focused on the country ones; I can go back and talk about the others if you need to. We have upgraded some of the codes to make them more stable and to make sure the quality was more

robust in a large number of our locations. Towards the bottom section, you will see where we have added new court facilities. These are the ones that we were scheduled to do by the end of this financial year: Armadale and the Children's Court will get new systems. That, again, has benefit for both linking up with Rangeview and linking up with the police stations or the courthouses so that kids do not have to be taken into major centres; they can be dealt with in their regional areas. That is something that Judge Reynolds is really keen to be doing. We have a new system in Leonora in the mining registry area. We have a new system in Mt Magnet against the mining registry. In Tom Price, we have not had a system, so we have a new one being put in there. There is also Margaret River and Bunbury. You can see the range of new systems that we are putting in place. Obviously a number of these have been lower in our priority, but we are at a point at which we can start going into those areas and doing those.

With respect to utilisation of videos, I refer to the spreadsheet titled, "2010–11 Warrants for Prisoner to Attend Videolink". That shows that, currently, we have close to 60 per cent of prisoners attending court by video link. Around 41 per cent are directly coming in person to court. When we look at the previous year, 2009–10, on the reverse of that sheet, it shows some improvement from the previous year, where it was 52 per cent by video link and 48 per cent to court in person. What has driven that? As we talked about before, it is largely driven by the protocols that have been developed between prisons and courts to make the arrangements smoother and to acknowledge that we have someone in Hakea, yet they are listed in the Broome court. We have protocols about how to make that known and to ensure that there is knowledge so that people are not put onto a bus and moved up to Broome; that audiovisual is the primary purpose, unless there is some other reason why a judge has asked for the movement to occur.

We have the practice directions that we tabled the last time we presented to the committee. Again, we are re-emphasising and holding those up as data requisites of the judiciary. There is a reason why we are not following that, identifying what are the exceptional circumstances and then applying the protocols to identify those exceptional circumstances. The strong messaging about all of those has helped increase the numbers. Training of staff within both prisons and the courts is, again, something that has made people more comfortable with the technology, and it has removed a lot of the errors that may have happened because people are a lot more familiar with the system, so it is not user error that is causing it to break down, if it breaks down.

We have undertaken a review of the judiciary's confidence around the audiovisual system we have rolled out over the past five years. Their confidence is very high, and one of the comments made by one of the judges involved was that they treated it as a business tool, they accepted that it was there, and they trusted that it was there. Previously, in the earlier days of the analogue technology, they would not have been able to say that.

The information I have given you comes out of the total offender management system, so it comes out of the Department of Corrective Services. We have been trying to build capacity within courts so that we can have our own intelligence about the use of the system. We also mentioned the last time we appeared before the committee that we were rolling out our own software. We have rolled out in the Central Law Courts software that tells us how often it is being used. It still does not quite link it to the personal information of people appearing before courts. That was rolled out just before Christmas, and we are now starting to try to get that data and making it into meaningful reports. We are probably a little way away from doing that. We are rolling out that software to give us that intelligence across the whole suite of where our audiovisual equipment is located, and that software will be completed by 30 June.

The CHAIRMAN: Do members have any questions on the video? The Attorney General advised the committee in a letter dated 25 June 2010 that a contract had been awarded for the conversion of the digital AV, which will enable the capture of detailed usage statistics. Are you able to provide a

response to questions 24 and 25 of our original questions dated June 2010? The committee is particularly interested in the use of the AV systems in remote and regional areas.

Mr Warnes: I think I probably answered part of that when I talked about the Central Law Courts. With our penetration of the audiovisual equipment across the state, in the remote areas it is probably Jigalong, Kalumburu and Balgo that do not have audiovisual connection, and they are the remotest areas. They largely do not, because we do not have the infrastructure at those locations for the speed we need to activate it. Balgo has a mobile phone tower, but that is not adequate for audiovisual work. But those are the three locations that are a deficit for us at the moment.

Hon KATE DOUST: Where was that?

Mr Warnes: Jigalong, Kalumburu and Balgo. All other locations, like Warmun, Warburton and Warakurna, as we said last time when we showed the spreadsheet of where we had penetration, have got it. What we are finding with the Kalgoorlie magistrates is that they are doing a lot of audiovisual to Warburton and Warakurna, and clearing matters out a lot faster before they get there, so when they go there, their lists and their attention to the lists can be a lot more intensive with matters they have not dealt with expediently through audiovisual.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions on the audio and video? I turn now to terms of reference 3. Justice reinvestment has been mentioned to us a number of times. I am wondering whether you have any advice for the government's present policy on justice reinvestment.

Mr Marshall: I can answer that one. In fact, I can table a paper if you really want a document. It is actually from *The Brief* magazine, the Law Society's magazine, which is a monthly publication. This is dated September 2010, and it actually includes two discussion documents between the Attorney General and Paul Papalia MLA, around justice reinvestment and their differing views on it. You asked that question at the last meeting, and we provided a bit of an answer. We have gone into a little more detail, and it is essentially a policy approach that started in the US, where a deliberate policy shift was made which led to funds being moved from imprisonment—what we call the back-end of the system, so to speak—into the front-end of the system, particularly identifying disadvantaged communities to stop them disproportionately contributing to the prison population.

[12.50 pm]

That is basically the logic of it. As you will see from the article, the Attorney is not totally in favour of that system; rather, his view is that we should invest at both ends—not move, but invest at both ends. Of course you would be aware that the government has invested in prison beds, but what you may not know so much—it certainly does not appear to have got the attention of the prisons—is that last year's budget allocated $43 million for what is called the youth justice strategy, which is an extension of a strategy that has been operating in the Kalgoorlie area. This is an extension of that strategy to the north. I am assuming that DCS may have given you some more information on its results. The feedback that we are getting on the ground in the courts is that it is producing some very positive benefits.

Hon LYNN MacLAREN: In relation to keeping people informed about the work that is being done in the Attorney General's area, there were some concerns that that information loop was not being completed and that people were not aware of the actions that you have initiated. Have you done anything over the past 12 months to improve the communication with interest groups that are particularly concerned about action arising from the death of Mr Ward?

Mr Warnes: We have certainly targeted JPs in terms of what we are doing around training and why we are doing it. The largest one that would have gone out for public consultation and informing is the two-tiered JP discussion paper that went out just before Christmas. It was not just about the two-tiers; it was also about a whole pile of other issues, concerns or ideas about JPs and the use of JPs. We had a close off date for submissions or views on JPs about the middle of December. We have just completed a report for the Attorney summarising the views that were expressed by community

members, judicial heads, the Law Society, the Aboriginal Legal Service, Legal Aid and the police. They were the groups that submitted. That analysis of feedback and ideas about JPs is with the Attorney at the moment.

Mr Marshall: I just might add to that in relation to Indigenous persons in particular. I think I mentioned at the last hearing that we were running a program called the Aboriginal Justice Agreement Program. What I did not mention was that that program has an advisory group called the Aboriginal Justice Congress, which is made up of representatives from all the local justice forums that we have set up. They have representatives who come to Perth and meet about three times a year. They also have direct access to the Attorney General. They meet with us and discuss all the matters relating to Aboriginal justice issues, but they also have direct access to the Attorney.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions, thank you very much for attending. It has been most helpful.

Hearing concluded at 12.53 pm