PUBLIC

THE JOINT SESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON GENDER AND EQUALITY MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON MONDAY, 21 NOVEMBER 2022

GENDER LEGISLATIVE INDEX

<u>**Dr RAMONA VIJEYARASA**</u>, Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Technology Sydney, WAS CALLED AND EXAMINED VIA WEBEX

The Committee met at 10.00 a.m.

CHAIR (Ms Forrest) - Thank you for appearing before the committee. As we have had a bit of discussion I do not believe we can ask you to take a statutory declaration as to the swearing in of the truth of your evidence, but we rely on you to give your information to the committee without the protection of parliamentary privilege knowing, that you have the right to look at the transcript and make any corrections if you wish you which the committee secretary will provide to you after today's hearing.

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thank you very much, Chair.

CHAIR - Ramona, in terms in the committee members, I am starting down closest to the screen: Dean Harriss, Nic Street, Rosalie Woodruff, myself, Josh Willie, Michelle O'Byrne and our secretariat and Lara Alexander, the member, is on WebEx also.

This hearing is being recorded and will be transcribed and form part of the committee's work. If you would like to introduce yourself and tell us a bit about your work, we have half an hour and members will have questions if you can leave time for that.

Dr VIJEYARASA - I want to thank the committee for the privilege of speaking with you today from the Gadigal lands of the Eora Nation, where the University of Technology Sydney, city campus stands.

First let me congratulate you on being the first Australian parliament with a committee with a standalone focus on gender auditing. This committee is an important innovation and so essential for us as a nation. We know, despite significant progress on gender equality at a federal and state level, there is still far to go.

Law has an important role to play in correcting that inequality and yet a major gap still exists in the capacity to systematically audit bills from a gender perspective and to bring this gender lens to parliamentary debates.

In this context, it is a privilege to share my research with you on gender responsive law making in Australia. I want to share some remarks over the next four to five minutes or so, before inviting the committee members to ask questions.

I am an Australian scholar of gender equality. I have published three books and dozens of articles on the topic. As an academic in the Faculty of Law at the University of Technology Sydney, I have brought back to Australia over a decade of experience working as an international women's rights lawyer in non-governmental organisations and inter-

governmental organisations all around the world. I have specific gender expertise in reproductive rights, sexual health, gender-based violence, human trafficking in modern slavery, and newly emerging areas of regulation, such as bringing a gender lens to artificial intelligence.

I believe in evidence-based policies and legislation and that requires asking the right questions and then being brave to avoid assumptions if the answers contradict our existing practices. I will share some slides now to enable me to share some of the content on the gender legislative index. I want to talk a little bit first about what it means to bring a gender lens to Australian law; second, what is the goal of gender responsive law making and then what gender responsive law making requires before I open up for questions. As an international lawyer, it is important to remind ourselves that a core expectation of international law is to bring this gender lens to legislation.

Australia became a state party to the convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women in 1981. The criteria I suggest legislators use to bring this gender lens - which I will share with you shortly - are all derived from Convention Against All Forms of Discrimination Against Woman. In other words, the process of doing gender responsive law-making is also about fulfilling the international commitments that Australia made as a state party to that CEDAW convention back in 1981. Importantly too, bringing a gender lens is about undertaking a gender audit across a full spectrum of Australian legislation.

As a nation, we are better at appreciating, for example, that women make up the majority of victims of family and domestic violence. We tend to bring this gender lens to issues such as reproductive health or early childhood education or paid parental leave. We are significantly weaker, almost absent, at bringing such a gender lens of law considered subject matter gender neutral, which of course they are not. Think here of issues such as taxation or corruption, or newly emerging areas such as regulating artificial intelligence.

Finally, we also often fail to appreciate that a gender lens means understanding how men, women and non-binary people experience law. This is a socially beneficial thing to do. It is not just about women. In this sense, I was interested to read of the committee's decision to study male suicide in Tasmania as one of your first issues.

Gender responsive lawmaking is nonetheless a tool to acknowledge which individuals and groups are most marginalised from fully enjoying the benefits of the law and are most likely to face barriers to access services, information or the protections the law is meant to provide, which is too often women and other sexual and gender minorities.

I want to turn to some definitional concepts. In my work creating the gender legislative index, I considered the end goal gender responsive legislation. Gender responsive legislation is about making the legislative system more responsive to explicit and implicit gender issues. It facilitates accountability and legislative and policy terms to the specific needs of different sexes and to different gender perspectives on pivotal social, economic and political issues.

Then we might want to ask ourselves how do we achieve this? What is required to bring this gender lens? To bring this gender lens, we need to consider how different groups of people will differently experience the law. There is a European institute called the European Institute for Gender Equality, a body of the European Commission. It is one of the few that is really focused on building frameworks and tools to aid - in this case - European member states on how to bring this gender perspective. So it is a really gender mainstreaming body and some of its work focuses on legislation and policy.

The European Institute for Gender Equality suggests we have to ask two questions: in which ways does the policy affect the everyday lives of women and men in general or specific groups of women and men. Second, are there any gender differences or gaps in the policy sector, for example, with regard to rights, participation and representation, access to and use of resources, the values and norms that affect gender specific behaviour. I think that is a really pivotable one when we begin to interrogate how much those values and norms feed into legislation in ways we may not even realise.

I created the gender legislative index to enable us to ask these questions in a systematic way. This is the home screen from the gender legislative index. It is a public tool that is available.

CHAIR - Ramona, the slides are not progressing, are you wanting them to, on our screen?

Dr VIJEYARASA - Yes, they are meant to, sorry, they are progressing at my end.

A member - It is okay, we have a hard copy.

Dr VIJEYARASA - I will just try to share that again, apologies, what a pity.

CHAIR - We have the hard copy.

Dr WOODRUFF - We just cannot see where you are up to at a particular time.

Dr VIJEYARASA - We are on page 4 now. I am on the slide 5 about how to bring a gendered perspective; that is the screenshot of the gender legislative index. I created the index as a public tool to go through that process of bringing that gender lens. I have established questions in the index to enable us to look at what those gender differences are. The gender legislative index to evaluate laws uses human evaluators and machine learning to undertake those evaluations and data science - particularly data visualisation techniques - to present those results. Laws are evaluated against seven criteria. I suggest when auditing legislation to assess how men, women, and non-binary people differently experience the law, we ask those seven questions. It is not that every question will be relevant to every law but it is about going through a process of asking to determine if those questions are relevant and if so, how. A committee like this one is a perfect space to force us to ask those questions systematically. As I mentioned before, the questions are derived from a study of the convention but also the 37 general recommendations that the committee had issued at that point in time over a 30-year period. The committee is now up to 39 questions.

If you move to slide 6, these are the seven criteria I use to evaluate legislation, that the team of evaluators uses. If you are more of a visual person, it is presented with a visual graphic on the right. I want to go through these seven questions to offer ways in which this enables us to bring a gender lens to lawmaking or to the auditing process.

First of all, does the law guarantee access to non-discriminatory and accessible, affordable, acceptable services? This is the kind of question that enables us to ask whether there are specific groups who are denied access to services based on their age, sex, marital, disability or migrant status.

Second, does the law guarantee access to information and education or require the provision of information and education on that issue?

Third, does the law guarantee non-coerced and informed decision making and, where relevant, protect women's confidentiality? Think here, for example, that most Australian laws at a state level lack protections and accountability if a government agency has revealed the address of a woman to a current or former spouse against whom she has a protection order. Does the law promote equal relations between men and women? Few Australian laws explicitly do this. Our paid parental leave scheme and the Workplace Gender Equality Act are probably the two few ones that do this, even though it's a requirement of international law.

Does the law protect women from situations of vulnerability linked to their gender? We can think here of older women in Australia and the evident vulnerability of homelessness, or the cycle that gets us there in the first place including the law's role. For example, we don't require in law superannuation to be paid during maternity leave.

Does the law guarantee accessible and effective remedies? When things go wrong, do women have access to justice?

Does the law promote the comprehensive monitoring of the situation of women? These questions are written very much with a women-centred position in mind.

The last one on comprehensive monitoring is pivotal. We can't know if laws are working without this, yet few Australian laws, at a federal level, build this monitoring into the legislation. Monitoring and data collection at a disaggregated level is essential and cannot be done on an ad hoc basis.

I have examples on later slides of evaluations that have been conducted with the gender legislative index including, for example, evaluations of our paid parental leave schemes, workplace equality and workplace safety acts. I would be happy to talk through more about the process of evaluating and the outcomes if it is of interest.

I would like to hand back to the committee to hear your specific questions. Since the slides aren't working, I will stop the share so you can see me directly as well.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR - Does anyone have a question they would like to lead off with?

Ms O'BYRNE - I would like to hear about the evaluation process. One of the conversations that the committee has had is how we do practically go through this process? A practical demonstration would be quite useful for us as we work out what our role can be. One of our challenges is that legislation passes our parliament very quickly and that can become a significant challenge in a proper assessment.

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thank you. That is a great question. I am glad you raised timeliness. If you look at the effectiveness, or lack of effectiveness, of other audit committees, not just on gender but generally, one of the biggest issues is timeliness. Our parliamentary joint committee on human rights at a federal level is often only able to provide their reports

after the bill has passed. It has undermined confidence that that is a robust and effective mechanism if the reports come too late.

In terms of the process, if you have the slides in front of you, slide 8 shows the final results of an evaluation. This is the evaluation of Australia's paid parental leave scheme. It is a time-intensive evaluation process that is important to acknowledge.

You have human evaluators who evaluate the legislation provision by provision. Those evaluators answer the seven questions that I have just mentioned: the criteria for gender responsive law making. They do this twice over. First, studying the law's intention. Does the law intend to guarantee services? Does the law intend to guarantee confidentiality and protect women from vulnerability? Then they look at the law's likely effect with the same criteria. Sometimes those differences are very subtle but sometimes they are very obvious, for example, if a law on domestic violence doesn't do enough to talk about stigma or even public policy around housing. A lot of the barriers for people to come and access services is around stigma. If there isn't built in some sort of campaigning or de-stigmatisation process or confidentiality process, even if the law intends to guarantee access to services, for example, to sexual minorities to health care, if it doesn't address confidentiality and stigma adequately, it is not likely to have that effect in practice.

Evaluators go through the seven questions for the intention of the law and its likely effect. They place their responses on a scale that you can see on the previous slide, from gender aggressive to gender responsive. It's a colour-coded system. Then the evaluator gives an overall assessment which is a subjective one, from complete disregard of international standards through to meeting international standards. When they're scoping that piece of law, they might say they're partially there but they're not fully there.

In the case of gender legislative index, there is a machine learning component. It is effectively, a complex decision tree. It takes all the human evaluators' responses - you can see this better on slide 9 - it computes their responses, regardless of how many evaluators and how much disagreement. Say there are three evaluators and they all have very similar responses to many questions but some divergence in others, you can see that in the picture on slide 9, the algorithm will then provide an overarching score for the law from that scale of not meeting international standards to meeting international standards.

There are a number of evaluations here, but at the top of slide 10 you can see the bar which provides the overarching evaluation. Part of the reason why I've used a machine-learning algorithm in this case is to remove some of the human bias and to correct in a way that's not just aggregating scores when evaluators disagree.

Regarding your question, what's most fundamental to me is a process of asking those seven questions, considering the law's intention and whether it's drafted in a way that will achieve those outcomes and placing it on that overarching scale. I imagine that if you have a draft bill that's somewhere in the middle, only partially there, it gives you an opportunity to ask what provisions are really falling down against those seven criteria, what to revisit to get it closer to meeting international standards.

CHAIR - Ramona, when you talk about the human people evaluating or the evaluators, who are these people who have done the work for you? Do you believe if we were to undertake

that role as a committee on a particular piece of legislation, that we would need to be better briefed and more skilled in assessing the questions?

Dr VIJEYARASA - It depends on the subject matter, Ruth. In my case, I've only worked with lawyers. I think there's a value in their ability to comb through the legislation with their legal expertise. They brought to the room a variety of subject matter expertise. I have had family law experts and gender-based violence experts in the room doing the evaluations.

In my case, my team of evaluators was also all female. While I had Australian lawyers, I also had a lawyer who studied in France, so understood a civil jurisdiction not a common law one. We have had a quite a bit of diversity. I imagine if the committee is briefed on the subject matter that the committee could manage the task at hand. I think there's a challenge that the parliamentary joint committee on human rights has seen where there's such a variety of legislation that comes across the desk that briefing may not be enough to do a robust evaluation.

When the evaluators evaluate the legislation, the gender legislative index has built-in benchmarks. The subject matter that's currently being evaluated includes gender-based violence, family law, reproductive health, workplace equality, financial services legislation, taxation legislation and mining legislation. When the evaluators make a determination in response to those seven questions, there are dropdown benchmarks in the system to enable them to know what this should look like: what are good practices around workplace equality? What does the ILO Convention say in terms of sexual harassment and sexual violence at work? What are some of the best mechanisms to enable people to report harassments and violence at work?

Similarly, with taxation, the dropdown benchmarks explain to the evaluators we need to have systems where you file tax as individuals, where there aren't dependent spouse tax offsets that discriminate against unmarried women and encourage women to stay out of the workforce. Those benchmarks in some ways would be the equivalent of the committee having a briefing paper on the subject matter.

I think that's what makes it more robust because not every evaluator will have expertise across every area and the benchmarks tell you what good practice looks like. Those benchmarks have been taken from a variety of regional and international law standards, such as ILO conventions, human rights treaty bodies, and older instruments like Beijing's Platform for Action on women's rights.

CHAIR - Thanks, Ramona.

Mr STREET - My question was going to be on who determines what the international standards are? Is it an amalgam of what everybody's doing and an average? Or, when you say international standards, do you mean best practice?

Dr VIJEYARASA - When I say international standards, I mean signed conventions and agreements that have been developed at a policy level. In reality, there may be no nation meeting these international standards. The idea when creating this index for using treaties that countries have signed up to and international agreements - ILO conventions or the human rights treaty bodies - was that every country is evaluated against the same standard. For example, when I compare the Philippines gender-based violence law to an Australian one, those countries are evaluated against the same standard. It is not practice. It is international treaty

and convention, policies and agreements made at an international level. I can give you an example. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women has these 37 general recommendations. Some are very robust at setting minimum standards. For example, recommendations on how many weeks of leave a woman requires after birth to recover, and then how best that is parental leave split. Or, for example, what are some benchmarks or requirements to ensure confidentiality reporting requirements? What are sexual and reproductive health barriers look like for younger people or sexual or sexual and gender-based minorities? How do we avoid the stigma, discrimination and harassment in those settings? All of that comes from international policy agreements.

I have had a team of researchers that struck those per subject matter and put those into the gender legislative index. If you go to the index and see the benchmarks, not only is the international policy standard cited, but it also references where it comes from. Everything is transparent in that sense.

Dr WOODRUFF - Ramona, this is amazing and very instructive. Thank you very much. The benchmarks are a kind of agreed international goal of where we ought to be heading and they have been established, I expect, on the basis of a lot of arguing and discussion about the evidence and the values behind those. They are a statement that Australia has signed to at some point - I hope - depending on which conventions you are talking about, of intent, a direction to head towards. While there are inevitable stumbling and a whole range of other reasons why we do not instantly adopt those in our legislation, they represent an agreed intent about where the evidence and the world's/country's values like us, an agreed statement of where we ought to be heading in order to achieve proper gender-based reform. Would you say that is a fair summation?

Dr VIJEYARASA - Yes, Rosalie. Thank you first for your feedback and yes, it is an excellent summation. I would take that one step further and say it is a statement of intent and, in some instances, Australia has been a little slow to get there. But it also does not mean it is the global best practice. There are countries that outperform those standards well before other nations do. It is almost an acceptable middle ground that all countries can agree is a viable goal to achieve, but some countries far outperform those standards. They have much stronger laws and get there faster. Tools like the gender legislative index and this process of gender lensing that other committees around the world are doing can also reveal good practice. That if we as a nation and at a state level have the commitment and the resources to get there, we do not need to just make the benchmarks but we can also exceed them.

I can offer one concrete example. I know this is a federal example, although it has a lot of resonance at a state level. Australia introduced this year two weeks of paid leave for victims of violence - so paid leave from the workforce. New Zealand did this in 2019. But for my research with the gender legislative index I found the Philippines was the first nation to do this back in 2004, which is quite some time ago. There is a lot of hidden good gender responsive practice that hopefully the collective auditing work of committees around the world can help reveal and share so we can get there faster.

Mr STREET - That was my point, Ramona, about the international standards. Even if we meet international standards we are not necessarily where we need to be, are we?

Dr VIJEYARASA - It depends on the standards. For the vast majority of these standards, if you meet the standards fully we will definitely be reaching towards a more gender

equal nation, absolutely. The standards alone would get us there. Whether we can correct the extent to which there has been discrimination over such an extensive period of time with those standards alone - no. As many of the committee members might know, in the Global Gender Gap Index produced by the World Economic Forum this year, Australia has been hovering around 43rd, 44th, for the last couple of years. That is well behind the other 30 richest OECD countries in the world, recognising Australia is the 10th richest OECD country based on GDP per capita.

Even if Australia just embraced the international benchmarks, we would help make significant progress from where we are compared to where we need to be. It is not that we have been record performing in the top 10, either in that index or on any other index, to say let us go beyond the international standards and let us produce. Many would love to see that, but we are not quite there yet. Even these benchmarks would help correct a lot of the inequality and have these conversations in a country that, in all frankness - and I think you know this as a committee - we do not talk about gender and gender differentials in the way we need to, either experienced by men, women or a non-binary person. This process is already quite a big step for Australian law making as it is.

Dr WOODRUFF - Ramona, in the benchmark drop down, the supportive material, what I am taking from you have said we could be using as a committee to help us in making assessments, amongst other material, does that provide the treaties and conventions, as well as the better practice that has been achieved by other jurisdictions?

Dr VIJEYARASA - No, it only provides the treaties and conventions, not the better practice at this stage and it is only for the seven subject matter that have been evaluated so far. My recommendation would be if it is a subject matter that is not, for example, in the gender legislative index, to invest the time to pull out those benchmarks and best practices, which would be the policy briefing the committee would need, depending on the subject at hand. Having said that, the more laws evaluated in the gender legislative index, the more laws there will be that are meeting international standards, that would be the best practice. My goal in the future is to get to the point where the gender legislative index is a truly global repository of the very best practice laws, so you have a place to go to look for that. In answer to your question now, no, it is just the standards and the treaty for the seven subject matter that have been evaluated in the gender legislative index.

Dr WOODRUFF - Thanks.

CHAIR - Ramona, you continue to work on that yourself to expand that? Or are you wanting to see this potentially adopted across a range of jurisdictions and then refine? What is your work into the future on this?

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thanks Chair, that is a great question. I suppose it is simultaneous. I would like to see uptake. I am working a little bit with the Inter-Parliamentary Union for some of their research. Possibly there will be other parliaments around the world that take it up. The Women's Legal Service of Victoria is very keen to work with me to evaluate some Victorian legislation. Our plan, if we get the resources we are seeking for that piece of work, is to actually hold some focus group discussions to discuss the benchmarks and to get feedback about the benchmarks and then to evaluate some Victorian legislation. Work is going ahead to build state-based evaluations and ideally, global evaluations. I am seeking Australian Research

Council funding because there is an incredible potential here in the index to go global. I would like to see some funding to make that happen. I am definitely continuing to work on it, Chair.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Ms O'BYRNE - When we are talking about this, we are talking about the new legislation that may come forward to the House. What is the merit in doing a more holistic review of existing legislation? Most of our legislation now is mending existing bills, but you get the odd, brand new, standalone piece of legislation. Is there merit in going through that kind of assessment and as a minimum putting in that work on the data collection and monitoring process? Most of our legislation we would say, 'Yes, absolutely, we are going to do that education for police officers in that area', but we have no way of monitoring whether or not that occurs.

Dr VIJEYARASA - To me, I feel that monitoring question is fundamental, it is really pivotal and if we have the tools at hand to monitor and disaggregate, that is where we will see who is being left behind from the benefits of law, whether it is women or men or particular groups of women or men or non-binary people. I very much push forward the suggestion of focusing on that particular criteria, criteria number 7.

In terms of reviewing existing legislation, my work on the gender legislative index has been entirely on existing legislation, so it is a very worthwhile process if the resources exist to review laws in place if there is will to amend them based on what is found. Certainly, I also wholeheartedly back that suggestion.

In some ways, the benchmarks together form good practice. If there was a new and emerging area of legislation you could look to the benchmarks and say, 'Well, holistically, this is what that legislation should look like'. This is relevant, for example, at the federal level, where they are trying to review the paid parental leave scheme. The workplace equality benchmarks in the gender legislative index would tell you where we need to go if we had the resources to actually back those standards. Benchmarks can be used for new legislation if that is relevant, but it is certainly a tool for a country like Australia to evaluate existing laws.

Mr DUIGAN - Ramona, when you were looking at legislation, where is the low hanging fruit? We were having a discussion the other day about what we could potentially bring in to the committee to have a look at, where should we begin to look?

Dr VIJEYARASA - In terms of subject areas?

Mr DUIGAN - Yes. When you are looking at legislation, where are the stinkers?

Dr VIJEYARASA - I can comment on more at the federal level.

Mr DUIGAN - That is important too because a lot of it is federal, but at a state level, where do you go?

Dr VIJEYARASA - If there are relevant state laws, work health and safety, workplace equality is a good place with some low hanging fruit because there are good standards there. State legislation that is in the field of gender-based violence, particularly around service provision, those who are left behind. Cultural and linguistically diverse people, that is also a

particularly important area. I know New South Wales is undertaking a new review of access to services through the law for culturally and linguistically diverse women in terms of family and domestic violence. In terms of the health care setting, sexual and gender minorities and young people is another place with some potential low hanging fruit.

The act of undertaking a gender audit and bringing that gender lens is already going to shift the debate a little, depending on how public you make your work in this space.

CHAIR - Thanks, we have run out of time.

Dr WOODRUFF - Lara had a question.

CHAIR - Quickly because we have the Premier waiting outside.

Mrs ALEXANDER - Thank you very much, Ramona, the presentation was absolutely beautiful. I enjoyed it and it gave me a good understanding of what's happening out there in the world around this topic. As a country, how are we reacting to the fact that we have such a multicultural and diverse society with ever-changing needs? How do we make sure that we engage and ensure that people coming from such a diverse background are understanding what we are doing with legislation? How they are being taken into account in the whole diversity?

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thank you for your question and your feedback, Lara. I know we are short on time so I will be quick and say that intersectional equality is a real challenge, understanding it is not just women. Particular groups of women or men who experience particular discrimination is a big issue for legislation. If you look at some of the submissions to parliament on some of the existing reviews of legislation, for example, the Workplace Gender Equality Act, one of the biggest points of feedback was that culturally and linguistically diverse women don't find their place in that legislation. There are certain groups of people who are feeling particularly excluded from the protections of the law. That needs to be addressed.

The Office for Women at a federal level is now developing a theory of change for their gender equality strategy. It will be important to see how diverse groups of men and women find their place in that particular strategy. These questions also very much lend them to understanding who is excluded. When it is about access to services the questions allow us to ask who is most likely to have a barrier, whether that is based on cost or language barriers or cultural barriers that don't allow, for example, a young woman from a migrant background to access reproductive health care because she doesn't want to be seen walking into the clinic. These are practical issues, which is what the questions need to ask.

Canada has done the best job in how it defines bias and discrimination in Canadian jurisprudence. It explicitly talks about discrimination on the basis of multiple criteria and characteristics, including gender but also all the other ones we know are relevant - migrant status, linguistic status, cultural background and so on.

Ms O'BYRNE - The Canadian legislation requires employers to prove that they haven't discriminated as opposed to people having to prove discrimination, which is a fundamental shift as well, isn't it?

Dr VIJEYARASA - There are a lot of shifts in Canadian legislation because in recent jurisprudence it allows quite explicitly positive discrimination. Even in its artificial

intelligence regulation it looks at biased output that discriminates but also biased output that has a positive discrimination. They have embraced a positive future direction for us to go in terms of how we understand discrimination. The fact that it explicitly looks at different groups, disadvantaged groups, which is language that doesn't tend to exist in Australian law, doesn't exist for example in our Modern Slavery Act, that is a definitional approach of what disadvantage looks like. It is a way forward for Australian legislation.

CHAIR - We need to wrap it up there. Thank you, Ramona, we could talk to you for hours about this. We appreciate your contribution today and providing your insights. We may well be back in touch with you for some further guidance in the future if members feel they need that.

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thank you very much. I'd be happy to come back to the committee. Thank you for your time today.

CHAIR - Thanks very much, Ramona.

Dr WOODRUFF - Very impressive, thanks.

CHAIR - Thank you.

Dr VIJEYARASA - Thank you.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.