



HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

Joint Committee on Draft Modern Slavery Bill

Oral evidence: [Draft Modern Slavery Bill](#), HC [1019], Thursday
6 March 2014

[Watch the meeting](#)

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 6 March 2014.

Members present: Mr Frank Field (Chairman), Baroness Butler-Sloss, The Lord Bishop of Derby, Baroness Doocey, Baroness Hanham, Lord McColl of Dulwich, Fiona Bruce, Michael Connarty, Fiona Mactaggart, Sir John Randall and Mrs Caroline Spelman

Questions [1027 - 1055]

Witness (via video link): **Eva Biaudet**, Finnish Ombudsman, examined.

Q1027 Chairman: Eva, hello.

Eva Biaudet: Hello. It is nice to meet you.

Chairman: Eva, welcome. I would like each of our Committee to go round and say who they are. Then we would love to start having a discussion with you, if we may. Thank you very much for making the time available to us.

Eva Biaudet: Thank you. I am very honoured to be here.

Q1028 Mrs Spelman: I am Caroline Spelman. I am the MP for Meriden, which is in the middle of England. Can you hear?

Eva Biaudet: Now I can, yes.

Fiona Bruce: Good morning. I am Fiona Bruce, Member of Parliament for Congleton in Cheshire.

Baroness Hanham: Hello. I am Joan Hanham, a Member of the House of Lords.

Lord McColl of Dulwich: Hello. I am Ian McColl, also a Member of the House of Lords.

Sir John Randall: Good morning. I am John Randall, the Member of Parliament for Uxbridge and South Ruislip, which is at the edge of London.

Chairman: I am the Member of Parliament for Birkenhead, which is another centre of the world to me.

Baroness Butler-Sloss: Good morning. I am Elizabeth Butler-Sloss. I am a Member of the House of Lords.

Baroness Doocey: Good morning. I am Dee Doocey. I am also a Member of the House of Lords.

Fiona Mactaggart: Good morning. I am Fiona Mactaggart. I am a Member of Parliament for Slough, also on the edge of London, by Heathrow.

Michael Connarty: I am Michael Connarty. We met with Parliamentarians against Human Trafficking. I am a Scottish Member of Parliament.

The Lord Bishop of Derby: Good morning. I am Alastair Redfern, the Bishop of Derby. I sit in the House of Lords.

Chairman: Thank you very much.

Eva Biaudet: It is nice to meet you all.

Chairman: I am going to ask Ian to begin our questioning, Eva.

Q1029 Lord McColl of Dulwich: Looking globally, where does the best practice on combating modern slavery lie, please?

Eva Biaudet: Thank you for this challenging question. I think we have lots of good practice in many countries. Unfortunately, perhaps there is not one country that has actually defeated the traffickers or this phenomenon. It is perhaps even naive to claim that any single action can fix the whole problem, but I have seen while working previously in the international arena in the OSCE and also afterwards, and then being here at the grass-roots level, that there are lots of things that can improve action.

The problem of course is that, with scarce resources, we need to be sure that what we do is useful. In that sense, I think that legislation for

an independent national rapporteur, who evaluates anti-trafficking actions, is connected with international operators and also gathers information from all kinds of stakeholders, has been the biggest step—the leap forward—at least for Finland. I have received, and we are constantly receiving, very good feedback from Parliament and other actors who are happy to see what are perhaps not such nice recommendations from us, and sometimes difficult criticism. But we know that we are discussing the real issues, and we leave the option to politicians and decision makers to decide on effective use of resources in a different way. I would say that, in countries where there is an independent rapporteur, you can see a difference.

But of course the rapporteur in itself—the institution—does not make trafficking go away. We still need the whole comprehensive preventive anti-trafficking work seeing to it that we do not have big exploitative markets in the labour markets or in the sex industry, that we have effective law enforcement, that resources are put in the right direction and that law enforcement really cares, wants to fight this crime, believes that it is there and, of course, then protects the victims. I am sure you have discussed these issues, but I believe that the national rapporteur is an important actor.

Q1030 Lord McColl of Dulwich: Thank you. And reporting to Parliament?

Eva Biaudet: Reporting to Parliament. I think that is the—

Lord McColl of Dulwich: But independent.

Eva Biaudet: Exactly. Every four years we report to Parliament and annually we report to Government. We have now done five reports. Every four years, it is a really thick thing. It has been an amazing process, I can tell you. In my previous life I was for 16 years a Member of Parliament and two years a Minister in Government, and I have never seen such positive action-orientated work stemming from what Parliament did with our report, concretely giving long-term future operating recommendations and decisions to Government. This has resulted in reform work on legislation and on practices, with manuals and directives for different authorities. It has been a fantastic thing that we have been able to report directly to Parliament. It has also raised awareness in Parliament about trafficking, which of course is very important.

Lord McColl of Dulwich: Thank you very much. That is very helpful.

Chairman: Alastair, can you take that theme on, please?

Q1031 The Lord Bishop of Derby: Thank you. You have given us a very powerful sense of the impact you have in Parliament and on Government. Could you help us understand the impact your office has in terms of support for victims and prosecutions?

Eva Biaudet: In general, the national rapporteur analyses information. We are again in the midst of a big piece of work, analysing prosecutions, police investigations and court procedures, because another feature that has been very important is that we have access to all information, including classified information. This has been very important because, for instance, discussing or looking at a prosecution or police investigation, very often the answer from the police and prosecution is, "We know our business. We have tried to do everything right." If you do not have the documentation, it is very difficult to see at what point actually there is a decision, for instance, to investigate not trafficking in human beings but a lesser crime. It is a common problem in all countries that it is easier to investigate the lesser crime; it is more likely to have success. It happens on every level, so we feel that we have—

Q1032 The Lord Bishop of Derby: How can your office make a difference to that tendency to go for the lesser crime?

Eva Biaudet: In analysing that evidence-based material, we also have the right to assist victims—perhaps this was your question—when we evaluate that it is of significant importance. But it is in our judgment. We do not do this as a rule; we do not sit in court proceedings being legal aides. We can advise the legal aides and discuss with the prosecutors if they need to discuss certain aspects, and sometimes we have been involved more deeply when there was a really difficult situation. Of course it would take a lot more resources, but it has been important to have this option as a possibility, because at the moment it seems that the pool of knowledge is still very narrow. Being able really to discuss with victims and all who assist victims has been enormously useful, but we do not do that very often.

Q1033 The Lord Bishop of Derby: That is very helpful indeed. Could I move on a bit and ask what impact your role and office has had on public opinion, and business opinion? Have you been able to be proactive in affecting public opinion and business opinion?

Eva Biaudet: This is difficult to measure, and we have not done any surveys on how we are perceived. But I would say that the evidence that we have a strong impact on public debate is that our recommendations were taken as such in Parliament, and they were followed by legislative reforms. The police and the labour inspectors

have, in co-operation with us and with our advice, made some manuals of indicators on how to improve identification of victims, for instance. I would say that we can clearly see an impact with the authorities.

It is more difficult to say if we have had an impact on business. Directly, perhaps not. We have had an impact in raising knowledge; for instance, we have been training prosecutors, judges and policemen, and we can see that there has been a rise in prosecutions, also concerning trafficking of labour. Indirectly, there has been a focus on the trafficking and exploitation that happens in the labour market, but I would not say that business has been very active. There is discussion in society in general, and I think our reports have been very good support for that and for the media. The media have been important.

Q1034 The Lord Bishop of Derby: Thank you. Could I ask one more thing? We are proposing a commissioner for slavery, for human trafficking. Your role is much broader; you deal with a much bigger range of people. Do you think that has advantages or disadvantages that we should think about?

Eva Biaudet: There can be many ways of implementing or doing the work of a national rapporteur. Independence and high integrity are crucial, and also the fact that, when your recommendations or your critique are uncomfortable, there should be no political censorship or filter. We are not an authority in Government that changes according to the political balance.

Another feature that has been important—I do not know how this has been perceived in your proposal for a commissioner on slavery—is that I am the national rapporteur on human trafficking and “related issues.” The “related issues” have broadened perception and enabled us to look at close-by and lesser crimes. This is important, because usually law enforcers do not identify human trafficking, and this is something that is a common feature in all countries. If we had not been looking at all the procuring offences and, in the labour market, different kinds of lesser crimes and asking, “What are the features there? Could they have actually been indicators of trafficking?”—which they have indeed, and this has also been a foundation, I think, of the Dutch rapporteur; I think she talked to you earlier, so I think it has been important to have a wide—

The Lord Bishop of Derby: Thank you, that is very helpful.

Q1035 Fiona Mactaggart: I do not know if you have looked at the detail of our Bill—

Eva Biaudet: No.

Fiona Mactaggart: We have a proposal to have a commissioner whose reports, for example, are kind of fed through the Home Office. In fact, our Children's Commissioner described it as another Home Office civil servant. Do you think that that could work?

Eva Biaudet: If I may be blunt, no.

Fiona Mactaggart: I am asking you to be blunt.

Eva Biaudet: No, I do not think so. If it was a national co-ordinator, it would work. I think there is also a need within Government to co-ordinate the work that is done in different Ministries, but of course, there is always a need for Government to defend their actions, and there are always compromises and prioritisations. This is real life. To be able to look at it without this kind of need to compromise is important, and the dialogue between these kinds of institutions is the one that matters. So I do not think it would work.

Q1036 Fiona Mactaggart: Thank you. You talked about having a wider remit that meant you could look at issues close to trafficking that can inform it. Could you perhaps give me an example of how that is operated?

Eva Biaudet: It means that, for instance, at the moment, when we are going through all the police and pre-trial investigations, we do not only go through those that the police have started as human trafficking cases; we also do, for instance, procuring cases, which are, of course, a much bigger number. Evidence from before showed that in a big number of these procuring cases they should also have been opened as possible human trafficking cases. I am not saying it necessarily would end there, but if you stop the investigation at a very early stage there is no way then to find a basis for a human trafficking case. The same goes for labour. If you start with smaller labour offences and do not open the possibility for human trafficking, it is not possible to make the case for that sentence in court. You cannot later find a graver crime.

Q1037 Fiona Mactaggart: That is very interesting. One of the things that we find in the UK is that very often in cases which are, we believe, trafficking cases, people are only prosecuted for lesser crimes.

Eva Biaudet: Yes.

Q1038 Chairman: Eva, might I supplement what Fiona has just asked you? What one attribute must the commissioner or rapporteur have to be effective that you think our commissioner will not have?

Eva Biaudet: Attribute? I think with integrity—

Chairman: Or power.

Eva Biaudet: I am sorry, could you please repeat that?

Chairman: It is the power.

Eva Biaudet: Power attribute?

Q1039 Chairman: Yes. What power must the Bill give the commissioner for her or him to be effective?

Eva Biaudet: I think the Bill must give the commissioner access to classified information and the possibility to make her own judgment about what information is necessary, and not leave it for others to decide if it has human trafficking importance or not. It should give the commissioner powers to report to Parliament regularly. I am not saying every year: with us, at least once in four years, once in a parliamentary term, has been a good solution. There can be other solutions, but with regular intervals.

Chairman: That is really helpful, thank you.

Q1040 Michael Connarty: Eva, apart from the strength of your own personality—you obviously are a well-known politician and you have, as we saw when we met you, many contacts—how do you maintain your independence from Government? Is it by the strength of your personality, or is there something written into the law that gives you that strength?

Eva Biaudet: The law says that we are independent, and of course the law says that we report directly to Parliament. But I must say also that, when we are reporting annually to Government, nobody is checking our report in advance. It is the Ombudsman's office, and I think in the Bill, when the national rapporteur function was given to the Ombudsman, one of the motivations was that the Ombudsman is an independent office with high integrity and, therefore, it is a suitable combination. I think it actually has been rather a good combination. These are the important features that the law can give you. Also, we do not take part in working groups as normal Members when preparing legislation, for instance. We are prepared to give our expert advice, or to be present as experts, but we are careful not to be working with compromises,

because then you would be in an impossible situation afterwards; you never know, of course, what really works before you have tried.

There is independence. Of course we have our own budget and I decide who I employ. The independent status is sort of engraved in many ways. The budget is always important, and I would say that we do not have enough resources. We could do much more. Independence has always—though, of course, it ends somewhere—

Q1041 Michael Connarty: Would you say that putting the commissioner or rapporteur in a department, or reporting to or going through a departmental chief or a particular Minister, would limit their power?

Eva Biaudet: I would say so. My office, the Ombudsman's office, is in connection with the Minister of the Interior, and I think ideally we could be in connection with Parliament. But, albeit that we are now in connection with a Ministry, I think that the legislation has provided us with the necessary independence, and it has been respected and well received. I think that the Government and Parliament have been quite satisfied that they were able to allocate their resources in a better way and be more aware about the options. We have not had any opposition to independence, not before and not after.

Q1042 Michael Connarty: Am I right in taking from what you said that no one vets or edits your reports, so that no Minister redacts passages or takes things out?

Eva Biaudet: Absolutely not, no.

Q1043 Michael Connarty: It is clearly independent. My final question is on resources. You mentioned resources. Could you specify what resources are fundamental to giving you the independence and power you require?

Eva Biaudet: Resources are very scarce with us too, so we also need to prioritise what we focus on; of course we are in continuous discussion that we need more resources. But it has been very important that—because the Ombudsman has a larger mandate—I have at least one or two experts with legal knowledge who can concentrate full-time on anti-human trafficking or on monitoring and evaluation. For the moment we have two full-time legal experts, and we also have a part-time press officer for the whole bureau, which has been very important because communication to the media and the public is important. We are trying to work in a very modern way. Then, of

course, we have the whole administration and administrative support, which is also important. There are secret documents, and we need a certain amount of bureaucracy, so we need expertise and support offices, and somebody who works with the media to support the Ombudsman.

Chairman: Thank you. Caroline.

Q1044 Mrs Spelman: Eva, I want to ask you some questions about data gathering. You have stressed the importance of access to classified information. What is your approach to gathering data about the scale of exploitation, and how reliable do you think that data is?

Eva Biaudet: I think the data that we are gathering is reliable in itself. We gather police protocols, court sentences, pre-trial investigations and decisions from the victims help and assistance system. We also gather information from NGOs. This information is reliable as such, but to be able to understand the phenomenon of trafficking, the national rapporteur puts the information together and actually looks at what is not there and at what lies behind the numbers: "Why was this a procurement case and not a human trafficking case?" For a picture of the phenomenon, the situation and level of protection for victims, we can interview a lot of victims, or look at the help and assistance systems. We can see the number of sentences alone or the investigations in human trafficking, and they are of course real, but they do not make up the whole picture. They are a very small portion of the picture. We are trying to focus on what is not there: "What is it that we miss?" For instance, we have found on several occasions that in Finland women, particularly foreign women, in prostitution are very poorly identified by the police, the courts and the health system for many reasons. Then we go in and try to see what are the reasons and what could be the thing that would improve identification there, and we try to give recommendations, and work together with the authorities.

Q1045 Mrs Spelman: You mentioned that you gather data from the NGOs and other Government agencies. Do you find it easy to work across different Departments of Government and their agencies to draw that information out of them, and what other roles do these agencies play for you?

Eva Biaudet: We try to work and to co-operate, and we try to make a case where we are actually all on the same side; we are all trying to fight trafficking. I have learned that, when you enforce your powers, you rarely get very far. But of course there is also a point when you have to say, "We have the law on our side. The law gives us a right to have classified information." I think there has been a learning process.

I would say that we are better off today with accessing information. The police force has had very good practice and also a challenging one, because the police are not so accustomed to this kind of human rights body, if I may say so, coming in and investigating pre-trial documents that they are not usually handling very openly, or which are secret. Of course they have good reason to be protective, because there can be cases that disappear if information leaks out. It is very important that we try to be motivated by the kind of information we need and that is relevant for our work. We do not need all kinds of information. But I think today that we do get information from the police.

The prosecution has been very good to work with. The border guard institution has also been very co-operative, and the police have become very co-operative. With the NGOs, it is a little bit more based on dialogue. They of course do not gather documents in the same way, but it has been very important to have good co-operation with the NGOs to complete the picture and to see the other side. The assistance system has also been very good with co-operation. I think it has worked, though sometimes it needs a little bit of—

Mrs Spelman: A push.

Eva Biaudet: A bit of strength, but that is how it is.

Mrs Spelman: Thank you very much.

Q1046 Baroness Butler-Sloss: We are struggling a bit with appropriate definitions in the Bill. We are looking to have a simple form of definition, which is easy for our prosecutors and judges, particularly because we have a jury who are 12 ordinary people. We have been looking at an umbrella phrase, which might be “exploitation” or “slavery.” One point that it would be helpful to know from you is that, as you are a national rapporteur on trafficking and human beings, does it limit you in dealing with people who may not have been moved internationally but have none the less been enslaved?

Eva Biaudet: No, it does not; it is “national rapporteur on human trafficking and related issues.” The national part comes from us reporting on anti-trafficking work nationally, but under the legislation we are also required to be aware of what goes on internationally, and to have co-operation with international operators. That international connection is actually given to us as an assignment. I would not say that this has been an issue. In practice, it seems that identification has been easier with victims who have been victimised abroad—for instance, in human trafficking for sexual exploitation—than with those who have been victims internally. But it has not been a question of

definition; I would say it is more about mindset, attitudes, misunderstandings about consent, attitudes on prostitution, thinking that they have somehow consented and that this at the same time somehow will entail that they can be exploited in whatever way.

Q1047 Baroness Butler-Sloss: In your legislation do you require that they should not have consented, or is consent irrelevant to the fact of being trafficked or enslaved?

Eva Biaudet: Consent is irrelevant. I think this is very important. Nevertheless, it is a difficult issue in implementation, because, even if the legislation actually says explicitly that you cannot consent to be exploited or trafficked, it somehow plays a role in the mindset of people very strongly; you can see at every level of decision that somehow it has played a role. I think it is very important to be explicit in the legislation from the beginning, so that the legislator clearly points out that consent is irrelevant and that nobody can give their permission to be violated in this way.

Baroness Butler-Sloss: Thank you.

Q1048 Chairman: Eva, in court cases, can people be found guilty of enslaving someone even if one has not proved the charge of moving them around—trafficking them?

Eva Biaudet: Yes, although we do not have so many court cases, and there has clearly been a learning process in Finland too. Lately, we have seen a rise in sentences for trafficking for labour. When we talk to prosecutors, they say that it seems to be particularly difficult to identify exploitation for sexual purposes, for the same reason that, usually, sex crimes are difficult. There are many reasons for that. We need to be aware of the difficulties. But with us it is abuse of vulnerability or dependence on the perpetrator that are the main features.

Chairman: Thank you.

Q1049 Baroness Hanham: Can I take you on a little bit about victims? We have been talking, and you have talked quite a lot, about the discussions you have had with the prosecutors about this, but we were just wondering how you make prosecutors more aware of the interests of victims. For example, when you get somebody who is trafficked into the country who is then arrested because they have committed an offence, but they have done it under duress, how do you get your prosecutors to understand that, and to look more at what may have happened to them rather than at what they may have done?

Eva Biaudet: This is very challenging. There is one level of awareness raising on the rational level, about legislation, but then there is another level that seems to be very important for different people—the prosecutors, the judges, the police—really to understand what human trafficking is about, about the role of the victim. Here, general awareness-raising to really understand that human trafficking is part of a long process, and that you need to see it from the perspective of the victim, is a challenging issue whatever legislation you have. Our experience is that prosecutors listen to other prosecutors and judges listen to other judges, so there is a need to try to connect and to share experiences with those who have dealt successfully with cases, for instance, both within the country, but also between countries.

The way the law is written makes a difference, to emphasise that it is the real situation of the victim—the coercion, the control, the abuse of vulnerability or the dependence. It is not about how I would have acted in the same situation; it is about how this person, depending on her or his history, capacities or knowledge, could act in reality. This is something that I hope one could somehow write into it, in the arguments behind paragraphs. But, in practice, I think it always requires a lot of work on awareness-raising, and training with prosecutors and judges. This knowledge does not seem to come only rationally, I am afraid.

Baroness Hanham: Thank you. That is very helpful.

Q1050 Fiona Bruce: To what extent are victim services and care enshrined in policy and legislation? What particular services and care do you have for child victims, and what do you think are the characteristics of successful victim support arrangements?

Eva Biaudet: This is another very difficult question. If I could start a little bit pessimistically, I have not seen many places where we really have been able to give durable assistance on a larger scale to victims. This is challenging, and I think it is an important issue because it is our societies—the destination countries—that allow this crime to happen against these people. This is something that we need to focus much more on in the future. We can see that for many victims, particularly when there has been sexual exploitation—be it that the trafficking has been in labour or in sex—the traumas are very heavy. With children, they all have a right to assistance that is appropriate, with not only housing, the practical stuff, but also health care, psychiatric care or social care. There was a study from UNICEF that looked at the Nordic countries overall, and said that the basic legislation on child protection was so strong that if it was also used for trafficked children it would be a good sort of framework. I think it is important that those children should have the same rights as our children.

Another issue is that they are challenging and it is not a short time. On the other hand, with a child, we have school and education, a longer time to work with them, support them and give them help. With adults, of course, they make the decision on their own as to when they want to leave, for instance, so the help can be very short if they want to return. Then we need to see what happens afterwards, but we would need to ensure that victims can stay a longer time within help systems, that it is not so short term and that it is practical: legal—social-practical but also legal, “What are your rights? What are your possibilities?”—and also medical, health care and psychiatric care. Many of our—

Chairman: Fiona, do you want to come back on that? I am sorry, Eva.

Q1051 Fiona Bruce: The impression I have is that you are on a journey in this respect, and that in Finland there is still the opportunity for inclusion in legislation but you are not yet there. Am I right in this? What have you actually already included in your legislation and in your policy for victim care?

Eva Biaudet: The legislation actually includes what is appropriate and what is necessary, but in practice what it means is that we have a health and assistance system that co-ordinates the help and ensures that victims get what they need. They get necessary health care and the same things as others. The problem is sometimes with the municipalities. After a while, for instance, after the sentences, after the immediate help has expired, there are some difficulties with information; the person will still be in need of particular health care services from the municipalities for a long time, but, even if they have a right to them, they may not know how to get them. The municipality health officials may not know what trafficking is. There is not perhaps a very high level of knowledge about what it would require. But I would say that they have legal access to health care and to housing. Sometimes, nevertheless, when, for instance, the criminal proceeding is not successful and there will not be a trial, we see that the help and assistance system may decide to reject a possible victim. This is a problematic thing that we have been trying to put our finger on, because it is a separate thing. You can be a victim without there ever being a trial.

Chairman: Thank you. We have two more questions.

Q1052 Baroness Doocey: I also want to ask you about children. Given the fact that a child clearly cannot consent to their own exploitation, does Finland recognise this within the wording of its legislation on criminal offences? Do you, for example, have a separate offence of child exploitation?

Eva Biaudet: It is separate if you do not look at the trafficking offence. On human trafficking, in the criminal code that defines trafficking, if I remember it correctly, I do not think that for a child it is a separate offence. It is something that makes it more serious, more aggravated, of course, for the perpetrator. In the new legislation that is being proposed, if I remember correctly—I am not sure I remember this correctly—there is, for instance, a requirement for a legal aide always. Of course there should always be a guardian, but there should also always be a legal aide, at least when there is a child. I am uncertain on this. If you want, I can come back to you in writing about the child thing.

Baroness Doocey: That would be very helpful.

Eva Biaudet: Thank you. I will remember.

Q1053 Baroness Doocey: How do you pick up and deal with a child that has been exploited as a domestic servant or been sent out on the streets to beg? How do you prosecute that, if you do not have a separate offence of exploitation specifically for children?

Eva Biaudet: It would clearly be a human trafficking case, I would say. But this is a hypothesis, because we have not had any cases investigated or tried. We have only had minors in cases, I think, of sexual exploitation. There has not been a case on child begging, human trafficking or labour, certainly not on domestic servitude.

Baroness Doocey: Thank you.

Q1054 Sir John Randall: In Finland, do you prosecute victims if they have committed a crime, or do you have an amnesty, as it were, for people who have committed a crime because they are a victim? If you do not have that, is it something you have considered, whether for serious offences or even immigration cases?

Eva Biaudet: Now that we are going into detail I should have my legal aide here, but, if I remember correctly, the law on the criminalisation of a victim, like punishing her or him for a lesser crime which actually she has been forced to do or is a consequence of being a victim of trafficking, is that they should not be punished. Nevertheless, I am not certain that this works in real life. I do not think we really know, as we

have not investigated in that sense. There is reason to believe that people are identified for these lesser crimes, and that the human trafficking crimes or other serious crimes against these persons are not identified at all. But we have not investigated, so I would not be able to say that this is evidence based. I am sorry. But, in principle, it should not happen.

Q1055 Chair: Eva, can we thank you very much for your evidence, which on a number of counts has really helped us? We are very grateful for your time.

Eva Biaudet: Thank you so much. I am hopeful that you will be successful in your work. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Chairman: We too are hopeful, thank you. Goodbye.

Eva Biaudet: Goodbye.