

**Indigenous Peoples' Development, Diversity, and Inclusion:
Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Asia-Pacific
A Webinar Series**

**Webinar 8:
Indigenous Peoples, Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations,
and Small Island Developing States**

Monday, 9 August 2021
3:00 - 4:30 PM

WEBINAR PROCEEDINGS

About

In observing the International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples, the eight installment of this IP Development, Diversity, and Inclusion: Emerging and Ongoing Issues in Asia-Pacific (A Webinar Series) trained its spotlight on the indigenous peoples, and on fragile and conflict-affected situations and small island developing states.

Speakers

Moderator: Samuel Tumiwa, Advisor, Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department (SDCC) and Chief, Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS), ADB

Webinar Series Introduction: Tulsi Bisht, Social Safeguards Specialist, SDSS, ADB

Panelists:

- **Victoria Tauli-Corpuz**, Former United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Founder, Tebtebba Foundation
- **Charles Petrie**, Independent Consultant
- **Steve Pollard**, Independent Consultant

Discussion

Introduction

Tulsi Bisht

1. Tulsi provided the background and update on the ongoing Indigenous Peoples' Development, Diversity and Inclusion: Emerging and Ongoing Issues in the Asia-Pacific Webinar Series. According to him, of the nine webinar topics in the series, seven were already concluded last year. He enumerated the themes of the last seven webinars, which are as follows:

- *Development, Diversity and Inclusion – IP and CSO Perspective*
- *IP, Health, and COVID-19 Pandemic*
- *IP and Environment – Need for Synergy in Safeguards Approaches*
- *IP, Climate Change, and International Policy Regime*
- *IP, Development, and Inclusion: Gender Perspective*
- *SR III: IP Safeguards – Implementation Experiences and Challenges*
- *MDB Approaches to IP Safeguards and Challenges*

2. This particular webinar is being organized by SDSS in collaboration with FCAS unit of the Sustainable Development and Climate Change Department of the ADB. It is one of the two remaining webinars in the series. The last topic of this webinar series is *IP, Inclusion and Sustainable Development Goals*.

3. Tulsi introduced the webinar chair and moderator, Samuel Tumiwa. Sam is currently Advisor, SDCC and Chief, Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations in ADB. He has worked as Director of Afghanistan Resident Mission of ADB and has first-hand experience of implementing development projects and programs in conflict affected situation.

Setting the scene

Samuel Tumiwa - Moderator

4. Sam presented the webinar agenda and discussed the rules to be followed for an organized discussion. He also provided the context for the webinar topic emphasizing that Strategy 2030 requires a greater focus on how the ADB would need to work differently in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCAS) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). He also underscored the significance of improving ADB performance in these areas because project completion levels of success have not been rated well as compared to ADB performance in non-FCAS countries.

5. He also announced the approval of a new FCAS and SIDS approach by ADB Pres. Asakawa in late April. The main point, according to Sam, is about tailoring the approach for each country and understanding that the work they do in each country cannot be a cookie cutter. ADB shall tailor-fit the approach in FCAS and will dig down deep and understand the specific context in each situation.

6. Sam also pointed out that FCAS is part of the SDCC team and SPD team that is updating the Disaster and Emergency Assistance Policy. He pointed out that there is now a blurring of lines between humanitarian assistance and development assistance, and the ADB's role as a development organization, especially in addressing climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic simultaneously.

7. He related how he has worked with Wendy Walker (Chief of Social Development Thematic Cluster) in the last six months as senior co-chairs of the MDB Platform for Economic Migration and Forced Displacement. In chairing the platform and in talking to colleagues, it became more apparent that ADB is doing a lot on the topic of economic migration and forced displacement. He announced the formation of a working group to support those that are working in economic migration and forced displacement. The issue of forced migration is important because of climate change considerations in the Pacific. He underlined that people living in coastal areas can be drivers for fragility and there is a need to understand their situation.

8. In working with Tulsi in this particular webinar, Sam narrated that such collaboration is part of developing more knowledge/analytical work to help the team understand the FCAS and SIDS issues. Through this webinar, Sam is hopeful that all the participants will find it instructive as ADB brings in knowledge from outside while the knowledge inside will likewise be shared to all.

International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples (9 August); and IPs, Conflict, and Fragility
Victoria Tauli-Corpuz – Panelist

9. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz is the former Chair of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2005-2010). She was appointed as the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples by the Human Rights Council in 2014 and served until April 2020. She gave a brief introduction on 9th August as International Day of the World Indigenous Peoples and its relevance. Vicky is an Igorot and currently the director of Tebtebba, the international indigenous people center for policy research in education.

10. She narrated how the International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples came to be, recounting her active involvement in advocating for it at that time:

- a. In the late 1970s, indigenous peoples from all over the world have been coming together. By 1979, the first big global meeting was held at the World Council of Churches in Geneva where indigenous peoples agreed to push for a body in the United Nations that will work on a UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- b. They managed to convince states to pass a resolution that will establish the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations, which is the group that is mandated to look at developments of indigenous peoples territories to receive some of the issues that indigenous peoples are facing, their complaints. And to (inaudible) grasp a UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples which will set the international minimum standards for the protection of the rights of inclusion.
- c. The first meeting of the UN Working Group happened in August 9 of 1982.
- d. When the UN General Assembly declared 1993 as the International Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples, advocates thought it will be good to push for an International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples.
- e. In 1994, the UN General Assembly declared August 9 of every year as the International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples. It is important to commemorate the first UN Working Group meeting as it marked the beginning of a long process of drafting the UN Declaration as well as getting the states to adopt it. It was a difficult process getting the states to agree to Article 3, which is the right to self-determination. Vicky recalled that the states were very adamant in accepting Article 3 at that time. They wanted to limit what the right to self-determination means. But the indigenous peoples stood their ground. They don't want to qualify it.
- f. Vicky also recounted the strong resistance they faced against the word peoples. In fact, the working group was called the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations. The right to self-determination says all peoples have the right to self-determination. Indeed, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples says that all indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination.

- g. In closing, Vicky recalled the other difficult articles to negotiate were the articles on lands, territories and resources. She thought that the right to self-determination was difficult enough but later discovered that the right to lands, resources and territories were even more difficult. The process took long and was tedious, from the first meeting in 1982 to the first draft in 1985, and finally in 2007 that the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was adopted by the UN General Assembly. It was very difficult, and it required a lot of indigenous leaders to constantly go to the UN.

11. Vicky thanked the ADB for inviting her to this webinar. She also extended her congratulations to the ADB for dealing with the issue of fragile states and the issue of conflict as these are relevant issue for indigenous peoples in many parts of the world.

Samuel Tumiwa - Moderator

12. Samuel thanked Vicky for her work in fighting for the larger global recognition of the rights of the indigenous peoples. He also commended everyone who are working with the indigenous peoples on this International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples.

13. Sam called on Charles Petrie to introduce himself.

FCAS & Local Communities

Charles Petrie – Panelist

14. Charles is a retired diplomat and now works as an independent consultant. He has also worked with the UN that involved working in several conflict situations including Afghanistan, Myanmar and countries in Africa. He co-authored OECD report on FCAS. His presentation provided insights from his long experience of working with FCAS with a focus on interim arrangements in conflict settings for local communities.

15. He spent almost 30 years working in the context of conflict and famine, much of it with the UN. Charles reflected on these three significant experiences from which he drew some insights and shared to the participants of this webinar:

- a. For three years, from 1998-2001, Charles was the senior UN official responsible for initiating and maintaining contacts with the different rebel movements in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Through that engagement, he was able to see how communities survive conflict and how they structure themselves trying to survive conflict.
- b. Charles spent seven years in Myanmar as UN representative from 2003 to 2007. In 2012, having resigned from the UN, he was asked to return to help facilitate the dialogue around the ceasefires between the ethnic armed organizations and the government.
- c. Charles also took part in an OECD DAC review on the fragile state principles in 2011. He recalled the conclusion was basically looking at how much had been learned and how successfully these principles were applied. The most important one was the promotion of non-discrimination as a basis for inclusion and stable societies. Then the little less on track was the alignment of local priorities in different ways and in different contexts. Even less successful are

on the areas of risk-taking, state-building, and recognizing the link between politics, security, and development objectives. What was not successful doing no harm, agreeing on practical coordination mechanisms between international actors, reacting fast by engaging long-term, and avoiding problems of exclusion.

Experiences

16. According to Charles, he was able to get a sense of the capacity to resist during those three years when he helped facilitate the dialogue between the ethnic armed groups and the government, more specifically the Tatmadaw, from 2012 to 2015. He was invited back by the government and he was authorized to engage with all ethnic armed groups, both those who had signed ceasefire agreement and those who have not. Charles narrated that he formed a team, and they would go to the individual groups who had signed ceasefires and offered to help them implement one of the clauses of their ceasefires as a way of testing the commitment of the Tatmadaw military to the ceasefires. There were series of interventions, ranging from the Chin National Front (CNF) who asked support in establishing a development body with the military. He learned that it is very important to try and have a process that was inclusive and that did not give unfair political advantage to the CNF, in terms of this form of engagement.

17. Charles was also asked to support a dialogue or negotiation between the New Mon State Party and the government on the inclusion of the Mon language in the state curriculum. The Mon people had developed their own curriculum but interestingly, they integrated the government curriculum in theirs. The idea was that they wanted to ensure that their population receive an education that will enable them to find employment within the state. Ultimately, what they really wanted was for students who have gone through the Mon education program to be able to take government exams and receive government certification.

18. The most telling action for Charles was when the Karen National Union signed a ceasefire in February 2012 and ended the longest standing civil conflict. He was asked to go out into the last government military outpost in the middle of the jungle, which was in an area previously defined by the military as a black zone and was able walk out of it, spending one night or two with the IDP's who would be hiding in the jungle since the 1990s.

Lessons Learned

19. Charles synthesized the takeaways from these experiences, which are as follows:
- a. First, communities in conflict-affected situations have their own governance structures. Unless they have been uprooted, unless they find themselves across the border in refugee camps, the communities in a conflict-affected situation have their own governance structures. They continue to function as entities. It is under strains and under stress, but they exist. Any intervention must be built on existing governance structures. Governance, development, rehabilitation, and emergency must focus all at once on these communities. Charles posits that one of the tragedies of modern humanitarian action is that it is deemed as purely lifesaving. By lifesaving, it means that it supersedes everything else. But in fact, it must be lifesaving through the building of and by respecting the capacity of local structures. It must be political - with a small p.
 - b. Second, these communities do not need much money. These are not communities that have the capacity to absorb massive amount of aid. They may not actually need the money. What they need are targeted interventions

and targeted amounts. Although these are only small amounts, the transaction cost however is enormous. Most international donors are not willing to assume those transaction costs. They are much more comfortable giving millions in a pot.

- c. Lastly, what we are seeing over the last decade or so is the proliferation of accounting and financial accountability mechanisms that are incredibly complex, log frames, reporting requirements that are prohibitive in terms of the ability of these communities to receive the funds and the ability of these communities to account for the funds. Most of these communities would not be able to account for the funds because the funds are being used in order for them to support an ongoing process. Donors are no longer willing to take political risks. But providing these funds entails engagement in some form of politics - politics with a small *p*.

Reflections

20. From these experiences, Charles distilled some significant reflections. One, the ability of international actors to engage with communities is far less effective than it was before. International organizations are far more distanced from local communities than they have been in the past. They engage with local actors, the civil society actors. But they don't seem to understand that this group of people they engage with are actually a new class of people within the countries. These are people who speak the language of the donors, for the most part English. But they are not as closely engaged with local communities. Charles shared his observation that many donors confuse their interlocutors with representatives of local communities.

21. Two, international actors have a tendency of pushing for consortiums. Donors want to be able to give big pots of money instead of targeted giving in small amounts. By providing money to the UN, for example, they also transferred the political responsibility to the UN.

22. Lastly, there is, especially now increasingly competition for funds among donors. As a result, when a new situation emerges, those responsible for managing the funds in government need to try and capture the resources as quickly as possible. Rather than building their understanding of the situation, they do it the other way around. They quickly try to interpret the situation on the ground in a way that fits the terms of reference about the funding. They define an intervention in order to be able to access the funds.

Wrap up

23. In closing, Charles reiterated the importance of understanding that the communities have their own governance structure. This governance structure has local community leaders who continue to function, but who are in certain contexts, they are constantly under threat in terms of their ability to provide support to their communities that are increasingly becoming vulnerable. On one hand, the communities are looking for leaders to support them. On the other, community leaders find themselves needing to respond to the greater needs of populations but are being unable to do so because of lack of predictability of funding or support.

Samuel Tumiwa - Moderator

24. Samuel thanked Charles for bringing up some very important points. One such point raised was about the presence of other government structures besides the central government. Sam related that the new FCAS and SIDS approach would make it easier to understand a project around the specifics in consultation with each of the decision-makers. Sam relayed that some of Charles' writings for the OECD has made their way into the ADB FCAS.

25. Sam called on Steven Pollard to talk about the SIDS side of things in the Pacific.

IP and Small Island Developing States: Pacific Perspective

Steve Pollard - Panelist

26. Steve Pollard spent the first 10 years of his career, from 1973 to 1982, working as an agricultural economist throughout the developing world. He was Chief Planning Officer with the Government of Kiribati from 1983 to 1986. He worked with the Asian Development Bank from 1996 to 2011 employed in various positions mostly on development of the Pacific Islands. Since 2012 he has been working as a consultant. His presentation focused on Indigenous Peoples in the SIDS of the Pacific islands, where he highlighted better approaches to building capacities for development, the importance of continued strengthening of core government functions and the necessity of participation (not just consultation).

27. Steve gave an overview of his presentation which revolves around three specific areas: i. capacity development; ii. building on core functions of government; and iii. participation constraints to development in the Pacific SIDS.

Capacity Development

28. For Steve, capacity is not just a matter of numbers and skills, but it is also a matter of relationship, including traditions in close-knit proximity of the small communities in the islands. He shared an anecdote about his good friend, an islander who used to visit me him at the ADB office in Manila. His friend shared his many plans to improve the lives of his people, but he is wary that the islanders would doubt his intention and would be questioning his motives.

29. Steve shared from his own experience and from the many evaluations he had worked on, that capacity is well noted but it is rarely adequately addressed. Capacity can also be greatly underestimated. While individual technical professional skills and management capabilities are inherently limited in the Islands, development programs will still go ahead and set up a banking commission in the state or an enterprise monitoring unit. Those units will likely struggle. Executive officials may never meet to discuss the nation's development policies, but projects and programs will insist on establishing more and more project committees, with subsequent poor attendance.

30. He also observed that it can also be very difficult for Islander to manage the people from his or her own village, his or her own island or country. Islanders still defer to a traditional standing and leaders of faith rather than to people with professional qualifications and experience.

31. Development assistance often overestimated or misjudged capacity because of the urgent perpetual machinery of development financing, leaving little time to consider alternative designs. The constant donor and government staff turnover and the lack of institutional memory is also an issue.

32. Steve recommended five solutions in designing projects and policy programs:

- i. Multitasking
- ii. More regional and sub-regional solutions
- iii. Training or backstopping
- iv. Simplify tasks
- v. Selecting acceptable managers is key.

Building a strong core central government

33. Steve identified another intrinsic concern when it comes to domestic capacity in the Pacific SIDS. The important role that strong core central government play a role in development must be recognized. At the base of this structure is peace and security. When this is in place, societies can fashion the organizations that will provide their desired goods and services. Now this great matter of provisioning societies needs will be embedded in the norms and behaviors that are acceptable to each individual society, so they vary. Steve recommended reading “Why Nations Fail” by Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson. When it comes to the goods and services selected for government provision, there are certain core functions that underpin their successful management and their provision. These four core functions are:

- i. Management of public finances
- ii. Management of public service employees
- iii. Formulation of policy
- iv. Regulating non-government activity.

34. In the islands, a perpetual concern is how government will share power with the private sector or civil society. Strengthening core functions of government is a prerequisite for the better provision of whatever public goods and services. This is crucial in the Pacific SIDS where capacities are so limited. This is partially being addressed with some degree of success. Steve reported that governments and lead development agencies in the Pacific Islands have indeed been focusing more on reforming core functions of government. He shared that early efforts struggled partly because they were far too ambitious, far too complex, and technical. They overestimated domestic capacities, including political capacity or acceptance. However, programs have become more successful, but still leaves much to be done.

35. Public finance management is also improving in many islands in the Pacific region, according to Steve. There are recent examples of progress and improved public service management, but there are very few.

36. Improved policy formulation is receiving insufficient attention possibly because of past expensive and difficult experiences. It may also due to vested interest in the islands that are stopping executive policy formulation. The state-owned enterprise sector is improving in many islands. New legislation is also been put in place to support private transactions, but much remains to be done that can stimulate more commerce and investment growth and development.

37. Reforms to core government functions can challenge the existing status quo and existing vested interests. These reforms may also be less of a priority in the Pacific SIDS where incentives are oriented more toward earning foreign rents.

Participation Constraints

38. While constraints are commonly referred to things like limited resources, narrow economies, natural hazards, greater distances, transport costs, small domestic markets and the lack of economies of scale - physical and financial matters - Steve suggested, based on his own experience, that personal issues are much more of a constraint in its broadest sense.

39. The history of participatory management and traditional leadership persist up to today, but it rarely features in international projects and programs. Steve said he do not want to overstate the practice of participation. It is not all warm and fuzzy from experience, according to him. Pacific participation can be overruled by individual vested interests, just as it can be anywhere else in the world. Steve underscored that participation does not mean consultation, that is too often can be so one-sided. For Steve, real participation can lead to greater transparency and accountability that is good governance. Real participation can also lead to inclusion, ownership and commitment to seeing something through to completion.

40. Steve shared how he witnessed participation not only becoming possible, but how it was relatively easily applied even by ADB. It has not taken up too much time nor added greatly to cost. Participation has worked even where larger concerns and vested self-interest have to be engaged.

41. In conclusion, Steve reiterated that there is a potential for further growth and development in the Pacific SIDS through alternative approaches to capacity development, further strengthening the core function of government, and through participation.

Plenary discussion

Samuel Tumiwa – Moderator

42. Samuel thanked Steve and remarked on how the topic of this webinar relates back to indigenous peoples having their own community and governance structures. In Strategy 2030, Samuel pointed out place context specificity and expanded it not just to context specificity of the country but also to the context specificity of that group that will be benefiting from the project within a country.

43. Moving forward, he opened the floor for the open forum. Sam asked Charles to respond to Steve's comment about the need to build a strong core of the government, their core capacity or core function.

Charles Petrie - Panelist

44. Charles expressed his total agreement with Steve. He further expounded that in resource rich contexts, citing Angola as an example, it is incredibly important to build strong institutions. One cannot depend on the altruistic nature of leaders. In resource rich environments, where economies are supported by oil or by extraordinary wealth, the level of poverty could also be higher. Institutions are important; therefore, the focus is on building these institutions to allow them to define the form of governance that needs to be applied.

Samuel Tumiwa – Moderator

45. The next question is from Marco Davila. He wanted some more explanation as to the distinction between consultation and participatory decision-making.

Steve Pollard – Panelist

46. Steve explained that consultations tend to be one-sided and technical. They tend to originate from Manila or in Washington, or maybe even from a hotel in the main island. Whereas participation is going initially to the people, establishing who is interested, who wants to engage, and how they want to engage. By engaging them, you help them build the issue. It is more of a demand-side approach. Steve further described participation as being insufficiently humble and insufficiently confident at the same time by going to people and seeking their participation.

Charles Petrie – Panelist

47. For Charles, building institutions is not in terms of the numbers and structure, it is more the framework in knowing which institutions are essential to have in place. The institution is the hardware while participation or engagement with communities is the software. Participation ideally requires going into the communities, and tapping into existing knowledge from institutions, from civil society leaders, and from academics. Charles warned that it is important not to become a hostage of one specific view. The challenge is to have a diversified and comprehensive sensing of various views.

Closing

Samuel Tumiwa – Moderator

48. Samuel thanked Charles and Steve for their insights and shared some of the key takeaways from this webinar, which are as follows:

- Engage and understand the contexts at the local level, whether it be the federal government or a small island state, for SID or for ethnic communities.
- The international development community is structured in a certain way. Fortunately for ADB, we are in the midst of this cultural transformation initiative. For many years, we have been told that we are an economic organization and should refrain from getting involved in politics - with the small *p*. Now, when we are doing country partnership strategies, we are now requiring FCAS and SIDS countries to do a fragility and resilience assessment, which includes a political economy assessment.

Safeguards Policy Update

Bruce Dunn

49. Bruce thanked all the speakers - Vicky, Charles and Steve, for their insightful presentations. He shared some of his reflections as he provided an update on the safeguards policy.

- a. As director of the SDCC, Bruce related that they are working on a comprehensive update of the safeguard policy statement which had been operational since 2010. The new safeguard policy is envisioned to be presented to the board by March 2023. He also shared that ADB's independent evaluation department already conducted a review and had given their recommendations. There is quite a lot of insightful thoughts they have put into looking at the way SDCC have been implementing the indigenous people's safeguards. There are gaps and some of the issues are the same ones that Charles brought up, particularly the need to be targeted in supporting community needs and targeted in providing long-term financing.
- b. The evaluation revealed that SDCC tended to reduce its engagement with indigenous people and ethnic minority groups down to where it is going to directly impacts them.

In trying to deal with that narrow context, we are obviously missing the deeper needs of these communities, that are often vulnerable groups dealing with conflict or grave fragility issues.

- c. Bruce conveyed that there is a need for a different approach. He reiterated what Sam said earlier about having a poor performance in some of the FCAS and SIDS.
- d. Bruce recognized that there is a need to pay much more attention to governance structures, local institutions, and decision-making processes of the communities or indigenous people's groups. The communities themselves can't be seen as passive participants in a wider government plan. They need to be actively involved in the processes and consultations. They need to be targeted as direct beneficiaries and involved in the processes that affect them.
- e. He also acknowledged the need to bring capacity issues into the policy reform process. He noted Steve's discussion on participation - not always warm and fuzzy - but it is something we need to give much more attention to.
- f. In retrospect, SDCC according to Bruce, tended to focus on consultation, information disclosure, and awareness raising but not truly around the participation processes.
- g. Moving forward, Bruce pointed out the following items in the policy update process:
 - On participation, the current policy for indigenous peoples talk about broad community support, where the benchmark across the international community and the expectation from indigenous people's communities themselves is one of free, prior and informed consent. Beyond changing the words in the policy, what does that actually mean in terms of how things are implemented differently. That will take a much more in-depth cultural understanding of the communities that we are working with. It's not something that you can just parachute in. You can't just do a quick review mission and say we've had some consultations and communities are okay with this. You need to have that in-depth cultural understanding.
 - Secondly, on processes. We obviously do need a lot of flexibility when it comes to implementing our environmental and social safeguards. We tend to just expedite the process. For example, putting frameworks in place for environmental and social management rather than doing the upfront detailed assessment work. But then pushing that all down the track and expecting that later on, we will come back and complete all that detailed work that we weren't able to do beforehand. We need to look at giving more time as Sam has touched on, making sure that we can do a lot of due diligence upfront, at least to the point where we feel confident that we've got the relationships and systems in place to be able to make it work during implementation.
 - Another factor is working with the players in the field. We've been trying to do very challenging involuntary resettlement in Afghanistan. Government obviously has limited capacity. It's working in conflict-affected areas on some of the projects for example around Kandahar, it's been a Taliban control area. Government can't go there. We can't go there. And again, we can't really expect that we will be able to implement things in the same way. In order to address that obviously upfront work, the building of relationships, seeing how we can actually implement that work on the ground and do a little bit differently would be very important for us. A much more nuanced and interactive approach and

a risk-informed approach is going to be needed and that's something that we are looking at and will be consulting more on over the next few months as we develop the policy.

Closing Remarks

Samuel Tumiwa – Moderator

50. Sam once again expressed his gratitude to the speakers and to all the webinar participants for making the session very interesting and insightful. He noted that while the discussions confirmed a lot of the current thinking, it also forced the everyone to go deeper than they usually often think about doing. He also thanked Bruce, Tulsu and the other colleagues. The webinar ended at exactly 4:30 in the afternoon.