



Centre for Inclusive Employment & Disability Employment Australia Lunch & Learn Session | Wednesday, 4 February 2026

How you can use evidence to make a difference in your work

Speakers: Michael Healy, Simone Casey (Centre for Inclusive Employment)
and Peter Bacon (Disability Employment Australia)

PETER BACON: Hello everyone, we'll just give it a minute or so before we crack on. People just joining we'll just give it 30 seconds or so more, and then we will make a start. Alright. Well, we have got somewhat of a packed session, I am sure some people will join in. Any technical problems, we have got Liv on-hand who will be able to help with those technical issues. My name is Peter Bacon, if you don't know me I am the CEO of Disability Employment Australia. We are very proud to be a partner member of the Centre for Inclusive Employment and obviously the host for many of these Lunch and Learn sessions. This is the first live session for 2026, so it feels a little strange to be saying happy New Year to everyone, being February, but happy New Year if we haven't interacted with you so far this year and I hope it is going to be an excellent year in the world of disability employment.

So I'd first like to start off with an Acknowledgment of Country. I acknowledge the Bunurong people who have been the custodians of the land I am on today and indeed I believe Michael and Simone too for many thousands of years. I pay my respects to Elders past and present as well as those from all the lands from which we are attending today. I acknowledge that this land is a place of age old ceremonies, where the living culture continues to play a unique role. So as I said, this is the first Lunch and Learn for the year. This is something which started in the second half of last year. We seek to run Lunch and Learns on a number of different topics, according to what you the professionals want to see. So far we've developed a number of sessions on things like how best to work with your participants who might have dyslexia or who are neurodiverse. Today we want to talk about what is evidence, why is it important, how can

you start to think about evidence and how you are going to apply it within your own practice? In terms of housekeeping, we do have live captions provided kindly today by Expression Australia. If you wish to follow along with the live captions Liv is providing more instructions in the chat as to how you can access them. I should say if you have any other further sort of requests around accessibility for future sessions please do let us know as ever we are trying to be as accessible as we possibly can be, and walk the talk when it comes to inclusion.

Today's session will be recorded and it will be available to view on the online hub. For those of you who have been following these Lunch and Learn lessons there is every chance we will be putting it on at another time where people can access it and there will be slides and a transcript available. Obviously some of you are using the chat, so it is good to have engagement and there is the Q&A button. If you have any questions that you'd like us to answer as a panel please do submit it through the Q&A button and we'll attempt to get to it. I can't promise that we'll get to it in the session, because we have to see how long we talk on for, but if we don't get through it in the session if it is something that will be helpful we'll certainly get back to you. Without further ado I'd like to introduce our speakers today. We have got Michael Healy. Michael is a recognised leader in the field of career development and employability. He is an award-winning educator and researcher. His work focuses on promoting effective and accessible careers and employability learning in schools, universities, and community services.

We have also got Dr Simone Casey the Principal Research Fellow, and evidence lead at the Centre for Inclusive Employment. Simone is someone who has been known to I think many of you, she has extensive policy research and communications across community services and welfare and Australia and the UK including 14 years as a policy advisor at Jobs Australia, now known as Amplify.

So it is going to be a bit of a discussion format today, a bit of a chat between us three as panellists and first up Simone. So could you start, please, by exploring what we actually mean when we talk about evidence?

SIMONE CASEY: Yeah, thanks Peter and hello everybody. It is nice to be with you. Look, it is a really good question. It is actually one of the reasons that the Centre for Inclusive Employment was set up is to actually look at what evidence can be used in our sector to help us do the work of getting people with disability into jobs. As a Centre for Excellence, we have had a good look around at kind of what forms of evidence exist and it is a very contested term and I think if we can move on to the next slide there is a little bit of a few dot points here that kind of outline some of the complexities around what actually counts as evidence. As a research Centre we will be taking a fairly kind of rigorous view of that, but I'll talk a little bit more about that later.

So Peter, I think we were also just going to talk a little bit about the fact that in our sector there has not been a very comprehensive approach to collecting evidence about what works. Research has been undertaken in very specific pockets with very specific focus, and part of what we are trying to do at this Centre is pull all that evidence together into one place so that we can learn from what has already been demonstrated to be effective in different areas. However there is and has been a real shortage of research evidence and other forms of evidence in our sector, which is what we are aiming to actually fill in terms of the work that we do going forward.

PETER BACON: Thanks, Simone. In your experiences what are some of those particular challenges you've encountered when trying to find the best evidence?

SIMONE CASEY: Well it is a really good question because the standards that people use around rating their research are all very different across different research areas, and it does not always take into account other forms of evidence relating to the experiences of people using services or even the people who are running those services. So that's an area of evidence that we are very interested in learning more about and particularly what work we can do to provide an evidence base for the work that you are doing in the employment services area. So one thing I was going to sort of give as an example of some areas where there has been specific research where there have been studies that have actually shown that the model works and is effective is the case study of the Wiseability model. Any of you who have had an association here with the people from the Centre for Inclusive Australia

would be aware that we have done a lot of work around the effectiveness of this model and it has followed a very rigorous research methodology; therefore, we are able to draw on that to identify what will work with working with people according to the Wiseability model. Now, that's a very specific discrete model that is focused on people making the transitions, particularly from the ADE environment. There are very specific pockets of research like that that we are now in the process of highlighting via the Centre's hub, and our objective is to make as much of that information about what works available to you through that hub.

PETER BACON: Thanks Simone. What does evidence look like for the Centre for Inclusive Employment?

SIMONE CASEY: If we can move on to the next slide. The approach that the Centre has taken that evidence standards for us in the work that we commission, or which we draw on in terms of our knowledge translation work that Michael will speak about a little bit more, we draw on evidence that we consider is a rigorous evidence base, and that has been produced with high quality research methods. We also focus on research that's relevant to our context, which means that it is comparable in terms of what can be learnt from it, and it is not dependent on any kind of particular contextual factors in like certain policy setting that's not relevant to our context. So those are the two main evidence standards that the Centre is using when we look at the kinds of evidence that we will be drawing on.

PETER BACON: So what other forms of evidence can the Centre look at?

SIMONE CASEY: Yeah. So this is a great question. So there are, you know, pockets of knowledge that are out there amongst providers amongst even people who are using services, and this is something that we are really particularly interested in learning about from you today after today's Webinar, is what areas of your work in employment services do you feel that there is a lack of evidence in and what can the Centre do to help provide more evidence for that? So one of the areas that we have been looking at quite closely, and which I have been discussing a lot with people is around defining what employment services practice actually is. It is an area where there is a lot of

knowledge in related fields such as social work or psychology, but there is not a lot of research that has been done in our area on what it actually means to do practice in Disability Employment Australia. So at the end of this webinar we'll give you our contact details, and you are more than welcome to check in with us to see whether your research idea, or your desire for evidence in certain areas is on the radar for the Centre and the work that we do. So far at the Centre we have started commissioning - and I think this is on the next slide - some evidence sin that sees in very specific areas that was called out in areas by the Government when it was established and rather than reinvent the wheel the approach that we have taken is to do what we call evidence synthesis which means collating all the available evidence on a particular topic and going through a very rigorous method to extract out of that what is kind of useful to be known in our sector. So far we've got four major evidence syntheses underway and they are in things like employer engagement in models that work for people with intellectual disabilities on what works for people who are mature aged, and/or who have partial capacity to work and also for people who are First Nations people who are using our employment services. But that's not the end of the story. There will be a lot more coming in this space over the next year. Now, as I mentioned it is a really good time to get in touch with us and let us know what you are interested in us focusing on. So that's the bit about the kind of evidence piece, collecting and understanding the existing knowledge and focusing on areas where there is the highest need for more evidence to be established.

MICHAEL HEALY: So my turn to pose a question and this time I am posing a question to Peter. So as the head of the professional association such as this, what's your opinion on why is evidence from research employment on the ground level? You know, why do we hope to provide this knowledge and information and insight to those people at the cold face, how do we hope that it is going to help them from your point of view?

PETER BACON: I think in the first instance the reason why evidence is important isn't because there is any one defined way to do things, which if you follow it precisely you are going to get the best possible results, that's not the world we live in because we are dealing with people and every person you deal with is individual. So for me the key thing here is to be curious and really consider, well what's out there and what can make me better? So if you thought of something that could be better, then there is a really good chance

that someone somewhere has also tried that. So, be a magpie, steer liberally. A famous quote from Picasso is that lesser artists borrow and greater artists steal. What he meant by that was that the truly great can take what's come before and they can add their own flavour to it and in so doing they become recognised for that as their own style, it becomes the sequence of style. You take what's come before and you adapt it to your own circumstances. That quote from Picasso, "It is rumoured, mature poets steal; bad poets deface what they take, and good poets make it into something better, or at least something different. The good poet welds theft into a whole feeling which is unique, utterly different than that from which it is torn." I think we should all aim to be good poets to seek to find the best evidence, the best from what's come before and turn it into something different and better. That's something that we are keen to do in DEA in the way that we operate. I think it is also important to know enough about the type of evidence that we are applying to Simone's point that there are different types of evidence and they mean different things. Think of it like cookery. If you are baking, and I am not a great baker, I don't have the patience or the precision for it, but if you are baking you often have to apply the recipe and its methodology very precisely and rigorously. You use the right ingredients, weigh them up properly, if you are whipping something, you whip it to the right degree and you correct the degree of professionalism in the icing process. There are processes in disability employment. It is a defined methodology and the fidelity needs to be tested. Personally my style of cooking, and it is probably also fair to say when I was on the frontline best part of 20 years ago, my style of doing professional practice is much more based on, well what's the rule of thumb, it is experiential evidence and what can I learn from the people around me such as to talk to this metaphor about cooking a bit further? If you have something with enough garlic and butter, it is probably going to end up tasting pretty good whatever you do. Both types of evidence in terms of good quality, experiential evidence and rules of thumb and the rigorous approach, they both have their place. So most of all it is important for practitioners to have an understanding of what they are trying to achieve. What's your objective and therefore what kind of evidence do you want to apply to get to that objective? In my experience people in this sector can proceed on blindly kind of without regard to the Evidence Acting on instincts. What's worked for you in the past? Do what feels right. What's generated positive outcomes in the past? There is absolutely nothing wrong with that. At least you are being thoughtful about what you are doing. Sometimes that is the right way to go. But we can all improve in whatever we do. One of the best ways to improve is to be curious, see what's out there and think, well, can I add that to my game? Is it going to

make me better? Is it going to deliver better results, even if I am delivering great results, is there something out there that can help me be better and help more people to stay in jobs?

For the cricket fans out there - and really I shouldn't be talking about cricket, because it is a sore subject at the moment and I really shouldn't be talking about this - but take Mitchell Starc, he is already one of the world's best bowlers, but there is Jimmy Anderson, and they were bowling with a team. He learned how to do it and added it to his game and he mastered it and came out of the last Ashes with 31 wickets, he was already brilliant, but he thought that's something that the best are doing, I can pick that up, master it and lo and behold it improves his game further. DEA what that means in practice is we are looking around the world and saying, what can we import to Australia, whether that's in practice or policy? So you can expect to hear more because we are taking a lot of interest in things that are happening in Britain and Europe. We are also taking a look at what are the different demand approaches around the world in some of the policy leaders that can be pooled that might get more employers to the team. We are also being magpies, we are trying to be great artists and trying to steal, but then apply it, build something better, build something based on that evidence.

Michael, I think that leads quite nicely into your section, which is look, you can go out there, you can find the evidence, you can be that magpie. How do we actually make it useful for providers and policymakers?

MICHAEL HEALY: Thanks, Peter. First someone in the comment said love that you can get poetry, artists, cricket analogies into a response. So well done on that.

PETER BACON: I do like my code of metaphors.

MICHAEL HEALY: We can also add in that there the cooking analogy which I will pick up as well. So first and foremost when we are talking about evidence in a form of practice, what we are not suggesting is that everyone goes out and does a PhD and dives deep into research and so forth. We are not looking for anyone to get mastery into all the obscurities that come from research.

That would not be in the best interests of your clients. But what we are, as Peter mentioned, what we are helping to make you do is gather insights and information from that collective experience and collective knowledge and take what might work to supplement to improve, to innovate your own practices. One way of thinking about it is to divide up different kinds of evidence-based practice. Just very roughly we might be able to categorise them in three ways, and that would be evidence-based principles, evidence-based tools and resources and evidence-based models. Where the Centre is starting and going to spend most of our time will be in evidence-based principles, evidence-based tools and resources. When I say "principles" I am really talking about very, very simple ideas. Peter mentioned butter and garlic take care of 90% of quality in many dishes when you are cooking. That can be taken here in terms of your professional practice, working with clients. So for example we often talk about things like person-Centred services, strengths-based approaches, trauma-informed practice and these can be quite conceptual, sometimes complex sort of academic discussions, some of them will have decades of academic discussion and debate behind them. You could indeed go and do a PhD on them. Often when you really have a look they boil down to a couple of key ideas. So for example person-Centred, in fact, person-Centred trauma-informed approaches they both agree that you need to always have an unconditional positive regard for your client, you must respect them as a person, you must have a central understanding of who they are, they can improve, they can change, they have the ability to work with you even if you are observing challenging behaviours, you need to have that faith that change can happen, there is a kernel of something in that person. Similarly, the person is an expert in life. We can make assumptions on a person based on what we know about them. We can say people with this disability experience these kinds of things, but at the end of the day it is the person in front of us that's going to tell us whether that's true or not and we need to allow ourselves to be corrected, we need to allow contradictions to emerge, and so on. Trauma-informed practice there is lots of models and lots of different things that are involved in that, but a lot of it boils down to just that sort of position that we take that challenging behaviours are responses to trauma, therefore empathy and sympathetic approaches is fundamental. Person-Centred counselling boils down to listen more than you ask and ask open rather than closed questions. These are simple ideas that are easy to implement, they are sort of, in some ways, values or ethical sort of positions that we might take. Many people wouldn't really know that if they are doing these things and they can make a claim to evidence-based practice, because I am sure Simone and I could give you all sorts of references and citations and

we could point to all the stuff that proves it, but really in the daily practice it doesn't mean that we are implementing a checklist of very complex tactics and strategies, we are sort of just looking from a certain kind of position. Does that align with your understanding in terms of professional practice in terms of how we live these ideals?

PETER BACON: I think that absolutely aligns. I think the points I am making around - the other thing I think that comes into it is, well look at your own caseload and go, okay, who have I got on there? What do I need to learn more about? Hopefully over time it will be things like the online hub will play into that and you can go, what's on there? What can I learn from that? What can I be a magpie about? So that understanding of models and approaches that plays into making sure that you are learning the right things to deal with the caseload in front of you.

MICHAEL HEALY: Magpie, so stealing, taking, borrowing, and so one thing that we are really looking forward to doing is supporting you to do just that. Evidence-based tools and resources, they take those principles and they implement them in a structured activity, or in some kind of defined task or a download form, a worksheet of some fashion, or a tool to use. Now, the hub really exists to help surface these. So we've been very busy gathering all sorts of resources from all over the world from different agencies, different organisations, but we are also going to be investing a lot of time into developing new ones so really you can look forward to lots of different things and I have got a few examples here that are already on the hub there in relation to trauma-informed career conversations. An article from the career development association from Australia, the jobs and skills is a way to explore different regions of Australia and what the key industries might be. Positive personal profiles, and more than just a job workshop facilitator's guide. So that's a great example. If you, in your work have decided or been assigned that some job workshops are necessary or maybe you want to take a look at what you've been doing and see if you can improve them, don't start with an empty document, don't open up a blank PowerPoint or Microsoft document without first going around and scavenging, because you might find that a lot of the work has already been done and there is great things and ideas out there that you may not have come across yourself. We are not necessarily saying that you adopt them wholesale, because they may come from a different context, they may have different constraints in terms of times and resources.

But what you can do is sometimes assemble great things from existing materials because as Peter mentioned, you are not the first person who has ever delivered a job workshop. There has been plenty of work and people have talked about what they have done, they have shared what they do, so you may go out there and find some excellent work that's already been done and generously shared. Because they have followed those principles built into them you can then make a claim confidently that you are working with evidence-based practice. In the next level would be evidence-based models. So a model refers to a more concrete, more specific, they'll often have a grant name, a specific name, they'll come from a specific organisation. For example we have got things like individual placement support, WISE ability customised employment, other things like that. Now these often have much higher expectations or requirements about what we call fidelity which means you implement it exactly as it is intended to be implemented and if you don't meet any of the standards or the criteria, or the markers of how it is delivered then you can't really claim to be doing it. So in that case there is a lot more rigidity in terms of what you can or should do, but the reason for that is because it is so strongly based on evidence that they don't want to diminish it by allowing degrees of freedom which could potentially mean that they are losing the core of it.

Now, in practice you often don't have the capacity to implement these sorts of models to fidelity, but what you can still sometimes do is look at them and surface some of those principles. Again, if you look at each of these models, you will see common things such as they are all person-Centred, so you'll see some of those principles coming through. You'll often see that they are trauma-informed, and so forth. So what we are really looking at doing is helping you discover and observe different models that have established and seeing if you can apply them, but maybe not, maybe you can take some principles and resources from it. So the intention of the hub is that we are covering all three of these categories allowing you to engage with them to the degree with which you are able to within the way that you work and the time and resources that you have, and then what I hope you'll find is that you start getting a taste for some of this and you start looking further and further and reading more and entering into your own discussions, so are we trauma-informed enough in our service? Having a conversation with your colleagues about that, and in discussing well, what might we do based on our experience, based on what we've been reading? Are there any adjustments that we can make in order to get us further towards that goal? I hope that's useful in

breaking up this idea and again getting away from that evidence, Evidence (with a capital "E") is be a little bit daunting because it implies that you are going to be examined or under the microscope for it. As I mentioned, if we are not too focused necessarily on these models the whole time you can relax because a lot of it is really about these broader ethical positions or sort of ways of relating to people that are still very much evidence-based. So Peter and Simone if you've got anything to add to that I'd be happy to hear it.

PETER BACON: I suppose to return to the baking methodology, I think what we are saying there is that you can apply the fidelity and you'll get the results that sit within the evidence base, or you can take principles of it and see how that works in practice. I think about the time I tried to bake gingerbread with my daughter and I actually used self-raising flour and they ended up being huge, but they did taste good and they were bigger, so there is something you can learn from that process and you can end up with an okay product and be open to that experimentation.

MICHAEL HEALY: Learning and experimentation. For me being able to answer the question of why did you do it that way? Why do you ask these questions? Why do you structure your workshop like that? Certainly you can say, well, it is based on my instinct or it seems right at the time, but evidence-based or high level of professionalism in terms of evidence would say, well, I do this because I know that if I do that then these outcomes can be expected, or it has been established over here that this works, or I have seen it happen with my own eyes. In some cases it is okay to say, it was a happy accident such as your gingerbread men.

PETER BACON: I think that's how penicillin got introduced as well.

SIMONE CASEY: About the hub content which we have been building out, so our approach to that is that the content that we create is evidence-informed, so that means that we have checked the available evidence sources. It may read to you as commonsense, but our approach is to make sure that we have actually checked against the evidence in composing the material that's there. So that means that we don't just write web content, like any old content; we are going through a thorough process of making sure that it is based on the

best available evidence and then we are translating that into language that is accessible to you in the work that you do, which is the intention in our work around knowledge translation in general is to make sure what we do is relevant to you at any point in time.

PETER BACON: I believe we've got, I think we have got a few minutes to answer a question or questions that we have got in the Q&A. I think the first I will direct towards you Simone, which is there is limited evidence about ASD in young adults with a disability between the ages of 15 and 18 when they can officially start work, 14 years' old and there is a massive gap in the continuity of support. So from your perspective what evidence is there around earlier intervention to pathways to employment, eg from 14 plus years with carer support?

SIMONE CASEY: Well, we have been looking at the ticket to work model in terms of the youth transitions, but we are very interested in probably picking up this conversation outside of here to look at ways that we can support this a bit more. So I'd invite you to contact me and we can make sure that we have this one covered. The Centre for Inclusive Employment is a consortium, as you are probably aware, and one of our consortium members is the Children Youth Disability Australia as well who I am sure also have a strong interest in doing more work around this. So it would be good to pick that up. That's what I mean, that we are still in the stage that we can look at what we could achieve in terms of reinforcing, or establishing an evidence base on some of these topics. But for the time being the content on the hub has been informed by the expertise of people who worked on the ticket to work program.

PETER BACON: Thanks, Simone. Anything to add to that Michael?

MICHAEL HEALY: Not specifically, but it occurred to me that maybe my job title is not exactly that immediately understandable. So Simone and I we work together, Simone is obviously focused on gathering that evidence and synthesising the commission, so the mobilisation in terms of taking it from the Centre is taking what comes from that and looking at ways to make it practical on a daily basis. My job is taking that and maybe producing tools and frameworks and things that people on Monday morning can open up, have a

look at and say, yes, this is going to actually help me with my appointments today, or I understand how this is going to help me be more trauma-informed. Simone has invited you to tell her what sort of evidence you'd like to see more of, I am inviting you to tell me what sort of practical tools would you like to see, what frameworks and models would you like to see your staff and colleagues to adopt and we can set our minds into thinking in terms of how we can do that in terms of training and practical tools and resources.

PETER BACON: There is a final question, I think I am probably best placed to have a stab at, which is "how are we balancing sharing knowledge in protecting contracts." That's been asked anonymously, it is that curly a question that people won't even put their name to it. It is a really important question. I think we have come through a period in the sector as not being as outwardly focused as certainly DEA would like the sector to be. In this - I am a former director of this development, so I do recognise that there are commercial considerations in all of these things, but I know my way in thinking about it falls binary, perhaps, but I will posit, is anyway you can be an organisation that keeps your cards really close to your chest, is insular and just develops using the knowledge that you've got as an organisation to get to where you are trying to get to, and there is an organisation which is outward facing. We'll share, look at what's out there, we'll be that magpie. Now, I struggle to think that the former organisation is better placed for success than the latter organisation, because why would you in your one organisation when this is a global movement to help people into work, why would you have a monopoly on the knowledge? Why would you have some secret sauce that no-one has ever thought of before? It seems to me to be implausible. So instead I think it is better to be that outward facing organisation which through this grand spirit of repository shares what they know in the world, but also takes from others what they know. I think we will together end up in a better place if we act that way as a kind of slightly prisoner thing, but collaboration is always the best way to go if you look at those mathematically and philosophically, I think rather than to compete. If you get really technical and under the performance framework you are not graded against each other, you are graded against what you should be getting with the caseload that you have. So actually there is more incentive to go, well, why don't we work together as a group of providers in the area to do things like joint employer office, have some joint employer pathways because it might encourage people into work and, so there are greater incentives to collaborate. I note you have got completed contracts, I don't know, like some of you here might have read our

review of the procurement process when it came to what we have seen in IAA. I don't know if...it is just not how it plays out in practice. I think if you have the best model, and you can cite, how have we come to deliver this? What is the logic? What objective do we have in our mind? What evidence sources would we consult when we are putting this model together and how do we apply it? What methodology, what results did we see from our experimentation and application of that evidence? I tend to think that's better than saying, oh, well, we've got our own way of doing things and we have iterated it for years. It is a medium winded way of saying for me the incentives to collaborate are greater to the incentives to hold everything internally, but mileage may vary on that question. Certainly at DEA we are intent on giving organisations and practitioners, professionals in this industry the opportunity to collaborate and share as part of the Centre too, and I would encourage you to take it up. It is your own commercial decisions to make and your own practical decisions to make as part of that.

SIMONE CASEY: I wanted to add on to that that one of the reasons that we exist is actually to bring that transparency to what is understood as being the best practice so that it doesn't exist in these silos of, you know, protected by competition, but at the same time we do really want to know what the sector knows as well and it will be an experience for us to go out and see how much people are willing to share when we get to that stage where we are drawing on practice, wisdom in addition to using those evidence sources that are more in the public domain as in existing research or research that we have commissioned specifically to support the Centre. But we are not forgetting that you all know a whole bunch of things that you've learnt over the years that are all forms of valuable knowledge and we are interested in tapping into that as well.

PETER BACON: We have just about come to the end of our time so thank you very much Michael and Simone and all of you who have come today and those who have asked questions. Please do contact us, as in me, Michael or Simone with any of the evidence that you'd like to delve deeper into and if you want to explore any things that the Centre are doing, Peter, Simone and Michael are the people for that. If you aren't a member for DEA, and if you aren't, you ought to be, but if you are don't forget to get your 2 points. Just a couple of - just a quick reminder, we are starting off an Emerging Leaders Network with a cap of two emerging leaders per organisation. If you'd like to know more about

that that's through the Centre that we are doing that work. Please do get in touch with me and we can work on that. These sessions are going to continue on a fortnightly drum beat. There is going to be a session on the 18th of February, so please do keep your eyes out on that. I think the first you'll see of it will be on LinkedIn. Thank you everyone for attending today and have a wonderful rest of the day.

SIMONE CASEY: Thanks.

MICHAEL HEALY: Thanks everyone, see ya.

(End)