

Management Committee Meeting 11 Minutes

Date: Thursday 13 November 2014 **Time:** 9:00am to 1:35pm

Location: Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus

Attendees

| Name | Position | Organisation |
|---|--|---|
| Community | | |
| Mr Paul Birch (Chair) | CEO | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Mr Peter Brady | Management Committee Representative | Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network |
| Mr Noel Bowley | Management Committee Proxy | Gladstone Region Environmental Advisory Network |
| Government | | |
| Ms Claire Andersen | Director – Strategic Policy Services | Department of Environment and Heritage Protection |
| Councillor Col Chapman | Councillor | Gladstone Regional Council |
| Ms Ami McGrath and Ms Peta Lane (via telephone) | | Department of Environment |
| Industry | | |
| Mr Kurt Heidecker | CEO | Gladstone Industry Leadership Group |
| Mr John Sherriff | General Manager, Safety Environment & Risk | Gladstone Ports Corporation |
| Mr Garry Scanlan | Gladstone Regional Manager | GLNG |
| Research | | |
| Mr John Gunn | CEO | Australian Institute of Marine Science |
| Other Attendees | | |
| Mr Ian Poiner | Chair | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Professor John Rolfe | Member | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Dr Richard Brinkman | Member | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Professor Bronwyn Harch | Member | GHHP Independent Science Panel |
| Dr Uthpala Pinto | GHHP Science Technical Officer | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Dr Mark Schultz | GHHP Science Technical Officer | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Dr John Kirkwood | GHHP Science Convenor | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Mrs Kirstin Kenyon | GHHP Secretariat | Department of Environment and Heritage Protection |
| Ms Rachael Stegemann | GHHP Secretariat | Fitzroy Basin Association |
| Ms Lyndal Hansen | Director | Amarna Consulting |
| Ms Crystal McGregor | Director | Amarna Consulting |

Agenda Item 1 – Introduction

Apologies:

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mr Peter Brockhurst | TUMRA Coordinator | Gidarjil Development Corporation |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|

All attendees introduced themselves.

Agenda Item 2 – Private committee discussion

The MC did not hold a private discussion.

Agenda Item 3 – Reports

3.1 Previous Minutes and Actions

Noted.

3.2 Science Program Report

Dr Ian Poiner tabled the ISP Report, and provided a brief update on Science Projects and the ISP meeting held yesterday.

Ian Poiner met with Peter Brockhurst to progress the development of the scope of works “Developing the cultural indicators for the Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership Report Card” to inform the cultural component of the First Report Card. The scope of works should be finalised in the next few weeks.

Ian Poiner is due to meet with Fisheries Research and Development Corporation (FRDC) representatives on the 1st December to progress the development of the GHHP fish health research program including the workshop to develop priorities that is planned for March 2015.

The Chair thanked the ISP Members, ISP Chair and Science Team for their efforts on behalf of the Management Committee.

Agenda Item 4 – Items requiring decision

4.1 Pilot Report Card Grades and Scores

Dr Ian Poiner gave a presentation on the Science Program, and outlined the caveats, grades, data used, guidelines; methods (explained by Prof Bronwyn Harch) and results (presented by Dr John Kirkwood).

- Caveats agreed to by the ISP to be included in the pilot report card technical report and reflected where appropriate in the pilot report card.
 - **Pilot Report Card:** The first Gladstone Harbour Report Card will be released in November 2015. This Pilot Report Card has been released a year in advance, using a small subset of the data and the indicators that will be included in the first Report Card. The purpose of the Pilot Report Card is to demonstrate the structure and format that the First Report Card will take, to test the methods for analysing data and developing indicators, and to provide an opportunity for stakeholders and the community to comment.
 - **There are some important limitations to note for the Pilot Report Card.**
 - **Data and data analysis:** The data, measures and indicators included in the pilot model are based on preliminary data analysis due to several data issues encountered, and the very short time available to generate the pilot scorecard. The scores and grades generated are indicative only, and not a definitive outcome.
 - **Methods:** The analytical methods used to calculate the first Report Card in 2015 are still under development by the ISP and Science Team and will not be finalised until March 2015. The methods used for the Pilot Report Card are robust but reflect the current state of development of the methods.
 - **Interpretation:** Great care should be taken in the interpretation of the Pilot Report Card as it was developed under very tight time frames and

as noted above only includes a subset of the data and the indicators that will be used in the first Report Card in 2015.

- **In summary**, the results of the Pilot Report Card should not be not be assumed to be representative of the current state of the overall health of Gladstone Harbour as defined by the GHHP Vision for the Harbour. It has been released to demonstrate the approach that is planned for the First Report Card, not as an early summary of the condition of the Gladstone Harbour.

Grades

- A 86 to 100
- B 66 to 85
- C 50 to 65
- D 26 to 49
- E 0 to 25
- For example, if a water measure meets water quality (WQ) guidelines it will receive a C or better grade.
- Social and economic indicators will use the same grading system but a baseline is still to be finalised. Establishing a baseline has been a key component of the science program this year.

MC Comments on Caveats / Grades

- Are the caveats listed today for both the Pilot Report Card and Technical Report 1? Yes. The caveats will need to be worded carefully within Technical Report 1.
- The MC confirmed Zones and agreed in principle to use the scoring system A B C D E at the previous meeting.
- What's the rationale behind the grading and scores displayed? The purpose of the agreed rationale for the grading and scoring system was to primarily address the use of 'C' as being below or above guidelines. Removing inconsistencies and using grades similar to a school report card, with 'C' or 50 being a 'pass' mark and meeting the guideline, and having a 'B' and 'A' grade proportionately above guidelines were other reasons behind the agreed rationale. Grades and scores implemented by other report cards were referenced during ISP discussions yesterday, with the ISP recommending the use of a different system. Plus and minus grades were briefly discussed during ISP discussions, and the recommendation is to not use plus and minus grades.
- Using a guideline as a tool to back up the rationale behind grading and scores is good when conveying the meaning of grades and scores to the community.
- What does an 'A' mean in terms of chemistry and other indicators? This will be explained in the methodology section within Technical Report 1.
- Weightings for indicators and zones are still to be finalised.
- The grading and scoring rationale within the Healthy Waterways report card was outlined. A nesting approach won't be possible across all Qld report cards due to the different indicators used and different grading and scoring systems currently used.
- Gladstone Harbour is a naturally turbid environment. This was confirmed when DEHP determined the local Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) and Environmental Values (EVs) for Gladstone. Concern was expressed if all objectives are met then the grade given is a 'C' which may result in issues surrounding community perceptions. The community perception may be that development within Gladstone may contribute to lower water quality scores.
- The purpose of GHHP is to 'maintain, and where necessary, improve the health of Gladstone Harbour.'
- Industry invest a lot of funds into meeting WQ guidelines, and will need to work a lot more to achieve the extra % to move from a 'C' to 'B' grade. Regulations surrounding WQO's and associated benchmarks were outlined.
- This is a Pilot Report Card. The expectation is that depending on community feedback grades may be changed between the release of the Pilot Report Card and the release of the First Report Card in 2015. Caution needs to be taken should grades be changed, as it

may damage the reputation of GHHP. GHHP need to decide what the best information is to convey to our audience, which is primarily the Gladstone community, in addition to the national and international community.

- DEHP's preference is to use the Reef Report Card scores of 0-20, 20-40, 40-60, 60-80 and 80-100 which are the scores used in the marine zones. Marine zone guidelines undergo a review and amendment every 10 years or so.
- Community expectation gauged so far indicates that there is no expectation that Gladstone Harbour is pristine, and that Gladstone Harbour is a working harbour.

- Data used
 - The available indicators for the Pilot Report Card were displayed. It is based on indicators of water quality, sediment quality, social health and economic health relevant to the 2013-14 financial year. This is only a very small subset of the data and the indicators that will be included in the first full report card in 2015.
- Guidelines
 - The water quality results were referenced to the Capricorn-Curtis Coast region: Environment Values and water quality objectives – draft aquatic ecosystem water quality guidelines that will be legislated by November 2014 including the new aluminium value derived from Golding L. A. et al. (In Press) Derivation of a water quality guideline for aluminium in marine waters Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry DOI 10.1002/etc.2771.
 - The sediment quality results were referenced to the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (2000).
- Methods
 - Data assets and data analytics are the intellectual property of what GHHP is trying to achieve through releasing grades and scores. The process from obtaining raw data to generating grades is a large one, with numerous QA / QC checks involved throughout the process.
 - Data assets involve a process from measured raw data – processed data (indicators) – rescaled data – aggregated scores – grade.
 - Data Analytics involve a process from QAQC – guidelines (adopted or developed) – Condition assessment: departure from guideline – Aggregating indicators & zones: Bayesian belief networks – 5 point grading scheme.
 - Condition assessments:
 - binary assessment (does not) meet guideline
 - very limited discrimination
 - Departure from guideline:
 - scaled difference (need worst case scenario to scale)
 - Amplitude ratio: degree of change (positive or negative). One measure to determine guidelines, and figure out how far away from central point (bell curve) the score is using a mathematic formula.
 - Aggregating across indicators and zones
 - Linear combinations (not used)
 - Bayesian belief networks (used)
 - Offers a framework that includes linear combinations (weightings) and probabilities
 - Allows for quantitative and qualitative data
 - Provides flexibility for incorporation of additional data, indicators and knowledge as generated.
- Testing of assumptions is important for the MC to include from between the Pilot Report Card and First Report Card.

MC Comments on Methods:

- Linear scale is used to best distribute data and apportion grades.

- The worst and best recorded scenarios are measured, with scores apportioned between the two scores.
 - How does GHHP address if scores are or are not okay to use if limited data is measured with boundaries that are not wide? The amplitude ratio can be used to expand on worst case scenarios, however complete creation of the boundary scale is difficult as the assumption is that the worst case scenario has already occurred. It's important to translate unknowns into indicators. Scores may not match if different assessment models are used.
 - Are there issues with skewing data results through increasing the sample size of aggregated data? No, as GHHP doesn't 'shop around' for best scores, it reports on what data is available and doesn't skew information received.
 - The Bayesian framework is conditional, and weighs each indicator equally for the Pilot Report Card.
 - Qualitative data has not yet been entered, and will likely not be entered at this stage due to the richness of data. Aggregation within the model using a probability basis can be implemented to ensure the system is not overloaded.
 - One issue the ISP has faced is the trade-off between information overload and transparency of information.
- Results

An in-camera presentation and discussion took place regarding environmental results.

MC Comments / questions on environmental results:

- Will ranges be provided? Ranges can be provided, however some variations occur due to the dispersing of sampling sites. Caution needs to be exercised when using ranges as minor events can skew range variations.
- Sample size can be included, and confidence can be included and determined through the Bayesian model. Simple summaries of sample sizes, ranges, and confidence can be provided within the Technical Report 1.
- Phenanthrene, Fluoranthene and pyrene are organic hydrocarbon compounds.
- Although the analytical methods used to calculate the first Report Card in 2015 are still under development by the ISP and Science Team. The methods used for the Pilot Report Card are robust but reflect the current state of development of the methods.

Morning tea break from 10:55am to 11:05am.

An in-camera presentation and discussion took place regarding social and economic results.

MC Comments on social and economic results:

- No guideline has been established for social and economic results.
- The social and economic results were run through the Bayesian model.
- Technical Report 1 should include interpretation of qualitative statements and value judgements such as 'are you concerned with...'
- Survey participants were telephoned at random. A suitable survey process was discussed by the ISP prior to engaging a project team to conduct the survey. Survey participants were asked if they wish to provide their contact details and be contacted in 2015 to answer similar questions.
- It may be useful to include a question about safety on Gladstone Harbour within a future survey. This can be added into the 2015 survey.
- Is the economic effect from the hinterland areas taken into account within the economic results? The Gladstone area boundary was displayed.
- Is there a single value for the economy of Gladstone Harbour available? No, as while there would be a single value for the economy of Gladstone, it would be difficult to separate the value for the Gladstone Harbour economy.

- Issues:
 - Tourism and fisheries results may not be included within the Pilot Report Card.
 - Aluminium results to be re-run.
 - General check of results is currently being done.
 - How to address the release of information over the next few months, such as seagrass, connectivity, etc. as some of the results are likely to indicate some of these indicators will score a low grade e.g. seagrass.

The MC voted on approval to use the proposed grades and scores within the Pilot Report Card.

MC Comments:

- All communication regarding the grades and scores needs to be clear and concise.
- Preference to use 0-20, etc. scoring system as per the Reef Report Card. (one member)
- There will be no 'E' grades with the proposed grades and scores. We need to use plus and minus grades for scores. (one member)

7 Yes votes and 2 No votes were made, with 1 MC member absent. Under the operating rules, the Yes vote was passed.

The Chair thanked the ISP Chair and ISP members for their recommendations.

4.2 Pilot Report Card Mock Up

The GHHP Annual Report 2013-2014 was displayed.

MC Suggestions / Comments on Annual Report:

- GHHP by numbers: include an amount of co-investment funding by research partners.
- Remove reference to Seagrass monitoring as seagrass results won't be available in the Pilot Report Card.
- Suggestion was made to include the mission and goals within the Annual Report.
- Was permission granted by the owner of the boat pictured within the Annual Report? No, however the boat isn't clearly identifiable with no registration number or boat name.
- The Annual Report is a brief statement to provide highlights of GHHP to Partners, and will be handed out at the Pilot Report Card launch on 4 December.

Action MC 11.1 Communications Team to make the below changes to the Annual Report:

- GHHP by numbers: include an amount of co-investment funding by research partners.
- Remove reference to seagrass monitoring
- Add GHHP mission and goals.

The Pilot Report Card Mock Up was displayed.

MC Suggestions / Comments on Pilot Report Card Mock Up:

- Text within the grading section needs to be clarified and provided, particularly the Grading scores which are currently A=very good, and so on. A few sentences will be added to include information on guidelines.
- Sub-Regional Zone Grades will be filled in. Sample points won't be shown on the map. The scores and colours will be filled in as required.
- A score for the Marine Zone will be provided by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority that monitor the marine area. The different data set and different grading for Marine Zone will need to be clearly identified within the Pilot Report Card.
- Suggestion was made to include a grey box stating 'Data not available' below ABCDE to state that data is not available, but will be included within the First Report Card in 2015.

- Update 'Gladstone Harbour Health: The Results' to 'Gladstone Harbour Health: The Pilot Report Card Results.'
- Suggestion was made to include a 'Pilot' watermark on each page of the Report Card. The Communications Team will determine if this is suitable.
- The key messages are yet to be determined, and will be written by the ISP Chair is drafted and sent to the MC with a short turnaround for comments.

Suggestions for key messages were:

- 1. This is a pilot report card by the Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership, developed to report the community's vision for a healthy, accessible, working harbour.
- 2. This pilot report card contains information and data that was available for the 2013-2014 financial year. Any gaps in environmental, social, economic, and cultural information and data will be included in the 2015 report card.
- 3. Information and data has been provided from a variety of sources for the calculation of scores. Information and data has been assessed for quality assurance by the Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership Independent Science Panel.
- 4. The first caveat stated within the ISP Chair Report, namely 'The purpose of the Pilot Report Card is to demonstrate the structure and format that the First Report Card will take, to test the methods for analysing data and developing indicators, and to provide an opportunity for stakeholders and the community to comment on information released.'
- 5. Data collected in from the 2013-2014 year.
- 6. The process of developing a Pilot Report Card, highlight the results available and outline results yet to come.
- A short description will be included against each overall result, such as turbidity within the environmental result. Short descriptions will be drafted and sent to the MC with a short turnaround for comments.
- Iconic species section will be sent to the MC with a short turnaround for comments.
- The Stewardship section has been amended to include a case study on Harbour Watch activities. Change 'Stewardship in Focus' to 'Stewardship Case Study'. Suggestion was made to include a section on climatic conditions, such as rainfall and events (this year rainfall compared to long term average).
- Suggestion was made to include a graph on turbidity developed by DEHP when determining the WQ guidelines, either in the Pilot Report Card or on the GHHP website. This may be included beside the section on rainfall if there is room.

Action MC 11.2 Communications Team to make the below changes to the Annual Report:

- Include a grey box stating 'Data not available' below ABCDE to state that data is not available, but will be included within the First Report Card in 2015.
- Change 'Gladstone Harbour Health: The Results' to 'Gladstone Harbour Health: 2014 Pilot Report Card Results.'
- Include a 'Pilot' watermark on each page.
- Change 'Stewardship in Focus' to 'Stewardship Case Study'.
- Include a section on climatic conditions, such as rainfall and events (this year rainfall compared to long term average).
- Include a graph on turbidity developed by DEHP beside the section on rainfall if there is room.

Action MC 11.3 ISP Chair to provide the following information within the Pilot Report Card:

- Grading section text to be clarified, with information on guidelines.
- A score for the Marine Zone, and information on the different data set and different grading for the Marine Zone.
- Key messages 4, 5 & 6 below
 - 4. The first caveat stated within the ISP Chair Report.

- 5. Data collected in from the 2013-2014 year.
- 6. The process of developing a Pilot Report Card, highlight the results available and outline results yet to come.
- Short description for each overall result, such as turbidity within the environmental result.

4.3 Pilot Report Card Feedback Form

MC Comments:

- Q1: change 'grading' to 'actual results'
- Q2: change 'grading' to 'results'
- Q3: change 'grading' to 'results'
- Q4: change 'grading' to 'results'
- Q19: change 'processes' to 'principles'
- Add 'Pilot' before 'Report Card' for all questions.
- Add a question 'Was it clear to you that this is a Pilot Report Card, and that more information will be included in the Report Card in 2015?'
- Add a question 'Was it clear that the results within the Pilot Report Card were obtained from data collected in 2013 and 2014?'
- The purpose of the Feedback Form is to elicit general responses from the community, with further information to be gathered through the focus groups.
- It would be useful to secure demographic information for respondents for information purposes.

The MC approved the Pilot Report Card Feedback Form with the proposed amendments.

Action MC 11.4 Communications Team to update the Pilot Report Card Feedback form with MC Comments.

4.4 Technical Report 1

Technical Report 1 Table of Contents were displayed. This be finalised and sent to the Communications Team by 28 November to go live on the GHHP website on 4 December.

4.5 GHHP Governance Charter

MC Comments:

- Add 'Any refusals by the Management Committee will be referred to the Partnership.' To the end of Clause 2.2.
- Add 'And Management Committee' to end of Clause 3.2.1.

The MC approved the amended GHHP Governance Charter with the proposed amendments.

4.6 Confirmation of MC Members and Election of Chair and Deputy Chair

The following MC Members were confirmed for 2015:

- Garry Scanlan
- John Sherriff
- Kurt Heidecker
- Peta Lane
- Claire Andersen
- Colin Chapman
- Peter Brady
- John Gunn
- Paul Birch

Action Item MC11.5 Chair to contact Peter Brockhurst to ask if he wishes to continue as an MC member for the next 12 months.

Paul Birch was re-appointed as Chair. Colin Chapman was re-appointed as Deputy Chair.

Agenda Item 5 – Items for Noting

6.0 – General / Recurring Business

Pilot Report Card Launch

Can the communications team prepare responses to sensitive issues for the MC to use following the Pilot Report Card Launch? Yes, if the MC send back dot points with sensitive issues.

Action Item MC 11.6 Secretariat to email MC requesting dot points on sensitive issues for the Communications team to prepare responses to.

Water Quality Objectives

DEHP are set to release their Water Quality Objectives on 28th November 2014.

Stewardship Project

Work is progressing on the Stewardship framework, with a meeting of the Stewardship working group to occur on Friday 28th November 2014 in Gladstone.

Gladstone Harbour Model

The Gladstone Harbour Model will be meeting with the Stewardship project team and other stakeholders to discuss progress on the Gladstone Harbour Model.

The next Partnership Meeting will be held at the Leo Zussino Building, CQ University Gladstone Campus at 9:00am Thursday 4 December 2014. The Chair requested that MC Members arrive 15 minutes prior to the commencement of the meeting.

The Chair reminded the MC about the importance of keeping today's results discussions in-camera.

Meeting Actions Register: GHHP and MC

(Once actions have been endorsed as complete in the meeting outcomes, they will be deleted from the list)

| Action Number | Action | Who is responsible? | When it is due? | Status | Notes |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-----------------|--|
| MC Meeting 4 | | | | | |
| MC 4.2 | Report Card Recommendation and Report Card Mock-up to be brought together by GHHP Communication contractor into a plain English Summary to put on the website and distribute to Partners. The ISP members would need to sign off the sections relation to the report card recommendations. | GHHP Science Convenor, GHHP Secretariat, GHHP Comms Contractor | ASAP | Underway | Report Card Recommendation and Report Card Mock-up won't be added to the GHHP website. GHHP Comms Contractor have worked with the Science Team to include details from the Report Card Recommendation document within communications products, including Harbour Focus (GHHP Newsletter) and information sheets. |
| MC Meeting 5 | | | | | |
| MC 5.10 | Amarna to populate the Draft Mock Up Report Card product with information as it becomes available from the ISP following the monitoring cycle completion in June 2014, to be ready for MC release in November 2014. | GHHP Comms Contractor | June-November 2014 | Underway | |
| MC Meeting 7 | | | | | |
| MC7.5 | Discuss with Science Team about the integration of the Stewardship work with the Report Card. | Science Team and GHHP Secretariat | ASAP | Ongoing | |
| MC7.12 | Use the GHHP Contact database to begin the internal and external distribution list. | GHHP Comms Contractor | 4 August 2014 | Underway | |
| MC Meeting 9 | | | | | |
| MC9.3 | Circulate GHHP Columns and GHHP media releases to the MC following the Chair's approval. | GHHP Secretariat (RS) | ASAP | Underway | |
| MC9.6 | Circulate updated Communications Plan to the Management Committee. | GHHP Comms Contractor | ASAP | Ongoing | Communications Plan is being addressed regularly through updates on activities, such as the GHHP Community Engagement Strategy, and Report Card Feedback Process. |
| MC Meeting 10 | | | | | |

| Action Number | Action | Who is responsible? | When it is due? | Status | Notes |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------|---|
| MC 10.1 | Create dot points of six key messages within the report card and circulate to all partners on Wednesday 3 December. | GHHP Comms Contractor | 3 December 2014 | Pending | |
| MC 10.4 | Draft a letter of support and send to GHHP Chair. | Peter Brockhurst | | Pending | |
| MC Meeting 11 | | | | | |
| MC 11.1 | Make the below changes to the Annual Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GHHP by numbers: include an amount of co-investment funding by research partners. Remove reference to seagrass monitoring Add GHHP mission and goals. | GHHP Comms Contractor | | | |
| MC 11.2 | Make the below changes to the Pilot Report Card: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include a grey box stating 'Data not available' below ABCDE to state that data is not available, but will be included within the First Report Card in 2015. Change 'Gladstone Harbour Health: The Results' to 'Gladstone Harbour Health: 2014 Pilot Report Card Results.' Include a 'Pilot' watermark on each page. Change 'Stewardship in Focus' to 'Stewardship Case Study'. Include a section on climatic conditions, such as rainfall and events (this year rainfall compared to long term average). Include a graph on turbidity developed by DEHP beside the section on rainfall if there is room. | GHHP Comms Contractor | | | |
| MC 11.3 | Provide the following information within the Pilot Report Card: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading section text to be clarified, with information on guidelines. A score for the Marine Zone, and information on the different data set and different grading for the Marine Zone. Key messages 4, 5 & 6 4Short description for each overall result, such as turbidity within the environmental result. | GHHP ISP Chair | | | |
| MC 11.4 | Update the Pilot Report Card Feedback form with MC Comments. | GHHP Comms Contractor | | | |
| MC 11.5 | Contact Peter Brockhurst to ask if he wishes to continue as an MC member for the next 12 months. | GHHP Chair | | Completed | Peter Brockhurst will continue as an MC Member in 2015. |

| Action Number | Action | Who is responsible? | When it is due? | Status | Notes |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|
| MC 11.6 | Email MC requesting dot points on sensitive issues for the Communications team to prepare responses to. | GHHP Secretariat (RS) | ASAP | Completed | |