		(i) the scope of the business and assets that would need to be divested in order to be effective;	(ii) whether there are risks that the scope of the divestiture package may be too constrained or not appropriately configured to attract a suitable purchaser or may not allow a purchaser to operate as an effective competitor in the market now and in the medium term and maintain a competitive pace of R&D;	(iii) the relevance and importance of GBST's Australian business and its UK Capital markets business – which could be retained by FNZ under this option - to the viability and competitiveness of GBST's wealth management operations in the UK;	(v) how easy or difficult it would be to implement the separation required to implement this remedy and the extent to which this would result in ongoing disruption to GBST and deterioration in its competitive capabilities.
	22. At this stage the divestiture options under consideration are:				
	a) A full divestiture of GBST.	Yes, this would be effective in allaying your concerns.	Not sure how many potential a nd viable buyers there are for all of GBST	N/A	N/A
	(b) A partial divestiture of GBST.				
	The three potential permutations of this are:				
	(i) Divestiture of global wealth management business;	It should allay your concerns	Not sure of the viability of the capital markets business as a stand alone entity / as part of FNZ Not sure how many potential buyers there are for the global wealth business	FNZ would retain Captial Markets business, not sure if FNZ would want this part of the business stand alone.	I think Separation would be difficult
	(ii) divestiture of all of GBST's UK business; or	It should allay your concerns	Not sure if just the UK business would be viable or attractive to a buyer	FNZ would retain Australian Business, this should be viable.	I believe separation would be very difficult due to shared code base
	(iii) divestiture of GBST's UK wealth management operations.	It should allay your concerns	Not sure if just the UK Wealth business would be viable or attractive to a buyer	FNZ would retain Capital Markets and Australian business this should be viable	I believe separation would be very difficult due to shared code base
	(e) for both a full and partial divestiture:				
	(i) whether there are risks that a suitable purchaser is not available or that FNZ will divest to a weak or otherwise inappropriate purchaser;	I am not sure there is a karge buyer universe in totality. Even less that would offer strong competition. I also worry that the sales process will not be balamced or competitive hence impacting price etc			
	(ii) whether there are risks that the competitive capability of a divestiture package will deteriorate before completion of divestiture; and	Depending on timing GBSTs competitiveness would continue to degrade. Current clients worrued with this prolonged period of uncertainty so may choose to move to a secure option in the short term.			
	(iii) any other elements that may be required for an effective divestiture remedy, or risks that the CMA should be aware of.	N/A			
	The CMA invites views on whether there are any specific factors to which the CMA should pay particular regard in assessing purchaser suitability, e.g.: (a) Whether non-retail platform solutions providers would be appropriate purchasers; (b) whether private equity firms would be suitable purchasers; (c) whether a UK prescence and understanding of the UK market is essential.	I think there will be a very short list of viable potential purchsers, so I don't think there will be much opportunity to be selective….			