

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Thursday 6 June 2019 - Estimates Committee A (Jaensch)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Thursday 6 June 2019

MEMBERS

Mr Finch
Ms Forrest (Chair)
Mr Gaffney
Ms Lovell
Mr Valentine
Mr Willie

IN ATTENDANCE

Hon. Roger Jaensch MP, Minister for Resources, Minister for Building and Construction,
Acting Minister for Corrections

Ministerial Office

Rowena Gilbertson, Chief of Staff
Anthony Reid, Senior Advisor; Planning
Simon Duffy, Senior Advisor; Housing
Lara Kirkpatrick, Senior Advisor; Children and Youth Services
Lauryn Smith, Adviser; Community Services

Department of Communities - Human Services

Ginna Webster, Secretary
Gail Eaton-Briggs, Deputy Secretary, Children & Youth Services
Sam Gunner, Manager, Executive Coordination & Communication
Rod Fazackerley, Principal Finance Officer
Kathy Baker, Executive Director, Capability & Resources
Ingrid Ganley, Director, Disability & Community Services
Mathew Healey, Executive Director, Engagement & Innovation
Mandy Clarke, Executive Director, Standards & Performance
Noel Fittock, Manager, Quality Improvement & Workforce Development

Department of Communities - Housing

Ginna Webster, Secretary

Peter White, Deputy Secretary, Housing, Disability & Community Services

Sam Gunner, Manager, Executive Coordination & Communication

Rod Fazackerley, Principal Finance Officer

Kathy Baker, Executive Director, Capability & Resources

Department of Justice - Planning

Kathrine Morgan-Wicks, Secretary, Department of Justice

Kristy Bourne, Deputy Secretary, Administration of Justice, Department of Justice

Brian Risby, Director, Policy Planning Unit, Department of Justice

Peter Fischer, Acting Executive Commissioner, Tasmanian Planning Commission

Sally Bridge, Senior Mediation Officer, Resource Management Planning Appeal Tribunal

The committee met at 9 a.m.

CHAIR (Ms Forrest) - Welcome, minister. Last day for us, second day for you.

Mr JAENSCH - The last day of the Estimates.

CHAIR - Yes, it is, too. So, I invite you to introduce the members of your team at the table for Hansard. If you want to give a brief opening statement - 'brief' being the operative word that I've used all week, with a great degree of success - that'd be fine.

Mr JAENSCH - Thank you very much. I introduce Ginna Webster, Secretary of the Department of Communities Tasmania, and Rod Fazackerley, Principal Finance Officer, to the table.

Since 2016 our redesign of the Child Safety Service's Strong Families - Safe Kids has delivered a range of actions to improve outcomes for Tasmanian children, young people and their families. Last year we invested an additional \$24 million in funding to support the redesign, including 25 more Child Safety officers and other frontline staff, and assist vulnerable children with very complex needs in out-of-home care.

A major achievement and milestone for the Strong Families, Safe Kids redesign in 2018-19 has been the commencement of the Strong Families Safe Kids Advice and Referral Line. The 2019-20 Budget provides funding for all our election commitments as well as continuing significant additional funding for important projects that support our continuing service to the [inaudible] and Reform Program.

The major focus is on early intervention: to reduce the number of children and young people needing to enter care by providing more intensive early support to families who are at risk. Additional funding of \$16.9 million has been allocated to meet the growth in demand for out-of-home care services, particularly for children in specialised placements with complex needs. The reality is that there are some children in out-of-home care who require an extensive period of time receiving specialised care with highly intensive wraparound services, whilst safe and stable options are pursued to address the future needs of those children.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

We're also committed to continuing the rollout of the Strong Families, Safe Kids Implementation Plan with an additional \$2.3 million to invest in strengthening quality assurance processes, improve practice in investigation and response, delivery of Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework initiatives, and ongoing change management activity to embed the principles of the redesign in the operation of the Child Safety Service.

The additional funding will also support the continuation of the Serious Events Review Team and Cross Agency Oversight Committee for children and youth services. Additional funding is also being provided for the Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People for additional resources to support the office to promote the rights and wellbeing of young people, enabling better consultation with them so they can express their views and opinions and play an active role in the decision-making processes that affect them.

During our first term, we provided \$600 000 in funding towards raising awareness, addressing and preventing elder abuse in Tasmania. In our second term, we committed \$150 000 per annum over three years towards the prevention of elder abuse that enables COTA Tasmania to continue to build the capacity of older Tasmanians and raise community and service provider awareness of elder abuse and the continuation of the elder Abuse Advocacy Service operated by Advocacy Tasmania, which provides follow up support for clients after contacting the Tasmanian Elder Abuse Helpline.

More recently we've been working closely with stakeholders on the development and updated Tasmanian Elder Abuse Prevention Strategy. We'll be releasing that shortly, delivering on our election commitment to do so. The new strategy will be supported by an additional \$850 000 in the 2019-20 state Budget. This is in addition to our existing commitment to recurrently fund the Tasmanian Elder Abuse Helpline.

Key actions to be funded from the additional \$850 000 in the Budget include a contemporary community awareness campaign, a new website to streamline referral pathways, development of training tools for Tasmanians who work in the sector, and commencement of a review into safeguards for older Tasmanians. The funding will also assist to implement the National Plan to Respond to the Abuse of Older Australians (Elder Abuse) 2019-2023 which was endorsed by the Tasmanian Government earlier this year. They are some highlights from the Budget and our workplan from the year that's just been, and the one we're going into, Chair. I'd be happy to take questions from the committee.

DIVISION 2

(Department of Communities Tasmania)

Output group 1

Children Services System Management

1.1 Children Services System Management -

Ms WEBB - Thank you, Chair. Thank you, minister, and thank you for your opening remarks. Is this the output item in which I'd ask about the role of the Child Advocate?

Mr JAENSCH - I'm happy to speak about the Child Advocate, no worries at all.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - Can you describe the remit of the position of the Child Advocate that has been brought into play in the last year or so? How are the activities and outcomes of that position being monitored and reported on?

Mr JAENSCH - The role of the Child Advocate was created as part of the implementation of recommendations from the Children and Young People in Out of Home Care in Tasmania Report released by the Commissioner for Children and Young People. The Child Advocate will provide a greater voice to children in out-of-home care regarding the quality of and decisions made about their care.

The advocate was appointed in June 2018, principally to ensure that children in out-of-home care in Tasmania are aware of their rights in an age-appropriate way and to ensure their participation in decision-making about their lives while they're in care.

One of the important questions frequently raised is: how does this role compare to that of the Commissioner for Children and Young People?

Ms WEBB - If you would like to speak about that, that's fine. I understand the difference but we can get it on the record.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. The Child Advocate can access and review child safety file material pertaining to any child in out-of-home care, directly contact and meet any child or young person and the people important to them and contact any personnel directly within the Child Safety Service. The difference between them is that the commissioner is focused on systematic advocacy for all children; the Child Advocate solely on out-of-home care children and young people and a far more individual treatment. I understand the Child Advocate reports directly to the secretary.

Ms WEBB - Is that reporting not more broadly made available in terms of activities or outcomes?

Mr JAENSCH - The Child Advocate reports regularly to the secretary and to me as minister but because the advocate's activities involve details of individual children, the full body of their reporting is not available publicly.

Ms WEBB - Sure. How about some indicative measures? For example, since the position began in June last year, how many children has the Child Advocate had contact with? Have they been children who have proactively contacted the advocate or has the advocate been in contact with them? What were the main, broadly speaking, issues raised by children in their discussions with the Child Advocate? What are the particular rights that feature most prominently in those interactions as points of discussion? Not mentioning specific cases, what further actions has the advocate taken, broadly speaking, from those interactions?

Mr JAENSCH - Briefly, in response to 75 matters that have been raised, the Child Advocate has directly consulted with 30 children and provided advice and recommendations relating to a total of 101 children. On some matters, the Child Advocate received more than one inquiry. She's consulted with a wide range of stakeholders since her appointment, including the Create Foundation, the Commissioner for Children and Young People, the Foster and Kinship Association of Tasmania - FKAT - the Office of the Ombudsman, Families and Children Tasmania, Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre, the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, White Lion, Social Action and Research Centre, Anglicare, Kin for Kids Association, Child Safety Legal

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Group, the Australian Childhood Foundation, the Department of Education, Youth Network of Tasmania, Tasmanian Council of Social Services and a range of out-of-home care providers.

A summary of the matters raised: contact with the advocate is predominantly initiated by email, phone and referrals direct from the Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People. The nature of the inquiries is predominantly flagging concerns and complaints the rights of a child are not being upheld and the primary focus of the Child Advocate's response is usually by consultation and supporting the resolution of concerns at the local level.

Ms WEBB - Can you clarify more? Who raises the concern that comes to the child applicant?

Mr JAENSCH - They are coming from a range. Can you speak to that?

Ms WEBSTER - They come from a range of people. Sometimes, it can be from foster carers, depending on the age of the child, it might be from the child themselves, sometimes because the commissioner for children cannot individually advocate for children and she might ask the Child Advocate to look at a range of issues she might have heard about. Sometimes I ask the Child Advocate or the Deputy Secretary of Children.

Ms WEBB - Is it possible to get a breakdown of how those numbers fall in terms of avenues and originating from?

Mr JAENSCH - On the numbers and how they are originated? Is that the sort of information the Attorney can provide?

Ms WEBB - Can I suggest, minister, acknowledging the individual matters dealt with by the Child Advocate are private matters and obviously don't belong in the public domain. Matters to do with the advocate's activities are of interest and particularly in this very sensitive area. I would ask you to consider a way of publicly reporting on this and to people in this House, but also more broadly, as an accountability measure around that position.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to consider that. With that caveat of not putting any individual case information into the public realm. I would like to cover what the Child's Advocate's activities are, which can add to that, but I'm happy to take the suggestion aboard and happy to discuss with the secretary and the Child's Advocate what we might be able to do and where that information might be made available.

The Child's Advocate is finalising a brochure to be distributed to all children and young people in care to outline a complaints pathway, so they are clear on how they can make contact and access her services. Creating a technology-based platform for children and young people to facilitate their direct involvement in the care planning processes. The app for kids might be a way they have personally controlled access directly to the advocate, not only through their carer or through a Child Safety officer. A webpage by which children and young people can directly contact the advocate, a youth panel for children and young people to have a direct hand in involving the policies and procedures of the Child Safety Service.

The advocate has assisted with the re-launch of the Charter of Rights for Tasmanian Children and Young People in Out-of-Home Care and is consulted on various internal processes relating to the design of the Child Safety Service.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

We have been thrilled with the performance of Sonya Pringle-Jones in this role over the last, nearly year. As a new initiative, having a child advocate is adding real value for those young people.

Ms WEBB - I would suggest the recommendation which drove position being created, which was an excellent one from the commissioner for children's report - would have envisaged some sort of public visibility on outcomes, impact and results from that position. I would add in my exaltation to you to make that available in some way.

CHAIR - Just to clarify, the question we'll put on notice to you is to provide a list of the referrals to the Child Advocate from individuals or organisations grouped together, like so many from the children's commissioner, so many from the secretary. Is that what you are able to provide?

Mr JAENSCH - I think if we can find a way of characterising that, yes, we will do that.

CHAIR - Maintaining privacy of individuals obviously.

Mr VALENTINE - I am interested in exactly where the advocate gets the head of power to be able to deal with a child without the parents' permission. If it's an out-of-home care child, is it the foster carer who is able to provide the advocate with that power to deal with that child or is it the child themselves? Can you explain a little bit about that?

Mr JAENSCH - For children in out-of-home care, the Government, through the secretary, is the parent effectively. The foster carer is engaged to provide a caring service and so we have access to the child through the secretary's power, which can be delegated through the advocate to have that direct access to the child.

Mr VALENTINE - That's under the act you are allowed to do that?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, and that's distinct from the commissioner, as I understand, who needs a different chain of permissions to be able to engage directly with children.

Mr VALENTINE - What happens in the circumstance where the child believes that he or she simply can't live there any longer and may be under 16 years of age - does the child have an opportunity to approach the advocate to seek assistance in some way, shape or form?

Mr JAENSCH - Are you talking about a child who is under orders, in care?

Mr VALENTINE - No, not a child who is under orders. A child who is in what you might consider a normal family situation although normally a child wouldn't want to move out of home so early, but if they do, what sort of avenues are open to them to seek assistance?

Mr JAENSCH - As I understand it, the Child Advocate's role is specifically around in the out-of-home care system.

Where you are going to is another interesting group of people we are very conscious of. We know there is a service gap and an interesting cohort there that we need to deal with. If you're happy for me to -

Ms WEBB - I've got questions on that so we could talk about it now or we can leave it to the line item where it's relevant.

Mr VALENTINE - I will leave it to you.

CHAIR - We will leave it to the line item and we will come back to that.

Mr VALENTINE - I just want to clarify that first part.

Ms WEBB - The Tasmanian Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework was much discussed last year in Estimates. It's not mentioned in this year's Budget, so I have a few questions to see where that has progressed. Is there funding attached to the continued implementation of the framework in this Budget? Where are you up to with the implementation of that framework? Specifically, how is it informing the work of your department? How is your department accountable to it? Is it being measured, monitored and reported on? What are the next steps?

Mr JAENSCH - As I mentioned in my opening comments, the \$2.3 million of additional funds in this Budget goes to continuation of the redesign, including implementation, embedding the principles of the Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework in our practice. I would like at this point to invite Mathew Healey, Executive Director, Engagement and Innovation, Department of Communities to join us at the table and give us some more detail on that implementation program.

Ms WEBB - Do you want me to repeat those questions for you, Mr Healey, so rather than give a pat spiel you could respond specifically to the bits I am interested in?

Mr HEALEY - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Is there funding attached to the continued implementation of this framework? The minister mentioned \$2.3 million broadly for the redesign. I am interested in what's allocated towards this framework, for instance. Where are you up to with the implementation of the framework, specifically how is it informing the work of the department? How is the department accountable and relating to how it's measured and reported? What are the next steps for the framework?

Mr HEALEY - The Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework was released 18 or so months ago, and has been instrumental in a lot of work progressing, not only within our agency, but across Government. For example, the Department of Education has used the wellbeing framework in its strategic planning. It has been used across services, for example, the Tasmanian Aboriginal Corporation is using it to frame a number of their service responses to children and young people.

Internally, we are using it to develop collaboratively with a range of agencies, a wellbeing assessment tool. We are also using it to define a set of outcomes and indicators for children and young people. We are using it across the entire system to focus our efforts to improve the wellbeing of children and young people.

There is funding to continue the work of Strong Families, Safe Kids, and includes funding for those officers within my division supporting the implementation of the framework and development of the assessment tool.

Ms WEBB - Where are we up to with the assessment tool?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr HEALEY - The assessment tool has been developed and now available on the department's website. We originally developed it with the intention of trialling it within the Department of Education through its Child Wellbeing Unit teams. We have been victims of our own success as it has raised a lot of interest across the service. The wellbeing assessment tool is now being promoted within, for example, child and family centres. It is being considered in terms of the future of case and care planning in the child safety system. It is being picked up by a number of non-government services. I will not specifically list them, because it is probably up to them to talk about their practice. We can barely keep up with the demand for the interest in the tool and how it might improve the integration of services or assist with common planning for the wellbeing of children and young people in this state.

Ms WEBB - With Child Safety Services, the department is using the tool and those others sit outside. How is it being implemented there?

Mr HEALEY - More broadly, what the wellbeing framework has done, it has allowed people to focus beyond their specific area of expertise to look at the broad wellbeing needs of the child, and obviously is core to the business of the Child Safety Service, core to the business of their planning for supporting of the wellbeing of children in care.

I do not want to over reach to say they are implementing the tool within Child Safety Service, but they are very interested in how the tool can assist them with improving case in care planning process.

Ms WEBB - Probably only in the planning stage of things?

Mr HEALEY - Yes.

Mr JAENSCH - Chair, we have been able to get the breakdown of Child Advocate inquiries and responses.

CHAIR - That is very prompt, minister, well done.

Mr JAENSCH - I have a very efficient department.

CHAIR - That is all on that line item?

Ms WEBB - No, I can ask more if it is okay.

Mr JAENSCH - Is that something you would like read into it?

Ms WEBB - If it is a lot of detail and a lot of numbers, it might be best to table it.

Mr JAENSCH - We can give you a quick overview but the other question was about how we might do this more routinely and make it available, but if you are happy for the secretary to give us a taste of it, I am happy for that to happen.

Ms WEBSTER - Individual contact, a secretary, 2; internal to children and youth services, 24; a parent or family, 11; service provider - that might be a service provider of out-of-home care, 14; the caregiver, 14; a child and young person, 4; other government agency, 6.

Ms WEBB - For a total of -

Ms WEBSTER - Seventy-five.

CHAIR - Does the commissioner fit in there, because we did mention the commissioner. Where would she fit?

Ms WEBSTER - I imagine she would be into the other government agency -

CHAIR - It has to sit outside of government, though.

Ms WEBSTER - She is listed as commissioner for children in the 'contact made via'. We can get that breakdown a bit further.

Ms WEBB - Moving on to another item, again not mentioned specifically in this but following up from funding that was allocated in last year's Budget, the Joined up Human Services Project. In last year's Budget there were \$500 000 per annum for two years, so therefore carrying over into this Budget and then nothing further in the forward Estimates.

Is the \$500 000 expected to be expended in the 2018-19 year? What activity and progress has been made on this project during that 2018-19 year? I will have questions about this next year's anticipated activity and spending in that project.

Mr JAENSCH - If you are happy for me to bring Mat Healey back to the table.

CHAIR - While Mr Healey is finding that, maybe I could follow up with a question from previously. It is a broader question on this output group in some respects, but Ms Webb touched on it with regard to your performance information. Ms Webb has talked significantly about some of the performance measures that could be more useful.

We look at the performance information of this group overall. When you consider it is about policy, planning, monitoring and service improvements, surely we should see some KPIs that actually give outcomes and impacts of policy development and implementation? You can plan all the policies you like but if it doesn't have a positive impact on the outcomes of children, it is a bit of a waste of time.

Is there any work being done in terms of having more outcomes-focused key performance indicators? We hope to see them in next year's Budget.

Ms WEBSTER - You are absolutely right. Meaningful KPIs are important and there is a community expectation around that. As a new agency it is certainly something we are doing. We had an interim strategic plan for our first 12 months that was very much focused on moving the two areas, or three areas really, into one department from two departments.

Now our focus is on how we want to be reporting, what are the important things for us to report on for the community, and what are the expectations. We have certainly talked about that in terms of the preparation of these budget papers. Going forward, you will see, with the minister's support, some changes to the way we report because there is an opportunity for us as a new agency to set some of that.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - This is a matter we have raised with every portfolio area and there are some that are much worse than this in that they are totally meaningless. You don't win the prize for that. You are not the worst by a long stretch, but it is such an important area. I am glad to hear that is happening and we look forward to seeing some of these appear in budget papers next year.

Mr HEALEY - I have found most of the information. On Joined Up Human Services, the member will be aware that there are a number of components of that project. A place-based initiative was progressed within Huonville and concluded over 12 months ago and we had some lessons from the work we did with that community.

Probably the most significant element of that project, and the one we are most excited about, is the Lead Support Coordination Service and the implementation of the Lead Support Coordination Service.

That service is our intent to try to deliver better outcomes for some of our most complex people in this state. The service model essentially assigns a lead coordinator to those individuals. That lead coordinator works with that person or that family to identify their specific goals. Then we measure quite specifically whether or not we can achieve a better outcome for that person over a period of nine months.

That trial has concluded and we have had a report on that, which we are currently working our way through at the moment. It points to positive outcomes.

Ms WEBB - When did that project conclude?

Mr HEALEY - It has not concluded and still running. Now we are taking the lessons from the trial and working with the service system to see if we can imbed the concept of a lead support coordinator into some of our more routine services. Specifically, we are working with Mission, Bapcare and Anglicare to see whether we can bring together the Lead Support Coordination Service with our youth support services, the Tasmanian Youth Support Service - TYSS- and the like. That is looking incredibly promising.

Ms WEBB - The TYS Service?

Mr HEALEY - The TYS Service, absolutely.

Ms WEBB - To combine the Lead Support Coordination Service with the TYS Service?

Mr HEALEY - Yes, so those services could take advantage of the opportunity to apply a lead support coordination model for better outcomes for complex youths.

Ms WEBB - Would the intention be to add more funding into the Targeted Youth Support Service through that in order to implement a lead support model?

Mr JAENSCH - Additional funding has been provided already. I am happy for Matt to refer to that.

Ms WEBB - Is that part of the Joined Up Services Project money added in during this two-year period?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr HEALEY - It was the funding provided for Youth at Risk, which has been brought together with the Lead Support Coordination Service to enhance the brokerage of support for young people.

Ms WEBB - Mixing it all together in a bucket? Isn't that nice?

Mr JAENSCH - The discussion raises an issue we see in many areas of this portfolio. I am not referring to any particular initiatives here. From the Family Violence Response Centre through to the Advice and Referral Line, through to this joined up approach, we have a body of growing professional opinion and evidence in literature about the importance of these 360 degrees wraparound multidisciplinary responses to people with complex needs. Each those services has its own systems, firewalls and protections to ensure it is compliant with obligations to maintain the security of people's individual information and their client service provider relationships. It is a huge challenge.

Ms WEBB - Minister, I absolutely agree on this model being an excellent way forward. My interest is in tracking where money is allocated. Money is allocated into the Joined Up Services Project - there is money allocated into the TYS Service and there is money allocated to the Youth at Risk service which I have questions on today as well. Then we find those bits of money begin to be tipped in together. In bringing an excellent model of a coordinated wraparound way of working, do we actually lose investment into services provided to incredibly vulnerable people and children? I am interested to know that in the process of introducing what is a good model, we are not also reducing the level of investment we are making in services.

Mr JAENSCH - In service delivery as opposed to the amount of service we are providing to some extent may be duplicating some aspects of process.

CHAIR - Can I ask a follow up that may assist here? I agree the linking up of services is an appropriate model and see it in other parts of the world where services are wrapped around vulnerable families and children. If you have funding allocated to this service and this service and this service, and suddenly they are all in the one bucket, is there any way of accounting for the funding being spent in a particular area or do we find it all gets lost? There is no accountability. Is that the question around the accountability of the funding?

Mr JAENSCH - Maybe Matt can clarify the different accounting of the funding for the individual services and the funding for the project joined together.

Mr HEALEY - The funding for the Lead Support Coordination Service is in addition to the funding provided to the Youth Support Service.

Ms WEBB - That is good because it would finish soon, wouldn't it?

Mr HEALEY - That is right. The \$2 million that is provided is over a period of three years. The lead support, the \$500 000 per year for two years, is also for the provision of support for adults with complex needs. The value of the Lead Support Coordination Service is it allows a common model to be applied for supporting the complex needs of multiple cohorts of individuals.

It does it in a way, we hope, which is highly complementary to our existing service system. We are not undermining the objectives of the existing service system. The point of this model is to do want you are talking about, which is add value to our existing efforts and not duplicate them.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - In table 2.12, Revenue from Appropriation by Output, we see that on this line item we have an increase across the 2019-20 and 2020-21 years and then quite a drop. The footnotes to the forward Estimates are dropping to 2021-2022 and 2022-2023. The footnote says that this reflects a redistribution of overhead allocations across the department outputs.

Could you explain that a little more so we understand why there is such a significant drop in those forward Estimates.

Mr JAENSCH - Broadly, that footnote flows to line item where, as a brand new department, the Department of Communities Tasmania has some hybrid arrangements where it is providing some of its own management services independently as a department. It is purchasing some services from what was the parent department previously, DHSS. That is modelled out over the years. There is a change in the arrangements as to how we require those services and who is paying for what. I will ask Mr Fazakerley to comment in more detail.

Mr FAZAKERLEY - Thank you. As the minister stated, this is a redistribution of apportioned portion overheads. It probably goes to the nature of budget paper reporting, which as you are probably all well aware, is on an output basis. The costs across the agency that support those service outputs so the Government is in the business of delivering [inaudible] housing services to children. To deliver those services we need corporate support services in the background. We need a secretary, corporate finance, HR and the like. The overhead distribution model is essentially a percentage apportionment model of those corporate service across the deliverable outputs.

What we have done in this case is review that. As the minister said we inherited our initial structure from the former DHSS and DPAC. It was what it was at the time. We are taking the opportunity as we go forward to review some of those overhead disbursements and say that they are not how we would see them now. I think that is an exercise which is going to continue as we mature as an agency and get a more accurate reflection of where our overheads should be apportioned on an output basis.

Ms WEBB - You might want to hold that off your efficiency dividend in the coming years.

Mr FAZAKERLEY - What this represents is a straight apportionment change. This exercise has largely gone into the related output 2.1 Children Services. So, it has pretty much been an agreed redistribution of overhead costs, not a reduction of cost but a redistribution of costs from the output 1.1, the system management line into the Children Services line, 2.1.

CHAIR - If that is the case that is somewhat frightening. When you look at the appropriation in output group 2.1, it does go up in 2019-20 but then it drops right away into 2021. I haven't followed up with the footnotes but with all due respect we often see this when governments seem intent on reorganising departments. Then we see these quite significant changes in the allocation of the corporate overhead responsibilities. Maybe we can talk about this in Children Services but if you take that bald fact, you have taken out quite a bit, as Meg alluded to.

Ms WEBB - Over \$2 million.

CHAIR - That is right. The budget for this year has been effectively allocated into the line 2.1. We are straying into this so I won't go much further with this - we can do it later - but \$116 million to \$119 million in two years time, two years from that.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - Line item 2.1 reflects the additional money in this Budget for 2019-20 for out-of-home care services -

CHAIR - I was skipping that year and going to the next, minister. I'm looking ahead.

Ms WEBB - We are looking ahead. It falls away in 1.1. The explanation has been provided that a great deal of that was shifted across to 2.1. If we were to assume that \$2.3 million or so has been shifted across, the rest of the things covered by 2.1 have gone down even more.

CHAIR - That is right, and that is the point.

Mr JAENSCH - Can I ask Mr Fazackerley to clarify that?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - I am happy to talk to the movement. It is under the next output group. Do you want to do it now?

CHAIR - We will do it then. I am just saying that we often see this and you have to look further into the future. You can have a big blip in the next year, with an extra bucket of money for something then it falls right away, but we will get to that in 2.1

Mr VALENTINE - It is difficult enough for us. Within the department it must be confusing as well because they're spending their time trying to make sure that they are not overspending. Yet they're actually spending on what the funds have been made available for but when you form a new department there's always that caution as well.

CHAIR - We will get to 2.1 and talk about this further.

Ms WEBB - Chair, you have already asked broadly about performance information, but I want to ask a couple more specific questions about table 2.3, Performance Information - Output Group 1, against 'Planned regular operational performance review completed addressing key issues within the remit of Children Services'. A target of 100 per cent is set for 2018-19, the year we are currently in, and again for 2019-20. That is quite a jump from the actual 2017-18, which was 75 per cent. Are we on track to jump from 75 per cent to 100 per cent in 2018-19?

Mr JAENSCH - I ask Gail Eaton-Briggs to the table to assist us with this one.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps when Gail joins us we could understand better what operational performance reviews refers to. Is that performance reviews of staff, members, of projects, of activity?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - We get regular reporting on operational performance. That comes to us via email. When I say 'us', it comes to a number of members of the CYS Executive and also senior managers in the organisation. We analyse those reports and discuss them at our executive meetings. They are also discussed at the statewide operations meetings led by the Director of the Child Safety Services. We use the operational data that comes out of the system to monitor our performance. We are very keen that there is a greater commitment to that through all the levels within the Child Safety Service, hence we've increased that target.

Ms WEBB - Are you expecting to hit that target of 100 per cent in the year 2018-19 we are currently in?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - I think we are going to struggle to get there in 2018-19, but certainly in the outer year -

Ms WEBB - Do you have an indication of where you might land for 2018-19?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - I think possibly around the 80 to 85.

Ms WEBB - The performance comments on page 24 mentions -

A robust schedule of training and development has been implemented in response to recommendations from serious events investigations reports conducted by the Serious Events Review Team.

That is the end of the quote. It also talks about mandatory training in risk assessment for staff. What proportion of frontline staff in Children Services is expected to have participated in training or professional development relevant to their roles in 2018-19? What was the training they undertook broadly? What proportion of frontline staff is expected to undertake training or professional development in 2019-20, this Budget year?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - One of the things we've really focused on as a result of recommendations out of coronial inquiries and the Serious Events Review Team reports and the SERT committee is that our staff receive contemporary training in risk assessment. We have a Quality Improvement and Workforce Development Team. Over the past 12 months they've been developing significantly improved risk assessment training. That risk assessment training is in three components and we expect staff to attend. Where we identify that a staff member has not attended the opportunity, the Director of Child Safety Services follows up to ensure that occurs. The third component of the risk assessment training is specifically in relation to infants. The development of that has just been completed and staff have been advised that they need to participate in a session in July this year.

Ms WEBB - Thank you for that information. My question wasn't so much about the content of the training. I'll repeat my question, which was: what proportion of frontline staff in Children's Services are expected to have participate in training or professional development relevant to their roles in 2018-19, and what was the training they undertook? You've covered some of that part. What proportion of frontline staff are expected to undertake training or professional development in 2019-20?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - If we're talking about mandatory training, my expectation is that it's 100 percent. Staff also have opportunities to undertake a range of other professional development. For those, we would be expecting at least 80 per cent on a team.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. I'm not sure if this is the right line item, to ask about recruitment in Children Services?

CHAIR - That would be appropriate, wouldn't it? Yes.

Ms WEBB - Okay. How many staff are currently employed in frontline roles in Children Services?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - If it's Children Services specifically, we may wait until that line item.

Ms WEBB - Okay, that's fine.

Mr VALENTINE - I think you have a new information system that's coming online for Children Services Systematic. Is that right, or am I mistaken?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - Sorry?

Mr VALENTINE - An information system. Could you tell us where that's at and how that's going to make a difference?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - We have funds available to do some work on improving the child protection information system. In the last 12 months we've been working on the interface that sits at the front of that system that we use in the Advice and Referral Line. Now we're about to scope up the piece of work that need to happen to improve the system, taking into account [inaudible] as well as -

Mr VALENTINE - That is only the child protection component, not the other child welfare system?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - I'm not sure what you're referring to there.

Mr VALENTINE - I thought that there was a new child welfare information system coming into play, but I might be mistaken. That's fine. Thanks for that.

Mr JAENSCH - The staffing levels is within that output, I think. Is it not?

Ms WEBB - I had a series of questions on that. Did you want to deal with -

CHAIR - Ms Webb, were you specifically asking just under Children Services or across the agency more broadly?

Ms WEBB - Well, it's Children Services. I just wondered whether it was relevant to ask about it in Children Services Systems Management or more broadly under the Children Services -

CHAIR - What do you think, minister? Where's the best bit from your perspective?

Mr JAENSCH - I don't care. I'm happy to talk about it.

CHAIR - All right. We'll do it now.

Ms WEBB - Under 2.1?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Let's leave it until then, then.

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms WEBB - We'll move on.

CHAIR - We'll move on. We're on to 2.1 now, anyway.

Ms WEBB - Yes.

CHAIR - So, if everyone is finished on 1.1. We have a substitute member from Estimates Committee B who wants to ask a couple of questions in this line item. I invite him to the table first. Then he can leave if he wishes to. The rule of our committee, minister, is that members of committee B can ask two questions per line item.

Mr JAENSCH - Okay.

Mr WILLIE - Thank you, Chair. Minister, yesterday you refused to table a review of the Intensive Family Engagement Service that UTAS had undertaken. There's significant public interest in this matter and it's being reported by a number of media outlets. Will you table the document today?

Mr JAENSCH - You are talking of the UTAS evaluation of the Intensive Family Engagement Service pilot.

There was some discussion on that yesterday and has been interest. The review has been conducted and the department is examining it at the moment and preparing some advice for me on how we will respond and how IFES progresses.

I am prepared to asked the department to look at that, how we release the evaluation and in so doing ensuring there is no information in that which may compromise any case management or future investigations afoot.

CHAIR - When did you receive the report, minister? How long ago?

Mr JAENSCH - The department received the report and is examining it. I have only seen a report of the report more recently. We do have it and discussed since yesterday, the practicality of releasing it and any sensitive information.

I would have to ask the department to check through the report to ensure there was no inappropriate disclosure of information that compromised any cases or the identity of any families.

Mr WILLIE - We are not after the sensitive information. We are after the evaluation.

Mr JAENSCH - Again, with the department's advice, I am happy to consider releasing the evaluation report.

Ms LOVELL - Can I clarify: you said you have seen a report of the report?

Mr JAENSCH - I have received advice which has summarised the outcomes of the report and the report has been provided as an appendix to that.

Ms LOVELL - You have seen and read the full report?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, I have.

Ms LOVELL - You said more recently. How recently was that?

Mr JAENSCH - I would need to go back to my office and diary to see when that arrived in my office.

Ms LOVELL - Can you give us a ball park - month, six weeks, six months?

Mr JAENSCH - Recently.

Mr WILLIE - If you need to go back to your office, will you take that on notice, when you first read the report? You said you would need to check your diary so you do have the information?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. I am happy to consider releasing that report. I want to check first the report is safe to release in terms of any information in it that might identify cases or children.

Mr WILLIE - You will release the report without the sensitive information?

Mr JAENSCH - I will ask my department if we are able to release it in a form which does not identify any cases.

Mr WILLIE - That is a 'yes', you will release the report without sensitive information?

Mr JAENSCH - If the advice from my department is I can do that, yes.

Mr WILLIE - You can ask your department now.

Mr JAENSCH - No, we will discuss that outside of the committee.

Mr WILLIE - Why are you putting in barriers to releasing this information, minister? It is of significant public interest. All you have to do is give an undertaking now you will release to information without sensitive matters. That is an easy undertaking to do.

Mr JAENSCH - If you want to frame it that way, I am happy to release the report but without any content that may identify life cases or individuals.

Mr WILLIE - That is what I am asking you to do.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to do that.

Mr WILLIE - Thank you.

CHAIR - Is there an expected time frame for that minister? How long do you think it will take you to review it, to try to give some clarity around this?

Mr JAENSCH - That is a matter of days.

CHAIR - So very soon?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - I am confident we can do that, but again I will seek the department's advice on that. I will not commit to a time frame.

CHAIR - We are not talking about months, though?

Mr JAENSCH - No.

Mr WILLIE - Minister, you would be aware of a report of a tragic circumstance reported by the ABC this morning, where a boy known to Child Safety Services suffered burns to 33 per cent of his body in a horrific accident.

His grandmother, who spoke to ABC, said the boy's sister discovered him on fire in his bedroom. This was after a fight with his drug-affected mother. The boy spent three months at the Royal Hobart Hospital recovering from full-thickness burns and along with his three siblings is now in the care of his father.

Yesterday, minister, you used the excuse that there was not enough detail on a case to answer the questions. Did this boy receive his allocated Intensive Family Support in the lead-up to that event?

CHAIR - I will caution you to be very careful about referring to specific cases, even though I acknowledge it has been in the media.

Mr WILLIE - The media has reported it.

CHAIR - Yes, I know, but in terms of any personal details around this child, we need to be cautious.

Mr WILLIE - It is a simple question. Did this boy and his family receive Intensive Family Engagement Service support allocated to them in the lead up to that event?

Mr JAENSCH - As I advised in the other committee yesterday, I am not going to provide any detailed response on any specific case.

Mr WILLIE - This is a cover up, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - It is not a cover up.

Mr WILLIE - The question is yes or no, was that family provided the Intensive Family Engagement Service support allocated to them in the lead up to that event? A simple question.

Mr JAENSCH - I am not going to provide any more information on that case.

Mr WILLIE - Because you are intent on covering it up.

Mr JAENSCH - The case has been reported on partial information where people have not been directly identified and where internal and potential coronial investigations may apply. I am not going to provide any more information.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - Minister and Mr Willie. It is important here we get some sort of indication of what you intend to do about this in terms of reporting in the future services this family were provided with. It is one family and we need to be cautious of not identifying a particular family and circumstances it may present in another setting.

Mr WILLIE - Chair, this is about the Intensive Family Engagement Service and the governance and the oversight of that service.

CHAIR - Is there a question about that that is the issue here?

Mr WILLIE - No, my concern is that this scenario is widespread. It is a simple question.

Mr JAENSCH - We are asserting that.

CHAIR - You might have used our two questions?

Mr WILLIE - It is the same line of questioning.

CHAIR - This is the second question. The first was regarding the report. This is regarding a particular case of the services you were referring to.

Mr WILLIE - The minister is deliberately not answering the question to avoid scrutiny.

CHAIR - We will stay on this line of questioning. I will go to Meg who has questions on this line item that may clarify some the points. Let's use it in broad terms.

Ms WEBB - With the IFES program, what number of families have been supported through that program to date?

Mr JAENSCH - It is 62 or 65.

Ms WEBB - Across four service delivery organisations?

Mr JAENSCH - It is 62 families in the one-year trial.

Ms WEBB - Across four service delivery organisations?

Mr JAENSCH - Four providers.

Ms WEBB - Equally spread across those four providers?

Mr JAENSCH - Equally spread, I do not know what the numbers are in individuals. Does anyone here have that?

Ms WEBB - Of those 62 families, in how many of those families was a removal averted?

Mr JAENSCH - The issue of how many cases of a child being removed have been averted is open to some conjecture and I've asked the department if they can provide that sort of information. The purpose of this program is to identify people and families in situations before they are at the threshold of a child needing to be removed, and to intervene and wrap services around them to

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

prevent them getting to that point. All these cases are cases which in another time might have escalated more rapidly to removal, where we are trying to instead to preserve the family and assist them to do the job of parenting better. The motivation is to divert from removal.

Ms WEBB - Yes, I understand that, that's why I asked the question. Perhaps, if I rephrase the question slightly differently.

Of the 62 families who have been involved or supported through those services, how many have resulted to date in a removal of children from that family?

Mr JAENSCH - I think that figure is one we would be able to get, but we have to generate that.

Ms WEBB - Thank you, I would like that figure.

Mr JAENSCH - I will take on notice but it may take some time to get that figure.

Ms WEBB - The question is: of the 62 families involved and supported through those services, what proportion of those families received their full allocation of hours available to them in those services?

Mr JAENSCH - Again, I am happy to ask the department what information we can provide on that. I note also though, as I understand it, the Integrated Family Support Services are tailored to the circumstances of individual families, so the delivery of services and the time involved and the nature of those services might differ from family to family and differ from time to time within the period that they're receiving the services, depending on what therapeutic processes, support and training et cetera are being undertaken. What might have been the budget allocation based on a number of cases and a number of hours for a type of service might be variable because we are making a bespoke response to a family's circumstances.

Ms WEBB - The service model is one that has a defined period of time involved in it and that families are worked with?

Mr JAENSCH - But sometimes these have been extended also. Yes.

Ms WEBB - And you would have an average amount you are funding for each family across that defined period of time?

Mr JAENSCH - What we have budgeted for the program, which would be sufficient to cater for x families for x hours with these types of services.

Ms WEBB - What we could find out is, of the 62 families, how many families fell below what you would have regarded as an average figure that you budgeted for, and how many fell above that figure? You would be able to provide that information, I would imagine.

CHAIR - What is the average figure? Have we got that?

Ms WEBB - Correct, and then how many of the 62 families received fewer hours of support than that? How many ultimately received more? Then we would have an understanding of how accurate that average might have been as it played out.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, for planning purposes, but then I would expect that the provision of services to an individual family will be the subject of a contract for services to that family and its circumstances.

This needs to be able to be not a one-size-fits-all is my point. That's the whole intention of this earlier intervention and this more complex support service. What the department will have done is identified a case where IFS might be the right way to go, matched with a suitable service provider and then developed a program of contracted service to provide to it. The important thing there is the contract management and whether the provider delivered what was agreed, and did it meet the result.

Ms WEBB - The department decides on the level of service will be required for that family and contracts that level of service per family?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, it does.

Ms WEBSTER - The Child Safety team actually determines what is required for that child and family and then they negotiate with the IFES provider and then the IFES provider works with the family. We have an opportunity to change, as that provider is working with the family, depending on the circumstances.

Ms WEBB - But the Child Safety Service determines the number of hours of support provided to that family?

Ms WEBSTER - Initially, and then the -

Ms WEBB - Then there is negotiation about need as time goes on.

Ms WEBSTER - Once the IFES provider goes into the family, there is obviously more negotiation around perhaps what we see when we get into the -

Ms WEBB - This might be reflected in the report we are to receive from the UTAS review, but perhaps you could comment on it now. To what extent, minister, are you and the department satisfied the level of service determined and then provided to those 62 families, each of them, was sufficient to meet their needs?

Mr JAENSCH - In terms of evaluation and our satisfaction with success et cetera, the UTAS report and the review there - which is about the model and the procedures therein - will provide some insight that the department and I have already seen, and generally endorses the model and the approach.

When it comes to individual cases, some of those are still ongoing and subject to continuing review.

Ms WEBB - In regards to the ones completed today then, how many of the 62 have received their completed allocation of services and support? To what degree are you and the department satisfied they received a level of support adequate to meet their needs under that program, in order to fill the intent of the program?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - Sufficient that we have allocated funding to continue with the rollout of IFES, that we will keep evolving based on the learnings from the pilot and the evaluation done by UTAS, but always with a view to the best interests of the child and the nature of the individual case. I fully expect the cases that receive IFES services, at the completion of a period of that, will require further ongoing services and support which might be different from case to case. In time, as we build case history with this, the question would be how many of those revert to the need for a statutory intervention.

Ms WEBB - Which is what my other question related to, and I would like to have that information.

Mr JAENSCH - That sort of strike rate there. We will endeavour to have that information for you.

CHAIR - On that point, obviously there are contracted hours provided initially, subject to review, so I am not sure, Meg. Are you able to provide the number of children who received the full complement of contracted hours and then those who are assessed as needing more services, those who receive those additional services which I assume would have been recontracted? That would be how it would work, wouldn't it?

Mr JAENSCH - Then they would still be contracted hours then, wouldn't they?

CHAIR - I am talking about two parts. The initial contract and then if they need more, there are ongoing matters or challenges for that particular individual or family, so the recontracted additional hours.

Mr JAENSCH - Is the question going to 'did the providers provide the hours that they were paid to provide'? Is that what we are looking at?

CHAIR - In the initial phase, yes. Then, for each of the families involved, those who are identified as needing additional service which you have talked about. That was the initial contract and then there were some who were provided with additional support and hours that would be contracted beyond that, then that second block as well.

Are the children and families getting the right services? Child Safety identifies the number of hours of services these families need and then they contract the service. Are these contracted hours being provided? I accept the point they might not be provided on a 'Monday morning from 10 to 12' every week. It can be variable, but we are talking about the total hours here. Can you provide that?

Mr JAENSCH - Because we are talking about contracted hours, we can get information on hours contracted and hours delivered.

CHAIR - The initial and the additional.

Ms WEBB - Any variance that was brought into play as service was provided.

Mr JAENSCH - I will need to ask the department's advice on is how we can provide information that gives you the insight that you are looking for.

Mr WILLIE - How are you not across this, minister? There have been some serious incidents.

Mr JAENSCH - What I am trying to do, Mr Willie, is to have a reasonable thing to ask the department to provide.

CHAIR - It is pretty clear, minister. Child Safety identifies a family that needs some services that is being provided under youth services. They determine the number of hours and contract the number of hours. Of those 62 families, how many receive the initially contracted hours in the contract period? For those who are identified as needing additional services or an increase in hours and subsequently had recontracted services, how many were there? How many of those received the hours that were contracted in addition to the initial contract?

Mr JAENSCH - I need the secretary to answer this one. It is about contracting operational matter.

Ms LOVELL - We have families now speaking out saying that they have not received the hours they were supposed to be receiving under their support that had been agreed to. Have you not been briefed on these matters?

Mr JAENSCH - I am regularly briefed in great detail by my department.

Ms LOVELL - Have you been briefed on these matters?

Mr JAENSCH - I want to return to Ms Lovell's question. Just because matters have been reported in the media, does not mean that I may still be in breach of the act if I am providing any detail relating to specific cases in this hearing.

Ms LOVELL - I am not asking for specifics. What I am asking you, minister, is: have you been briefed on whether families are receiving the support they are contracted to receive?

Mr JAENSCH - In relation to the Chair's question about the hours, I would like the secretary to speak to that matter.

Ms WEBSTER - Through you, minister, we are dealing with very complex families. The design of this services is specifically for those families who are at the cusp of coming into statutory intervention and working in a wraparound way, which we all agree is best if it's safe to do best by keeping the child at home.

We have to be really clear that this isn't a one-size-fits-all approach. You would understand that at times there is initially some reluctance by families to have someone in that very intensive wraparound space in the very early days. We expect this and we work with the service providers to gain the family's trust and to work with the family. This system won't work unless the family is engaged. It takes some time to work into that.

This isn't a crystal-clear, one-size-fits-all contract delivery; it's actively managed by the Child Safety Service. There's an intensive family engagement team leader who actually works in this space. These are complex families with complex needs, often mental health needs, often family violence, drug and alcohol, a whole range of issues that I know the minister and the committee are aware of but it isn't a one-size-fits-all.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

We can provide some information where we can through you, minister. I just want to be clear that it isn't a one-size-fits-all.

CHAIR - Surely, minister, the Child Safety Services would assess all the matters that the secretary has referred to in terms of families who lack trust and need additional 'gently-gently' until you can gain their trust to wrap those services fully around them? Wouldn't that be part of the assessment and part of the decision about how many hours the family needs?

Mr JAENSCH - It may be that we have to take it offline and work out how we can respond to the committee's request for information, knowing that we've got 62 or more individual cases that all have a different diagnosis of need and responsiveness, and are possibly still ongoing and adapting to those needs as the families' situations evolve. How do I provide the information you are asking for without providing a level of insight into the 62 cases?

I need to be able to characterise it somehow.

CHAIR - Minister, the Child Safety Services must assess the needs and then contract the services. It can't be that hard. I know they are all different and complex cases but this is the assessment of the service.

Mr JAENSCH - There's been an evaluation of the model by UTAS. How it is worked is something we will endeavour to provide in much detail and as completely as possible.

Mr WILLIE - Minister, the secretary has highlighted the concern; these families are in crisis. They are on the cusp of having a statutory intervention - that is, the children being removed. The concern is that the contracted hours are not being delivered to these families, which is even worse than removing the child. Our concern is that some children will potentially be left in dangerous situations because the oversight is not there on the service from your department -

CHAIR - The question is?

Mr WILLIE - The question is: when did you first become aware of problems with Intensive Family Engagement Services?

Mr JAENSCH - The Intensive Family Engagement Services has been a pilot. We've had evaluation; we are dealing with high-complexity, high-risk cases which are individually unique. None of them is easy. All of them involve risk. From what I have seen in the evaluation, there is not a systemic problem with the model; it is one that needs to continue to evolve.

When you talk about allegations of failures in individual cases, that's something that I can't speak to here.

Mr WILLIE - You could rule it out; it's been reported in the media.

Mr JAENSCH - It's been reported in the media. It's alluding to cases. I am not in a position to share information or to speculate on what might be the outcomes of internal or independent coronial investigations on any case. I can't comment further on it.

Mr WILLIE - Just tell the truth, minister. You are avoiding scrutiny. It's going to come out in the wash eventually anyway.

Mr JAENSCH - I have given the answer that I am prepared to give.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, I asked you before but we moved away from that question. I would like to go back to it. I'm not talking about individual cases. There have been serious concerns raised about whether the needs of these families are being met as they should have -

Mr JAENSCH - When you say these families, you are referring to cases which I am not going to comment on.

Ms LOVELL - Okay. All families who are engaged with the IFES system. As a system, there have been concerns raised -

Mr JAENSCH - About the whole system?

Ms LOVELL - about whether or not those obligations are being met.

Mr JAENSCH - Who has raised concerns?

Ms LOVELL - Will you let me finish my question?

You have had several questions this morning about whether those full hours are being delivered in support, delivered to the families as contracted and you have not seemed to be across whether or not it is an issue, or whether that information is available. You have referred to your secretary and your department officials a number of times.

My question to you is: with these concerns being raised and with an evaluation having been done, have you been briefed on whether this system is meeting its obligations?

Mr JAENSCH - An evaluation has been done by UTAS and I have undertaken to provide as much of that report as possible for anyone to look. When you and Mr Willie have raised concerns or reports of concerns regarding cases within the IFES system, I am not going to provide any commentary on those individual cases.

Ms LOVELL - I am not asking you to provide commentary on individual cases. I am asking whether you have been briefed on whether the IFES, as a system, is meeting its obligations in terms of hours contracted to families? Are those hours being delivered? Generally speaking across the system, have you been briefed on the matter?

Mr JAENSCH - Generally across the system, has every case had a contracted service delivery being met?

Ms LOVELL - Are you aware of whether the system is working? Have you been briefed on it? It's a simple question.

Mr JAENSCH - What we have a review being undertaken, an evaluation of the system we can use for continuous improvement of that system into the next stage. Then the other thing is individual cases and the performance of contractors in individual cases, in which case I am not going to provide commentary on individual cases.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - This is a broad question, minister. You note the evaluation has been done by UTAS and you will look at what you can release in that but the question here is, as I hear it, have you been briefed in terms of the content of the report and does that report go to the overall operation of IFES, as a system, and have you been briefed about any particular issues with it in terms of its operations? That's the question. We are talking about what you have been brief on.

Ms LOVELL - There are two questions. Have you been briefed on it? My second question was going to be - these concerns being asked of you now, is that part of the UTAS evaluation? Did the evaluation look into whether or not families are being delivered their hours of support contracted to be delivered?

CHAIR - There are two questions there.

Ms LOVELL - If you had read the report, minister, you should be able to answer that question.

Mr JAENSCH - Could I bring Mathew Healey back to the table to speak to the matter of evaluation?

Ms LOVELL - Have you read the evaluation?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes.

Ms LOVELL - Can you tell me whether that is part of the evaluation?

Mr JAENSCH - Can I bring Mathew Healey to the table to speak?

CHAIR - You can bring Mathew Healey.

Ms LOVELL - Can you answer my question first though, please, minister?

CHAIR - Your question?

Ms LOVELL - My question is: this matter about whether families are being delivered their hours of support they are contracted to receive, was that part of the UTAS evaluation? Was that part of what was evaluated?

You have read the report, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - You do not need the advice. You have read it.

Ms LOVELL - If you have read the report, you should be able to tell me yes or no whether that is part of the evaluation. It might be the answer is no but you should be able to tell me that.

Mr WILLIE - This is a joke, you are not across your portfolio, minister.

CHAIR - Minister, can you answer the question? The question is about what is contained in the broad terms of the report. Did the evaluation report consider the number of contracted hours and were they delivered? Was that part of the evaluation of the service done by UTAS?

Ms LOVELL - It's a yes or no answer, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - The evaluation looked at those matters, but it was also conducted before a number of the service contracts were completed, so that's my hesitation there. It was conducted at a point in time and not at the conclusion of a full set of contracted service provisions. Mr Healey's closer to that detail.

CHAIR - I did look at that, but some of the service delivery contracts weren't complete.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, but I don't believe that it is going to cover the 62 cases through to their conclusion and provide that information. Mr Healey maybe can provide more detail on what is included that we could expect to see in a report if we were able to release it.

Mr HEALEY - I can, minister. A degree of the complexity in these answers is that this is a rolling service for families over a period of time. The evaluation report looks at a point in time and was quite comprehensive in looking at the views of the service providers and the views of many clients within the service. It looked very specifically at what proportion of the families were achieving the goals within the service that they were setting. It looked very specifically at what proportion of those families didn't complete this service and pulled out - not because the hours were not delivered to them but because there were circumstances of the family that meant that the full package that was originally put together couldn't be provided to that family -

CHAIR - The contracted package?

Mr HEALEY - That contracted package.

The minister is absolutely right. We are working through the document to see what is appropriate to put out in the public forum. The report was very positive about the value of this service. It was very positive and said that there is very strong and widespread support for this service and it does change the lives of families.

Ms LOVELL - I appreciate that answer, thank you, but I am surprised that the minister couldn't provide that detail considering he has read the report.

Ms WEBB - I am going to try to wrap us up and get to something definite that we can tie back in with the Chair's question earlier.

There are three elements here that we could break this up into and we can dispense with two of them. The three elements are: there's a model, there's the implementation of the model and there are individual cases that occur within that.

We have dealt with the fact that the evaluation on your reporting appears to confirm the model is a good one, it's valued and it's going to be taken forward. So we can put the model aside. We can acknowledge that we won't be talking about individual cases - that third element - and that it's inappropriate for us to do so, and we can put that aside. That's not what we are talking about.

There is still the question that remains in that middle section, which is the implementation of the model. The report done by UTAS was done at a point in time and couldn't give us a complete picture of that necessarily in terms of numbers and facts and figures around delivery. However, I believe that your department, minister, could give us some figures to date and that's what the Chair was asking for earlier. For clarity, because you still seem to be confused about the question, it's a

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

very clear one. Of the 62 families, a certain level of service was contracted, and it may have been renegotiated at a certain point, but across that we have a clear picture of what was contracted. We would like to know, for each of those 62 families, without details of the families, what was delivered to them. Was the contracted level of service delivered across the time that they were within the service?

CHAIR - How many received fully contracted hours?

Ms WEBB - It's a very clear set of numbers. You will have the numbers of the contract.

Mr JAENSCH - If that summarises the committee's interest, I am happy to ask the department to provide that information.

Ms WEBB - Thank you.

Mr JAENSCH - I understand that [inaudible].

Mr WILLIE - Minister, we don't want to be sitting here next year with more allegations regarding the Intensive Family Engagement Service. I want you to guarantee that the IFES is delivering the hours that it's contracted to and that you have appropriate oversight over that.

CHAIR - Mathew Healey mentioned that some families withdraw from it. I don't know if you can guarantee the contracted hours but if you would like to reframe the request.

Mr WILLIE - Excluding withdrawals.

Mr JAENSCH - We will manage, as right across the service we manage contracts for delivery of service; we will continue to do that to the best of the department's ability.

Mr WILLIE - When were you first made aware of problems with IFES?

Mr JAENSCH - Again, I think what we have got here is that the member is making reference to problems without being specific.

CHAIR - No, he is not being specific.

Mr WILLIE - You cannot be more specific than the ABC story, minister. You are avoiding scrutiny.

Mr JAENSCH - On the other hand, we have the committee asking for information which we are happy to provide. We have an evaluation report, which we are going to provide. When we are talking about problems, they are either problems in the model, as Ms Webb identified, or problems in the delivery, or problems with individual cases. I am not going to respond to an assertion that there are problems and am I aware of them.

Mr WILLIE - How do you think the families feel about that, minister? You are refusing to answer questions. There are families that have been affected by this.

CHAIR - Mr Willie. From your view, minister, have there been problems with the system in the service delivery? I am not talking about an individual case. There can always be problems with

individuals, but have you been advised or are you aware of outstanding concerns or matters that perhaps do not reflect a fully functioning system? Are there any examples of that?

Mr JAENSCH - Issues of risk or individual cases aside, what we have had is a pilot of a brand new thing which has not been delivered before by the people who are providing the services in this format. We are commissioning a new type of service and working with service providers to provide it. We are evaluating how that is going and we are learning from that and improving it. Are there problems? Put it this way: are there things we have identified that we need to do better or that they need to do better, or are there services that they are not competent yet to deliver and that we need to go and find other providers for? Definitely, in all those areas. That is why you do pilots. That is why you do evaluation.

Mr WILLIE - So you are taking responsibility?

Mr JAENSCH - And take responsibility for it. Definitely, because this is something we need to do. We need to stop taking kids away from families, the first thing we do when a concern is raised. We need to intervene earlier, provide more complex services to support families to stay together where it is safe to do so, always putting the best interests of the child first and foremost. Is it risk-free? No.

CHAIR - These families are high risk, you have said that.

Mr JAENSCH - Is it something we can fix with a pill? No. It is going to be messy from time to time as we evolve the way of doing this well. We are committed to doing this. We are not going to run away and go back to the bad old days where child protection comes and takes your kids when someone makes a phone call.

Mr WILLIE - No-one is questioning the intent. What we are questioning is the governance and making sure the services engage with the families, minister.

CHAIR - Let the minister finish.

Mr JAENSCH - I am responsible for these services, these interventions and these preventions of statutory intervention.

CHAIR - The question here is -

Mr JAENSCH - Are we aware of problems? This is an evolving science and therefore is it all perfect? No. Is there risk? Yes. Are there going to be accidents and incidents when we are talking about 62 highly complex, risky cases involving kids? Yes. There are going to be.

CHAIR - In terms of ongoing review, openness and transparency about the system, I think the intent is admirable to try to wrap services around some of these families with very complex needs, but in responding to and identifying issues as they arise, what commitment can you give the people of Tasmania and this committee, when problems are identified, that you will act on them and you will do it in a way that gives public confidence?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, I will.

CHAIR - How will you achieve that?

Mr JAENSCH - Through evolution of the model; through the individual management of projects that have contracted services; through keeping data on what the outcomes have been as a result of these interventions; and if and when there are adverse outcomes or incidents, to channel them through our Serious Events Review Committee, supporting coroners and other types of investigations, as is normal practice.

CHAIR - We have spent quite a bit of time on this matter within this line item. Unless there are any other really burning questions, I am going to have a morning tea break and we will come back and complete line item 2.1, Children Services.

The committee suspended from 10.35 a.m. to 10.50 a.m.

CHAIR - Thank you, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - With the Chair's indulgence I table the executive summary of the IFES Pilot Evaluation Report February 2019 by the Institute for the Study of Social Change, University of Tasmania.

We are confident the executive summary provides an overview of the evaluation. We are still examining and taking advice on some content of the body of the report. We will endeavour to release that in as complete form as possible as soon as we can.

CHAIR - When do you expect to have that completed? As we are asking for that on notice, would you have it completed by early next week, or not?

Mr JAENSCH - We will aim for next week.

CHAIR - We will put it in our questions on notice to you which we have next week. We do our budget wrap-up the following week. If it can be provided, it will have the full complement of information requested, so thank you minister. It is appreciated.

Ms LOVELL - I want to make have one question about some comments made before the break.

CHAIR - I will give some leeway for this one question but I will pull it up if it is going back into areas we have already covered.

Ms LOVELL - I want to make one point and give the minister an opportunity to review some of those comments he made. Before the break, he described 'these instances that we have been talking about' and we are talking about some really horrific events that have happened. You described them as 'messy' and 'accidents'.

I want to give you an opportunity to review those comments because we are talking about serious injuries and deaths of children under the care.

The question is: would you like to review that reference to 'messy'?

Mr JAENSCH - The reference to 'messy' is a reference to the fact across the whole IFES introduction, we are dealing with a large number of cases that are individually complex and carry high risk. This is not straightforward, it is complicated and there will be learning along the way.

When you have conflated that with my characterisation of specific incidents reported in the press, that is out of line. I am not referring to specific events and I have consistently said I will not be.

Please do not connect my statement of this is 'messy' or it is 'complex' to the individual events you have raised.

CHAIR - Thank you, minister. Mr Valentine has a question on grandparents raising their grandchildren. Is that a line item under this one or is it somewhere else, I wanted to check?

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to range across all topics.

Ms WEBB - Without spending too much time, a follow-up on something from last year's budget which has continued to be funded through this year and the following, the Youth at Risk Strategy. There was \$670 000 per annum for three years allocated to this budget for 2019-20, would be the second year.

What was delivered in 2018-19 under the \$670 000 funding for the Youth at Risk Strategy, what is expected to be delivered in 2019-20 and what impact, monitoring and reporting do you have to provide us?

Mr JAENSCH - The Youth At Risk Strategy was released on 5 June 2017, to provide a long-term whole-of-government strategic direction for responding to the safety and rehabilitative needs of young people aged 10 to 17 years at risk.

The strategy aims to improve outcomes for Youth at Risk. It does so through improved information sharing coordination and realignment of existing services and increased investment where a need has been identified and where additional actions may be required to intervene earlier in the lives of vulnerable young people.

The strategy contains 34 actions to be fully implemented over a four-year period. The actions span multiple government departments and existing reforms. Eight of these actions have been completed and implementation has commenced on an additional 20 actions. All outstanding actions will be completed by July 2021. Completed actions include -

- (1) The creation of a wellbeing assessment tool based on the six wellbeing domains in the Tasmanian Child and Youth Wellbeing Framework. The tool will assist in the earlier identification of children and young people showing signs of risk.
- (2) Recurrent funding of \$600 000 per annum provided to the not-for-profit organisation, Save the Children, to continue to provide ongoing support for young people on bail and youth transitioning from juvenile detention.
- (3) The establishment of a children's advocate position to provide increased oversight of an advocacy for children and young people in out-of-home care.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

- (4) The creation of an online referral map or service directory that will assist practitioners to identify the best supports available for children and young people.
- (5) The establishment of Colville Place, a youth at risk response centre located in Moonah. The centre accommodates up to nine young people of any gender, including young people living with a disability. The first floor of Colville Place includes crisis accommodation while the ground floor is used for the provision of integrated ancillary services including support coordination. Recurrent funding of \$800 000 per annum, indexed, has been allocated to meet the operational and staffing requirements of the centre;
- (6) Improved access to assertive family supports through the Intensive Family Engagement Service and the development of Youth Matter: a practical guide aimed at increasing youth engagement and participation in Tasmania. The document was co-designed with almost 400 young people from across the state.
- (7) Exploration of the use of single case management and coordination for young people and complex needs, building on the Lead Support Coordination Service pilot.

In the 2017-18 Budget, the Government committed \$16.4 million to implement the strategy and the Government then committed an additional \$21.13 million to the strategy in the 2018-19 Budget. I can go through what the new funding applies to.

Ms WEBB - Is it a long list or will you provide it to us as a list?

Mr JAENSCH - It's so much and it's so good. I would like to be able to detail it. There are five points.

Ms WEBB - Is it funding you also list under other election commitments or areas of service delivery? Have you just aggregated other services, initiatives and announcements under this new heading of Youth at Risk?

Mr JAENSCH - No, it's an old heading of Youth at Risk and these were actions identified.

Ms WEBB - In my experience, the Youth at Risk Strategy was somewhat of an aggregation of a whole bunch of other things in other distinct areas that had been spoken about, presented or funded under a new heading of Youth at Risk Strategy. Is this what we can expect from this list too? For example, you have listed the IFES program as something relating to delivering on the Youth at Risk Strategy or Colville Place, which is also talked about in other contexts and not necessarily developed under the Youth at Risk Strategy but in planning before that.

Mr JAENSCH - Colville Place was reported in Housing because of the provision of the facility but then there is the funding of the service under Youth at Risk. I am not trying to trick you but there are a number of initiatives within the area of interest for Youth at Risk.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps there is a reference in which we would find that list and we can move on, in the interests of time. Where would we find this list of funded items or initiatives, including what you've read about the completed and ongoing actions?

Mr JAENSCH - Whilst that conversation is going on, the actions I was going to refer to are: investment in targeted support for young people in out-of-home care; extending out-of-home care

to the age of 21 initiative; and payments to foster carers and young people for successful completion of secondary education.

Ms WEBB - Are you putting that under the Youth at Risk Strategy?

Mr JAENSCH - It is referenced in the new funding.

Ms WEBB - Aggregated from somewhere else. That is fine. We will come to some of those in more detail in other areas of today's discussion. It would be good just to know where we could find this list and refer to it for our own purposes.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to provide a list for you.

Ms WEBB - It is surprising we wouldn't be able to access something more broadly, publicly, for people to understand where the implementation of that strategy is up to. Do you provide regular reporting on that strategy as it plays out?

Mr JAENSCH - We just tried to and you asked us to stop reading. We can put the information together for you.

Ms WEBB - No, I do not mean in this context. I am not speaking about this context. I am speaking about for the members of the public, for members of the sector, for others who would be interested in the delivery of this strategy, where it is up to and when it is expected to be completed, the various elements will be delivered.

CHAIR - Minister, is there a list that you can provide to us or is it something where more work needs to be undertaken?

Mr JAENSCH - We are happy to provide that.

CHAIR - On notice?

Mr JAENSCH - But also, the individual initiatives are considerable in their own right and will have their own audience and communications built around them. If you would like more, I can ask Mr Healey to come in.

Ms WEBB - No. Some of them we will pick up in other discussions because they sit in other areas too, as part of the aggregation that I spoke about.

Let's go to one of those now if that is all right. You mentioned on out-of-home care, extending out-of-home care to the age of 21, which was referred to as the Home Stretch campaign. I was part of that in a previous role and it was excellent it was adopted by the Tasmanian Government. That was in last year's Budget where \$1 million per annum over three years was allocated.

How is the funding allocation for this in the 2018-19 Budget being deployed across the 2018-19 year? Has the \$1 million all been spent? Has that allocation for the 2019-20 year remained in this Budget? What will it be spent on? How are the results or the impact of this new policy, the extension of out-of-home care to 21, being measured and reported on?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - Last year's Budget or this current financial year's Budget committed that \$1 million per year over three years. It is forecast that we will spend \$201 584 of that in the totality of the 2018-19 financial year. That being less than \$1 million reflects delays in the appointment of three extended care support positions and the progressive rollout of the program. This has been the start-up year for the program.

Ms WEBB - Will that unused funding from 2018-19 be carried across into 2019-20?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. Either to 2019-20 or an out-year.

Ms WEBB - What was that \$201 584 spent on in 2018-19?

Mr JAENSCH - Can I bring in Mr Healey?

Mr HEALEY - A total of 18 young people received care beyond the age of 18 in 2018-19.

Ms WEBB - Do you mind if I ask whether that was the anticipated number, or lower or higher than the anticipated number?

Mr HEALEY - We always understood that there would be a ramp-up of the program. We were very uncertain as to what that would be because obviously young people choose for themselves whether they stay in care or move to independence. We were fairly conservative on the numbers that we budgeted for, which were lower obviously than what we actually experienced.

Ms WEBB - You say 'obviously', but it is not necessarily obviously.

Mr HEALEY - We sought a budget of \$1 million to cover the costs of extending that.

Ms WEBB - What number had that catered for? I appreciate that it is variable. I understand that the uptake of that program was hard to predict ahead of time. I am not asking in order to be difficult. I am wondering when you had planned a budget, how many young people had you anticipated might take that up in the first year, 2020?

Mr HEALEY - Twenty-eight.

Ms WEBB - So we had 18 who did. That is fine. What is your anticipation for numbers in this 2019-20 year?

Mr HEALEY - Our modelling assumes that about 30 per cent of young people will choose to move to independence every year. We are modelling 48 in the second year.

Ms WEBB - Did you adjust that modelling after the lower than possible number the first year?

Mr HEALEY - We haven't changed our modelling. The funding was provided last year and that was the basis for the provision of that funding. We are working on the rollout of the program now.

Ms WEBB - So the \$1 million budget that was there for 2019-20, would that be a provision that would accommodate 48 young people taking up that program?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr HEALEY - Yes, it will.

Ms WEBB - Then a similar number in 2020-21?

Mr HEALEY - Through you, minister: it is three years between 2018 and 2021 so the number will continue to increase.

Ms WEBB - Oh, I'm sorry. This is a cumulative number? The 48 included the 18 from the first year? I understand, because we are supporting people across a three-year period.

Mr HEALEY - That's right. To be specific, our numbers were based on 40 young people with a 30 per cent reduction each year. That is what gives you 28 and then 48 in the second year.

Mr JAENSCH - The other factor in this is that it is not intended to necessarily be every child for another full three years.

Ms WEBB - No, I appreciate that.

Mr JAENSCH - The notion is to, as we do with our kids, we support them until they're developmentally ready to live independently. Kids will advance at different paces, leave earlier or later and require different levels of support. We are also conscious of other entitlements they will progressively have as they become independent young adults. We need to work out how to then move from the foster care environment into independence without diminishing their eligibility for the other sorts of payments and supports they might get.

Ms WEBB - How are the outcomes of the new policy being measured? How will they be reported on?

Mr HEALEY - The outcomes come down to the number of young people who are receiving support after the age of 18. The initial imperative was until the end of the year in which they completed year 12 and then beyond. That is the primary measure.

Ms WEBB - Just numbers? Will we at some point look back at the life outcomes of young people who engaged in this extended care process and then also young people in our out-of-home care system who chose not to engage in that process or didn't have the opportunity to? Will we have a way of knowing whether this program delivered the outcomes we hoped it would?

Mr HEALEY - The ongoing work on care planning and linking the care planning to the well-being assessment framework is for exactly that purpose, so that we can work on and understand the broader wellbeing needs of all our kids in care.

Ms WEBB - What I am asking is: do you have a plan in place to follow up and see what outcomes these young people who remain being supported in care beyond 18? Say, at the age of 25, were we to check in with those children who received extended care, compared to those who didn't and have an opportunity to see attempt gauge the impact of this model so we know whether it is a good investment or not?

CHAIR - Are you asking if the department would do that?

Ms WEBB - Do we have a plan to follow that up?

CHAIR - Is this something they would need to subcontract? Does it fit under this area?

Ms WEBB - I am interested in whether there a plan to do that work. We are investing in a program.

Mr JAENSCH - Not built into the current project as it stands.

Ms WEBB - So we are funding it for three years: is there an intention to fund it beyond that time?

Mr JAENSCH - What we have made is a policy commitment. We have funded it for the first time. We are nation leading in elements of this. We will evaluate it and we will make decisions on further investment in future budgets based on the results.

Ms WEBB - I am interested in the evaluation bit. You said that you will evaluate it. Naturally you would evaluate it in order to decide whether to continue funding it. Other than numbers, which Mr Healey mentioned, are there other ways of measuring to evaluate the impact or the outcomes of this program to inform your decision one or another whether to continue to fund it?

I am sure young people in care who are 13 or 14 coming towards us will be keen to know at the earliest opportunity whether they can expect this to be part of their trajectory or not.

Mr JAENSCH - I will be asking my department for advice from whatever sources, data or qualitative assessment from stakeholders who have been around this, and from peak body advocates and so on, their assessment of the value of this initiative and what it could do in the future. We won't have access to the later life outcomes of the young people.

Ms WEBB - It would be very interesting to think about ways you could endeavour to do that. I am glad to hear that there is a plan to evaluate various aspects of this program beyond raw numbers.

Mr JAENSCH - We wouldn't just let it run and finish.

CHAIR - I am conscious the output of human services finishes at 11.30 a.m. notionally. We have got a long day so please try to make your questions short and answers succinct.

Ms WEBB - I think it is another one we are quite interested in hearing as it says 'follow up from last year' also. There was some uncertainty last year into how this would play out. It is the out-of-home care learning incentives. Last year's Budget was again a three-year commitment of funding: \$350 000 in 2018-19; another \$350 000 in 2019-20; and then \$500 000 in 2020-21. In 2018-19, how many young people in out-of-home care received or are anticipated to receive a learning incentive payment for completing their schooling? How many foster carers have received that learning incentive payment?

Mr JAENSCH - Sixteen young people and 11 carers were provided with the incentive allowance in 2018; the education year is a calendar year. Fourteen of those 16 young people had completed year 12, while two others completed the equivalent. In 2019, the learning incentive allowance component for carers has been modified to be paid as a series of staged payments to assist with the cost of supporting young people in education.

Ms WEBB - Before the completion of study?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, in stages. We need to be able to provide an incentive for the young person and there is support for the carer.

Ms WEBB - I am very pleased to hear that is being modified. That is always the way it should have been; foster carers crying out for more support to ensure that the children they care for can have the best opportunities at school. They need the support early.

Mr JAENSCH - One of the factors of the timing of this is that in the first year of rollout, the young people were already well advanced in their final year so we didn't have the opportunity of getting in early. The first year payments came on completion. Rolling into the new year we have been able to stage it through.

Ms WEBB - Are kinship carers also eligible for the payments?

Mr JAENSCH - Formal kinship carers, yes.

Ms WEBB - Grandparents, raising grandchildren?

Mr JAENSCH - If they are formal kinship carers, yes.

Ms WEBB - If there are unspent funds from the first year of the rollout, are they being carried across to the subsequent years?

Mr JAENSCH - We are not going to give it back to the Treasurer.

Ms WEBB - Excellent. I can leave that one and go to somebody else, Chair.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, there was some discussion in the committee yesterday about information accessible to non-government organisations working on the Advice and Referral Line service. Obviously, there is some highly sensitive information stored by Child Safety Services about some of our most at risk children. Can you confirm non-government staff do have access to sensitive information that is recorded and agreed through contractual agreement and does this include the child safety database?

Mr JAENSCH - I have some updated advice and happy to put on the record. Non-government organisations working in the Advice and Referral Line have been appointed as Community-Based Intake Services - CBIS - under the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1997. One of their statutory functions is to assess whether a child is at risk and to determine the most appropriate referral service for the child and family.

It is critical a Community-Based Intake Service has access to the information about a child and their family held by the Child Safety Service in order to complete the assessment. Sharing information with the CBIS was critical to the statutory framework within the inception of the CBIS in the 2009 amendments to the act. Issues associated with confidentiality and the protection of personal information have been addressed through the secretary's instruments of agreement with the CBIS and the statutory guidelines for the operation of Community-Based Intake Services developed in consultation with the Crown-Solicitor's office.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Finally, due diligence was given to ensuring the NGOs working in the Advice and Referral Line had adequate policies and procedures in place to respond to inappropriate access or use of information including appropriate codes of conduct. Agreements refer to appropriate use of information and each NGO employee has signed a confidentiality form.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you, minister. You did mention there it was done in conjunction with the Solicitor-General's Office; is that correct?

Mr JAENSCH - In consultation with the Crown-Solicitor's Office.

Ms LOVELL - Did you seek advice from the Solicitor-General about the legalities of sharing this information?

Mr JAENSCH - Not me directly, but I might ask the secretary if she could make comment. Mr Healey was directly involved in establishing those arrangements, Chair; could I ask him to respond, please?

Mr HEALEY - Obviously, the sharing of information by Child Safety is a very significant issue for us and we have sought comprehensive advice from the Solicitor-General about the Child, Young Person and their Families Act and what our duties are for the sharing of information. We do have comprehensive advice from the Solicitor-General on that and we have used that advice to establish the arrangements in the Advice and Referral Line.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you, Mr Healey. So, minister, you are confident to say the advice of the Solicitor-General is being complied with?

Mr JAENSCH - I would defer to Mr Healey's answer. Advice has been sought and received.

MR HEALEY - And we are confident we comply.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you.

Mr VALENTINE - With respect to Kin Raising Kids, you probably receive the same communications as a number of other members in relation to this from Wendy Roberts, publicity officer for Kin Raising Kids, raising the issue that there is a cohort of grandparents looking after their children's children in arrangements that aren't formal, they are informal, and they are not receiving any support of any type.

A lot of that might go to Australian Government carer funding et cetera and we can't deal with that here today, but how much are these people on your radar? What is the department doing to help them in the circumstance they find themselves, not through any doing of their own?

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to have that question. I am very much aware of this remarkable group of people who have stepped up to take care of family members. It is grandparents but there are also other relatives.

Mr VALENTINE - It could be sisters looking after younger ones.

Mr JAENSCH - Exactly. They do a fantastic job. The correspondence you have and the issues raised were generated from a forum held in Burnie, which I attended and spoke at. I am in

frequent contact with Frank and the organisation to understand their various needs and expectations. This is an ongoing piece of work for my office and my department, to see what we can do to better support them.

This is acknowledging that grandparents and kin who are involved in the care of children under formal orders receive the same supports as foster carers in the system.

Mr VALENTINE - Out-of-home care?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. There is another group who you correctly identify as informal carers. Their circumstances are quite individual. My interest in this was piqued through people I know personally who are in that situation.

CHAIR - Minister, try to keep the answers succinct. The question is: are they on your radar and is there any intention to do anything?

Mr JAENSCH - They are definitely on our radar. Two things. First is that we have a body of work being run out of my office to try to work out what we can put together as better support for this group.

There are things we provide now, as the state Government, that we need to ensure they are accessing. The Government currently provides funding to the grandparents and other relatives caring for related children program to deliver programs that support them. In 2018-19, funding for the informal carers group is \$349 947, equally split between two service providers managing statewide delivery of programs.

Mr VALENTINE - Is that for formal carers?

Mr JAENSCH - This is for the informal carers. Baptcare and Mission Australia, via the Gateway Services, provide services specifically for this group. Through this service, eligible informal kin carers can also access training, information and advice about community services and one-off financial assistance also, to purchase items that their children might need.

Services provided and activities undertaken include: case management and brokerage; low-level, short-term case management - approximately 15 hours of support, which might include assisting with Centrelink, childcare benefits, getting children registered and ready to attend school et cetera; limited brokerage attached to case management, for example when children are moving in they may not have much in the way of clothes or furniture and so on that needs to be set up to assist them to make that transition.

We are also looking at what is happening in other jurisdictions around Australia.

Mr VALENTINE - Apparently other nations are addressing this - New Zealand, the UK and Canada, according to information provided.

Mr JAENSCH - Exactly. What I have asked my department to do is to take the issues and priorities raised by Kin Raising Kids, together with the work I already had them doing in this jurisdictional scan, to bring advice to me on what we can develop.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr VALENTINE - Some of these families have kids with mental health issues, developmental issues and some have foetal alcohol syndrome. They are not insignificant issues. I am keen to hear you say that level of support, or at least pointing to agencies providing those supports, will now be on your radar.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, being a broker and a guide for what is available now and that they are entitled to, to help them in their role as well as what other support we can provide them.

Mr VALENTINE - Thank you. There are likely to be 1300 families in this situation in Tasmania, and there are apparently 63 000 in Australia. It is not an insignificant number.

Mr JAENSCH - No, and they do a fantastic job.

Ms WEBB - I will bring several things to you another time. I will ask some straightforward questions and hopefully you will be able to respond directly, minister. How many families within the Child Safety system have been reunified in recent years, say, in 2016-17 and 2017-18, and what is the number expected in 2018-19?

Mr JAENSCH - I will have an answer provided for you, perhaps you have other questions.

Ms WEBB - Great, thank you. What proportion of removals result in reunification of the family across those recent years? Do we have benchmarking for a target in that area? What would our target of reunification of families be as a proportion of removals? I am asking these questions because we know, from clear international and local evidence, that reunification is the best outcome for families and children in the long run.

Mr JAENSCH - While we wait for the numbers, I am unaware of specific benchmarking targets but the department may be able to refer to a benchmark they are working to. We are working on a number of fronts to reduce the number of children removed from their families.

Ms WEBB - We don't need to speak about that, I am aware of those early intervention efforts. This is talking a post-removal event.

Mr JAENSCH - Reunification is one of the other aspects. Other permanent arrangements are another aspect, which may not be unification.

Ms WEBB - I am going to keep it simply to reunification for the purpose of these questions. I would be interested to explore the permanency adjustments but not in this context.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy for us to take the question of numbers on notice.

Ms WEBB - Excellent. I have a couple more to add: how many families are currently on a reunification pathway within the department?

Ms WEBSTER - There were 304 children with a reunification case and care plan as at the 3 June. I have seen the number of reunifications somewhere but I cannot find it at the moment.

Ms WEBB - Of that 304, how many families currently in that process of reunification have, as an issue, a lack of appropriate housing as a main impediment to that reunification progressing?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBSTER - We would not have the data on that, as to the reasons why they're not progressing or how they're progressing.

Ms WEBB - You would be aware, minister, that -

Mr JAENSCH - Some excellent research and advocacy has been done recently.

Ms WEBB - That has been done to indicate that there is a crossover between the housing issues we are facing as a state and successfully reunifying families. I would like an understanding of what magnitude that issue has as an impediment to reunification, if you could provide that for me?

CHAIR - Is that a question that could be asked in the minister's Housing portfolio? Are you more likely to have answers there, Mr Jaensch?

Mr JAENSCH - I doubt we would have answers there but I am aware of the issue that has been raised and the research and advocacy that has been referred to.

Ms WEBB - As part of the redesign process, separate to the laudable early intervention efforts put in place, prior to removal, what additional resources or new programs have been introduced to facilitate higher rates of reunification following removal?

Ms WEBSTER - A couple of quick things, and I think the Child Safety Service redesigned the process. There is a consultation process underway for that at the moment and that will see a greater emphasis in the post-Advice and Referral Line on the organisation of teams and how we focus on reunification. That is something we are specifically looking at in the redesign but we haven't finalised that process. We are still going through the consultation process with stakeholders and there are a couple of forums coming up toward the end of this month.

There have been 65 reunifications of children and families between 1 July 2018 and 31 March 2019. I don't have any other information. I know you mentioned -

Ms WEBB - Yes, I was interested to hear about the two previous -

Ms WEBSTER - I don't have that information but we could provide that.

CHAIR - Minister, do you wish to table something?

Mr JAENSCH - This is in relation to the earlier line of questions on child advocate matters. We have aggregate data of individual Child Advocate activity on July 2018 to March 2019. I am happy to provide that.

Ms WEBB - In the same area, noting that other consultation is being conducted toward future potential support, what support is currently being provided to birth families following removal, particularly in relation to services or support that connect to the reasons for removal?

Mr JAENSCH - Could I ask Ms Eaton-Briggs to comment on that?

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - The post-removal support for parents is something we know locally, nationally and internationally, there needs to be more focus on. It is something we will be working on in the redesign of the non-Advice and Referral Line components of the Child Safety Service.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

We know, through feedback from parents and research, that in order for them to successfully reunify, they need that support. There is a lot of that focus to come up in the next 12 months through the redesign of the Child Safety Service.

Ms WEBB - To clarify, we currently have nothing for that in our system, which is we are looking to -

Ms EATON-BRIGGS - That's correct. There is nothing formally, even though some of our Child Safety officers still working with them.

Ms WEBB - Can we look forward to a commitment to an investment in a newly-developed support in this area in future, minister?

Mr JAENSCH - I am personally interested in, as we come to know and evolve the IFES-type approach to prevention and preservation of families, if there are not elements of that which might work in reverse to prepare families for reunification and address risk factors.

Ms WEBB - Continuity of support across those unfortunate instances where removal is necessary would be beneficial to expedite unification for those families.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, you said earlier that your department is collecting data regarding Intensive Family Engagement Service delivery. You are briefed on serious incidents when they occur and you have briefing notes in your folder. Why are you not able to provide data around whether or not all contracted hours are delivered?

Mr JAENSCH - I do not have that information to hand to report to you on; it is part of management of contracts by the department. I am happy for the department to be preparing that information -

Ms LOVELL - Can you give us a time frame on when that information will be available?

CHAIR - It is on notice.

Mr JAENSCH - It has been taken on notice already. I will have to ask the department what is a practical time frame for writing that, because it will have to be manually generated.

CHAIR - It is on notice and we expect to get an answer. We will write to you and we expect to get it be middle- to late-next week, because we have to have it by then for our report.

Mr VALENTINE - Is it possible to obtain some performance information on the number of informal carers the department has contact with during the years, so we can have an idea how many families we are dealing with?

Mr JAENSCH - I would expect we would be able to get some indication of what contacts we have had, but it may not reflect the number of informal carers.

Mr VALENTINE - No, the department has some contact with would be a help. It would help to build a picture as to what the field is like.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - The secretary is indicating this might be something that can be extracted from the Advice and Referral Line record.

Mr VALENTINE - At the moment you are only dealing with those who are in foster care or under the care of the department.

Mr JAENSCH - We have others who are accessing the Gateway services, Mission and Bapcare. We can give you an estimate.

Mr VALENTINE - I am not particularly asking for extra information now. So, we have that body of information to be able to look at for next year.

CHAIR - You are asking for the information to be included in next year's report?

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, any information provided on performance information. How many of those families are contacting you and you are assisting?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, thank you.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, yesterday there was a question asked around stripsearches, or partially clothed searches, conducted on young people at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre and the committee was advised there had been 204 stripsearches with no contraband found. Further to that can you please advise how many stripsearches or partially clothed searches and which type of search has been conducted on young people while being held on remand prior to being transferred into the custody of the Ashley Youth Detention Centre?

Mr JAENSCH - Did you say prior to Ashley?

Ms LOVELL - Prior to Ashley while they are being held on remand.

Mr JAENSCH - That would be information you would need to obtain from the Department of Justice.

Ms LOVELL - You do not collect that?

Ms WEBSTER - Children on remand are held at Ashley. Are you talking about children who come in before they are charged or when they are -

Ms LOVELL - Yes, correct.

Ms WEBSTER - charged would be a matter for Department of Justice.

Ms LOVELL - The children on remand who would be held at Ashley, I am assuming would have been included in that figure?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, because that figure was about the number of searches.

Ms LOVELL - At Ashley, yes. Thank you.

CHAIR - Any more questions? Are there any prioritised funds?

**Output Group 3
Independent Children's and Young Persons' Review Service**

3.1 Office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People -

Ms WEBB - I have questions, but mindful of time and they are not pressing. It is not a large allocation and it is very promising what has been delivered. Unless others would like to ask questions. It is work I am familiar with and see the need to press on.

**Output Group 6
Disability Services and Community Development**

6.1 Community Services -

Mr JAENSCH - I will start with [inaudible] and then we will open this Swiss Army knife with the Department of Communities Tasmania and find the right tool.

Ms WEBB - Is this the line item under which gambling support would fall?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Excellent. Last year a new gambling support program strategic framework was mooted to be developed for the period from 2019 to 2024. Have this gambling support program and strategic framework been developed and when will they be rolled out?

Mr JAENSCH - The Gambling Support Program is guided by the Gambling Support Program Strategic Framework 2014-19. The framework for 2020-23 is currently under development. It will continue to focus on harm minimisation prevention services and the provision of services to support those directly impacted by gambling.

We are committed to harm minimisation measures and supporting Tasmanians who are directly or indirectly affected. Our Gambling Support Strategic Framework 2019 to 2023 is due to be released between October and December 2019.

Ms WEBB - Thank you. What proportion of those people seeking help from gambling support services are currently affected by a problem with gambling on poker machines and then on other forms of gambling?

Mr JAENSCH - I bring Ingrid Ganley to the table. Ingrid, could you please assist me with your formal title for the record?

Ms GANLEY - I am the Director of Disability and Community Services.

Mr JAENSCH - The question again?

Ms WEBB - What proportion of those seeking help from our gambling support services in Tasmania are affected by a problem with gambling on poker machines and then the proportion on other forms of gambling?

Mr JAENSCH - If I could take that on notice, Ms Webb?

Ms WEBB - Thank you. It would be good to have a comparison of recent years.

In the new proposed policy the Hodgman Government has for individual licensing of poker machines, you will be collecting, as a government, more revenue and also a higher Community Support Levy. You have stated is to have a greater ability to address harm minimisation and invest in essential services.

What magnitude of increase in harm is expected to occur under the individual licensing model your Government proposes?

Mr JAENSCH - What we can refer to is the increased levy arrangements. Pubs will pay 5 per cent; clubs 4 per cent; and the Casino, for the first time, will pay 3 per cent. If these levies are not sufficient to double the funding pool from current levels, the Government will top that up from current levels. Your question relates to?

Ms WEBB - The expected increase in harm under your policy, given you're expecting to have to increase harm minimisation efforts.

Mr JAENSCH - We are increasing our capacity to respond to the full range of gambling addiction, which is not only around pokies. The interesting thing is that the decline in the levy receipts over recent times suggests there has been a change in activity levels that maybe transfers to other forms of gambling addiction.

Ms WEBB - That is not remotely indicated by that decrease in figures, minister. You would know that. Decrease in losses does not equal decrease in harm.

We don't know which players have had a decrease in their losses. It may not be those players or their families who are being harmed. A decrease in losses does not indicate that and it does not indicate a transfer to other forms of gambling. We will be interested to see the figures on proportion of poker machine-related harm. My understanding it is in the vicinity of 80 per cent and has been for a long time. People seeking help through our services have that as their key issue.

You are increasing your resources to harm minimisation. Either that is in response to an expected increase in the level of harm under your new policy, or it is an indication that the current levels of support being provided are not sufficient if you are expecting the current levels of harm to continue. Which of those is it?

Mr JAENSCH - At the moment there is a drop off of receipts under the current levy arrangements and we are going to be increasing the receipts by increasing the levying across more forms. This goes to maintaining revenue for harm minimisation activities which is a good thing.

Ms WEBB - It is more than maintaining. You are planning to increase revenue.

Other eastern seaboard states of Australia already have an individual licencing model, such as the one you are proposing we move to. They, in entirety, have higher levels of harm under that model than we do in Tasmania. Are you anticipating that Tasmania will increase its level of harm under an individual licencing model that you bring in? Will each member of the Hodgman

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Government - you included, minister - take personal responsibility for any increase in harm that occurs under this proposed policy?

Mr JAENSCH - As my ministerial responsibilities go, through our policy we are anticipating an increase in revenues under the community support levy arrangements that we can apply to problem gambling in our community.

Ms WEBB - I am wondering about your anticipated impact on level of harm under your policy, not the revenue.

Mr JAENSCH - In our portfolio, in terms of dealing with harm minimisation and gambling addiction, what we are doing is making sure there will be more money coming in to offset the decrease under the current levy arrangements so that we can continue to address problem gambling in our community.

Ms WEBB - As a member of the Hodgman Government, minister, and minister responsible for gambling support, what I have asked you is: will you take personal responsibility as a member of that Government for any increase in harm that results from the introduction of your proposed policy?

Mr JAENSCH - As a member of the Government, I stand by our policies. We take responsibility as government for our responsibilities and their effects on the ground. Part of what we are doing in this portfolio and this Budget is projecting an increase in receipts for harm minimisation in our community.

Ms WEBB - Are you aware, minister, that virtually no comparable country globally places poker machines in community venues that are not destination gambling venues, such as casinos?

Mr JAENSCH - I will take your word for that.

Ms WEBB - Are you aware that countries where poker machines are located only in casinos or destination gambling venues have a significantly lower rate of poker machine addiction, lower losses and lower levels of harm caused by poker machines than we do here in Australia and Tasmania?

Mr JAENSCH - I accept your statement.

Ms WEBB - Are you aware that with 0.3 per cent of the world's population, Australia has close to 20 per cent of the world's poker machines?

Mr JAENSCH - Again, I don't seek to contest any of the matters you are raising. I am happy for you to put them on the record.

Ms WEBB - Are you aware that when we look at poker machines outside of casinos or destination gambling venues, Australia has 76 per cent of the world's poker machines?

Mr JAENSCH - Again, if you are confident of your sources, I have no reason to contest that.

Ms WEBB - Do you accept, minister, then that Australia and Tasmania are abhorrent globally in their regulation of poker machines?

Mr JAENSCH - No. I don't have an opinion on the 'abhorrentness' or otherwise of our regulation of poker machines.

Ms WEBB - Have you accepted the facts I gave you just then?

Mr JAENSCH - I am not contesting the facts.

Ms WEBB - That's fine. Do you regard poker machines to be a dangerous product?

Mr JAENSCH - They can be dangerous to some people.

Ms WEBB - Do you accept that due to the proven addictive properties of poker machines, public messaging that people should 'gamble responsibly' is misleading because it implies that it's a matter of choice and individual behaviour as to whether a person is harmed by a poker machine?

Mr JAENSCH - I am not going to offer a personal opinion or response on that question. I am happy to accept the questions and put that assertion on the table but I am not going to offer a personal response to it.

Ms WEBB - You are the minister responsible for gambling support and you are responsible for much of the public messaging about poker machine gambling that goes out to the community. You fund it through your programs. I am wondering about how you regard messaging that implies that gambling on poker machines is about gambling responsibly as opposed to the addictive nature of those things, making choice and individual behaviour entirely out of the realm -

Mr JAENSCH - As we label our alcohol containers with 'use alcohol responsibly' we note that it can be addictive for people. We know that people can also enjoy it for recreation. We believe in choice and we believe in personal responsibility. We also believe that we need to support those who find themselves addicted to alcohol, gambling and other substances as well.

Ms WEBB - I am happy to talk about alcohol at another time. We're talking about gambling at this time.

Mr JAENSCH - That's what we're doing through increasing the levy and continuing to provide services.

Ms WEBB - You're mopping up the harm that's caused after the fact through the absolutely globally abhorrent regulation of this product.

Mr JAENSCH - I respect your advocacy and your opinion.

Ms WEBB - Last year you mentioned there would be an expansion of the gambling support program research agenda. I would like to know what that expansion will deliver?

CHAIR - For a particular research project you are asking?

Ms WEBB - Or what the direction of the expansion will be. What will it look at?

Mr JAENSCH - I will ask Ms Ganley to speak to that, please.

Ms GANLEY - We are looking at that as part of our consultation on the new gambling strategy and looking at what we can currently do with our available funds and what we might have coming in to the future. We are always looking at research projects around the effectiveness of our awareness campaigns but we want to scope that out with the community as part of our strategy consultation.

Ms WEBB - The research will be on the effectiveness of the support campaigns and awareness campaigns and not on the impact of gambling on this state, for example.

Ms GANLEY - That's what our current research has been but we would like to look to future about all the kinds of research. That is what we want to pick up through our strategy consultations.

Ms WEBB - When are those consultations occurring?

Ms GANLEY - They are in the process of getting set up to occur in the next couple of months.

Ms WEBB - This year?

Ms GANLEY - Yes.

Mr GAFFNEY - Western Australia confines its poker machines to the casinos and has the lowest percentage of problem gambling statistics in the country. How does the Government in its policy decision regarding EDMs in pubs and clubs weigh up that sort of situation? There was a push here some time ago to get them out of pubs and clubs. Initially they were brought into Tasmania to create a revenue flow. They looked at supporting clubs like the RSLs in New South Wales. We've only got five or six RSLs in Tasmania. Here we have a decision made by the Government that proves there's harm in the community yet it is still looking at proliferating these things throughout places like Glenorchy that can't afford -

Mr JAENSCH - We are reducing the cap. I don't intend to revisit the full debate of the Government's policy on electronic gaming machines. That policy has been adopted and I stand by the Government's policy. My responsibilities in this portfolio are to support the services we are rolling out to support those people who have a problem with gambling in all its forms and to ensure there is a future revenue stream that isn't diminishing and that we are doubling to support those activities in the community.

Ms WEBB - From a revenue stream, 50 per cent of which comes from those who are actually being harmed. Can I have a quick follow-up or clarification question from one of ones I asked to the minister earlier? I asked: what magnitude of increase in harm is expected to occur under the individual licensing model that the Hodgman Government proposes to introduce? I don't believe you provided me with an answer to that. Perhaps to clarify that question further: what modelling has been done on the level of harm under the model you are proposing to introduce around individual licensing to inform the Government about an expected level of harm?

Mr JAENSCH - As I understand, the model will not be increasing the number of poker machines.

Ms WEBB - I am not talking about increasing the number; I am talking about increasing harm.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - If we are talking about harm as a result of changes to the prevalence of poker machines in our community, they are not going to be increasing.

Ms WEBB - I am not talking about that, minister, I am talking about the change of model. In the move to individual licences, the model change that you are proposing, what modelling has been done to ascertain any change in the level of harm that will result from the introduction of that model?

CHAIR - The first question is: has any modelling been done?

Mr JAENSCH - I think this goes again to policy decisions that have been made, led by other portfolios in the past -

Ms WEBB - It is relevant to your portfolio because you deal with the harm.

Mr JAENSCH - I think you would be better off directing this to the Treasurer.

Ms WEBB - I believe it is relevant to your portfolio, with all respect, because your portfolio deals with the harm. If we have modelling that shows, for example, an increase in harm, that is relevant to expenditure in your portfolio.

CHAIR - The question is: has modelling been done?

Ms WEBB - The question is: has modelling been done? The second question is: what does that modelling show, and are you using that modelling to inform future spending in your portfolio area around support?

Mr JAENSCH - I am prepared to direct you to the Treasurer on that question, and I am not familiar with what modelling or what changes in modelling apply.

Ms WEBB - Does that mean you will take it on notice and provide an answer back to us?

Mr JAENSCH - No, I'd refer you to the Treasurer.

CHAIR - With all due respect, minister, I think this is a question that you should answer: has modelling been done to give guidance to your portfolio area where the funding is allocated to deal with the harm? I think it is a reasonable question for your portfolio.

Mr JAENSCH - But it's based on the assertion that the Government's policy relating to licensing of venues or electronic gaming machines will be reflected in modelling of harm.

CHAIR - The question is: has modelling been done? You said you weren't aware.

Mr JAENSCH - I am not familiar with it; I don't know if there has been.

CHAIR - The question is - we will ask you to take it on notice: has modelling been done?

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to take that question on notice.

CHAIR - If it has, can you provide detail of the outcomes of that modelling? If it hasn't, you can't provide it, obviously.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to take the question of what modelling has been done.

CHAIR - The modelling might show there is less harm. I can't imagine that would be the case.

Mr JAENSCH - But then the question of who is responsible for that information and further questions on it, I would have to be able to refer to the appropriate minister.

CHAIR - The information would feed into your portfolio deliberations regarding your budget line item. That is why we are asking you the question.

Mr JAENSCH - Please, give me the ability to direct inquiries to the appropriate minister and department.

Ms WEBB - That is my follow-up question to this. Minister, you are responsible for the funding that goes into this line item dealing with the harm resulting from gambling, and potentially an increase in harm; we don't know if the modelling has been done. You are going to come back to us on that, but as the minister responsible for the funding to support people: do you not think that you should have been involved in those discussions or be aware of modelling done?

Mr JAENSCH - I am responsible for what we do with that revenue and how it is applied in the delivering of harm minimisation programs and the research that informs it.

Ms LOVELL - Do you think it would be appropriate you, as the minister responsible for this particular item, would be involved in those discussions and modelling?

Mr JAENSCH - I am responsible for the revenue and its appropriate allocation -

Ms LOVELL - Or at least be aware of whether modelling has even been done?

Mr JAENSCH - I have undertaken to ask that question, but I am responsible for what we do with that revenue and how we apply that to -

Ms LOVELL - That is right and my question.

Mr JAENSCH - And why we have forward strategy to be released later this year.

Ms LOVELL - Do you think you should have been involved, or at least be aware of where there was modelling done given you are responsible for delivering the programs?

Mr JAENSCH - I have undertaken to ask the question about modelling -

Ms LOVELL - But you are not aware currently?

Mr JAENSCH - and -

Ms LOVELL - It is really quite outstanding.

Mr JAENSCH - I have undertaken to ask that question.

Ms LOVELL - Okay, thank you. Yes.

Mr JAENSCH - What I am responsible for is how we apply that money to -

Ms LOVELL - Yes, you have said it.

Mr JAENSCH - deal with problem gambling.

Ms LOVELL - Yes, you have said that to the committee, thank you.

Mr VALENTINE - The member for Nelson raised a significant number of observations which everybody around this table was probably astounded by. What I am wanting to hear is that you will covenant to seriously consider each one of those observations and how you are applying the money you have under this line item to address some of the issues raised?

Mr JAENSCH - The member put on the record, and she's entitled to, a series of assertions or pieces of information or opinions, comparing to other jurisdictions with Australia and Tasmania. I am not in a position to contest anything she has raised. I am happy for her to put it on the record. I am responsible for how we build and deploy gambling support programs for people who are affected by gambling. I am sure there is a far larger conversation, and many people have information and opinions to share or assert, around the issue of gambling in our society and how we regulate or otherwise various forms of gambling. This is not a matter for here and now. What I am responsible for as minister is how we build and run our programs dealing with problem gambling in our community.

Mr VALENTINE - I am not asking you to take on face value what the member has put before us today; what I am asking is to seriously consider them and, if necessary, test them and focus what the allocating funds to look at those in a serious manner and say something has been raised. Is it or not true? Have it tested and if it is true, apply funds to deal with it.

Mr JAENSCH - You are talking matters of policy and licensing arrangements, a remit of other ministers and you should be directing that to them. I am dealing with how we design and deploy our gambling support services.

Mr VALENTINE - I am talking about the harm aspects, not about licensing. I understand some of those observations may well be under the remit of another minister. There are some of those observations that basically spell out the sort of community we have and how they are being harmed by these machines. If you can covenant to me you will seriously consider each one of those, that is all I ask. I am not after a matrix coming back, but to know the minister responsible for this particular aspect is actively looking at the harm side of things.

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy to note the matters raised by the member. They are directed to decisions regarding licensing models which are the responsibility of another minister. As part of the Government, again I am happy to hear, note and understand those issues, but my responsibilities are in how we deal with problem gamblers.

CHAIR - I have a question for you: how do you determine where you need to focus your support - whether you need to do more in assisting people with problem gambling online or those addicted to poker machines, or those addicted to casino gambling on the tables, for example?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

How do you make decisions around that if you don't know what the actual harm is?

Mr JAENSCH - The way those decisions are informed includes through the Liquor and Gaming Commission, which encourages responsible gambling and gaming under the Gaming Control Act, under the Department of Treasury and Finance, and they also undertake social and economic impact studies.

CHAIR - When was the last social and economic impact study?

Mr JAENSCH - I don't know when.

Ms WEBB - I can help you with that, minister. It came out in January last year.

Mr JAENSCH - There you go, January last year. There is an evidence base.

CHAIR - What did that last social and economic impact study in terms of where the attention and focus needs to be in your decisions about how you spend the money in this portfolio area?

Mr JAENSCH - They are the matters which will go into the development of the gambling support program in its next stages.

Ms WEBB - I could tell you some of the things that the social and economic impact study that came out in January last year did show, minister. It identified that the highest level of harm is delivered through gambling activities on poker machines in our state.

Playing poker machines is an activity being engaged in by all age groups in this state. In the context of your responsibility for gambling support services, have you read that study from January last year and do you have a response to it?

Mr JAENSCH - What we have undertaken to do is to build and release our strategic framework for 2019 to 2023, which will draw on a number of sources of information and providing our response to them.

Ms GANLEY - I wanted to make mention of the gambling help services that we provide and the fact that we are running a tender process at the moment. As part of that process, the tendering organisations are outlining their strategies and what is best practice, picking up on the discussion around harm minimisation.

It is those services that we are contracting in. We look to them and we are working around what are the best practices in terms of the different ways of delivering that service. It is constantly evolving to keep pace with the trends that are occurring in gambling. That is part of that aspect, and then there is the community education campaign as well, which informs how we promote our services.

CHAIR - Minister, do you support a harm minimisation approach?

Mr JAENSCH - I support a harm minimisation approach and I support our continually updating, using the best information available, the best ways of applying the resources available to us to address the needs of problem gamblers.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

I respect the passionate advocacy that there is around this table and in the community regarding the issue and the differences of opinion on policy that exist around the table. We have our policy; as part of the Government, I support it. My job is to manage how we deal with people who have gambling problems.

CHAIR - But you need to know where they are.

Mr GAFFNEY - In 2014, which was confirmed by the alcohol and gaming thing, there were 2000 high-risk Tasmanian adults and 8000 moderate-risk - concerning gaming and gaming machines. How do you measure the success of whatever program you put out there? It must be very difficult.

Ms GANLEY - We have had dedicated studies look at the impact of the programs. The other is the data and information that we ask our contractor providers to collect in terms of the outcomes that we measure from the programs that we are contracting.

I wouldn't say it gets down to the level of detail around exactly what is the outcome for individuals, but we certainly look at the effectiveness of the programs that we are funding and the outcomes we are aiming to achieve.

Mr GAFFNEY - Do you target certain communities and groups where it is identified that they have a greater degree of gambling? Is it across the state? In Glenorchy, \$20 million in a year gets taken out of that community through gambling. Do you target pocket areas or an across the state issue?

Ms GANLEY - We use the information provided through the studies and through the [inaudible] to help target our community education campaign. By way of example, in the past we have done particular letter drops and advertisements on what services are available into the Glenorchy area, in particular. We also have had some studies undertaken which looked at the impact of gambling on international students. Therefore, how do we work with TAFE and the Migrant Resource Centre to target our resources so they are applicable and attractive to that population group? We use all the vast information other people gather. or commission ourselves. to help us guide the development of our community education program annually, the data we collect from our providers and what gambling services are telling us in terms of community need.

Ms WEBB - In relation to building a picture of what direction the level of harm across our community is moving in, particularly poker machine gambling, information from services will not provide a picture of what movement is happening across the community in terms of the level of harm. To some degree, the social and economic impact studies do, for example, one in January last year indicated the proportion of our community who identified as high-risk problem gamblers increased. It also, for the first time, examined impact on family and friends of people who are having a problem with gambling. On that, are there other efforts that can be considered in the development of the new research agenda to better measure community-wide the level of harm being experienced by our community in terms of poker machine gambling? Also, other gambling, but primary, given that is our clear and present danger, is it being considered in the research agenda?

Ms GANLEY - It certainly can be; we are at a point where we are collecting ideas, suggestions and information.

Ms WEBB - Minister, can I have a personal commitment from you to actually read the most recent social economic impact study released in January last year, commissioned by the state Government. It does cover a very broad range of areas, including the harm to others aspect. Can I have a personal commitment you will actually engage with that report and read it?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes.

Capital Investment Program

CHAIR - We will move to Capital Investment Program, this relates to the Ashley Youth Detention Centre redevelopment.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. I will start with the book and we will add people.

CHAIR - Minister, I will open the bashing on this one. Can you give us an update on the works program for redevelopment at the Ashley Youth Detention Centre? What is actually being done and still yet to be done? Is it on track, on time, on budget?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. We have committed to keep the Ashley Youth Detention Centre open on its current site. We have committed to \$7.28 million for a major redesign and upgrade of the centre, in instalments over the next two financial years.

The redesign will ensure Ashley is fit for purpose and enables a therapeutic youth justice model to play out there, as across our youth justice system. An architect and youth justice planner have been engaged, conducted inspections at the site and interviews with a range of participants and a report generated with some options in it for us to consider of the redesign of Ashley. I have seen the report. In the light of it, I have asked the department to prepare recommendations to build our capital works program now.

CHAIR - What is the predominant focus of the works. You said you decided to keep the facility where it is.

Mr JAENSCH - The facility is structurally sound as I interpret the report's findings. The buildings have life in them. It is a facility designed with a capacity of 50 detainees. It currently has far fewer than that, which leads to some inefficiencies in how the space is deployed but it also creates opportunities. This is my reading as a layperson reading the report. It creates far more opportunities to be able to separate and scale up and down the level of supervision, care and security applied to detainees within that space.

Options exist to meet the needs of individuals and subsets of the Ashley population within that structure. The scale of the structure and the buildings there give us the space to do that quite well. To me, there is some synergy with the therapeutic approach being rolled out, including the training which is all about de-escalation of behaviours and allowing people to find their own space and calm. The facility has to be adapted to meet that new operational therapeutic model of care.

CHAIR - What about the educational spaces, what are you planning for those? The former member for a number of things would always raise education as a particular issue.

Mr JAENSCH - The education function in the space there is a critical part of the experience. I might ask the secretary to comment further.

CHAIR - Who has experience on the other side of the fence.

Mr JAENSCH - We have received some advice; I have seen it. I am asking the department to now convert that into a work program for us. We will be consulting with another group of people about how that is deployed. I will ask Ginna if she has any further comment in response to your question.

Ms WEBSTER - The report makes a number of recommendations that go to some improvements to vocational education and education area. As the minister said, we have kept the consultation to Ashley staff, other departmental staff, the Commissioner for Children and Young People with a child advocate, custodial inspection, unions and other government agencies. What we would now like to do whilst we are informing the next steps is actually go out a bit wider with the organisations that work with Ashley, including education. Although the Ashley school was involved in the initial consultation, we want to take that wider in terms of the organisations we work with and Aboriginal communities, and also what happens post-release with Ashley - how we make sure those people are ready transition back into the community and address reoffending behaviour.

There is the internal aspect. How do we have a facility that allows de-escalation that provides quiet space and calm space, including a creative space and things like music therapy or acting that are not just a one-size-fits-all school space or a sports space. It goes across the continuum. We want to test some of those with our providers and with people who are on the receiving end of some of those children exiting Ashley. They are the next steps.

Vocational training is important as part of that as is making sure the visits area of Ashley is okay for families coming and that it feels like a safe and private space for visitors. When you are entering into the facility, even though it is a secure facility and we have a requirement to keep not only the residents safe, but also our staff and visitors safe and secure, it needs to be done in a way that is therapeutic, hence involving the Child Advocate, Save the Children and those sorts of organisations. There is a lot we can do because the facility is structurally sound; there is a lot we can do to make it more therapeutically sound. I guess that is our aim.

We want to make sure we are doing that in a way that is trauma-informed. We know that a lot of the children in Ashley not only have committed crimes, but they also have trauma in their background. Some of those children are on care and protection orders, so we need to make sure there is flowthrough to the out-of-home care providers. The focus has been on that element of the redesign and what we can do with the bricks and mortar to make that a better experience for children and young people and address their reoffending behaviour.

Mr JAENSCH - In some ways there is an interesting irony in that Ashley is servicing a far smaller number of people than it was originally designed for, which gives us the scope to do some of this work, to break that space up and differentiate it functionally internally.

DIVISION 2

(Department of Communities Tasmania)

Output group 4

Housing Services System Management

4.1 Housing Services System Management -

Mr JAENSCH - I bring to the table Mr Peter White, Deputy Secretary, Housing, Disability and Community Services. In light of the time, I get no opening statement?

CHAIR - In light of the time, you can edit it.

Mr JAENSCH - I have edited it extensively already.

In recognition of continuing demand, our Government has allocated almost \$68 million in the 2019-20 Budget to boost the supply of new social and affordable homes in Tasmania. We have heavily front-ended the \$125 million housing commitment to accelerate the building of more houses.

The allocation this financial year under the action plan is \$40.5 million with a further \$27.4 million under Housing Tasmania's capital program. Our first action plan 2015-19 set out a number of targets that we are working towards to increase the supply of affordable homes to Tasmanians through a number of different measures. As previously advised in our March quarterly report, we are on track to assist over 1600 households, including new supply of 941 affordable lots and homes by the end of June 2019.

We are due to report against the achievement of those targets at the completion of the June 2019 quarter, but for the purposes of today, I will provide an update. As at the end of May we had delivered 316 of the 372 social housing dwellings that we targeted. Right now, over 100 homes are at an advanced stage of construction, so we are confident of meeting or exceeding our target. This is part of the total supply thus far of 843 affordable lots and homes against our 941 target. We are on track and, had at the end of May, assisted a total of 1438 new households out of the 1600 target, with responses including 347 households assisted into affordable home ownership, 291 affordable lots of land released, 316 new social housing dwellings, 269 households assisted into affordable private rentals, and 111 new units of homeless accommodation provided.

We are glad that we are on track to meet those targets. We note a lot is happening in this next few weeks but we are monitoring on a daily basis the delivery of new stock against our contracts for delivery.

I also wanted to mention another activity in this area of housing and homelessness, noting the issue of young people at risk of homelessness. This a complex issue and we have been receiving a lot of input through our consultation on our Affordable Housing Action Plan. That's why we have committed in our second action plan to establish a skills-based task force to identify and prioritise special care arrangements, new arrangements for homeless children and youth under 16 years who aren't in our out-of-home care system.

The under-16 homelessness task force will be independently chaired and it will report directly to me as minister. I can announce today that Danny Sutton, the CEO of Colony 47, has agreed to be the independent chair of the task force. Mr Sutton has strong knowledge of the issues facing homeless young people in Tasmania and he has the skills to draw together the views of policymakers, service providers and other experts to give us advice on relevant issues. The other members of the task force I am appointing are Dr Catherine Robinson, social researcher with the Social Action and Research Centre at Anglicare Tasmania; Professor Shelley Mallett, who is the Director of the Research and Policy Centre of the Brotherhood of St Laurence; Marcus Turnbull, an experienced legal practitioner in family law and an independent children's lawyer in child safety

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

matters; Ginna Webster, Secretary of the Department of Communities Tasmania; and Mandy Reynolds-Smith, Principal Project Officer, Student Engagement with the Tasmanian Department of Education.

This task force is a small membership that will initially be appointed for a short period to identify the particular issues, cohorts and a range of immediate and longer term initiatives they will recommend to the Government to address this issue of these in-between kids. These are kids who have, in our sector's language, self-selected out of their homes. They aren't yet in our out-of-home care system, with ambiguous guardianship and homelessness status and care arrangements, but they are turning up and we need to deal with them. This task force is going to help direct us to what the Government should be doing, including interacting with our child safety, education and homelessness and housing systems.

The Department of Communities Tasmania is absolutely the right department to be leading this work and we thank Mr Sutton and the other members of that task force for agreeing to assist. We thank Catherine Robinson and SARC for their strong advocacy and identification of this issue over the last year or so that we've been speaking to them.

CHAIR - They produced a report I don't think we were all briefed on.

Ms WEBB - To follow up on that, I have a couple of questions about the task force. You mentioned a defined time frame within which the task force would be undertaking its work. What time frame is that?

Mr JAENSCH - I have suggested around six months.

Ms WEBB - This year, from now?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, but I am in the hands of the task force. I did not want to create an ongoing project. If we are going to utilise these people's valuable time, I want to indicate to them it's not rolling on forever and we hope they will be able to come back to us with a process. We have an indicative time frame commencing late this month with the hope of having their final advice handed to me in November.

Ms WEBB - Would that be in the form of a report?

Mr JAENSCH - I will be asking them to identify short-term initiatives that can be delivered within a 12-month period and long-term initiatives that will require systemic changes. They will be presenting me with that advice. It will be derived from talking to a range of other people. I'd be happy to be sharing that advice.

Ms WEBB - Excellent. Is it down to the level of specific services and programs, not a broad, overarching policy approach to this area?

Mr JAENSCH - We want to work out which adjustments can we make immediately to the systems we have now to better address this group of people, and then what we might need to invest more money and time in to understand or generate new service responses.

Ms WEBB - Given there's a lack of a policy framework for this cohort of children and the issues they're facing within your department now, aside from developing specific program

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

responses - short-, medium- and long-term - how will you ensure consistent policy approaches and principles are behind that? Will you be developing that within your department?

Mr JAENSCH - This work will inform that, as much as anything. We have to discern who the target cohorts are. There is some ambiguity around who and whose they are, so defining them and identifying the issues relating to them are part of the role of the task force.

Ms WEBB - Do we know how many children under the age of 16 have presented to homelessness services in the last 12 months?

Mr JAENSCH - I have seen figures. I don't have them today, but the matters being raised with us by advocates and shelters are the reason we are looking at this.

Ms WEBB - I would be interested to have an updated figure of -

Mr JAENSCH - You probably provided it, so -

Ms WEBB - The research done when I worked at SARC was from a few years ago. We had a figure but I would like an updated figure if possible. I'd also like to know the daily average of unaccompanied young people in crisis accommodation, the daily average of children under the age of 16 in crisis accommodation, and how many children under the age of 13 years presented to crisis accommodation and were turned away in 2017-18, and what is the expected figure for 2018-19? This is all unaccompanied children. Would you like to take those on notice to come back to me?

Mr JAENSCH - No, I'd like to take the question in itself. Mr White, is this the sort of up-to-date data we can access from the shelters or is this information we would be generating anyway as part of the task force process?

Mr WHITE - We'd have to go to our crisis providers in order to obtain the information the member alludes to. We are not getting that as a regular report.

Ms WEBB - You don't collect information on the number of young people under the age of 16 who are in your crisis accommodation?

Mr WHITE - I don't have it to hand but I would suspect we did. You had some very specific questions in that list. I just don't know whether some of that would be collected in the form you've asked the question.

Ms WEBB - In that, are you referring to the question I asked about how many children under the age of 13 presented and were turned away?

Mr WHITE - That's one example of that, that's correct. I'm not sure whether we would have that data when we go to the services.

Ms WEBB - Does your department require service providers to collect information about children under the age of 13 who present to their services but who they're not able to provide that service to because of the age restriction?

Mr WHITE - We wouldn't be asking for that information specifically to the age of 13.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - Do you collect information about the number of young people over the age of 13 who present and are turned away because there's not space?

Mr WHITE - The providers would have information under-16s. What you are talking about is a breakdown in age groups and I'm not certain of whether, for example, they would know. If they have listed the ages specifically, we could identify within those numbers how many were 13 and below, but if all they have is the identification that the person presenting was under 16, we can't break that down further.

Ms WEBB - We would know how many under-16s, in total, come to services and are turned away because they're not able to be accommodated, but we wouldn't know what proportion of those were under 13 because we don't ask services to collect that information as a department?

Mr WHITE - The answer is I don't know at the moment. We may have that information, but I am not confident they are collecting specific ages of a range of clients who present, noting that in some cases they have a very short interaction with those clients versus others that may well have a longer one.

Ms WEBB - Minister, might I suggest to you that as a key piece of information for your task force to have to hand as they make their deliberations, this would be very important information to have collected by the services that provide the support.

Mr JAENSCH - Indeed, and that was going to be my question back to you in terms of the data you've referred to. I am sure there are many other fields of data that the task force will require in order to be able to prepare its advice and to conduct its investigations. I am happy to take the range of fields of information you have asked for as something that we add to the list of information that we prepare and provide to the task force for its deliberation.

Ms WEBB - Excellent, as well as on notice back to us if it is available.

Mr JAENSCH - To the extent that we can get it, I am happy to provide it.

CHAIR - Just to clarify, what the committee is asking for is the number of young people -

Ms WEBB - Do you want me to read out the ones I have asked for?

CHAIR - I am going to paraphrase it slightly: the number of young people under the age of 16 who present to these facilities, as Ms Webb has alluded to, broken down to under-13 where possible. Is that a reasonable way of - ?

Mr JAENSCH - What I want to check is of the data currently kept by service providers, to the extent we can gather that and provide it for the information of the committee, I am happy for us to do that. If that is not available, I note that it is of interest and will be of interest to the task force, so we will capture that. Mr White has some more information that he can provide.

Mr WHITE - The information we have for the 2017-18 financial year, which relates to the confidential unit record file data - or CURF data as it is known - is that there were 889 instances of young people aged from 0 to 17. Again, this comes back to my point about your specific questions of who presented alone to homeless shelters in Tasmania. That figure of 889 includes repeat clients. The primary age group for that group, being 84 per cent, were 15- to 17-year-olds. We had

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

16 per cent, or 81 instances, of children aged from 0 to 14 who were supported that year. That represents 7 per cent of all clients who received homeless support that year.

Ms WEBB - They are not ones who were turned away, they are ones who have received support?

Mr WHITE - Yes, they presented alone.

Ms WEBB - You've said the age group is from 0 to 14; we are assuming that because shelters can't take people under the age of 13, that is 13- and 14-year-olds, if they have received a service?

Mr WHITE - Children under that age could still present.

Ms WEBB - That is what I am speaking about. The number I am interested in is the number of children under the age of 13 who have presented, haven't been able to receive a service because they are below the age cut-off and therefore have been turned away. That was one of my questions, whether we had that data?

CHAIR - Could it be assumed then that all those children, if they are too young to access the service, would have been turned away?

Ms WEBB - Yes, but that doesn't appear to be a figure we are able to get.

Mr JAENSCH - What it might not pick up is what other services they might have been referred to.

Ms WEBB - Minister, please correct me if I am wrong. We currently do not have any services - shelter, housing services, homelessness services, somewhere those kids can go and sleep for the night - available currently for children under the age of 13. They may have been referred to another service that doesn't provide them with a place to sleep, might be able to assist them with some other elements that they are finding difficult in their life, might be able to send them off with a mobile phone for the night so they can ring for help if they need to, but those children aren't provided with anywhere to sleep for the night, or care wrapped around them?

Mr JAENSCH - This is why we are doing this.

Ms WEBB - Yes, absolutely, and I agree it is a good thing to do.

Mr JAENSCH - We need lots of information. What I am keen to do is to focus our efforts on equipping the task force and members with what they need to do the job. I am happy to provide to information in response to questions here, but prefer to do the data work once with the focus on the task force, rather than developing new information specifically for the purpose of this committee hearing.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps from those questions I asked and the ones you are able to answer, great, and the others as time develops and you can begin to collect the data in ways that will inform the task force, it would be good to understand.

CHAIR - To clarify, the committee is to be provided the data you can access in relation to young people at various ages turned away from services?

Mr JAENSCH - As the member has read into the record.

Ms WEBB - To check with you, minister, to see whether you have plans as a state government to reduce the historic housing debt we owe to the Commonwealth, either through further advocacy to the Commonwealth or secondarily within your own government advocacy to see debt dealt with more broadly in Finance-General rather than through the Housing Tasmania budget. This would free up an extra millions of dollars a year to be spent of housing.

Mr JAENSCH - I can confirm on communication with the federal Cabinet. I have written already to the new Minister for Housing and the Minister for Community Housing, Homelessness and Community Services, introducing myself, congratulating them and introducing this issue as something we would like to speak with them about and resolve as I have with their predecessors. Opening our account with new federal counterparts to name up our Commonwealth housing debt is a matter we would like to address and what we would do with it.

I am pleased we were able to negotiate the \$30 million contribution from the Morrison Government under the City Deal for more social and affordable housing. For comparison, I have raised that as an example of what we can do with \$15 million a year and what benefit it can have. It demonstrates the value the Commonwealth has in terms of our advocacy for that money to come back through.

CHAIR - They have heard it a number of times, minister.

Ms WEBB - The same rationale could be applied internally within your own state Government, minister, that \$15 million spent in housing compared to \$15 million on a road or a bridge is quite significant in terms of impact on the community.

Mr JAENSCH - There are many pressures on a budget; at all times we advocate strongly and I am glad we have been able to bring \$20 million forward over the next two years to help us really maintain the high level of activity we currently have in the social housing program, which is peaking about now. In terms of winding up over the last few years reaching a high level of activity, wanting to keep that going because of the urgency of new supply in our market. I will continue to advocate in the budget process for the resources we need to do the job.

CHAIR - In terms of advocating for it when you do discuss, meet with or communicate with your federal counterpart, what were you actually asking for?

Mr JAENSCH - I am asking to have the debt retired.

CHAIR - Completely forgiven and no penalty attached?

Mr JAENSCH - My starting point is to do that and to not have it transferred over to a cut from GST receipts.

Ms WEBB - In the original affordable housing plan put out to 2015-25, data was presented on the housing needs in Tasmania as assessed in the preparation of that plan, and I quote from that -

Research indicates Tasmania needs an average of 2392 new dwellings a year to meet its long-term supply needs through to 2031. Of these new houses, it is

estimated that 13 112 (27 per cent) or 656 per annum need to be low-priced affordable homes. These homes need to be developed by a range of sector participants.

Those figures provided would have been put together in preparation for this plan prior to 2015, perhaps in 2013-14; have you updated data on the housing needs of the state, and particularly the affordable housing needs of the state, knowing how much has moved in that space in subsequent years?

Mr JAENSCH - I'll refer to Mr White in a minute because he is closer to this than I am, but there are two parts to that from me. First is that we have a very clear picture of current demand for social housing and other housing responses based on our housing register and our engagement with the sector generally. That's what is driving the immediate strategy and work program for Housing Tasmania and the Affordable Housing Action Plan, based on consultation that we undertook again late last year to refine that strategy. What we've also committed to in the second Affordable Housing Action Plan is to work with our social services and housing sector - and I think we named the University of Tasmania - to conduct some new modelling of future demand that takes account of things that have changed in the market since the original modelling was done. That's work that we've committed to do and it's in the action plan -

Ms WEBB - What's the time line on that work, minister, in the action plan?

Mr JAENSCH - I'll just refer to Peter White for advice on when we're aiming to commence that work. We aim to have that work completed by the end of the calendar year, this year.

Ms WEBB - Thank you.

I am on page 28 of the budget papers, Performance Information, output group 4, table 2.5. The performance measure there is talking about social housing owned and/or managed by the community sector. I note that the target for 2018-19, the current year, is 42.4 per cent and that's the same target being set for 2019-20. Can you tell me what the actual number of properties is represented by the 42.4 per cent and what proportion of those is owned and what proportion managed?

Mr JAENSCH - Mr White has that information to hand, I believe. I'm happy for you to speak to it directly.

Mr WHITE - Yes, the data there presented on the 42.4 per cent relates to a range of properties owned by the Director of Housing. In total that represents approximately 5300 dwellings and that's made up of properties managed under the Better Housing Futures arrangements, under supported accommodation and other community housing programs we have, community tenancies and the like, so they all come under that area. One area we have data on that we are working to improve is the properties owned and managed by the range of community providers providing social housing for clients that aren't owned by us but are owned by the organisation. We are looking to improve that data to have a better picture of the overall response.

Ms WEBB - So the 42.4 per cent is 5300 dwellings in 2018-19?

Mr WHITE - Yes. That would be the current figure.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - In terms of those owned, does it include the ones where title has been transferred or it doesn't it include the ones where title has been transferred?

Mr WHITE - That does not include properties that are in the title of those providers.

Ms WEBB - Why does the performance measure say - 'owned and/or managed'? Why isn't it just 'managed'?

Mr WHITE - This is the issue I was talking about around the data. We found this with Mr Fazackerley's reporting as well. The data we are getting from some of the community providers is at times incomplete or not as reliable as we would like. We are working on that. You're correct in that; we should just talk about that as being 'managed'.

Ms WEBB - There would be a separate figure presumably if you had the data available on 'owned'?

Given that you've had that as a target for the year we are currently in and for the 2019-20 year, have we settled at 42.4 per cent as the proportion for the foreseeable future?

Mr WHITE - Certainly, we have no intentions of changing that figure. As you can see under action plan 2, we obviously have a desire for a new supply to be developed through a committee of housing providers. Therefore, once we get better accounting over the rules, perhaps you will see that number include those owned by the providers as well as managed.

Ms WEBB - As we develop more social housing under that action plan, it doesn't change the proportion aspect of those managed by community sector providers?

Mr WHITE - Not significantly. Pure mathematics says. yes, if you are changing your numerator or your denominator, you are going to have a variation in percentages, but we are not seeing it as a substantial change from, say, 42 to 50 per cent or the other way.

Ms WEBB - Are there any further plans to transfer the titles of properties to community sector organisations?

Mr WHITE - There are no plans at this stage.

Ms WEBB - Do you have figures on the outcomes of the trial of transfer of title that was on the pilot, where I believe - and you could probably confirm the number - around 500 properties had their titles transferred to the community sector?

Mr WHITE - The titles transferred across that had been managed as tenancies will total 330. To date 230 have been transferred and 100 more are to be transferred to Centacare Evolve Housing when they complete their program.

Mr JAENSCH - That's under existing arrangements as opposed to any new or planned additions.

Mr WHITE - Correct. These were already tenancies they were managing under Better Housing Futures programs.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - Now title has been transferred on 230 already and another 100 to come; 330.

Mr WHITE - Yes, 100 to come. That is correct.

Ms WEBB - So we have never reached the 500 transfer of title figure? Was that ever in the mix?

Mr WHITE - While we had a target of 500, several providers who were interested in the program did not proceed. That's why the number was not achieved. I think your question was 'What outcomes'?

Ms WEBB - That's right. Let's talk about what the total figure has been, have you achieved what you were expecting in return for that gift of title?

Mr WHITE - What we are expecting is 159 new social housing dwellings to be completed. I need to make it very clear that this number includes 29 properties that were significantly refurbished. They were earmarked for demolition but they were significantly refurbished by Centacare Evolve Housing. There are 130 new constructs of which Salvation Army Housing is delivering nine and Centacare Evolve Housing, 121, and 29 extensively refurbished dwellings.

Ms WEBB - Is that in line with the intended outcome when this policy was first proposed? Was that level of return anticipated? If we went back and looked, would we find that it was anticipated?

Mr WHITE - The original target we had with the 500 to be transferred was 150. Given the numbers we transferred ultimately, we exceeded the target we had.

Mr VALENTINE - It is about the interaction between your portfolio and Disability Services in relation to housing matters, when people are expected to move into a house.

CHAIR - Disability Access Housing?

Mr VALENTINE - Yes, it might come under Housing Services.

Ms WEBB - I might have one that relates to that, if I may. Again, on page 28 in the Performance Information comments, it notes -

More new social housing will be construction over the 2019-20 budget and Forward Estimates to meet the diverse housing needs of Tasmanians. All new social housing properties will be universally designed and suitable diverse for a range of tenants, including the elderly, those living with a disability, families or singles.

With the needs of the community for a diverse range of properties, what research, data or modelling has been used to determine what those needs are? How has that been applied to the decisions made on the type and location of new properties planned in this Budget and forward Estimates?

Mr JAENSCH - I will ask Mr White to respond to the research aspect, but more generally will note there is a commitment of \$20 million over three years, specifically for provision of disability

housing and the adoption of the universal design approach will better enables a broader range of the houses we produce to be customised and fitted to needs of, say, people with mobility needs. In terms of research to inform what and where, I will ask Mr White to respond.

Mr WHITE - Certainly, some of the work that occurred when the Affordable Housing Strategy was developed, which you alluded to previously, forms part of what we do about our responses. We have recently been doing further work looking at demand around the state and the need at the LGA level. Within our portfolio, we manage approximately 7000-odd properties ourselves and we know within that 20 per cent of those people are on aged pension and 33 per cent are on disability support pensions. We know within our current portfolio that we have people at times in those cohorts who require modifications to homes and so on. Unfortunately, sometimes our homes are not suitable for those modifications. Looking at the growing level of accessible accommodation is something we see as very important to meet that need alone, plus also those people who are coming through the housing register, particularly, when in the private market, there is not a lot of accessible accommodation, whether it be private rental or home ownership markets.

Ms WEBB - Indeed, very little. Minister, would that mean as part of the data and modelling being done for you in conjunction with UTAS to be delivered at the end of this calendar year, will some modelling on the needs of diverse tenants be part of that work?

Mr JAENSCH - The demography of demand, yes, it will be part of that work.

CHAIR - Does that answer your question, Rob?

Mr VALENTINE - Partly. What happens when a person has a certain level of disability and a need for one of your houses to be changed to suit their accommodation? What sort of communication happens between you and the minister for disabilities to make sure those needs are met? What is the process?

Mr JAENSCH - The deputy secretary is the best person for both to take you through the process.

CHAIR - He looks at himself in the mirror and has a good discussion.

Mr WHITE - With the process we go through, if it is our tenants, they would often have an occupational therapist who would make recommendations over the design requirements for the tenant, whether it be access, bathroom or kitchen modifications. We scope those modifications up and consider whether the property is suitable. If someone said, 'They need a fully modified bathroom' and it has eight steps to the front door, well, it is probably not practical for that home to be looked at for that sort of modification. Where that occurs, we will work with the tenant to try to transfer them into something more appropriate. If there is new supply coming through, whether it be from Housing Tasmania or the community housing providers, we can certainly look to do a transfer as part of the process. We do allocate funds within our maintenance budget. There is also funding available through the NDIS for modifications for clients who are part of the NDIS for home modifications to make their homes more appropriate for their living circumstances.

Mr VALENTINE - I am aware of one case and will take it off-line with you because it is not fair to do it here.

CHAIR - No, not an individual case. Minister, we'll break for lunch, back at 2.00 p.m. and continue with Housing.

The committee suspended from 1.01 p.m. to 2.01 p.m.

**Output group 5
Housing Services**

5.1 Housing Services -

Ms LOVELL - Minister, we were talking about housing stock before we went to the break, and I would just like to follow on from that conversation.

Yesterday, you told the committee that there was total stock of public and community housing of 12 485 houses. Last year, in Estimates, it was 12 587. You have said this morning that to the end of May, there were 316 additional houses. That would equal 12 903. There is a shortfall there of 418 properties.

I am assuming that some of those may be because of HomeShare properties, but I am wondering if you can explain that shortfall, please.

Mr JAENSCH - There are a few different figures you have related there. The 12 485 is social housing properties including the social housing public, which is Housing Tasmania, Aboriginal housing.

Mr WHITE - Yes, we own those.

Mr JAENSCH - Community Housing, we own. Then there is supported accommodation, Better Housing Futures, and other community housing which comes under Community Housing as well. There have been transfers, in the period, comparing those two figures?

Mr WHITE - Yes, minister, there were some transfers.

Mr JAENSCH - And the 316 new houses are across the years from 2015 through to 2019, not the one year.

Ms LOVELL - So it's not in the last financial year?

Mr JAENSCH - No.

Ms LOVELL - How many of those were in the past financial year?

Mr JAENSCH - How many new social houses in the past financial year?

Ms LOVELL - Of the 316?

Mr JAENSCH - I will ask Mr White to give us the number of those.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr WHITE - Yes, I just have to refer to the Affordable Housing Strategy. Apologies, I don't have the number with us at the moment for this financial year. I thought I did.

Ms LOVELL - Can we get that?

Mr WHITE - Yes, we can certainly provide that.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you. The other line I would like to ask about is the HASI program - I can't remember what the acronym stands for.

Ms WEBB - Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you, Meg.

I understand the funding for this financial year has been transferred across to Health, because of the mental health connection, but there was \$500 000 in the last financial year that did come under line items in the Housing portfolio.

I have a couple of questions about this. What did that \$500 000 deliver in the last financial year? The initial election commitment was \$1 million over two years to the HASI program. It was originally under the Housing portfolio, \$500 000 per year in last year's Budget for this current financial year and 2019-20. The \$500 000 for 2019-20 has been transferred across to the Health portfolio in this year's budget papers. First of all, what has the \$500 000 in the budget papers for last year under Housing delivered in terms of that initiative and that commitment?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, happy to provide that now. This is the number of social houses delivered to 31 May: 155 new social housing dwellings. Now, the \$500 000 in the 2018-19 Budget for the HASI line item.

Mr WHITE - That program is being run through Mental Health, so we have been working with Colony 47, which has been identified and selected as the partner organisation to work with Mental Health on that program.

Ms LOVELL - So the \$500 000 from last year's Budget - the total commitment was \$1 million over two years; obviously one year of that is almost up, \$500 000 lay within the Housing budget for this financial year, so what has that \$500 000 delivered?

Mr WHITE - That extra money wasn't in the Housing budget. The money for HASI was certainly not in our allocation.

Ms LOVELL - Yes, it was in last year's budget. It has been transferred this year into Health.

Mr FAZACKERLEY - It was transferred.

Ms WEBB - Absolutely, it did.

CHAIR - Ask the money man.

Ms LOVELL - There was \$500 000 for the current financial year within the Housing budget for the delivery of HASI; I'm wondering what that has delivered.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr FAZACKERLEY - My estimation is that the current year amount has been transferred as well.

Ms LOVELL - That's not what's reflected in the budget papers. There's only one year's worth of funding and that total is \$500 000 in Health this year, so there was \$500 000 for this current financial year in Housing -

Mr JAENSCH - I'll ask Mr Fazackerley to confirm the advice that the amount was transferred post-budget papers.

Ms LOVELL - There is a second year's worth of funding, again \$500 000, but that doesn't add up.

Mr JAENSCH - You're talking about 2018-19 Budget?

Ms LOVELL - Correct.

Ms WEBB - And again, when asked about it the other day, the Health minister wasn't able to answer questions on it because it hadn't been in his portfolio for the first year.

Mr JAENSCH - We will get an answer for you on that, definitely.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you. While we're looking for that answer perhaps -

CHAIR - I think he has got it.

Mr FAZACKERLEY - It's probably one we need to confirm, but certainly my understanding is that it's clearly, as you say, an allocation last year of \$500 000 a year both in 2018-19 and 2019-20, but I would probably want to take the opportunity to confirm that both those amounts have been transferred.

Ms LOVELL - That's not what is reflected in the Health budget for this year. The Health budget in this year's budget papers shows \$500 000 for this year alone, so there seems to be \$500 000 that's gone missing there.

CHAIR - Did you ask the Health minister about this?

Ms LOVELL - I believe Ms Webb asked the Health minister.

Ms WEBB - I asked the Health minister about the HASI project; he acknowledged it was now sitting in his department. When I asked him about whether evaluations were to be done, he wasn't able to comment on what had been done to date because it hadn't been in his -

Ms LOVELL - Regardless of what's happening in this -

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, I'm happy to take that on notice, get clarification of it and report back.

Ms LOVELL - Thank you. The HASI program is to provide assistance to people and support people living with mental ill health and particularly long-term consumers of mental health services.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

It is a partnership between Housing and Health, so what conversations have you had, minister, with the Health minister about how the two departments can work together on this program?

Mr JAENSCH - I haven't had direct conversations with the Health minister about our work together on the program per se, but between our departments I'd be happy for the deputy secretary to make comment.

Mr WHITE - As I mentioned earlier, we have had conversations with Danny Sutton from Colony 47, who are looking to roll out the program. We have discussed how we might be able to support the housing response to that. We have also had conversations with Mental Health Services and its officers in relation to the initiative, for example, for us to understand what services are being provided, how they intersect or complement those services in the Housing Connect network and the housing response that would be associated with the program.

Ms LOVELL - I believe we have some more information coming on HASI - Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative - and how that funding has happened -

Mr WHITE - The funding transfers, yes.

Ms LOVELL - and what that has delivered in the last financial year. If we can go back to the housing stock question where we had further information come forward, in the last financial year to the end of May there were 155 additional -

Mr JAENSCH - Social housing dwellings.

Ms LOVELL - Yes. That still gives us a decrease of 257 dwellings, can you explain that shortfall or that decrease?

Mr WHITE - I believe the first part of answer relates to the 155 social housing dwellings. The majority of those are being delivered by community housing providers, so the numbers we are providing around the stock owned by the director does not include those properties. We talked earlier about the need to have the counting rules established so we know how many properties the different providers across the state have in relation to social affordable housing. Many of the 155 dwellings are not reflected in the figure of 12 000 you referred to before. Another aspect to that is last year's numbers, which were quoted as 12 442, included 135 properties under purchase contract.

Ms LOVELL - Last year's figure was 12 587, that was the figure given in Estimates.

Mr WHITE - Yes, the 12 587 would have been 12 442 plus the 135. The 135 are purchase contract properties, an historical arrangement in which the Director of Housing used to hold the title but it was a home ownership program. The 12 587 include 135 properties that come under that scheme. The numbers we have quoted today relate to social housing properties, they don't include the purchase contract properties.

Ms LOVELL - They are not the same measure, I suppose.

Mr WHITE - That is fair to say. If you took those numbers out, you would 12 442 last year.

Ms LOVELL - So, 12 442 and 12 485 this year?

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr WHITE - Yes.

Ms LOVELL - An increase of 43?

Mr WHITE - That is correct.

CHAIR - With regard to purchasing the home while the Director of Housing holds the title, is that the program you were referring to, Mr White?

Mr WHITE - Yes, it was called a purchase contract program.

CHAIR - Did the housing director maintain the title until it was paid off?

Mr WHITE - Yes, that was the way it worked. There are still quite a number of those in the system.

CHAIR - How many?

Mr WHITE - It goes back. It was 135 last year but they are reducing as people pay out the scheme. It was a program that started in the 1960s.

CHAIR - There are still 135 in that scheme?

Mr WHITE - There were 12 months ago, I don't know the latest number.

Mr FAZACKERLEY - The equivalent number Mr White is referring to, the total under previous assistance programs - there are 107 outstanding loans with a value of \$768 000 as at 31 March. That comprises both the old housing scheme, the purchase contracts Mr White talked about, the home purchase scheme, which was a later variant on the purchase contracts, and a very small number, only two, who had elected under the options within those contracts to convert to mortgage agreements.

CHAIR - Thank you. Did you find the answer to the question about the money?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - I have some people looking at it now.

Ms WEBB - In light of the National Rental Affordability Scheme - NRAS - coming to an end, what is the state Government's plan to assist households with the transition of properties to market rent as that scheme comes to end? Has money been allocated within the Budget to assist Tasmanian households with that transition? Presumably they will go from a situation in which rent was set below market rate under the NRAS and could be full market rate at the end of that scheme.

Mr JAENSCH - My advice is that the vast majority of the NRAS tenants in Tasmania are managed under long-term arrangements either with registered community housing providers or as student accommodation by the University of Tasmania. Community housing providers, under the national regulatory framework, do not charge any more than around 75 per cent of market rent. My department will continue to monitor the situation in case there are instances in which assistance might be needed toward helping people with continued access to affordable accommodation.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - That is reassuring for the vast majority, but what is the residual number of people who won't be covered by community housing or student accommodation?

Mr WHITE - The balance would be in some private investors who would have developed NRAS. I don't have a specific number but I can give an estimate if that would help. It would be around 290 dwellings.

Ms WEBB - That is not an insignificant number of tenants in private dwellings who may be facing switching from what can sometimes be thought of as affordable renting, below-market rent, into full market rent, potentially, with the end of NRAS. It could be 290 families.

Mr JAENSCH - I don't think anyone said that it isn't a reasonable number. It's not the vast majority of NRAS tenants.

Ms WEBB - For the 290 who will be impacted by the end of NRAS, are plans in place to support those families if their tenancies become unviable because their rent has increased?

Mr JAENSCH - Those coming out of NRAS arrangements will be doing so progressively, from this year through to 2025, so it won't all be in one hit. People entered NRAS arrangements under different eligibility criteria; some may be eligible for social housing under our current eligibility requirements and others maybe under the Private Rental Incentive program or another program that can cater for people who have higher income or other assets than those who qualify for the social housing register.

Ms WEBB - What I hear you saying, minister, is that the suite of opportunities that exist for the broad community now will exist for those 290 families as they are potentially no longer able to afford their home as NRAS comes to an end. You are not offering them anything further or any particular assistance. Is my understanding of what you are saying correct?

Mr JAENSCH - Anyone coming of those arrangements whose rent changes, are having difficulty or finding themselves in rental stress would have the full suite of products we currently have available to them, subject to them qualifying as per the normal process. One of the things that might be advantageous for them is if they know when their National Rental Affordability Scheme tenancy is expiring, they are able to investigate those options ahead of time.

Ms WEBB - It would be good if we had a method of contacting them for that. There may not be one.

Mr JAENSCH - It is a Commonwealth program but we could make inquiries.

Ms WEBB - I am not suggesting it would be easy to do that.

Currently there are 290 dwellings that exist in the private rental markets covered by NRAS. Are they counted in our tallying of affordable rental properties in the state?

Mr JAENSCH - They are not counted in any of our affordable housing strategy targets or completions. They are not included in the total figures for social housing properties that Mr White provided earlier to Ms Lovell but they would be included in ABS statistics covering affordable housing stock.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms WEBB - Through to 2025 we will lose 290 affordable rental properties in the state but that won't come off a tally anywhere that we will see.

Mr JAENSCH - Only if they have been included in ABS statistics. The other thing is that between now and 2025, other things can change in the market. One of the things that we have considered in our private rental incentive program is that in some cases that it may be that good tenants and landlords find that at the conclusion of an incentivised period, and again depending on what the market is doing around them, that they might be able to come to an arrangement.

Ms WEBB - I am absolutely thrilled that you bought that up, minister. I am very interested to see if that transpires. Won't we all be thrilled if that is that does happen? I will be interested to see when we have some data on that.

Can I make a suggestion: that with the 290 properties coming to an NRAS end, it would be wonderful to approach people to see if they would like to be involved in your Private Rental Incentive Scheme? That might be quite a nice receptivity if they could maintain a lower level of rent under your state-based scheme rather than the Commonwealth-based scheme.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, if they happen to be the right format of housing in the areas that we have identified demand that is an option.

CHAIR - We might need Mr Fazakerley to answer this one. We raised this earlier when we were in output group 4.1 in relation to the reallocation of overheads. The footnote for 5.1 says -

The variation in Housing Services reflects changes in the funding under the *National Housing and Homelessness Agreement*, as well as changes to applied overheads.

Could we have a breakdown of page 41, which is Revenue from Appropriation by Output. When Meg asked a question earlier about the dropping down of appropriation in the out-years in 4.1, most of it related to reallocation of overheads. We were told a lot of it went to this output group. I would like a breakdown of how much relates to additional money coming into this output group because of the reallocation of overheads, and how much we are losing in dollar terms as a result of the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement funding changes.

Mr JAENSCH - Mr Fazakerley, I will refer to your reading of this.

Mr FAZAKERLEY - I have a reconciliation based on the expenditure summary which is similar to table 2.2 on page 22.

The revenue from appropriation, of course, forms a part of the funding of that line. Housing is a little peculiar in that it has a fairly large retained revenue component through its rent roll. Most other parts are largely funded through the Consolidated Fund whereas Housing gets to retain its rent proceeds, so it is slightly different but the underlying movements are pretty consistent.

In that table there is a net movement of about 0.6 of a million dollars, from \$136.3 million down to \$135.7 million. If I look at the main movements, there is in fact quite a neat fit here. That is about 0.6 of a million dollars. We have a 0.6 million dollars exactly in the reduction of funding which was one-off funding under the Family Violence Action Plan, formerly from DPAC in the 2018-19 which dropped out because it was as settled as a one year-only funding.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

There were a range of other things including the ones mentioned in the footnote. So, the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement funding has increased by about half a million dollars - \$33.2 million up to \$33.7 million. There is a raft of other movements included in those overhead apportionments, which I won't bore the committee with again. Probably the other notable one is that there is an adjustment to the depreciation chart, which again is a non-cash item. As you know, of the large asset portfolio in Housing when we split the two agencies, the original apportionment of appreciation between the remaining agencies of Health and Communities wasn't quite right, so we have taken the opportunity to adjust it. A non-cash item doesn't affect dollars on the ground for service delivery.

That's the explanation for the first year of the 0.6 million. The out-years move fairly consistently. Of course, indexation is applied each year. The only large move is in that third year, moved to year 2021-22. The primary movement there is around the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement Funding where we see a drop in that year in the Commonwealth forward Estimates from \$34.3 million in 2020-21 to \$32.8 million in 2021-22, which is a \$1.5 million reduction. That coupled with indexation and overhead movements is the primary driver of that year.

CHAIR - Are overhead movements still flowing through all the way?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - There are minor adjustments in most of the years in this output area, for overhead adjustments. If you think of overheads as being a percentage of [inaudible] model, when you change a number, the number changes, if that makes sense.

But they are fairly minor movements. As I said, in this output in the year 1 movement there is a cash reduction of \$600 000 which equals the total movement in the output group in that first year.

CHAIR - That's family violence?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - Yes, it is the family violence drop. In that same year, there is a whole raft of movements both up and down; the two primary ones being an increase in funding under the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement offset by a reduction the other way in allocated depreciation. In the other years, there are very minor changes.

CHAIR - With corporate overheads, we're not just talking about depreciation, are we?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - No. They are two separate things. There are a range of accrual entries of which depreciation is probably the primary one in this space. Then we have overhead distribution apportionment that we talked about before. .

CHAIR - Yes. Have you got an amount for the overhead portion that was transferred?

Mr FAZACKERLEY - I might have to take that on notice because I have them rolled up into one line in my reconciliation with accruals including the depreciation line. In the out-year, the year 3 we are talking about, there's a \$430 000-odd adjustment, which would primarily be overhead adjustments. I would need to take it on notice if you want a detailed analysis because I have other accrual entries included in that figure.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - You mentioned the changes between 2020-21 and 2021-22. There is about a \$3 million change. It didn't seem to add up to that much in the changes you were referring to.

Mr FAZACKERLEY - I have noted a \$1.5 million or a bit over reduction in the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement. The other driver is a reduction on the back of some of those moves we apply, Treasury indexation, your movement of funded levels too. So, there is a slight reduction in indexation applied to this output group and a reduction, I think, driven by a forecast move. I will have to take this on notice because I have it listed as operational expenditure which will be potentially related to retained revenue levels, which I probably need to take on notice.

CHAIR - There is still almost \$1.5 million unaccounted for.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, I wanted to go back to HASI trial or commitment. I understand there is some work being done around where the funding of \$500 000 has disappeared to.

Mr JAENSCH - Not where it has disappeared.

Ms LOVELL - As minister you are not across where it has gone. Nobody seems to be across where it has gone.

Mr JAENSCH - I do not think you can assume it has disappeared.

Ms LOVELL - My point is the HASI trial was one of the Hodgman Government's commitments around the election. It is part of this very beautifully produced second year agenda, Building Your Future, page 13, quarter 1, April to June 2019. We are now in the beginning of June 2019. One of the items is identified in this document, so obviously it is of importance to the Government and is one I am pleased to see, because it is a gap in Tasmania and an important initiative, is supposed to be taking place in the April-June quarter - which we are coming to the end of - is to commence the Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative Trial. HASI will be a partnership between the Tasmanian Health Service, Housing Tasmania and Colony 47 to provide Tasmanians with mental illness better clinical and psycho-social support linked with stable housing and its supported accommodation. Are we on track to commence the trial before the end of June as committed to in this document?

Mr JAENSCH - I expect we are. I need to direct you back to the Minister for Health because that is where the project lead exists now.

Ms LOVELL - As we said earlier, the Minister for Health directed us to you. We can leave that aside for now. Again, my question to you is: given this is a partnership between Housing and Health, what conversations have you had with the minister about how this partnership arrangement will work? It has been in the pipeline for 12 months.

Mr JAENSCH - I have not had a direct conversation with the minister, but our departments clearly have across our different elements we share in that initiative.

Ms LOVELL - I do not know it is clearly.

Mr JAENSCH - Housing working with Colony 47 and with the Health department.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms LOVELL - You are happy to say you are confident this program will commence before the end of June?

Mr JAENSCH - This has been our commitment and I have heard nothing to say it will not be proceeding, but we do not have the project lead on that now.

Ms LOVELL - The funding has not transferred to Health until this coming financial year.

Mr JAENSCH - We are clarifying the funding transfer. The project management, I understand, is with Health now. The person we need to give us the definitive answer on the funds transfer is in other Estimates hearing at the moment, so we cannot get them straightaway. We will take that on notice. You need to get your answer on the status and the timing of commencement of that initiative from the Health portfolio.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, I find it really difficult to believe and accept this is one of the Hodgman Government's election commitments. It was something that fell into the Health portfolio. It was in last year's budget papers. There was a description of the program. It is a partnership agreement. It is in this document. It is clearly one of your Government's lead items, one of the big projects you are delivering. How is possible as the minister responsible for one of the portfolios involved in this partnership you are not across this?

Mr JAENSCH - Not the lead. I refer you to the Health portfolio.

Ms LOVELL - There is a partnership between Housing and Health, the lead being Health, you are telling us now, so the lead is the only one who needs to know about that? Nobody else in that partnership needs to be across? The minister responsible for those other portfolios does not need to be across this?

Mr JAENSCH - You have heard before in previous answers on this same topic there has been engagement across the agencies and with external party in Colony 47. Health is the lead on this and you should be directing your questions to them.

Ms LOVELL - Okay.

Ms WEBB - To Housing and the homeless area: on the Private Rental Incentives Scheme pilot we spoke about briefly, has it been evaluated on the basis for a decision to extend it for a further four years?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes.

Ms WEBB - Can you tell me what that showed in terms of the total cost of that pilot phase, including the breakdown of that cost in terms of the internal costs to the department to administer and evaluate it? Any costs incurred by community housing participants? Any cost of subsidies provided to the owners? I would also like to know the number of households assisted in the pilot and therefore a cost breakdown per household assisted.

Mr JAENSCH - As at 29 May, 110 properties have been accepted into the pilot scheme; 84 of those are under lease with tenants. Also I note 116 properties that applications have been made for were declined because they were inappropriate, not in the areas we need, or met the other criteria. Total expenditure under the pilot has been \$1.55 million, including incentive payments of \$965 000

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

to participating property owners, tenancy management payments of \$400 000 to participating community housing providers that are the head lease holders and administration costs estimated at \$189 380 towards property consultants and advertising to raise awareness of the initiative. Again 110 approved, 84 households tenanted.

Ms WEBB - So under 84 tenanted, what is the cost of those 84?

Mr JAENSCH - Cost per household assisted is approximately \$11 488 which does not include the administration cost.

Ms WEBB - With the pilot and the 84 leased within the pilot scheme, how many of those have now expired in their 12 months?

Mr JAENSCH - The first ones will be due to expire shortly and Housing Tasmania has been in contact with the property owners and tenants to talk to them about their interest in entering the second phase of the private rental incentive program.

Ms WEBB - The second phase where they would continue to receive an incentive payment or where it then becomes a matter between landlord and tenant?

Mr JAENSCH - Where they would roll into the revised scheme, which will operate over the next four years. The pilot has been evaluated and views sought from various participants and their views taken aboard so we are able to see what has and what does not work and what is a good fit to the current market conditions. Under the second stage Affordable Housing Strategy, we committed to continuing the scheme after completing the evaluation. Evaluation has occurred and the model has been amended. Longer lease terms of two years will now be offered with the option to extend for a further two years for the property owner and the tenant. Maximum weekly rental amounts and incentive amounts for property owners have been updated. The incentive amounts vary by region and property type, to reflect differing market conditions and supply and demand in different parts of the state. Rents for tenants are capped at between 25 and 30 per cent below median rental rates for the area. Revised incentive amounts available to property owners are \$14 000, being \$7000 per annum over a two-year lease for one- and two-bedroom properties in the north and north-west; \$12 000 on a similar basis for three- and four-bedroom properties in the north and north-west; \$18 000, being \$9000 per annum over a two-year lease for one-, two- and three-bedroom properties in the south; and \$16 000, being \$8000 per annum for two years for four-bedroom properties in the south.

We are currently discussing these changes and updates with existing property owners and tenants to confirm if they wish to continue in the program. Our intention is that as many of those as possible who want to continue will be rolled into that new scheme.

Ms WEBB - Would they enter the two-year element?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. Two years with the capability to roll over for a further two years.

Ms WEBB - So they would come into year 1 of the first two years?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, that's right.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

What can happen during the period of time people have been in the private rental incentive program, is that the market conditions are changing around us. We are adjusting our levels of incentive to reflect the changing market, but if someone is entering a private rental incentive deal now for two years and potentially rolling for another two years, the private rental market conditions at the end of that period might be quite different to what they are now. They may be a low-income household which then has a four-year rental history, a relationship with a property owner and backing behind them to go out into the market, which they might not have had before.

Ms WEBB - One of the things that the homelessness sector often wonders about and that comes to mind here under the Affordable Housing Action Plan, which commits the Government to building a range of new and extended emergency and transitional accommodation facilities, is the recurrent funding commitment for ongoing operations of those facilities and whether it is adequate to meet the need for that. Specifically, does this Budget commit additional ongoing funds sufficient to meet the operational needs of the new Youth at Risk Centre in the north, the expansion of Thyne House, the expansion of Magnolia Place, the Hobart Youth Foyer, the Burnie Youth Foyer and the new Men's Shelter in the north-west?

Mr JAENSCH - For the new homeless and supported accommodation and Youth Foyer developments in the Affordable Housing Action Plan, no, the current Budget and forward Estimates do not include their recurrent operating costs.

What we know is that for each of those, particularly the larger new foyer developments, there is a considerable lead time in planning and identification, securing sites and development approvals, partnerships et cetera. We are progressing into the capital works program for those.

Ms WEBB - That's budgeted for?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, but there is a lead time for that. Once that is commenced, we will be starting the process of working out the operating model, who we are doing it with and what the costings will be for that and when they will kick in. We will then be making budget allocations for the years they fall due.

Ms WEBB - You are not thus far budgeting for the operational elements of those facilities? Can you just repeat the ones you said that was the case for?

Mr JAENSCH - The new Youth at Risk Centre in the north, expansion of Thyne House, the Magnolia Place expansion, Hobart Youth Foyer, Burnie Youth Foyer and the new Men's Shelter.

Ms WEBB - So for all those ones I listed we are not budgeting yet for operational funding?

Mr JAENSCH - And those costs aren't due for a couple of years.

Ms WEBB - The Wintringham Specialist Aged Care development at Wirksworth, which is a partnership with the Department of Communities Tasmania, is a fantastic model. Can you provide an update on that initiative and the ongoing funds committed to bringing that to fruition?

Mr JAENSCH - I can proudly do so. The Wintringham at Wirksworth has been talked about and planned for some time. The development application has been approved and the planning permit issued by Clarence City Council. The tender for construction of the facility will be released very soon and construction is expected to take around 18 months. It will provide affordable

high-quality care and accommodation to elderly Tasmanians who are financially disadvantaged, homeless or at risk of being homeless. Construction is worth around \$13 million, subject to confirmation of a tender and the site, once operational, will involve 32 full-time jobs. Where the operator has a licence as a Commonwealth aged care provider, their business model is dependent on a [inaudible] aged-care facility funding under that licence. We have invested in the built facility and it is very exciting; it is a beauty.

CHAIR - Minister, I want to ask about the maintenance of the properties Housing Tasmania has responsibility for. There has been a significant backlog. What are your outstanding maintenance expectations and what progress have you made in the last 12 months?

Mr JAENSCH - Is this regarding current contracts to provide maintenance?

CHAIR - I would like a comprehensive update on maintenance because it is an ongoing challenge.

Mr JAENSCH - Investing in maintenance is key to providing safe and secure housing that meets community standards and the needs of our tenants. Following a successful tender process for general maintenance of Housing Tasmania's portfolio, new contracts commenced on the 1 July 2018 for an initial four-year period expiring on 30 June 2022. New contracts provide for increased accountability, performance measuring and process monitoring, which will generate lots of data. New arrangements are already delivery improvements by way of increased level of service to Housing Tasmania tenants; financial savings for Housing Tasmania; increased capability to undertake planned works, including disability modifications and improved transparency with respect to subcontractors' payments - that is an interesting one we could discuss if you want to - increased opportunities for employment in the regions in which the new contractors operate; and access to new technology, including 3D void property scanning used to record details of the property in [inaudible], enabling 3D walkthroughs so you can verify quantities used in delivering property maintenance. Do you also use that in tenanting processes?

Mr WHITE - We can use the diagrams for those purposes.

Mr JAENSCH - Housing Tasmania will continue its planned maintenance and upgrade programs to ensure the deferred maintenance liability continues to decrease. This ensures the value of the portfolio's maximised current deferred maintenance liability for the social housing portfolio is estimated at approximately \$60 million. Properties managed by Housing Tasmania make up approximately \$25 million of that amount. This has seen a steady reduction over the last few years as the portfolio continues to benefit through more targeted, planned maintenance -

CHAIR - Is that comparable? You said it has reduced regarding the number of houses Housing Tasmania has, but if you have reduced the number of properties you own, it's not necessarily a useful measure.

Mr JAENSCH - The \$60 million includes the Better Housing Futures properties. The breakdown is between \$25 million and \$35 million.

Mr WHITE - It is around \$34.5 million -

Mr JAENSCH - This is of the Better Housing Futures properties, with \$25 million in the Housing properties. The deferred maintenance liability for Better Housing Futures properties was

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

reduced by a little over \$2 million this year, and \$9.5 million over the life of the Better Housing Futures. The estimated maintenance budget for 2019-20 is \$22.3 million. Of this, the estimated general maintenance works for 2019-20 are likely to be approximately \$19.9 million and \$2.8 million on landscape maintenance. It is anticipated approximately \$5.6 million will be spent on the planned maintenance program, which includes upgrading lock replacements, internal and external painting, heating efficiency upgrades and kitchen and bathroom upgrades.

CHAIR - You said that the overall deferred maintenance liability is still a challenge but it doesn't mean you only have that to deal with. More maintenance will be required this year. How has that liability declined over the last five years?

Mr WHITE - We had an estimate of around \$90 million a number of years ago, which has been used -

CHAIR - How many years ago, sorry?

Mr WHITE - It was five or six years ago. We developed a methodology the Department of Treasury and Finance supported, which looks at the condition of a number of components in each of our homes and ranks those from a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 being as new. Depending on the various elements, we attached a prize or cost of replacement to those properties. For example, if it was a kitchen and if it was a 1, it might have a \$7000 or \$8000 cost attached to it as deferred maintenance, indicating that kitchen is in very poor condition. That figure is calculated is based upon those formulas, using our condition assessments as they are updated in the system.

CHAIR - Who has the contract?

Mr JAENSCH - Maintenance services are provided through a head contractor model with four providers across two regions: general maintenance in the greater north, which I take is north and north-west -

Mr WHITE - That's correct.

Mr JAENSCH - I think you're the only person who calls it the greater north - RTC Facilities Maintenance, which has a depot at Cooe; and in the greater south it is Contact Electrical Pty Limited. The contracts for landscape services are, in the greater north, with the Dess Corporation, and with Alison's Garden and Landscape Pty Limited in the greater south.

CHAIR - Minister, you mentioned the greater levels of accountability and reporting in your first response to my question. Can you go through how this new contract arrangement will improve that because it has always been a challenge?

Mr JAENSCH - I am remembering this from before I was minister. One of the features of this is how we are factoring in transparency regarding the subcontracting rates. These are head contractors and will be engaging local providers. One of the changes made - and Peter will fill in the gaps - is that we have visibility of the subcontractors' charges so the head contractors are not bundling up and choosing their own rates at what they pay their subcontractors. We have head contractors for the purposes of maintaining our overall maintenance programs and that is their management responsibility. They will engage people locally, but we are able to see through them to the local contractors and ensure those people are being paid at proper charge rates. That is a safeguard.

CHAIR - What sort of margin does the head contractor take?

Mr JAENSCH - It works on a different model to previously. I will get Peter to explain.

Mr WHITE - I could give you an example. We use scheduled rates items and for the replacement of a front door - say, if it is \$200, that is the fee the subcontractor will get paid. Under the previous model, if that was \$200, the subcontractor might only get paid \$100 for that. What the new contract has done is decouple the scheduled rates items and the payments that go to the works from the management, which includes the coordination of works across a range of sub-trades. The provider's management fees are essentially a percentage fee of the total works under their program. The two head contractors receive that fee, which is performance-based. There is a set of criteria we use each month in looking at the contracts, timelessness of work, quality of the work and so on. Some relates to tenant feedback et cetera. If they are slow in doing the work, if the quality of work is poor, the head contractor is the one penalised under the contract. The subcontractors will get paid the \$200 for the door or whatever it is. It is open to transparency and the smaller businesses receive a fair payment for the work they do.

Mr JAENSCH - Which is better in regional areas like ours.

CHAIR - There is still a significant backlog, or deferred liability as you called it. Do you have an expectation of a period in which you clear this or is it going to keep on rolling along? In five or six years, it has gone from \$90 million notionally to \$60 million.

Mr JAENSCH - One of the things that does knock it down somewhat -

CHAIR - Selling off old tired houses?

Mr JAENSCH - It is. It is moving out of some and either selling them through property sales, mostly to their tenants under HomeShare or some other arrangement or in some cases, demolition of old properties, houses on large blocks and replacement with multiple smaller, more modern units up to current specifications. We retire some of the liability with those properties and turn one house into two or three that meet our current demand. There is a fair bit of that going on and that program will knock big holes in our long-term budgets.

CHAIR - That will be classified as capital expenditure, not maintenance, if you were knocking it down and building a new one? Maybe the knocking down would be maintenance? How you categorise is a matter for the accountant.

Mr JAENSCH - If we have a property from an asset management perspective, due to have its roof and kitchen replaced and a decision is made the house is no longer a good fit to the demand we have for that area and could more profitably for the Housing Register, put three units on the block, then we achieve a better stock outcome and retire some of our deferred maintenance. It comes off the books at the same time.

CHAIR - Is there an expectation of retiring this liability in the foreseeable future?

Mr JAENSCH - There is an expectation the number will continue to come down but what I do not have is a program that says by when. I have not had advice on that.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

CHAIR - In terms of the ones that you have knocked down and built a number of units, do you have numbers of those that have been converted from a single dwelling to two or three units?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, we should be able to report against that program; I will just ask Mr White.

CHAIR - I assume these are done around the state, not just -

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, it is one of the programs we have. For example, 26 properties in 2016-17, 15 properties in 2017-18 and none in this financial year to date. The community housing providers or the Better Housing Futures providers would also be in their portfolios making those same sorts of changes as they are either refurbishing or retiring old properties and replacing them with new ones. Their reduced liability would be working the same way.

Ms LOVELL - Minister, Hobart City Council has called on the Government to work with the council on addressing the homelessness crisis in Hobart. Yesterday you committed to meet with the council and I am pleased to hear that, it is an excellent first step. What additional funding is there in the Budget or what options are there to bring funding forward, to fund any initiatives or solutions that might come out of that meeting?

Mr JAENSCH - I am yet to have a confirmed date for that meeting or an agenda to understand the council's specific expectations or if they have any proposals that are new. As I understand it, first up it is to get stakeholders in discussion to see what the ideas are and to update each other on what we are already doing.

We have, over the last 12 months, predominantly in the Greater Hobart area, spent around \$1.9 million on homelessness services and outreach through Housing Connect, which includes engaging more staff resources on the ground to move around the Greater Hobart area and interact with people who are sleeping rough or finding themselves in acute housing stress, and additional funds for brokerage, the capacity to secure motel rooms, cabins in caravan parks and other forms of accommodation to take people for a short-term crisis care before they can be relocated into longer term or transitional accommodation.

We have been investing to that level and we have also indicated to the organisations providing that service that we will stay in touch with them and their assessment of the needs for more resources in those areas. I have met this week with Colony 47, TasCOSS, Shelter and Anglicare and asked them for their updates on what they consider the outstanding needs to be, or new modes of service delivery for homeless people in the Greater Hobart area and in the north, through Anglicare, where they are the provider for Housing Connect.

We have extended what was a winter package from last year now into a year-round package and over the next four years, through the Affordable Housing Action Plan, on that same basis that we will extend it to meet demand for provision of those services. Within the Affordable House Action Plan 2 we have embedded that service. Within the \$125 million and the money brought forward we have some flexibility in being able to bring forward or reallocate money within that overall budget to meet those needs.

Ms LOVELL - The \$1.9 million you spent on homelessness services I am assuming has been over the last financial year: is that funding continuing for that purpose into the next financial year?

Mr JAENSCH - What is committed to in the action plan is a continuation of the capacity to deliver and actual drawdown will depend on what is spent in each of those years. We have added resources to the program over the last 12 months as it has been needed, but that has given us an indicative cost for running the service over the last year.

Ms LOVELL - So that capacity is still there?

Mr JAENSCH - That capacity will continue over the four years. We have the ability to talk about how we best deploy those sorts of resources and supplement if needed.

Ms LOVELL - Okay. Minister, you have spoken about \$20 million of funding brought forward to address the housing crisis, what should we expect to see this funding spent on?

Mr JAENSCH - The \$20 million is funding brought forward from 2022-23 financial year into the next two financial years is \$10 million in 2019-20 and \$10 million in 2020-21. In discussion with the department, when we asked what can be accelerated in the overall work program that was also in most urgent need, the area of our work plan that came back was the social housing investment program. I have asked Peter and his team to build a work program delivering more houses sooner. That will be reflected in the soon. We will be releasing an indicative schedule of tenders for provision of capital works across the four years of the portable Housing Action Plan. We undertook this as action 3.1 under the action plan, predominantly to give our community housing providers and their building contractors, subcontractors and suppliers a picture of the pipeline of work so they could coordinate and pace themselves. This also helps us to make the most efficient use of available workforce and at a time where everyone is very busy. We will be releasing this soon once it's finalised and should have a clearer picture of how many dwellings, where we have been able to bring forward the commencement and time frames in which we would expect them to be delivered.

Ms LOVELL - How will applicants for accommodation through HASI interact with the current waitlist for Housing Tasmania applicants? Will it operate out of the same waiting list?

Mr WHITE - The applicants for HASI would be coming through the Housing system so they would be on our register and identified for the program. We would probably expect some clients in the program may not need housing, they may even have it or other forms of satisfactory housing. But for those who do require it, we would look. Again, it is consistency about having the single door for a housing system and clients know they can go there. That was part of the reason for Colony 47 being involved, because it managed the front door in the south for us under Housing Connect.

Ms LOVELL - Have any decisions been made around where they will fall into the priority on the waiting list or will those applicants take priority? Will there be properties specific to HASI or how will that operate?

Mr WHITE - We are still working through some detail. We have some rapid rehousing properties associated with mental health. There could be some of our own portfolio or property provided by community housing providers, or potentially properties in the private rental market, whether under it's under the private rental incentive or through the normal Private Rental Assistance Program. Those clients will be identified separately within our waiting list, those who are eligible, so they can identify those HASI clients to provide them with housing. They certainly would be seen as priority applicants on the register.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Ms LOVELL - How many Tasmanians is this program going accommodate or provide for?

Mr JAENSCH - I don't have that information.

I am very keen for you to direct the bulk of your questions on this back to Health, where they are the lead on this initiative.

Ms LOVELL - Yes, I think I understand that.

Mr VALENTINE - Some further information on the housing debt, the Commonwealth debt. You said you are hoping have the debt retired.

Mr JAENSCH - I would like it to be. I'm not holding my breath, but we're going to keep asking for it.

CHAIR - It has been asked for many times.

Mr VALENTINE - Just wondering if you aware of what the situation other states are in with regard to their debts? Have they been retired and what is the circumstance? You probably hear this from other ministers.

Mr JAENSCH - I understand all states and territories, except Victoria, have an outstanding debt. I think Victoria paid its debt down. They paid it off earlier.

South Australia has negotiated some relief but still has a residual debt, and I understand they had some other offsets potentially as well, in the numbers area.

This is one of the things we need to be watchful of, and other members of the committee sort of winked at earlier. When I discuss this with my colleagues, I will campaign for retirement of the debt, but we don't want that to be transferred to a cut in other Commonwealth revenues.

CHAIR - Just on that, minister, if you were offered a retirement of the debt in the form of a grant that was going to be considered by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in our assessment of our GST, would you refuse it?

Mr JAENSCH - As a responsible minister and Cabinet member, I would have to be in discussion with my colleagues about the net impact on Tasmania of doing so.

CHAIR - I expect it's just a transfer to Finance-General and let them handle it, as the member for Nelson suggested.

Mr JAENSCH - Certainly, when we're in the argy-bargy on these things, someone will nominate whose budget the money should now come out of.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps now, minister, that you sit in this new arrangement where you have a coordinated say in decisions about outcomes that cross-portfolio areas - I have forgotten the name of that arrangement you now sit in - but perhaps you will more sway to have it moved across.

Mr JAENSCH - The Strategic Growth Subcommittee. Who knows? I will always champion the case for more funding for my portfolios. We have been moderately successful so far.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

At the same time, we need our Health system. We need our education, schools and teachers. Everyone will suggest where they think it should come from.

Ms WEBB - The money doesn't have to come from there, from those roads instead.

CHAIR - When we look at the way the Treasurer has managed the Budget, this year, he tucks away and he's done it last year as well. He tucks away amounts in Finance-General, this time notionally for Health demand. Last time it was for Health and it was all sucked up, as Health will suck up most of the cash that is not nailed down to some other portfolio.

The question I have here is: if your approaches to the Commonwealth come with a 'Yes we will retire your debt. It will be done in the form of a grant that will be not quarantined from the GST assessment', would you then go to the Treasurer and your other colleagues and suggest that you don't wish to accept the debt be transferred to Finance-General, being the logical place?

Mr JAENSCH - I hear your proposition and there are lots of variations on it. I will always be looking for the resources that we need in my portfolio, and I will participate in the budget process, like all the other ministers do.

CHAIR - We have people living on the streets. We have people who are working and are homeless. It is not just the unemployed people, which tends to be the view of some - I'm not saying you but some in the general public who think it is the dole bludgers who don't have a home.

Mr JAENSCH - We always need to address the whole spectrum.

CHAIR - It is much broader than that. You have a significant deferred liability in maintenance and we have spoken about the public housing stock. There is a huge need.

Mr JAENSCH - That is why we put \$125 million toward it last year, and why I have been able to -

CHAIR - I accept that but there is another \$7 million -

Mr JAENSCH - negotiate \$20 million into the next couple of years and \$30 million from the Commonwealth for social housing for the next two years. We will continue to pursue the housing debt issue with vigour but not in such a way that it is a sleight of hand in that what we pick up on the swings we lose on the roundabouts.

CHAIR - People who are homeless are more at risk of using our acute health services and disengaging from our education system. If we look at Finland, the Housing First policy, what they do for all of their citizens - admittedly, they pay a lot more tax than we do and more than we are prepared to pay, but housing is the first priority. Are we going to look at a housing first approach in order to address the challenges in health, education, justice and other areas?

Mr JAENSCH - The challenge we have across the board, regardless of the mechanism, is supply; the sheer physical capacity to accommodate all the people who need it. We don't have under-occupancy of our housing stock in the public, social or broader market. It is below 1 per cent and we are at above 99 per cent occupancy. We have to generate more houses, which means we need more land available in the right areas and we are working on that. We need to deliver more

housing on that land for those who cannot provide their own and we need to create incentives and continued confidence in the private investment market, which is going to deliver many times more houses than the government ever will alone. As supply starts to meet demand, there is downward pressure on property prices and rents and they begin to normalise again. There will always be those in acute need, we will always need to support people who find themselves in housing crisis for a range of reasons, but we are in a particularly hot period of not having enough houses.

CHAIR - We have to deal with these challenges in the short term. Winter is here, suddenly, and there are opportunities to utilise tiny houses and self-contained pop-up houses. Rather than have tents at the showground, you could purchase some of those in a range of public spaces in order to manage this in the interim. Has that been considered?

Mr JAENSCH - There are many ideas. You might recall that when we introduced the Housing Land Supply Act last year, the first draft included a proposal to create temporary TRPs, we called them - short-term, temporary residential permits that, from a planning perspective, provided a mechanism by which you could take a piece of land in any zone and create the temporary housing on it. We received consistent, strong advice from a considerable cross-section of the social services and housing sector that it was not a solution they wanted to see pursued.

CHAIR - Not even for the short-term? The risk is that it becomes a long-term -

Ms WEBB - Chair, that was the concern of some in the sector.

CHAIR - I understand that.

Ms WEBB - That is only because the sector had no faith there would be the delivery of the medium- to long-term outcomes to then shift people from a temporary arrangement. I don't mean to speak on behalf of the whole sector in saying that but that would have been the general concern.

CHAIR - I share that concern, but having people in tents at the showground and other places is not good. We have people in tents in the main street of Wynyard, as you would know if you have been at home recently.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, I am aware of that too. We received very strong advice that it wasn't the type of solution that would work. We changed the draft bill to remove that provision because of that strong feedback. My question now, and I put it again to some of those peak bodies the other day, was; if not that, what? Something I am hearing in the public discussion is a lot of people wanting to be involved in creating a solution. It concerns me a little is increasingly the talking about 'the homeless people' as one group of people needing one solution but they're not. Until other better and well-supported options are presented, we will keep working on investing in capacity at all stages of the program; the outreach crisis response, more shelters, more space in shelters, more transitional accommodation for people to progress into and longer-term accommodation, so that you can move people through that system and match them with solutions that meet their individual needs because they're not all the same. We can't fill up a football ground with cabins and put all of our homeless people there to make the problem go away.

Ms WEBB - There was an unfortunate quote from the Treasurer in *The Mercury* on Tuesday 28 May. Treasurer Peter Gutwein, said, '...the Government was already doing all it could to help ease the present housing crisis.'. I hope we would agree that there is always more we can

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

be looking to do and it would be your intention as minister to be endeavouring to do considerably more to help ease this crisis across your tenure.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. You will see is a large range of initiatives and issues raised that we've undertaken to deal with in the Affordable Housing Action Plan. We need to treat that plan as a living document that is responsive to changes in demand and new initiatives that come up. That is going to be one my challenges; being accountable for delivering on the targets are set under that, at the same time as being flexible and responsive to new needs as they arrive. Perhaps my colleague, the Treasurer, was referring to the work we are doing at all levels in the system, from outreach and crisis support to shelters, transitional, supported accommodation, aged care, social housing and incentivising greater private investment and home ownership at the other end of the pipeline. You can't pick one part of that market and that pipeline and invest in it. We have to deal with capacity at all levels.

Ms WEBB - Perhaps that is what the Treasurer meant.

Mr JAENSCH - That's what he meant, yes. He tends to be short sometimes on some things but that's what he meant, I believe.

Ms WEBB - Minister, can you clarify how much the maintenance budget for Housing Tasmania has changed since the commencement of the Better Housing Futures program? It would be useful to have year on year data from 2013 through to 2019, which shows the maintenance budget for public housing and the maintenance budget for Better Housing Futures properties. Could we also have a breakdown of the current deferred maintenance liability for both those of cohorts of housing; public housing and community managed housing?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. The maintenance budget by year for public housing was \$32.8 million in 2013-14; \$21.3 million in 2014-15; \$20 million in 2015-16; \$22.6 million in 2016-17; \$23.4 million in 2017-18; and \$22.99 million in 2018-19.

The maintenance budget by year for Better Housing Futures is given in a different way. It's average cost per property as opposed to overall portfolio budget. Better Housing Futures didn't come fully online until July 2014. So for 2014-15, that was \$3263 average cost per property. For 2015-16, it was \$3310; 2016-17, \$3810; and 2017-18, \$2499. Year to date for 2018-19, \$2269 as at 31 March. Do you have a supplementary question?

Ms WEBB - The deferred liability maintenance for public housing and for community-managed housing. You might have given the public housing to Rhys already.

Mr JAENSCH - As at 31 March, the total for maintenance liability was \$60 million for public housing and Better Housing Futures together, of which \$25 million is public housing and \$34.55 million is for Better Housing Futures.

Mr VALENTINE - How do you quality assure that?

Mr JAENSCH - I do not have an answer for that. Mr White -

Mr WHITE - Under our contracts we have quality assurance officers who work for Housing Tasmania, who do audits of the work. For general maintenance works they do around 20 per cent of works. For all the vacated works they do 100 per cent.

Mr VALENTINE - Thank you.

Capital Investment -

CHAIR - We have touched on some of these divisions on the way. Does anyone have any questions?

Mr VALENTINE - Mine have been answered on the way through.

CHAIR - I think we have addressed most of those on the way through, minister. That brings to the end this exciting part of your portfolio area.

Mr JAENSCH - I would like to thank the secretary, Mr White, and Mr Fazackerly for their excellent work, and the work still to come in providing answers to questions taken on notice.

CHAIR - We will send you a letter about things that are outstanding.

The committee suspended from 3.27 p.m. to 3.32 p.m.

DIVISION 6

(Department of Planning)

CHAIR - Welcome back minister to a new portfolio area. I would like you to introduce the people on your side of the table and then if you would like to make a brief opening statement about this area.

Mr JAENSCH - I would like to introduce Kath Morgan-Wicks who is the Secretary of the Department of Justice and Brian Risby who is Director of the Policy Planning Unit. Thank you I will make a short opening statement. From the outset in this portfolio the thing that was top of mind for me was the reform fatigue facing local government, in particular across Tasmania. It has been in the process of being interim draft or transmission through episodes of reform for over a decade and we set the top priority for me as planning minister to finalise the Tasmanian Planning Scheme and associated reforms.

To aid this I reached out to our local government councils across the state and asked them to help me with that challenge and to bring forward their work on their local provision's schedules, which is the last component of the new Tasmanian Planning Scheme. To have those available for the Tasmanian Planning Commission to start its assessment by the middle of this year. We built an acceleration program across the PPU and the Tasmanian Planning Commission and moved some extra resources into a position where we could assist councils directly where they needed it, to finalise the work on their LPS'S. Which is an addition to some cash we have provided earlier to each region to assist with that task and to acquire data and matters like that.

I am pleased to advise as of the end of June, we expect to have nearly half of those council LPs's formally lodged and the majority of the others complete in their work program and awaiting their council's formal endorsement, ahead of submission. This means we end up with critical mass of LPS's then able to be fed into and work flow plan through the Tasmanian planning commission

so they can be assessed expeditiously and we can get to the end of the assessment and adoption of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme as efficiently as possible. I thank local government for responding to that call to action and getting an enormous amount of work done over the past year to make that happen.

Another component of the reform that we have foreshadowed is to build something into the planning system in Tasmania which has been missing for very many years in the form of Tasmanian planning policies, to provide purpose and direction for the regional land use strategies and the application of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme at a local level.

Formal preparation of draft Tasmanian planning policies has now commenced. The first stage will be the release of a scoping paper, through which we will seek the views of a broad range of stakeholders and ordinary Tasmanians on what they believe the planning policies should address and what an initial suite of policies should look like, how it should be structured and how it should be integrated. That is a process that is getting underway now. While the LPSs are being assessed, we aim to be working through the development of those Tasmanian planning policies.

We've also been, through the Planning portfolio, sitting alongside my Housing portfolio, pulling planning levers that can help us to address the need for greater supply of housing across Tasmania. We have the Housing Land Supply Act, which enables the fast-track rezoning of government-owned land. That is to make it suitable for affordable housing development in areas of high demand. That passed through the parliament and we've got a suite of housing land supply orders now either passed through the parliament and rezoned that are recently tabled and going through the disallowance process. Yesterday I announced that we've commenced the consultative period for a new housing land supply order for the Huntingfield Estate which can yield, we believe, over 450 dwellings not far from Hobart. That is the demonstration now of the power of that planning approach to be releasing land that wasn't previously available for housing in areas where we need it. The Planning Policy Unit has been fantastic in responding to that issue as a whole-of-government issue and taking advantage of the co-location of housing and planning in one minister as well, I think.

The PPU has also responded to concerns in the community regarding compliance and the need for robust data regarding the short stay accommodation sector and developed the Short Stay Accommodation Act in record time, which has passed through parliament. We are now going to be the first jurisdiction in Australia to have a comprehensive data set showing us who is doing what and where in short stay accommodation as a basis for future policy and planning. That dataset is unique and a lot of people will be watching what we can do with that.

Looking forward, we remain committed to our planning reform agenda, finalising the Tasmanian Planning Scheme, developing the planning policies, developing a robust and comprehensive framework for our regional land use strategies to respond to those planning policies, and in line with what the Premier announced in his Premier's Address earlier this year, developing now new planning rules and performance standards to create a permitted pathway for medium-density apartment-style developments in urban areas, increasing a new type of product in the market that can potentially deliver a large number of dwellings or large amount of capacity for housing in our urban areas where the demand is greatest right now.

We are also going to progress into the reform of major projects and a new major projects bill to replace the Projects of Regional Significance process which has existed for some years but never been used. We will continue through the process of generating housing land supply orders to release

more land for affordable housing. I am very proud of the work the department, our planning unit and the TPC has done over the last year. We have a full agenda and looking forward to your questions.

DIVISION 6

(Department of Justice)

Output Group 1

Administration of Justice

1.11 Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal -

CHAIR - We are starting off with 1.11 Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal which seems to be starting at the wrong end in my view, but there you go.

Mr JAENSCH - You can start wherever you like.

CHAIR - We would rather have the planning right in the first place and maybe we would have less need for this tribunal and workload. I am going to go to the performance measures on page 148 of budget paper 2, volume 1, which says that the percentage of appeals resolved within 90 days without an extension for 2016-17 was 57.5 per cent; for 2017-18, 63.9 per cent; and the target for 2018-19 is 100 per cent. I will commend you on the target, but in a realistic sense: what is the likely percentage of appeals resolved within 90 days without extension?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - We have had an improvement since 2016-17, 57.5 per cent to 63.9 per cent, noting 100 per cent might be aspirational target we are trying to achieve. With extension in time, it can depend also on requests from the parties.

CHAIR - That is what I mean, it is an unrealistic target.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - It will also depend on the complexity of the matters before the tribunal from general experience.

CHAIR - How are you tracking? What do you expect the result to be as opposed to the target?

Mr JAENSCH - That might apply for all other things being equal or things within our control compared to requests for extensions from people.

CHAIR - That is not what it says though, minister.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - At the moment in 2018-19, we are actually tracking at 56 per cent and the vast majority of extensions have been a result of the conduct of the parties. It can be noncompliance in terms of directions, for example, allowing further time to try to achieve compliance or at the request of the parties. Usually, they will receive a request for later than usual hearing dates or we may adjourn to try to facilitate mediation between the parties to achieve a mediated outcome.

CHAIR - Minister, it would be appropriate to have a more realistic target when there are so many factors outside the control of your department. We are having a blitz on performance

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

indicators this year, every year we do it but it does not seem to make a lot of difference. We will keep at it.

Mr JAENSCH - We can take this feedback for preparation of the budget. We want to put a bit of reach into it, don't we, though?

CHAIR - A bit of a stretch target.

Mr JAENSCH - I do not want to average the last five years.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Certainly, year upon year we do a review of our key performance indicators and would be very happy to examine it.

CHAIR - That would be good, because a target that is unachievable is meaningless. Maybe some commentary about a breakdown of those not as a result of requests from the complainant or noncompliance. For us, sitting on this side of the table, what we are looking at is a budget allocation for RMPAT, if there are significant numbers not being dealt with in the statutory time frame, that could be a resourcing issue. It makes it easier to us assess is this enough and we ask the questions to try to determine that. On that front, there is a gradual increase in appropriation for this output group. The number of claims is one thing, but the complexities are another. If you read the media, you would understand there are quite a few complex ones on their table at the moment.

Can you give us a bit more of information about the resourcing of the office for dealing with these complex ones? There are two big ones in Hobart I know of and I am sure there is more as the mums' and dads' residential ones are caught up in this and perhaps delayed as a result.

Mr JAENSCH - I can speak to you about some of the staffing resources in the office. The tribunal staff consists of a statutory independent chairperson appointed for five years, a registrar at band 7, a senior executive officer and six senior mediation officers, two executive assistants, and three administration officers. This financial year a legal research officer was appointed for a 12-month period to assist in the provision of legal research, which is appropriate.

Those are the current staffing levels. The tribunal conducted both pre-mediation and full mediations for proceedings. All matters are subject to pre-mediation, 111 cases as at 30 April, 62 mediations were conducted as at the 30 April 2019, 16 mediations were convened for appeals or applications based in the north and the north-west, eight mediations were conducted on-site and eight mediations were convened by telephone conference.

Mr VALENTINE - Are those last two incorporated into the other above or are they separate too?

Mr JAENSCH - Sixty-two. Out of the 16, eight onsite and eight by phone conference.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry, you gave pre-mediation 111, mediation 62 and then you gave two other figures - 16 and eight - and I am wondering whether they are in the 62.

Mr JAENSCH - The 16 is part of the 62 and eight and eight make up the 16.

CHAIR - In terms of the outcome of the mediation, were the matters resolved at that point or is there ongoing work and it sometimes goes on and on?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Probably one of the most important KPIs is how many of these are actually settled. The tribunal continues to retain a high settlement rate of appeals, through is alternative dispute resolution processes. There were 86 formal judgments which determined appeals and applications on their merits up to 30 April 2019. Seventy-five of those decisions were consent judgments, arising from a successful form of pre-mediation, formal mediation or negotiation between the parties. Reflecting successful results being achieved from those efforts of the tribunal.

CHAIR - The ones not successful obviously end up in court.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Yes, they go through to decision in terms of the tribunal. ADR is a process and trying to achieve a negotiated agreement between the parties is a far better use of the tribunals time facilitated by the staff the minister talked through.

Mr VALENTINE - Sorry ADR?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - Alternate Dispute Resolution.

CHAIR - Minister, are you confident the office has enough resourcing to not delay this process?

Mr JAENSCH - We have not had a backlog. In my regular briefings from the secretary, it has not been flagged as an area, compared to PPU where we have budgeted an extra \$2 million over the next four years to deal with the workload we have ahead of us there. We review these things periodically and at the moment there has not been a trigger for reviewing the resource.

CHAIR - So there is no backlog, there is nothing sitting there waiting because the tribunal has not time to hear it?

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - When we say no backlog, there are obviously matters there and lodged but in comparison to the Supreme Court or the Magistrates Court criminal backlogs, there is not a backlog and it has not been raised as an urgent issue.

CHAIR - Does it tell you what the average wait time is to mediation? Do you have an indication, or to pre-mediation at least, because some are resolved there?

Mr JAENSCH - I am happy for us to take that on notice if it is not available to you.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I am advised it is within 14 days of the first directions hearing.

Mr VALENTINE - What about an average length of time until the appeal is resolved? Perhaps by class, residential versus major.

Mr JAENSCH - Happy to take on notice.

Output Group 4 Regulatory and Other Services

4.2 Tasmanian Planning Commission -

4.3 Planning Policy and Reform -

Ms WEBB - Minister, it is a rather unique opportunity for you to have portfolio responsibility for housing and planning. Noting those specific initiatives, you mentioned earlier, the Housing Land Supply Act and the Compliance and Data to Short Stay Accommodation, as being initiatives related in both those ways and planning - if it is being brought to bear - to support the Affordable Housing Action Plan. Can you describe how the planning reforms more broadly and perhaps more substantially in a foundational way will contribute to addressing our Affordable Housing situation in an ongoing way into the future? In what way does the planning reforms ensure affordable housing is something fundamentally part of the way we think and act across planning matters.

Mr JAENSCH - There are a lot of layers to the answer.

Ms WEBB - I do not mean small initiatives but fundamentally as a core part of the reform. Where have you built in affordable housing as a key part of how we move forward with planning?

Mr JAENSCH - One of the measures, with the adoption of Australia's first statewide planning scheme with consistency is the way matters are dealt with across the state where they are the same matters. The simplicity and the confidence should create in people building and investing in residential land and should generate more supply in itself, or clear the way for it. We should reduce time and complexity in the process of getting land and new buildings to market.

We also intend, through the Tasmanian planning policies, to have planning policies that apply statewide for future settlement strategies and identification of areas for preferential development aligned to infrastructure, demand, education and employment opportunities integrated or related to the development of our utilities, our roads and transport networks and public transport. That will inform our regional land use strategies and you end up with a cascade through the planning system focused on where we are going and what we want to achieve through that. The incorporation of affordable housing for people that meets their needs can be imbedded in that. Whether that goes to the extent of something like inclusionary zoning or simply good design of settlements that can accommodate smaller lot sizes closer to services and therefore create an option for entry to the market which is not there now, is a moot point. It is about how you do it rather than what we can do. I see that is where we are going, and I think it is at a time when Tasmania is ready to have a conversation about those things. Maybe 10 years ago we weren't. We were more interested in making the development assessment process simpler, from a red tape perspective, rather than looking at where we are going to be 10, 20 and 40 years down the track. I think we can do more of that.

Ms WEBB - You are expecting that in those future settlement strategies and the regional strategies, that affordable housing and insuring that we have an adequate supply into the future will be explicitly embedded in those strategies?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. As a policy intent, and then that will be something that needs to be addressed in those strategies.

Ms WEBB - You talked a little bit in your preamble about the intention to make it easier to build apartments and townhouses. That is the phrasing the Premier has used in his State of the State address - medium-density, I guess, infill-type arrangements, which is a sensible thing to be considering, but I just wondered how does easier approval fit with being well planned, and how is

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

the Government ensuring that making it easier to build apartments and townhouses will actually deliver more affordable housing? There is not necessarily a straight line between one and the other.

Mr JAENSCH - The intention with this at the moment, if you intend to build a higher density apartment-type complex in the Hobart City area, in what may be predominantly a commercial or mixed-use zone, you need to go through a process of getting appropriate zoning before you start planning your new development. It adds time, cost, complexity and risk and is sometimes a deterrent then for investment to proceed.

If, through good planning, not just building the rules, but looking at where there is a good fit for this type of development across the city and along transit corridors et cetera, we can build zoning and then apply it on the ground where it is wanted and needed and then promote that to investors and developers, then it will be quicker to come to market.

Again, there are concepts like - I have had people promote to me the idea of reserving a certain proportion of that for -

Ms WEBB - The inclusionary zoning idea - that was going to be another question.

Mr JAENSCH - That is a concept that is out there. At this stage the intention is to make it more possible to develop that sort of development.

What I would anticipate is that, as in other residential zones and development, you can have particular projects and developments that have different target markets, price points et cetera.

Ms WEBB - Yes, but unless you mandate that, there is no guarantee that any of that would be affordable housing.

Mr JAENSCH - But it could be that one the directors is the Director of Housing, or Centacare Evolve, or Anglicare, or a partnership with the Hobart City Council.

What we need to create first is the ground on which to do it, with the rules -

Ms WEBB - So you are not interested in promoting that idea with private sector development that they should take a role in delivering affordable housing in their development efforts, which is what inclusionary zoning would do. The people you have just mentioned there are not private-sector developers. You've basically said that the onus on providing affordable housing falls back to the community sector, the government sector and the local government sector.

Mr JAENSCH - Or partnerships between them as well.

Ms WEBB - Between whom?

Mr JAENSCH - Between any of those players, just as we have now.

Ms WEBB - Yes, but the private sector could be brought on board and, in fact, I have heard members of your Government talk about the fact that we can't achieve solutions to this situation around affordable housing without the private sector on board.

How are you ensuring that the private sector comes to the party and does its share of delivering affordable housing for our state?

Inclusionary zoning would be one way of doing that. Do you have an intention to go down that line, or are you pursuing that through other avenues or levers?

Mr JAENSCH - The intent is that there needs to be a diversity of housing, options and planning that facilitates delivery of a diversity of housing - lot sizes, locations and price points - in the market. Our focus initially is to create the land use planning rules which allow those sorts of developments to proceed. Post-that, there is a range of different ways that you can incentivise through to regulate, how that is populated and who it is built for and by whom, but I'd point to our Homes Act and the work that we're doing in the affordable Housing Action Plan to show some examples of that. With the Huntingfield development we are consulting on right now with orders, over 450 dwellings or so may be delivered out of that.

At the moment I think that's not going to be broadacre social housing. It is going to be a mix of lot sizes and locations and densities, and the intention would be that we would retain a proportion of those in different classes of lots for social housing, interspersed with blocks sold on the private market. We have control of it in that instance, but we would be working with a developer to deliver that sort of outcome and we can do so again in other settings.

Ms WEBB - Let me bring you back to the question, minister, which was relating to the role of the private sector in assisting with solving our affordable housing situation. What you've described there is social housing. That is fine; of course, we need efforts in that space and I applaud those efforts. However, if we are to bring the private sector in as part of solving this situation, we need levers, incentives, regulations - something to facilitate them to become part of that situation. We know the market has not delivered that to us through the private sector. It hasn't done it on its own, so there are levers - you said yourself there are a range of ways we could do that. What is your intention to pull those levers or to take steps in a very distinct way towards bringing the private sector in to be part of this solution for us around affordable housing? Do you have an intention to do that and if so, what is that intention?

Mr JAENSCH - We are talking about a zoning that may apply in several cities around Tasmania in a range of locations. There is not a master plan for who builds what on each of the blocks that that will apply to. We are creating a planning provision which will be available to anyone who takes it up. With regard to the mix that you're talking about, I think what I've tried to demonstrate is that we have engaged with the community housing sector and the private housing sector, private investors, in delivering a mix of housing types in the existing residential zones. I am not ruling any future options in or out. My preference would be though, and I think the more conventional approach of working in partnership with private developers and investors is preferable at this stage to foreshadowing any form of mandated proportional investment in -

Ms WEBB - An inclusionary zoning effect, you mean. What does that partnership look like that brings private sector into the space of delivering affordable housing as part of our solution to that in this state? What initiatives do you have planned, or in train already, that do that?

Mr JAENSCH - I'd reflect on probably the Huntingfield complex -

Ms WEBB - What you have described is releasing land; some of it will be developed by the community sectors, some by government, some by private.

Mr JAENSCH - There's more to come on this as that model rolls out, but one of the options there, and we've been looking at models interstate, is to look at the overall development as a partnership with a private developer. The Government owns the land -

Ms WEBB - To deliver affordable housing within the private development, but not within an inclusionary zoning-type arrangement? We are getting some type of contractual arrangement?

Mr JAENSCH - No, but in that case we could achieve the same outcome by being the owner from the outset and working in partnership with them.

Ms WEBB - I'm not sure exactly what that looks like. It doesn't sound like that's a private developer developing and having some form of that contribute affordable housing into our space. That is what I am asking you about.

Mr JAENSCH - You are talking about a mandated minimum contribution of affordable housing.

Ms WEBB - Not necessarily that; possibly that or some other lever or mechanism.

Mr JAENSCH - I am talking more about a partnered approach with which we might be able to go to market and look for a private developer and say, 'There is an opportunity here with a block of land, we are interested in these outcomes, you may be interested in others' and doing something together that yields both. I think there is a lot of scope for that.

Ms WEBB - I will leave that question there. We haven't quite arrived at a satisfactory conclusion to it, but no doubt we will continue at another time.

Can I move on to page 167 in the budget papers, Revenue from Appropriation by Output, table 6.10? I want to ask a couple of questions about that appropriation. First, under 4.2 for the Tasmanian Planning Commission, I note that the appropriation there is relatively flat across the forward Estimates. It looks like it is just indexation or something like that. My question is: given the large amount of work that the commission is undertaking at the moment, and I am noting there in particular the local provision schedules, which I believe will all be coming through in the next little while, is there not an extra resource required within the commission to process those?

CHAIR - In answering that question, if you could give us a breakdown of the staff who are in the office, that might be helpful.

Ms WEBB - I would like to understand that because presumably there is ongoing work that the commission normally undertakes and then they have the LPSs coming through all in a rush, all 29 I would imagine, over the next little while. How will that be achieved?

Mr JAENSCH - I will give you some general comment and then the secretary then may be able to break down more into the make-up of the staffing resource there. Over the last period, with this acceleration program with development of the LPSs and assisting local government, there has been some excellent collaboration between the Planning Policy Unit and the Tasmanian Planning Commission staff in working together and moving out to work with councils. Effectively, the TPC has contributed some people power to the effort of generating or assisting councils with elements of the LPS.

Ms WEBB - Was that from their existing resource or did you put extra resource into the TPC in order to do that?

Mr JAENSCH - There has been a bit of both. Some existing resource and some contracted for the purpose. We have moved some resource the way of the PPU to assist councils with the LPSs and there will be a bit of a commensurate moving of resources back across into the TPC as the body of work moves from being in the councils and planning area into the assessment phase. That is a delicate balancing act, but it has been very well managed across the PPU and the TPC at that technical officer level, making sure we are maintaining appropriate separation from people involved with the development of the LPSs and subsequent assessment of them. By putting extra resources into the PPU this year, the TPC, whilst its resourcing is proportionately minor increases year on year - it starts at a fairly healthy level so you have to argue in the scheme of things - we have been able to optimise the resource across the two offices for this reform work.

CHAIR - Can I clarify, the LPSs are going to be dealt with very soon, but this would suggest they are still with the Planning and Policy Unit in the next year. I thought you said they were going to be with the Planning Commission this year?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, they are.

CHAIR - This is the point Ms Webb is making. The allocation, whilst it is higher, goes up proportionally higher in the TPU, but in the Tasmanian Planning Commission there is a minimal increase.

Mr JAENSCH - There might be a borrowing of some staff across from one to the other.

CHAIR - Are they still going to be funded out of the Planning and Policy Unit? If we could have total numbers, that would be helpful.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, because we are adding more work to the PPU at the same time as well with the new housing-related and short stay-related and other work as well.

Ms WEBB - We have crossed across both those here in this revenue appropriation -

CHAIR - You can because they obviously are sharing resources.

Ms WEBB - Indeed, but what I know is that there is that increase under 4.3, the planning policy reform, and it talks about that as a key deliverable, that \$500 000 per annum across those forward Estimates, it says -

To assist with the achievement of government planning reforms and planning priorities, including government election commitments made in relation to a Tasmanian Planning Scheme, the related planning reform agenda in planning policy and strategy areas, work to support the activation of the Hobart City Deal and other government initiatives for reforms in the short stay accommodation and affordable housing land release.

That seems like a lot of ground for \$500 000 a year to cover, and now you're given us to understand that that's also some extra, effectively through sharing of staffing, that's supposed to

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

assist the Tasmanian Planning Commission with the work they have on their plate. I'm wondering, what is the breakdown of how that \$500 000 covers all that additional work? Is it sufficient and what will its key priorities be in this budgeted year, 2019-20?

CHAIR - Can you give us the staffing numbers and then address how they're going to achieve the workload?

Mr JAENSCH - I think the secretary has both of those ready to go on the TPC side of things and then also on the PPU resourcing.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - On the TPC resourcing, it has 20.31 FTEs with a headcount of 23 and within that group there's approximately 12 planners, assisted by administrative and support staff.

In relation to the second question on the \$500 000 increase to output 4.3, Planning Policy and Reform - that group will, in terms of the expenditure statement in table 6.2, have between \$1.2 million and \$1.3 million over the forward Estimates to undertake that list of tasks the minister has just walked through - not only the \$500 000. The unit itself is a relatively small unit in the grand scheme of things. We have recognised that in terms of the additional resources that are being put into this Budget so that we can increase the members of that team, but over the last two years in which I have been associated with the department, I have seen the resourcing move between a very flexible and good-natured way between the TPC and the PPU in trying to assist, depending on the project or reform that they are undertaking.

It does come though with its complexities in forming panels to assess LPSs. We have to be careful around conflict of interest. Certainly, individuals from either the PPU or the TPC that have actually been aiding councils or working to develop LPSs will not then form a panel to assess that LPS.

CHAIR - So they don't review their own work?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes, that's right.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - We have to balance it out carefully, but it is all noting that there is a limited pool of planning resources available in the state. We do our best to try to attract those through the department.

Ms WEBB - Can I just clarify that? Looking at table 6.2 on page 143, the expenses summary - that is virtually the same as the revenue from appropriation table where in 2018-19 in the expenses summary, in that planning and policy reform line, there was \$771 000, which moved up in 2019-20 to \$1.29 million. Over here, in revenue from appropriation, which is the one we were discussing, it moved from \$771 000 to \$1.28 million. The question remains: it's an additional approximately \$500 000 in both those tables, so I'm not sure why you were suggesting there was an increase of \$1.2 million.

Ms MORGAN-WICKS - I didn't suggest there was an increase of \$1.2 million; the increase is \$500 000. I refer you to the expense summary because this is actually the table that records the expenditure planned for the output for the year rather than only the appropriation in the appropriation bill.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

The Expense Groups Summary, you will notice differences in all of the outputs between the two tables because this will actually show then if there are any retained revenues, or trust account funding, etc, also being spent in unit.

Ms WEBB - That is fine. However, in this case, it does not change the nature of my question, whether we use one table or the other, because they are virtually identical figures.

The question remains - It is \$500 000 a year extra. How is that achieving the range of things across the two units it is meant to be delivering because effectively it is being shared? What specifically is being delivered by that \$500 000 a year?

Mr JAENSCH - That pays for extra staff capacity in the PPU to process the workload.

Ms WEBB - What staff capacity is that delivering?

Mr JAENSCH - We have staffing for PPU [inaudible].

MORGAN-WICKS - The staffing for the PPU is currently 7 FTEs, at the headcount of 7, also.

We anticipate adding an additional 2 FTE, or thereabouts, but also currently assessing the resourcing at the Tasmanian Planning Commission, dependent on this next stage of the LPS and the dates and times of which they are coming in to the TPC process.

Ms WEBB - So there is some review to be had there, as those LPS are coming into the TPC as to whether those 2 FTEs delivered by the \$500 000, will be sufficient to do that work, and there is a possibility if it is not, it could be reviewed. Is that correct?

Mr JAENSCH - The other element in this is how quickly I want this all done, and how cleverly we can manage the workflow.

There is a business analyst assisting the TPC with the task of working out the best and most efficient work programming of the assessment of the LPS so we are not doing one at a time, 29 times over, each with its own statutory exhibition periods, and all those other things.

Can they be grouped into job lots? Can there be panels assigned to similar types of schemes, based on the different regional templates we have and they can progress them in parallel as much as possible and get them through expeditiously.

That is why we tried to bring the LPS forward, they were not trickling in over a very long period of time and being dealt with on arrival.

If we can get a job lot there, then there is the capacity to manage the best workflow across the 29 LPs.

That work is being undertaken currently and a business analyst is helping the TPC.

Mr VALENTINE - In doing it that way there a danger of one-size-fits-all approach as opposed to the individual local provision schedules addressing in those areas, which might be quite different.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

Mr JAENSCH - They might be, but there may also be the situation of where the same matter arises again and again in neighbouring councils.

The question is the same, the answer is the same, and there maybe a way to do a job lot response which cuts out duplication.

Mr VALENTINE - It was originally \$300 000 provided.

Mr JAENSCH - \$100 000 per of the three regions.

Mr VALENTINE - How much has been spent to date? I always thought it was too low.

Mr RIGBY - I do not have the exact figure, but last time we calculated some months ago, we had spent all but a few thousand.

There have been some invoices since then and I am confident we have accounted for all that money.

That was started a couple of years ago and rapidly gobbled up by the councils and the regions. Agricultural mapping, natural resource mapping, geographic information systems work and the like.

In fact, we have added some additional funding over and above of another \$100 000 for GIS work, which has predominately been used up.

Mr VALENTINE - Have you an estimate of what the LPS work is likely to cost at the end of the day by the time you get through your 29 councils? Any idea?

Mr JAENSCH - At the assessment?

Mr VALENTINE - The work the \$300 000 was put aside for originally. I am interested to know.

Mr JAENSCH - It has cost all of the \$300 000, plus some additional cash supplied, plus the internal resourcing of the staff from PPU and the TPC who have been working with the individual councils in different ways, because they each have different capacities and complexity of work to do to assist them through. There will be an easily accounted cash component of what assistance has been provided. Then there is partial allocation of in-kind staff time across the PPU and the TPC.

Mr VALENTINE - It is a bit hard to estimate at this point.

Mr JAENSCH - That is right. The most important thing is we get it done and are making good progress.

Mr VALENTINE - As long as it is being done.

Mr JAENSCH - Yes.

Ms WEBB - I would ask questions about performance information, were there any on these two-line items to ask but we do not have performance information associated with these.

Mr JAENSCH - We are confident we will have all the LPSs in by the beginning of August, except for one.

CHAIR - In for assessment?

Mr JAENSCH - Yes. That is my performance target I have set so far.

Ms WEBB -Is that the only one you will be prepared to commit to, not completion of assessment?

CHAIR - Completion would be a good outcome? We are talking about outcomes-focused KPIs, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - I am negotiating at the moment with the department and the TPC. We need to be fair. We provided extra resources. They are doing a business analysis. I am keen to see the planning scheme in place, which means all of the assessment is completed. That is my mission. I do not want to break anything on the way through and there are statutory time frames for those processes. My hope is we might be able to have many schemes in assessment in parallel, rather than in a conger line taking years.

CHAIR - Minister, in view of that and how we assess the performance of the Planning Policy Unit and the commission, wouldn't it be helpful to have some performance indicators you could benchmark against?

Mr JAENSCH - It would, but one of the things I can sense from either side of me right now is that this time last year the Planning Policy Unit did not know it was going to be developing new legislation to rezone government-owned as a matter of urgency, new legislation to require short stay accommodation platform providers to declare their data by law. To get new legislation on both of those fronts drafted, to introduce and see through new legislation around developing Tasmanian planning policies. All of that happened on top of business as usual within the last 12 months, which has been remarkable and I will rate that as performance any day. Did we plan it and see it coming? No. Did we need to it happen? Yes. It has happened well and both Houses of parliament have passed those through unamended.

Mr VALENTINE - The commission ought to be able to provide the numbers of matters dealt with and those sorts of metrics. I understand the Planning and Policy Unit is a different breed, but the commission deals with specific matters. You could provide that sort of feedback of the numbers of matters dealt with by the commission, whatever you believe is a way of being able to put some metrics around it.

Mr JAENSCH - There is a record of performance in the TPC annual report.

CHAIR - As there is in every department's report.

Mr JAENSCH - Exactly, and will cover things for the first three quarters of 2018-19, statutory assessments on 42 planning scheme amendments, implementation of 11 requests for urgent amendments to correct zoning, completion of pre-exhibition assessments of draft LPSs already for two municipalities and public hearing commenced following public exhibition of a third, and

commencement of pre-exhibition assessments of a further eight draft LPSs. There is a history of productivity or performance that exists upon which you could build benchmark targets.

Mr VALENTINE - It's just that when we see a budget line item, it would be good to have at least have something that is directly related to that line item to understand the workload that they have. I'm talking in a community welfare sense here, caseload is not workload; it is a different beast. Some matters that the commission deals with are much longer and more involved than other matters. Simple numbers don't necessarily tell the whole story, but it would be good to have something to compare in the budget papers

CHAIR - Minister, when you look in the information about this output group, the Tasmanian Planning Commission, on page 158, there are dot points of all the things that the commission is responsible for, but absolutely no information - they could have to do all of that but they might have done none of it. We know that is not the case and it's part of the purpose of our sitting across the table having to ask these things, but some of the key performance indicators, whilst they are in the annual report, could rightly be reflected to give the committee the opportunity to understand whether they are achieving these things and whether it is a resourcing issue if they are not.

Mr JAENSCH - I would be happy to take that matter onboard and discuss with the secretary and with the acting executive commissioner and chairman of the TPC what performance fields would be useful and what level of reporting benchmark we could offer.

CHAIR - We don't need all the ones in the annual report.

Mr JAENSCH - There are some that have already been collected, so it might be that there are some that could be surrogates for the overall workload.

Mr VALENTINE - I have a question and it comes from some constituents of mine, who have forwarded me these questions and they want me to ask them:

Will the minister categorically rule out introducing amendments to the State Policies and Projects Act 1993 to allow for projects of regional significance or separate legislation in order to facilitate the building of a cable car on kunanyi/Mount Wellington?

I suppose you could expect this question to come forward.

Mr JAENSCH - The Government has very clearly committed to any application for a cable car project being assessed by the Hobart City Council under the normal planning scheme.

Mr VALENTINE - It is definitely go through the Hobart City Council?

Mr JAENSCH - That is what we have committed to.

Mr VALENTINE - The issue of regional significance?

Mr JAENSCH - There are already projects of regional significance functions within LUPAA that have never been used as call-in powers. That is why we are intending to bring a different approach through major projects legislation by the end of the year, which will provide the capacity for projects of a certain scale or complexity to be able to be referred to a development assessment-type approach.

UNCORRECTED PROOF ISSUE

We are talking there about projects like the Bridgewater Bridge, certainly not the cable car project. We have been explicit about the cable car.

Mr VALENTINE - In February 2017, following advice from the Coordinator-General to the effect that the proposed cable car for kunanyi/Mount Wellington was not a project of state significance, the Government stated that the proposed cable car 'should go through the usual planning processes'. Will the Government stick to its commitment or will it override the City of Hobart or any subsequent appeals if the cable car is rejected? Not if it goes through.

Mr JAENSCH - I would refer you to my previous answer.

Mr VALENTINE - That is letting it go through, but if it gets rejected is the main nub of that question. You are reiterating the answer to question one.

Will the minister categorically rule out the use of taxpayers' funds to subsidise the proposed cable car? More specifically, will the minister rule out ever providing public funds to the company behind the proposed cable car, including in-kind support and the costs of associated infrastructure, such as roads?

Mr JAENSCH - I don't think that's a Planning portfolio matter. I refer you to the Minister for State Growth.

Mr VALENTINE - The next part of the question was: If not, why not? It sounds like I'm going to get the same answer - to the Minister for State Growth. Thank you, minister.

Mr JAENSCH - My pleasure.

I thank the secretary, Mr Risby, and others in the room. Thank you, Chair, and thank you, committee.

The committee suspended at 4.31 p.m.