

**REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL ISSUES**

**INQUIRY INTO ISSUES RELATING TO**  
**REDFERN/WATERLOO**

---

**At Sydney on Friday, 12 November 2004**

---

**The Committee met at 2.00 p.m.**

---

**PRESENT**

The Hon. Jan Burnswoods (Chair)

The Hon. Dr A. Chesterfield-Evans

The Hon. Kayee Griffin

The Hon. Robyn Parker

The Hon. G. S. Pearce

The Hon. I. W. West

**COL GELLATLY**, Director General, Premier's Department, and

**MICHAEL RAMSEY**, Project Director, Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project, on former oath:

**CHAIR:** Could I acknowledge the fact that we are conducting this hearing on the land of the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation.

I should point out in relation to the questions that we have prepared that we had sent you questions some time ago before we cancelled the other hearing. In addition to that, because of the announcements that have been made this week, we have prepared some extra questions and we are very conscious that we have now far more than we might reasonably expect to get through. The extra questions we distributed to Committee members and to you, Michael, I hope, between about 12.15 and 12.30 p.m. today.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Yes, something like that.

**CHAIR:** I think they were put under Committee members' doors and emailed to you, but we are conscious of the fact that, given the shortness of time, it may be necessary for you to flag that you are taking some things on notice. In terms of the number of questions that we have and the different areas that they cover - the first batch and the second batch - we may need at some stage to try to allocate some time periods, but we will see how we go. Obviously with the deadline for our report coming very close there is a lot of information that the Committee wants to get, but, as I said, we are conscious that we have prepared an unusually large number of questions, so I suggest we see how we go, starting with the batch that you have had much more notice of and, if we seem to be getting bogged down in a particular area, it may be possible to speed things up or take things on notice and move to another question.

Do either of you want to make an opening statement?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I would just like to say that obviously since we last appeared before your Committee you have delivered your interim report; there has been the completion of the human services review and there have been some Government policy decisions made, obviously culminating with the introduction in Parliament of the Redfern-Waterloo Authority legislation, which is currently I think in the Legislative Assembly, so there has been a number of activities and also the announcement that Minister Sartor will be the minister responsible for the Redfern-Waterloo Authority, if it goes through Parliament and is established, and issues relating to that, so there has been a number of developments. During that time I think there was a good example of Government coordination when the rugby league tournament was held over the long weekend, which involved a lot of preparation in terms of working between the agencies and working with the community towards what eventually turned out to be a very successful weekend. I think they are the main sorts of issues, but we await your questions.

**CHAIR:** Michael, you did not want to say anything to start?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** As I said, we have a very large number of questions under a series of headings. The ones we had prepared at the time of the first range of announcements concern the Redfern-Waterloo Authority, the redevelopment of the Block and so on, so let's start with those. We have six questions in relation to the proposed Redfern-Waterloo Authority, and we have now seen the Bill and we have circulated Minister Sartor's second reading speech from yesterday, but could you please tell us about the proposed new authority, its genesis, its role, how its 10-year plan will be rolled out and its organisational structure?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I am not sure I can really add much at this stage. It depends on the proposal. The Government has made a policy decision and introduced the legislation into the House and that outlines the board and the main functions of the proposed authority in terms of the plan for

the area, the planning responsibilities and the establishment of a fund into which moneys will be paid and so on, and the Minister's second reading speech - I mean it is a policy decision of Government that was generated through the Cabinet process and there is nothing we can really say other than that.

**CHAIR:** Anything more about the 10-year plan?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Well, I think it will be for the board, the CEO and the Minister obviously, once they are up and running, to work on that.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Make it up as they go along.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** We had some evidence and there was a statement by the Premier in February that the Redfern-Waterloo resolution was going to take 25 years. What is the relationship between the 10 years and the 25 years that the Premier was talking about?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I cannot comment on what the Premier said then. We just know the situation here: A new authority and a plan.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** How do you get the 10-year timeframe? What is meant to happen in 10 years?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Well, that will be a matter for the authority to work out and it is a long term compared to a yearly financial business plan, I mean 10 years is a fairly long term or medium term type program.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Has he allowed funding for 10 years? Is that what you are saying?

**Dr GELLATLY:** No, the funding arrangements are being worked out and will depend on the activities of the authority with its real estate and that sort of thing. I think it is early days.

**CHAIR:** A lot of our questions are about the interrelationship of the various agencies. Question 2, for instance, is very specifically about how will the proposed authority impact on the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project and we quote the media release that "The Minister responsible for the Redfern-Waterloo Authority will coordinate all State Government funding within the area", so what will the role of the RWPP be under the proposed authority?

**Dr GELLATLY:** This has to be finalised yet and discussions had with Minister Sartor. The Government has made a decision to extend the Redfern/Waterloo project and in fact provide a couple more resources, particularly in the communications area, but at this stage it is staying located in the Premier's Department. Clearly the Minister will be responsible for that area and, like a number of other projects that happen, people can be located in the Premier's Department and report to another minister, as happens in the drug strategy and community solutions at different times, so those arrangements are to be finalised, but the two concrete facts are that Minister Sartor will be responsible for the overall activities in the area and the partnership will continue but will be distinct from the authority. That is at the current time.

**CHAIR:** Could I ask, because of the recent media releases, the role of Minister Tebbutt in relation to this?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I think that, given the fact that she is the Minister for Community Services and has the agency of community services and the staff delivering services located in that department, there has to be some interaction between the two ministers, both in terms of the human services delivery and the placed responsibility, if you like, of Minister Sartor, so clearly there is an interaction.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Could I clarify--

**CHAIR:** Could I go through these outline ones about the structure and then invite any members of the Committee to fill in? As I said, we have quite a complex set of questions.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I don't want to fill in, I just want to clarify what Dr Gellatly said.

**CHAIR:** We will perhaps come back to that because the next question is numbered 3, which is: What will now happen to the RED strategy?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I think it is in the legislation in terms of the plan that the infrastructure will be part of the authority's functions. That was always an issue in terms of how you get all the bits of infrastructure and we talked about that before I think in terms of the infrastructure strategy, by bringing it together, and some of the planning issues, that we have one authority which is responsible for all the infrastructure direction and the planning issues and give it some authority rather than having to deal with individual agencies all the time.

**CHAIR:** In that section we have a few more questions about consultation and specific social disadvantage and also the role of the board and so on. I do not know whether we should finish those ones that the secretariat has prepared and then hand over to Committee members to ask questions.

**Dr GELLATLY:** As I said, it is a bit hard to comment too much until the authority actually gets through Parliament and gets established and the board is set up.

**CHAIR:** So you do not have any answers that you have prepared for us in relation to questions 4, 5 and 6?

**Dr GELLATLY:** No. As I said, at this stage it is early days.

**CHAIR:** What about the one about whether you have had feedback from the Redfern and Waterloo communities about the announcements that have been made?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Michael might be able to comment.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Only general feedback, we have not had any formal sessions and that will not occur obviously until the authority is established. We have had just general comments from people, and that is the best way you could describe them. There is clearly interest from the community about how they envisage the authority will work and what we are trying to do is actually make people as aware as possible that the Bill is going through Parliament at the present time, so we have a fact sheet already on our web site describing the authority. That fact sheet is being distributed to households and so forth, just to give a brief outline of the functions of the authority, so that people can be aware of it and therefore people can feed into the processes that are in place in terms of progressing.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** I am a bit in the dark, as I imagine most of the rest of the Redfern community might be about this. You seem fairly vague about it. It seems like a plan for a plan. Can you tell us where this whole thing is heading, or are you just making it up as you go along?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Governments make decisions about policy and then they introduce legislation to drive it along and that is what this is.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Where did the policy decision come from?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Cabinet makes a decision to introduce legislation. It is a Cabinet process.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Has it been dreamt up in a vacuum, or is it based on some evidence, or has our inquiry encouraged that to happen?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I said at the start that since we were last giving evidence and your interim report has been delivered.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** It is a response to our inquiry?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Not directly in response to it.

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly did run quite a few things.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Things have happened. Clearly it is evolving in handling and dealing with it. Government response to the Redfern/Waterloo situation is evolving. It is another step down the path of human services, as was the initial establishment a couple of years ago of the partnership, and for the first time we have concentrated resources there. My own personal view is that we are not making it up on the run. It has been an evolving process where there has been input obviously from the community, from this Committee, from everyone, from Government when Cabinet makes the decision, and that is the way forward.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Part of the criticism, and indeed I think some of the Government submission criticism of the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project, and a number of submissions to this inquiry have said there has been a lack of consultation and a lack of accountability and a lack of benchmarking, and yet it has continued to be funded and it is continuing on, are you then imposing another layer of bureaucracy where you going to address some of the consistencies with the problem with the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project and are you going to have benchmarking and performance indicators with this new authority, or is it going to continue on in the same sort of fashion?

**Dr GELLATLY:** No. Obviously we are all, in Government, working in the agencies. When the Government makes policy decisions we are trying to make them work as efficiently and accountably as they can. Criticisms about the communication and lack of consultation by the partnership during the first 18 months or so we have accepted, and we are trying to find ways to improve that, including putting some resources into that. There are some explanations about why that was the case but I think that is a very legitimate concern and we are going to address it.

The Authority will clearly have that and having a Minister responsible takes it to a new level, if you like, in terms of someone with accountabilities and responsibilities within the Government. The issues that you raised last time about benchmarking and so on are, I think, legitimate questions that we will try to address.

The work that we are doing right across Government in human services in particular is not an easy thing. It is not an easy thing to say what is something like the partnership process contributing. There are obviously a lot of other external factors that make a difference in most social indicators, whatever you are measuring, whether it is unemployment, wellness and that sort of thing. They are difficult questions but it does not mean that we should not be trying to do them, that we should not be trying to measure performance.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Certainly you have benchmarks for any NGO, for example, in the human services field which gets funded by the Government. Surely the level of funding for the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project could have the same sort of benchmarks and be able to achieve some sort of accountability.

**Dr GELLATLY:** I do not disagree with the need for benchmarking, but I do not think it is that simple. You can have process-type measures and that includes in human services the number of clients you are dealing with. The real issue when you are trying to do benchmarking is how do you address the quality issue. We could have a measure for the partnership project that they have so many community meetings and so many interviews and that they have done this and that, but the issue is really the quality and where does that make a difference. That is what it is about. It is about government resources and activities making a difference on the ground.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Heavy criticism about a lack of communication has existed with the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project right across the board with this inquiry, yet you have now introduced in the last couple of weeks several new initiatives and still the community has not had the communication and consultation that it requires, surely.

**Mr RAMSEY:** We have acknowledged in our submission to this inquiry, and since then, the significant issues around communication and the problems that we have had with that. What we also in our submission, I think, articulated reasonably well is that I think we have done extensive consultation. In fact the community has said we have consulted too much and they wanted to see what the outcomes were of those consultations.

Our processes, which are all articulated in our submission, through the community engagement strategy, through the Morgan Disney review, there is a whole range of processes we have put in place in terms of consultation that have actually lead to the outcomes that have now been delivered. Whether or not we have actually then communicated back to the community about that is a thing we have acknowledged that we have not done well and we have actually acknowledged that right from our submission to you last time.

For example, with the human services review alone, we engaged with 550 people. With the population of Redfern and Waterloo that is actually a significant number of people. In fact, of that, the largest single group that was actually engaged with in terms of that human services review was the Aboriginal community. We have actually engaged with lots of people. What we have not done, and again I emphasise it, we have acknowledged that we have not done the communication well.

We are seriously trying to get on top of that issue now so the fact is that the day that the human services report was released it was actually up on our web site. We actually got out an e-mail to every single agency in Redfern and Waterloo that day, making them aware that the report was up on the web site within an hour or two hours of the Minister making the announcement.

As I said, we actually have fact sheets up on our web site already about the community health facility in Redfern. We have one up already around the authority. We will have one up there early next week on the human services review. We are actually coming to terms with the issue of our communication.

Even further than that, the series of events which have occurred since your interim report, if you look at the progress - I admit that our web site is clunky, it does not look good, but the information is put on our web site as soon as we can. We are trying to grapple with that issue. The fact that we have now got dedicated resources being allocated to communication will go a long way towards resolving the criticism that you have actually raised here and that the community has raised. The Government is committing resources to the project to address it.

Again I emphasise that I think we have done consultation well. What we have not done is communication, and they are fundamentally different things.

**CHAIR:** I remind everyone again that we have, I think, about 40 written questions here which the staff have directly identified as things we need to discuss for our final report. As far as possible, I want to make sure we get through them.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Just in relation to the expression about getting action and something about putting a firecracker up a certain passage, in this case I am pleased to see the Government has actually put a Molotov cocktail or two up the side passages, to move it to action. Dr Gellatly, in answer to a question you said that the partnership had been extended and had extra funding. Was that the announcement made earlier on of the extension to 2006, or was there another extension as well as that?

**Mr RAMSEY:** The Premier, I think in his announcement a few weeks ago about the Redfern plan, made a statement that the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project will extend. The Government has actually said that the project will be extended to 2008. As I said, as part of that they

have also agreed to actually restructure the partnership project so that we can actually have the resources that the community is demanding, in terms of giving us the capacity to deliver on what the community has demanded.

**CHAIR:** These statements and details are in this fact sheet that was circulated.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** We wanted it as evidence. A lot of the criticism, apart from the consultation and communication and those sorts of issues, was that the on ground services, particularly the non-government services, would have preferred the funding go to them rather than bureaucrats and Barnardos and so on. Can you comment on that?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I am not sure how actually to answer that question. If you want to talk about Barnardos specifically and why we actually funded Barnardos, there is a question that you have asked about that and I am actually happy to go through the answer to that.

**CHAIR:** Barnardos is specifically question 13.

**Mr RAMSEY:** How about I answer that and come back to the generic one. In terms of Barnardos, when we set up the intensive family support service we went to an open tendering process and the Department of Community Services led that tendering process and they actually developed the service specifications that would be required to be met.

Within that tendering process we encouraged the development of partnerships between the community, but what we actually really wanted was agencies that had the capacity to be able to meet those needs at the high end, if you like, young people and children and families in the area, because that was actually a deficiency that the community itself had articulated, and that were articulated by a whole range of other needs analysis and so forth.

In calling then for tenders, we obviously had to make sure that we complied with the requirements of the Government procurement guidelines. We also had to adhere to the requirements that ICAC laid down for tendering processes, so it is actually a fair and transparent process.

In all of that process the organisation that met the criteria best in term of selection process was Barnardos. The panel that actually selected Barnardos actually had independent people on it. One of the independent people was the New South Wales Council of Social Service. It also had on it an Aboriginal person. It was a rigorous tendering process and they were selected on the basis of that.

Should we have actually selected a service within the area to meet that need? On the evaluation of all of the information available and through that tendering process, Barnardos met the criteria and we would have been absolutely remiss and crucified if we had not selected Barnardos, because they demonstrated the capacity to carry out the requirements of tender.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I think the evidence has been that Barnardos are doing a great job. My intention is not to criticize them.

**CHAIR:** Since we are part way through that question can you tell us about the rest of it, about whether it has yet been evaluated, or reviewed, and what the findings have been and how you will assess the effectiveness? It may be too soon. I am not sure what the time scale was.

**Mr RAMSEY:** As part of implementing the human services plan that we have announced Barnardos will be evaluated within that context, because we needed to have them up and running for some length of time to do a comprehensive evaluation of them. Barnardos itself is actually working with the University of New South Wales at the present time to set up a program evaluation framework, and that will be rigorous and will clearly feed in with the external evaluation that we actually put in place.

It is worthwhile to know and I agree with you, Mr Pearce, that it is doing a good job. In the first six months of operation they assisted 72 families, and 43 have been ongoing cases and 29 have

been brief intervention. That is actually really significant, given we are talking about high end and high risk young people, that is children and families. That is actually a significant workload and I think they have actually done that really well.

Again, I think we have to objectively evaluate it and we will do that, so it will be incorporated within the next stage of what we actually do. Barnardos is aware of that and they have set up the data collection frameworks and everything they need to do to facilitate that.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Just finishing on that, perhaps it is the inevitable difficulty of governments dealing with things against private enterprise, but it was said to us that some of the voluntary non-government organisations—

**CHAIR:** I do not think Barnardos would like to be called private enterprise. Perhaps you should say NGOs.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Some of the private enterprise non-government organisations were saying that they could do the same job for one tenth of the budget, and that was a common theme that those organisations could do it well. What do we say to them in answer?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Literally we encouraged non-Government organisations in Redfern and Waterloo to apply through the tender process. We seriously did. We went out to inter-agencies and made sure that agencies in Redfern and Waterloo were aware of the tender process and I can guarantee that they absolutely were aware of the tender process, because a number of them actually rang up for information and so forth, so they were aware of it.

Literally Barnardos were selected because they demonstrated the capacity to deliver on it. Other organisations who applied through that tender process did not demonstrate that capacity. I am not saying that they may or may not be able to do it, but in that process they did not demonstrate that capacity. I guess the results speak for themselves. As you have said yourself, Barnardos is showing that they are actually meeting that high end need and prior to us setting up that intensive family support service that high end group was not being met by the existing services. I guess I could turn it around the other way and say that, if that capacity already existed within Redfern and Waterloo, those services were not meeting that need. We encouraged them to come into that process, but Barnardos had the skill set that they have obviously established internationally and they were able to bring that in in terms of a new approach in Redfern and Waterloo, which has shown to be successful, and again subject to the evaluation - I do qualify it.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Dr Gellatly mentioned that you took on board the issues, lack of objectives, measurement and so on, for the Redfern/Waterloo partnership. What is your timeframe for actually responding to that and coming up with something concrete in terms of measurable outcomes?

**Dr GELLATLY:** In terms of our internal planning processes, Michael's team is establishing a business plan and trying to give us some measures on how we can look at it. There is a framework in the human services area that is quite popular at present, the Freidman framework, which we are trying to work on and get some measures out of that.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Are we talking about six months, twelve months?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes, I think within this financial year, so by June next year.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And you will publicise those?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** In relation to the Block--

**CHAIR:** No, I am sorry.



**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I am filling in a couple of questions.

**CHAIR:** I am sorry, Mr Pearce, Ian and Arthur--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I have had five minutes.

**CHAIR:** But the Block is a whole new subheading.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** This is just background. What has happened to the evaluation and the audit--

**CHAIR:** No, Mr Pearce, really it would be a great help if Committee members get their fair go. You can ask questions about the Block--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I have had five minutes and you have taken up half of it.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, we will get on to the Block later.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** No, it is background that I would like to know.

**CHAIR:** Mr West has the call. You can ask your questions on the Block when we get to the Block, but we cannot hop amongst six Committee members and something like eight different topics.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** With regard to the redevelopment of the Block--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Just to make it plain, the Committee has not agreed to your list of questions.

**CHAIR:** Mr West, could I ask you not to ask that. I thought you had a question about consultation?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You are going to play one rule with him and one rule with me, are you?

**CHAIR:** I just asked Mr West not to get on to the Block.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** The Committee has not agreed on the order of questions and, if members want to ask questions on things that are of interest to them, that is what members normally do on parliamentary committees. If I could have asked the question, it would have been answered in two minutes and I could have handed over to Mr West without you causing another commotion. It is a simple question.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, I am going to say three or four very simple things: Firstly, the questions are not prepared by me, they are prepared by our secretariat, in this case particularly by Julie and Merrin. Secondly, I made--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Precisely. Members are entitled to ask whatever questions they want to ask and I will ask the questions that I want to ask.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, could you please let me finish? Secondly--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** If you had let me ask the question we would have had it over and done with by now, we would have had the answer and it would have been all over and done with.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, you have been objectionable on many occasions during this hearing.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** No, you are the objectionable one. You keep interrupting when I am asking a legitimate question. Ian West wanted to ask similar questions.

**CHAIR:** As the Chair of this Committee, I am going to finish the statement that I was making: The second point is that at the beginning of this whole session I pointed out that we have two sets of questions under a number of different headings. I then said we have the first section on the Redfern-Waterloo Authority and we would try to finish that and, having gone through the framework, different members of the Committee could join in. It happens that we have gone on to the third section, government and non-government services. Since well before you started asking questions, I have had both Mr West and Dr Chesterfield-Evans asking if they could ask questions. I had assumed, I must admit, because Mr West said something before about consultation, that his questions - and Arthur also assured me - were in this area, so we are going to finish on related questions. Then we will move on to the Block.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You do not have the right to insist that I cannot ask the questions that I want to ask.

**CHAIR:** Mr West, you have the call.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You are appalling as a chairman, absolutely appalling.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** In regard to the question of feedback from the Redfern and Waterloo local communities and the issue of the quality of that consultation, you mentioned the fact that there was a web site. I am trying to visualise the amount of people in the Redfern and Waterloo community who would have access to that web site and I am thinking to myself that that is part of the consultation process, but in terms of trying to measure the quality of that consultation I am somewhat concerned about the proactivity of the consultation process.

**Mr RAMSEY:** I am sorry, I was only using the web site as an example of how we are trying to address the communication issue. In terms of the consultation, the major initiatives we have put in place in recent times have been around the human services review and, as I said, our consultation. Admittedly we used consultants to actually undertake the consultation, but that is quite a legitimate process in order to get transparency. It was probably one of the better consultation processes and the community I think would actually acknowledge that Morgan Disney were a highly professional, competent firm that consulted with them very well around the human services review. Again, in our submission, there was other consultation and what we are trying to do is pick up the communication part of it, so we have developed a communication strategy. We are just in the process of implementing that, and I acknowledge we are still grappling with it, but that communication strategy is actually going to be built around some elements related to community engagement. We want to meet with all stakeholders and actually identify with them what the key issues are that they want addressed and how they want to be communicated with. This will come out as we have the communication person on, we will have the capacity to do this. We want to develop a meeting strategy and have that published well and truly in advance, almost giving people three months or six months in advance and saying: This is what our meeting schedule is going to be and these are the issues, so we actually give people advance notice of what we are doing.

We have not done this well, I am not saying that we have done this well up to now, I am acknowledging that, but we want people to know what is happening and when it is going to actually happen. We want to ensure that there is consistency across information because again we have inconsistent information that has gone out across agencies, so we want consistency across all government agencies in terms of the messages we are actually sending out. We want to develop a whole range of materials that will ensure that people are informed so that they can actually then make their own decisions about the direction that we are going in and those communication materials will include fact sheets and newsletters. I mean the fact that we have been able to get fact sheets out in a reasonable period of time this time is at least a start. We will have a newsletter out, my guess is, within the next two or three weeks which will bring the whole lot together and so forth, and we will also publish and tell people when those are coming out. What we are also trying to do is create

themes. I think I actually have some fact sheets - if you have not got them, I am happy to table them - but what--

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** I am more concerned about what the local community has and I am concerned that history does not pass us by. I am getting the impression that the whole communication process of the Redfern/Waterloo project - not Morgan Disney, who is a consultant who came in to do a job on human resources, but your particular organisation.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** I hope I am desperately wrong, but I am getting the distinct impression that your communication skills, if you like, are not hitting the mark.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Mr West, we have acknowledged that we have not--

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** That has been acknowledged now for a number of months.

**Mr RAMSEY:** But, to be perfectly honest, what we have had to do is actually get the resources and the capacity to be able to meet those shortfalls in our performance - and they are shortfalls.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** You have not got the time to be gathering those resources for the next 12 months.

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, I agree with you totally, which is why these fact sheets are already out on the web site, they are being hand-delivered on Tuesday of next week--

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** I want to say to you, Mr Ramsey--

**CHAIR:** Mr West, I think you need to let him finish the sentence.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** I think I know what the sentence is.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I think Mr West is going very well.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** Can I say that I think the number of people that would see the web site out there, who really are the ones you need to communicate with, would probably be about .01 percent.

**Mr RAMSEY:** I agree with you.

**CHAIR:** I think the problem was that the half-sentence was that these sheets would be delivered in letterboxes.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Next Tuesday. They will be delivered next Tuesday to the households. By Friday there will be a human services newsletter out to the community. As I said, we have been slow in doing this, but we are now addressing this issue. The Redfern plan actually talking about the authority - the Bill only went into Parliament yesterday. That is readily available and it will be out everywhere by Tuesday. The community health facility was only announced 10 days ago - don't hold me to that, 10 days ago or thereabouts - and that fact sheet is out. The human services review was only announced on Wednesday. That fact sheet will be out next week. The jobs plan fact sheet will be out by the end of next week, and that is to households.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** A newsletter does not make a communication, does it?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, I am agreeing with you, it does not.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And a fact sheet does not make a communication.

**Mr RAMSEY:** No.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** With \$12 million worth of funding.

**CHAIR:** Could I please ask Committee members to respect the right of other Committee members to ask their questions?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** If you respected the right of Committee members to ask their questions you would not get so much concern when they are not allowed to ask their questions. If you respected my right to ask the questions which I wanted to ask before, we would have filled in less time arguing and got some answers.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, your greatest problem on this Committee is that you would like to be the chair, but you are not. Mr West, could you continue with your questions, and then Dr Chesterfield-Evans wanted to ask some questions.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Mr West has already had eight minutes; you gave me five.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Could I say that I think Michael is underestimating the amount of communication he does. The office is located in Redfern and the staff are there. There needs to be some specialist staff on communications, but I know just from the contact I have with Michael that there would not be a day going by where he would not be talking to one of the community leaders in the Redfern-Waterloo area, and often on more bases, so it is happening out there. One of the difficulties, like any difficult issue where there are social issues and different groups, some people when they do not see a decision made or they see something happening that they do not agree with say they have not been consulted and that there have not been communications. I think that there is an incredible amount of informal consultation and communication happening and I agree with the comments that it is not just about newsletters and particularly access to the web site and all of that, but it is a matter of on-the-ground talking to people on a daily basis when you see them in the street and that sort of thing, having community meetings and meeting with community leaders. I know that that does happen and I think Michael is underestimating it, but there is always going to be criticism that it is not enough and it is a matter of trying to find smarter ways to do it and get to more people.

**The Hon. IAN WEST:** I do not doubt for one moment that that is being done. The urgency in my questions goes to the issue of the perception on the ground that has been there probably since 1788, but we need to try to come to grips with it.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** The criticism seems to be that more and more layers are added on top and that the communication between the top and the people doing the job has been poor. I was interested in your answer when you said: we have newsletters coming out real fast now, they are coming down like confetti. I mean, when you talked about the tendering process, if you had a set of needs and you had a set of people delivering services who all, to our ears, said they were under-resourced, if you then put a complex tender to somebody who is going to offer a pretty comprehensive service, obviously you are going to favour a couple of big NGOs over the little ones which together may provide that service. Was not Barnardos just putting another layer in on top, rather than understanding what was going on?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, I actually do not think so. What Barnardos brought in was a skill set which was absent from the service system within Redfern and Waterloo, which is why it has achieved the success that it has actually achieved. There were some families who were at the really hard end whose needs were not actually being met.

**CHAIR:** DoCS failed them.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Was that a lack of resources in the people?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, it was actually a different skill set that was required, a capacity to do really intensive one to one work with families with a particular set of interventions and so forth.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** You had not done the human services review at that stage?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** How could you make that decision?

**Mr RAMSEY:** This actually came out of a lot of work that was done by a number of agencies, so the total consultancy that we referred to in our submission was the work that actually led to the development of that intensive family support service, and the specifications around the criteria that would be used to develop that service came out of that process.

That was actually done in consultation with the community. It was done in consultation with services. There was an agreement across the sector about the type of skill set that was needed to deliver that sort of service. Whether Barnardos was the appropriate one, or whether there were other organisations that had the skill set was unknown at the time we went to tender, and it was only through the tender process that it became apparent that Barnardos had the skill set that we wanted to deliver that.

That does not mean that agencies within Redfern and Waterloo did not apply to actually provide that service, but through that tender process and through the evaluation of the tender - and I emphasise that this was an objective tender process--

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Do not these tenders always favour big NGOs over a combination of little ones, by definition?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Then explain to me why we actually selected in that broader tender process some of the small NGOs to provide some of the other services in Redfern and Waterloo. If you look, for instance, at the Redfern/Waterloo street team, some of the partners in that street team are actually from services within Redfern and Waterloo. I am not prepared to disclose their names, but I can tell you that some large organisations tendered for that, to be part of that street team, and they were unsuccessful. Why they were unsuccessful was because they were not able to establish that they had the skill set that they were able to deliver that we needed for the street team. It is actually a matter of actually matching up skill sets against the criteria that we use.

Let us talk about the Mudgin Gal in home family support service that was put in place. Again, there were other organisations who tendered for that service. Mudgin Gal is a very small service, but they demonstrated through that process that they had the skills and the connection to the community that assured us that they could deliver on the outcomes that were to be achieved by that project. The same with the cultural and linguistically diverse family counselling service. We did not select agencies on the basis of whether they were small or large, we selected agencies on the basis of could they deliver the outcomes that were required to meet the needs of Redfern and Waterloo. That means that some large organisations missed out on some of the tenders and Barnardos happened to meet the criteria for one of the tender processes.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** The general principle of the Government is that you call for tenders consistently, rather than work with teams and know how they are going and help them along in a partnership agreement. The title of your organisation is Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project, yet you went back to the provider funded split model where you take them out and demand tenders to do it, rather than saying this is what this group is doing, let us work in a cooperative or partnership model.

The Government does that, what, as a matter of policy, because it seems that all of the NGOs complain that they spend half of their time, a huge amounts of resources, forever preparing tenders which they do not get, so that all of the competitive advantage, if you like, is lost in the resources of preparing a tender, of which presumably there is only one successful tenderer each time.

**Dr GELLATLY:** I think that you have hit upon a question that becomes a government procurement and always has about the balance between the probity and what is right with partnerships and how you get that. I can assure you if there had been some deals done and someone in the project said "We think they are a good organisation, we will get them in and work with them" there would have been someone else complaining if there was not a competitive process and it was not fair and there was favouritism and that sort of thing. You have to balance that.

We are aware that it comes up in the review that the issue of the amount of time some of the small NGOs have to spend on paperwork and that sort of thing and there are possible ways we can get around that by having a common provider so that they do not have to do it themselves and spend an inordinate amount of time.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Certainly a number of them have said they would like a common protocol. One said they had nine project grants from six organisations with six different reporting requirements, both Federal and State. If at least the State ones rationalised their reporting requirements and tender requirements it would be a lot easier for them.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Certainly at a State level we are doing that. In the Premier's Department we have just finished a review right across the Government called the Grants Administration Review. We have been looking at those and we are developing some protocols which the Auditor General mentioned recently in reports about having a common database and having common application forms and reporting requirements, and probably trying to lessen a few of those shorter term lower amount ones, because we have found that some of the reporting requirements for a grant of \$60,000 might be the same as for a few million, so there has to be a bit of risk analysis, saying that we only need the basic facts for the lower one.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** The Morgan Disney review seems to be very general in that it does not seem to do a report card on anybody. If you were trying to say: okay, we have these general laudable objectives but who do we give the money to, after you have had somebody review the human services in great detail, you still have not got them saying to you: look, give the money to this one and not that one, for this purpose and not that purpose. Without apparently any marking, if you want to call it that, or inspecting or evaluating of service providers, how are you going to make those decisions in future?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Can I answer one part and I will come back to that, just to pick up on an issue. I think there is an issue about monitoring of services and the expectations which are high in terms of non-government agencies. One of the outcomes of the human services review and one of the things that we will be implementing as part of this new human services plan, is we are moving to one agency review and monitoring of service delivery, so instead of having accountability across four or five government agencies, we are moving to single agency accountability across the whole of Government.

That will actually address some of the fundamental issues you are saying, so instead of having to report to different government agencies we will have one agency evaluating on behalf of all government agencies. That will streamline the process quite significantly.

What it will also do, which is perhaps even more significant, is it will ensure that community outcomes are delivered rather than program outcomes, so it will break down those silos where the focus is actually on programs, rather than trying to reverse it around, which is about let us talk about delivering community outcomes, let us talk about delivering individual outcomes and then they should link to program outcomes. It should not be the other way around.

The single monitoring of services allows that to actually occur. Equally though, what it does is put in another benchmark in terms of increased accountability, and this is accountability of both government and non-government services in Redfern and Waterloo. It is all well and good to talk about non-Government services, but government services in Redfern and Waterloo should also be accountable.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Why did you leave the government services out of it?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Well, that is it, we did not.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Particularly if you--

**Mr RAMSEY:** We did not.

**CHAIR:** Can I ask - excuse me, Michael.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Hang on, let me finish.

**CHAIR:** No.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** It is right on the point he has just spoken about.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Come on, let him ask his question.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** It is right on the point he has just spoken about.

**CHAIR:** The Deputy Chair of the Committee just asked me specifically whether we have got on to the new questions on the human services review yet and I said no, because we had not finished. She then said that you had.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Why do not you do what was said before and respect the Member's right to ask the questions he wants to ask?

**CHAIR:** I would ask you to hold that question until we have completed the questions on notice, because the questions of the human services review, like you they only got at lunch time.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** I will come back to the previous subject then.

**CHAIR:** I will allow you to ask it by all means. As I said to the Hon. Greg Pearce, I would allow him to ask the question on the Block, which is the next question in our earlier ones.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Let me go back to another question.

**CHAIR:** I think we could pick up the Block now. I am trying to go through the questions the secretariat has prepared and circulated and make sure we cover them and let Members ask both them and their own. I think it is going to be a lot better if we try to stick to particular sections.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** I was going to link the Elizabeth Rice one with the ones we have done already on the subject of the scope of the authority.

**CHAIR:** Please, it would make more sense if we try to deal with them in batches, so at this stage it would be better if The Hon. Greg Pearce got his chance to go to the question on the Block, and then we have some remaining services. I was hoping that you would ask the street team one, for

instance, and finish through those. If we could pick up the ones on the Block now, which probably need to be slightly updated, given that those questions were prepared a couple of weeks ago.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** What has happened in relation to the valuation of the Block?

**CHAIR:** That is not in the first one we have sent them.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** These are not Committee questions.

**CHAIR:** They are Committee questions.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** The staff do a fantastic job and they have done a wonderful comprehensive job here, but I am sorry, I will ask the questions I want to ask as a Member of the Committee particularly given that we will run out of time.

**CHAIR:** I am sorry, that is not the way it works.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** One of the outstanding issues - it is the way it works.

**CHAIR:** These questions were sent to you over two weeks ago and if you did not like these questions you could easily have told the secretariat about it.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I like the questions, they are very good, but I have other questions. What has happened about the valuation of the Block?

**CHAIR:** Which is the actually the second dot point.

**Dr GELLATLY:** The work has been done but it has been prepared for the workings of Cabinet and there are still deliberations going on.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And the audit of the Aboriginal Housing Committee?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Similar.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** When will we see the outcomes on that?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I cannot comment on that. When the Government makes or Cabinet makes the decision.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** What was the cost of the Morgan Disney report?

**CHAIR:** I am sorry, that is another question which is in the second batch.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Come on, you said you wanted to get through the questions.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, you told me you wanted to ask questions about the Block.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I told you I want to ask the questions I want to ask.

**CHAIR:** There is a question here with a whole series of sub-questions on it.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You can ask those or I will ask those at the end.

**CHAIR:** If you do not wish to ask them, I will.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I want to finish my questions and if you had just stopped interrupting we would have been finished my questions ages ago.



**CHAIR:** You may ask the prepared questions that the staff gave you two weeks ago on the Block, or I will. Dr Gellatly or Mr Ramsey, if you would answer question seven. Can you tell us the role that the RWPP has had, what involvement--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You really are outrageous us and you really ought to be replaced as Chairman. I think we might have to do something about that.

**CHAIR:** --it has had with the Aboriginal Housing Company--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You really are an appalling Chairman and you make people think--

**CHAIR:** --and the Pemulwuy Redevelopment Project since our interim report was released in August.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You make a mockery of the whole Committee system. You make an absolute mockery of the Committee system.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, if you had wished to ask these questions, I have given you about five opportunities.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I have told you that I want to ask questions that I as a Member of Parliament and as a Member of this Committee am entitled to ask. If the Committee had ever made a decision we would have asked particular questions and that is what we would have done.

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly, would you like to start on the questions we sent you a couple of weeks ago?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I want to ask the questions that I, as a Member of Parliament and as a Member of this Committee am entitled to ask.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Apart from general discussions--

**CHAIR:** We have agreed we are going on to the Block and you have had your opportunity.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** We have not agreed anything.

**CHAIR:** Thanks, Dr Gellatly.

**Dr GELLATLY:** As I said, apart from--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** We have only agreed that you should be replaced as Chair.

**CHAIR:** Go on, Dr Gellatly.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** That is the only thing we have agreed on.

**Dr GELLATLY:** It is very hard to answer a question when somebody else is talking.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Dr Gellatly, as you know the Committee Members are entitled to speak and entitled to ask questions and entitled to resolve issues.

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly I think--

**Dr GELLATLY:** I was asked a question by the Chair and I am trying to answer it.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I would have preferred that you answer the question that I had already asked you.

**Dr GELLATLY:** I have to respect to the Chair's position.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Which was the cost of the Morgan Disney report.

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly, may I suggest that you--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** If you say that you want to answer a question, you should answer the question that I asked you, which was the cost of the Morgan Disney report.

**CHAIR:** Mr Pearce, we have discussed on many occasions--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Are you ruling that it is out of order because it is outside the terms of reference, or what are you doing?

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly, would please answer the question that I asked you?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Answer the question that I asked you because I was given the call and I have asked you a question.

**CHAIR:** Would you please start answering question 7, which we sent to you a couple of weeks ago?

**Dr GELLATLY:** There is not much to say.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You want to hide the cost of the Disney report?

**Dr GELLATLY:** No, I am happy to answer that if I am asked.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Answer it.

**Dr GELLATLY:** I am answering--

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly, could I--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Just answer it and we will move on.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Shall I say it to both at the one time?

**CHAIR:** Could I ask you to answer the question?

**Dr GELLATLY:** In terms of the development of the Block. The Disney Report Cost was \$149,000.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Thank you very much.

**CHAIR:** Dr Gellatly, would you please address question 7, which we sent to you prior to the hearing on 3 November, which we had to cancel?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Basically, apart from informal discussions that I think Michael has probably had and I have had with Mick Mundine on a number of occasions, there has been nothing decided. There are clearly some issues that have to be worked out within Government and there has been no decision made as yet, so I cannot comment on that policy process.

**CHAIR:** In the first section - and perhaps Michael should answer this - we asked what

involvement the project had had with the AHC and the redevelopment project since our interim report was released. Have you had further discussions with them since then?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Clearly we have had ongoing discussions with the AHC to try to clarify what the options are so we could actually start to progress the position in terms of the Block, but it is only informal discussion. State Government agencies have still been working with the Aboriginal Housing Company to facilitate the redevelopment. For instance, the government architect has spent a significant amount of time working with the Aboriginal Housing Company to look at what the options are around the Block. That work will continue. There has been ongoing work, but there is no resolution and, until such time as Cabinet makes a decision, there is nothing further we can do.

**CHAIR:** So, Dr Gellatly, would it be correct to say in answer to the last two sub-questions that the New South Wales Government has not yet made a decision about a funding commitment of its own?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Also is it true that the Government has not yet approached the Federal Government in relation to making a contribution?

**Dr GELLATLY:** We had some informal discussions, Michael and I, with some Commonwealth Government staff, but that was before the election, so they were in caretaker mode, and it was just a general background discussion. Really it is an issue that needs to be taken up. There are things happening on broader policy framework and what happens after ATSIC and also the type of funding arrangements that they are going to have with Aboriginal communities, what that would mean for the Block and so on, so I think there is a number of issues floating around at the national level as well that need to be taken into account and worked out over time.

**CHAIR:** We are still going through those questions that we sent you some time ago. I have crossed out questions 9 and 10 because I think they have been overtaken by events, given that the human services review has now been released, but we have not yet addressed the policing question and there are a number of others in relation to government and non-government services and the partnership project that we have to run through. Ms Parker, could you pick up some of those and then we can get on to the new set that was distributed today?

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Before we do go to that, one of the reasons we ask our own questions at times rather than having a set of questions and you responding to them - we could write to you and you could respond - is that things are said in discussion that raise other questions. A large part of our terms of reference was proposals for the future of the area known as the Block. I have to say, after months of this inquiry, we have not really got very far. Did you say that the Committee would not be supplied with information about the audit and the financial affairs of the Aboriginal Housing Company or the progress in terms of an evaluation?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes, currently those documents are part of the Cabinet process.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** They were not Cabinet process before.

**Dr GELLATLY:** They are now.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** So we can expect some sort of announcement at some time?

**Dr GELLATLY:** You have to remember that this has been tried to be solved for I don't know how long, since the land was granted to the Aboriginal Housing Company back in 1973, we are talking about 30-something years. This is a really difficult issue and process. There has been a lot of work in the last few years; we have been working closely with the Aboriginal Housing Company in a lot of the work they have been doing.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** But you have not been able to give us any more information

since the first time you came here. In the meantime the Government has given the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project another commitment of \$2.5 million a year up to 2008 and you have no more information in terms of the redevelopment of the Block.

**Dr GELLATLY:** But they are totally different issues.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** But that is what this partnership project has been doing.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes, it has been working on it and I think you have to have patience. It is a really complex issue. There are different views amongst the different Aboriginal community leaders on this issue and there are some very, very complex--

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** The audit is a financial statement, it is not a community view; it is a black and white financial statement.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes, but what is the point of that? We are talking about the redevelopment of the Block. That is one bit about the internal affairs of the Aboriginal Housing Company. The redevelopment of the Block is a lot more complex and a lot broader than that. That is just one small part and it is not necessarily how to do the solution, it is just some information that is around.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** It is some information in terms of what is there, an evaluation and an audit and an estimation of capacity to manage, surely?

**Dr GELLATLY:** But where do you go from there with that? I mean there has to be a lot more work done on the design, the whole issue.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** You have not been able to tell us where you go from there. Chair, can I get some clarification: We are not talking about the human services review yet or are we talking about government and non-government services?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** You can talk about what you want to talk about, but you will just be stopped.

**CHAIR:** I have pointed out that the questions that have not yet been addressed are questions 8 and 11, the policing and the health care facility, and then parts of the questions on the project. The suggestion was that we then get on to the new questions, which obviously have only been circulated at 12.30. Would you like to deal with the policing one or the proposed primary health care facility questions?

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** I would really like to ask a general question about government and non-government services and that is, in terms of the human services review and your proposed combining of NGOs, can you give me a commitment that that is not some sort of way to defund some of those NGOs? Will their funding be maintained?

**Mr RAMSEY:** It has been articulated well before this, when we started the human services review, that the intention of the human services review is not to reduce the level of funding to Redfern and Waterloo. That was the clearly articulated position.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** That might be your intention, but can you give me a definite commitment that funding to NGOs will not be reduced as an outcome of this initiative to combine NGOs and have them pool their resources, et cetera?

**Dr GELLATLY:** We cannot give a concrete undertaking that there will never be any defunding of things. All we can say is that the process we have been undertaking under the direction of Government is to look at ways of improving the allocation of the money, not to look at trying to achieve savings, but we cannot give a categorical commitment, that is a matter of the budget process and appropriations and that sort of thing. I am not in a position to do that.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** The details of the primary health care facility, which you have talked about and we have had an announcement about, in Lawson Street, Redfern, have been somewhat sketchy. Can you tell us what is actually going to be provided there; what consultation you have had with the community, with health care providers; why you have determined that location; when are you going to close the needle van and what sort of availability will there be in terms of availability of clean syringes, et cetera, to people 24 hours a day?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I will answer the question, but some of the detail you may need to actually raise with the appropriate department, that is the area health service. Let me give you where we are up to at the present time in terms of it: The community health facility is intended to provide an improved and holistic response to the health needs of the whole community. It is not an Aboriginal specific service, but will provide improved outcomes for all of the residents. It aims to provide a fundamental range of services for people who may not usually access mainstream health services and so we are going to provide a continuum of services ranging from health assessments to treatment and care of drug related injuries, drug and alcohol assessments and referrals, welfare support, counselling, family support services, ante-natal services, so it is a full range of community health services. There will be a range of specialist visiting services that will be made accessible through that community health care facility and that will include things like mental health and sexual health services, HIV AIDS and hepatitis screening, ante-natal/post-natal will be provided in collaboration with stakeholders such as the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and local general practitioners, but again it is important to emphasise that this is not intended to duplicate what is on the ground, it is intended to complement what is already on the ground.

It is scheduled for completion by about the middle of 2005, to be up and operational by then. It will cost about \$1.5 million, and I think that was in the announcement, with an annual commitment of about \$550,000. The entrance will be on Lawson Street. The site was selected on the basis that it was a good location for a health service. The reason that the service was established was in response to repeated calls from the community for both improved health outcomes and also for the relocation of the mobile needle and syringe service. You raised that issue specifically in your interim report and this new facility responds exactly to the issues you raised in your interim report. There has been obviously extensive consultation with the community even around the relocation of the needle van. You are aware of that consultation, it has been ongoing for 18 months to two years, et cetera. Added to that, the review of human services actually identified that there was a need for additional health services in the area, which you are aware of. This responds to what some of those are.

The bottom line in all of this is that we are trying to put in a community health facility. As soon as that is up and actually running then we will relocate the needle van because you have to recognise - and you raised this issue yourself in your interim report - we have a responsibility in terms of public health to make sure that we address appropriate and real health concerns around intravenous drug users.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** My question was not to dispute the value of such a service, it was to find out the specifics in terms of availability of clean syringes 24 hours a day, the location of that sort of service and what you propose to do with the needle van. The press release I read said that it was going to close down. I am just wondering, when it closes down, what your alternative arrangements are. I know about the holistic health service and I understand that.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Well, the mobile needle and syringe service will actually be closed down at the time that we have the community health facility up and running, so that there is no gap between the provision of appropriate public health responses that this community obviously needs.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** So people who require clean syringes will be able to access those 24 hours a day?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, I did not say 24 hours a day. At present they are not accessing syringes 24 hours a day. The existing service operates, I think, from 10 to 3 in one location and from 3 to 5 in another location. It is not our intention to reduce the hours that such a service would be available

once the new service is actually up and running.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** So you are not going to have a vending machine or anything like that?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No. What we are trying to do is provide continuous services, so that when people actually come in they are actually getting an appropriate health response and within that context they access the availability of needles.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** If I could just start off by perhaps asking Dr Gellatly to make a comment on something that I am just about to say and that was in relation to the issue that was mentioned previously in today's hearing, about the reporting processes that NGOs and probably State Government bodies have to go through when there is funding that crosses between Federal and State, that there is no uniformity about how those processes occur. That is certainly a complaint from NGOs in relation to the amount of time that is spent in the reporting process when funding might go across.

If you go back to the example of small NGOs collaborating to try to provide services through a number of them in an area such as Redfern/Waterloo - but this problem obviously operates not just in Redfern/Waterloo but outside - Dr Gellatly, could you comment on how the State Government is trying to resolve some of these problems, because that is time and money that is taken up by not providing the on the ground services.

**Dr GELLATLY:** Yes. As I indicated, we have undertaken the grants administration review and that has been in discussion with the peak NCOSS, the State body, and the messages that have come through have been what you have said. People worry about the complexity of reporting, the fact that they have to comply with a number of different levels of government and those sorts of things.

There is a number of things that government agencies are doing. There is a computer system, an intranet, that is being linked up for all NGOs of all sizes so that they will be able to access the data, tap into it, and it is called an on line database that they will be able to access and see who has money available and that sort of thing. It is providing the capacity in the NGOs to be able to access that in terms of computer and broadband access and so on.

I could give you in detail in writing, I guess, what is happening across the board but it is an issue over the last three or four years where we have been working mainly with the human service agencies, but it happens in the natural resource agencies as well and it happens in the environmental area generally. It goes right across, because the total amount of grants if you look at it in the budget, depending on how you define grants, you can certainly get a couple of billion and if you include some of the transfers through arts institutions and so on, you are probably getting up to five million.

I think that there is about a billion across the Government in terms of human services, environmental, sporting and recreation, all those sorts of things, there is about \$1 billion in those smaller grants that we are trying to get some efficiencies out of. I can certainly give you some recent information on that.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** Is there discussion with the Federal counterparts in relation to some uniformity across organisations?

**Dr GELLATLY:** We have had some recent talks over the time with the Commonwealth about this. I have noticed that they have now got a new Minister and a portfolio which is combining all the agencies that hand out money in terms of Centrelink and so on, so we will be keen to have a talk with them about where we can work with them to simplify it.

We have government access centres located throughout the State in the Roads and Traffic Authority offices and we have been working with Centrelink on a number of occasions to see whether they can provide access for both citizens and NGOs, but it is something we have to do some more

corrected

work on.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** I think the Committee would appreciate some further information.

**Dr GELLATLY:** We are happy to do that.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** Could I ask about one of the issues that has been mentioned all the way through this inquiry, which is the involvement with policing issues, particularly since the Committee's interim report. Are there any comments in relation to the relationship between policing Aboriginal communities since the interim report?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I might ask Michael to give any comment. Clearly this is an issue more for the Ministry of Police and the police service themselves. The one comment I did make earlier about the rugby league tournament that happened over the long weekend, there was lot of interaction with the police and the Local Area Command and all of the people on the ground and I would just comment that that worked very successfully and Michael might be able to provide some more general comments.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Obviously the role of the partnership project is actually to facilitate government responses and clearly our relationship with police is within that context, so any comments are within that context of us undertaking that role. In that capacity I think that police have made some significant headway in actually addressing some of the concerns that have been raised by the Aboriginal community.

Operation Allunga was widely praised by the Aboriginal community leaders as being a new day in Aboriginal and police relations in Redfern. The Aboriginal community had been saying for a long period of time that they wanted drug dealing dealt with effectively in Redfern and Waterloo, and they saw Operation Allunga as actually achieving that. The fact that there were five addresses on the Block that were identified and were actually targeted in that and 28 people were identified through controlled drug purchases, was actually really well received and in fact I am still hearing comments about that, and Aboriginal people are very responsive about the fact that police are actually taking action in terms of that.

I think also the fact that police now in Redfern are undergoing cultural awareness training is a very good, positive step and again I think it actually has the support of the broad Aboriginal community. It has been run out of Tranby College and the feedback seems to be quite good about that.

To add in terms of what the Director-General has actually said, the success of the Aboriginal knock out, it was seriously considered that this was the best knock out that had actually occurred in Redfern. If you go back a few years it operated nowhere near as effectively as this. Again, it was not actually just that it was a successful event, what made it so good was the actual relationship between all of the people that were directly involved in this, particularly the police and the Aboriginal organisers and the Aboriginal community in delivering an absolutely successful event.

The police have also set up advisory committees, the ones that they talked about when they were here last. They have been set up and established, so I think that the police are absolutely heading in the right direction in terms of their relationship with the Aboriginal community and we will continue to encourage them to actually work along that way.

Having said that, if you want more detailed specifics I think you need to go to police about that and ask for more details from the Ministry of Police about that.

**CHAIR:** At this point I think that we have covered most of those questions that we sent you a couple of weeks ago. We might need to ask on notice for some more details, but we should get on to the new ones, particularly about the human services review.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Why were the core services of some key Government departments such as DoCS, Police, Health and Education excluded from the review and I note the comments on page 122 which commented, "whilst the core services of some key Government departments were excluded from the review, issues related to the delivery of these core services was raised constantly during the review". Obviously that is a problem, particularly as Morgan Disney is being quite non-specific and generic, so they are not doing an inspection of the report, so that anything that the departments were doing or not doing would not have been specified, so is not that a slightly defensive strategy for a comprehensive service review?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, because this was an incredibly complex review. In fact Morgan and Disney have described as without precedent in terms of the extent of this review. The review involved 192 services. It was a phenomenally large complex review to actually undertake.

Because it was so complex, if we had tossed into the equation the statutory responsibilities, and that is the only exceptions, the statutory responsibilities of those large government agencies, we would be waiting another six or 12 months for the outcomes of the review to be actually produced.

We did capture in the review government services, so every single government service in Redfern and Waterloo outside of the statutory responsibilities of those key agencies were not included. For instance, in terms of DoCS, a number of DoCS services were captured, such as the Yallamundi intensive family support service; in terms of police, the youth liaison officer for the police was captured; the domestic violence officers were captured. In terms of education, a lot of their school community programs were captured and reviewed. We did not exclude those agencies.

We captured a number of health services in the review because they are specific to Redfern and Waterloo. What we did not address is those non-specific core statutory responsibilities because the review was already complex and we knew it was going to be complex, and in fact it turned out to be more complex than we ever anticipated. That does not mean that there are not issues about some of those core statutory responsibilities of those services that may need to be addressed and that will be the next step along the process.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Is it not extraordinary that you have been running the partnership project for some time, you did not have a list of the 192 services. There is 192 services being put in there, I think 130 something agencies, it seems it grew up like Topsy. No-one has a clue and even when you get a consultant in it is so complicated that you have to leave some of the Government departments out. Does not that say something about higgledy piggledy administration, that in this State you do not even know what your are doing? This is only two suburbs where we have all these services. Surely there ought to be some sort of structure into which this fits and someone ought to be know the structure and understand it so that you can actually manage it. How can the State manage it when it has not got a clue and it gets a consultant in and then it is even too complicated for the consultant to look at.

**Mr RAMSEY:** First of all, not all of these services are State Government funded services. When we talk about 192 services, some of them were actually funded by the Commonwealth and some of them were funded through the Sydney City Council. What we have is a holistic picture for the first time of what services are out there within the community.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** They are not even mentioned here. You have a lot of generality but you still do not know who is delivering what, do you?

**Mr RAMSEY:** We absolutely do. We know--

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** There are appendices here but they are not available.

**Mr RAMSEY:** There is a list of services. We are producing a service directory that will go out to all services, which lists what those services are, and that will be made available and Morgan Disney is preparing such a list for us now. We have a comprehensive overview of what services are



in Redfern and Waterloo and we need to know that and the community needs to know that so they know how to access those services.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** It will be management by list.

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, it is not management by list, it is management by trying to actually get a service system that has the capacity to respond to the needs within that community. I think that if you read that Morgan Disney report it gives clear direction where to go to in terms of the future. The options that they have put forward, options 1, 2 and 3, and any recommendations that they included in the report, give actually a very clear future direction. Once that is actually put in place I think you will find that it will be a fundamentally different service system.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Is the Government guaranteeing to implement the Morgan Disney report?

**Mr RAMSEY:** The Government has adopted the Morgan Disney report.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** It has three options. Which option are you going to do?

**Mr RAMSEY:** We announced that we were taking option three, and option three actually has been accepted. We are working towards having option three implemented by May next year, which is what our intention is, and we will take it back then to Cabinet for sign off in May next year. Again, that was articulated by the Minister for Community Services and the Minister who now has responsibility for Redfern and Waterloo.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Is the authority merely just a Minister on top of you with a bit more resources to implement this plan? It has much the same responsibility, has it not, or is it more complicated?

**Mr RAMSEY:** The authority is focussed on infrastructure in Redfern/Waterloo.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** In that a criticism of your partnership, that you are too focussed on infrastructure and not enough on human services?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No. The partnership project will have defined areas of responsibility, around human services delivery, around community safety, coordination of government agencies, around crisis management, work that needs to be done within the area because there are significant issues that arise from time to time in terms of families being in crisis, so there are defined areas of responsibility between the partnership project and the authority.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Why did you choose option three?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And what was the difference between that and the other two options?

**Mr RAMSEY:** These are options that Morgan Disney gave us. Option one was to re-tender all contracts in the context of a new competitive funding environment so, in effect, to actually lead to a compacting of services and you end up then with a smaller number of stronger and more viable services. Option two was to selectively re-tender contracts for services in priority areas to alter the organisational mix across Redfern and Waterloo. Option three was to pick up on a strength based reshaping of the human services system, based on an integrated service delivery capacity, building a greater community involvement. This picks up on the--

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Could you say that in English?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Basically what we are transitioning - option three is to allow us to transition from working with the agencies to actually get them to move to the new service delivery model that is

going to be put in place. That service delivery model will be built around some of the elements that everybody in this room would agree, I think, were good elements for a service delivery system, and I will find them in a second. So the elements are things like a common assessment and referral system; information provision, which actually goes across the whole service system, electronic network that goes across the whole service system; resource-sharing between services so, rather than having services being strapped because they do not have resources, making sure that they can share them. We are looking at again creating a virtual pool of funding so that instead of having funding across a number of government agencies you link that to monitoring and evaluation of services, so you monitor and evaluate services on the basis of the total amount of money that they have actually received. In some instances, in partnership with the services on the ground, it may involve some reorganisation of management structures; it may involve physical co-location of services. Some of these services are actually at present in poor facilities. You cannot sustain the level of facilities across the whole area. Maybe we need to co-locate those services so that, in effect, if somebody comes in, they can have a suite of services operating out of the same room or the same facility to meet their needs.

It is coordinated case coordination. A good example of coordinated case coordination is the case coordination framework that we are putting in place for those high-risk young people. I think the last time we were here we were talking about that case coordination framework. We have been negotiating with the Privacy Commissioner to get an exemption under the *Privacy Act* and the *Privacy (Health Records) Act* because you cannot exchange information across services unless you actually have this information. The draft exemptions have been drawn up. The Privacy Commissioner has supported the application. It is currently under consideration by the Attorney General and the Attorney General has to go through a formal process before granting it. We are hopeful that the Attorney General will sign off on it and once that actually rolls out we can then implement the case coordination framework that we talked about the last time we were here. If you want more details I am happy to come back to you and provide you in writing with details about how that case coordination framework will respond.

**CHAIR:** You might take that on notice.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Yes. All of that then is within the context of actually saying let's work in partnership, picking up on your point, Dr Chesterfield-Evans, about why bring in new services, when you were talking about Barnardos and the street team, why not work with the people on the ground, the services on the ground, rather than bringing people outside? That is exactly what we are trying to do by picking up on option 3. It is intended to work with the agencies to bring them along to a new service delivery system so that we provide a strengthened service delivery system that has the capacity to be sustainable and meet the needs of that community.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And you reckon you are going to do that by May next year?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I reckon we will have a plan, which has been signed off by all of the agencies and the community in Redfern and Waterloo, by May next year and then we will start implementing it. This is not an easy process, I accept that, but I think what we have is strong evidence, not just from the community; we have strong evidence from the services themselves. 53 percent of service providers said in terms of the assessments they provided to the Morgan Disney review that they thought the needs in Redfern and Waterloo were not being met, so the service providers themselves are saying the needs are not being met. I think there is a willingness within services in Redfern and Waterloo to change and I think we will end up with a strong, vibrant, resilient service delivery system if we work down through option 3. If we picked up options 1 or 2 we would have a totally dysfunctional service delivery system because it would cause anarchy, to be perfectly honest. It would not achieve the outcomes that we all want. Option 3 is the only viable option that was given to us by Morgan Disney.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Can you guarantee that the infrastructure planning goes with the human resource planning? I mean the Aboriginal involvement in the building industry scheme has not been kept as a selection criteria for head contractors for government tenders, even by the housing department, so if the infrastructure planners are not required

to take the Aboriginal jobs scheme, even at a basic level when there is a lot of infrastructure being built, how are you going to find jobs for Aboriginal people?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I want to limit what I say about the Redfern-Waterloo Authority because this is a policy decision of Government, however I would draw your attention to the functions that have been articulated in the Bill before Parliament and within that it actually makes specific reference to those very issues that you are actually talking about.

**CHAIR:** We might move on. Robyn wanted to take up a couple of questions we sent you earlier today. Were they questions 6 and 7?

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Yes, largely, and really in relation to youth services, before I do ask questions relating to 6 and 7: You mentioned in your last answer that the need to combine human services was because a number of them are in poor locations, et cetera. One particular service that was part of your government submission some months ago now, which recommended a relocation, has given evidence to us - we have visited the service - and expressed incredible frustration that the Premier's Department has not even been able to answer their phone calls in terms of advancing a relocation to an appropriate place. I just wonder how much confidence we can have if your own recommendation is relocation and yet they cannot even get phone calls answered about it. Do you know the service I am talking about: The Fact Tree?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Yes, I do know the service, I wasn't going to identify it, but I do know the service you are talking about. I cannot remember the exact words that were in the submission, but I acknowledge that we said that it needed to be relocated. This is off memory, so you can shoot me down if my memory is wrong here, but if I remember correctly what we said was we wanted to see the outcomes of the human services review first, because it would have been inappropriate, until we saw what the youth services system was going to look like, to relocate one service in isolation for exactly the reasons you are saying. I think there are a number of services that we need to look at: How do we actually make that mix of services work physically or whatever together more effectively? Within that context we want to work with the City of Sydney Council in terms of their facility planning process and they have been waiting on the human services review to come out for exactly that reason so that we actually marry what the new human services system is going to look like with the facilities that are needed to deliver that human services system. It would have just been not prudent to move a service when we did not know what that actually then meant in terms of what the outcomes and the recommendations were coming out of the human services review.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Would it not have been good to let that service know that that was the case?

**Mr RAMSEY:** And we actually did let that service know. I apologise if they did not clearly get that message. We did try to relocate them, and I think we acknowledged that in the submission, and we actually found only one building which was suitable - and again this is all off memory of the submission and so I qualify it in terms of that. We did try to relocate them and that was admittedly about 18 months ago. There is a paucity of buildings in Redfern and Waterloo that could you could physically locate that service in for a whole variety of issues in terms of appropriate placement and so forth. We only identified one building, or Resitech did and the Department of Housing on our behalf. By the time we were actually in a position to make an offer, a commercial enterprise I think came in and grabbed that building. We then were not able to find any other suitable buildings and, while we were waiting for that to happen, the human services review rolled out. In terms of timing, it was just better to wait for the outcomes of the review. Clearly it is an issue we will have to progress.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** If that is your track record so far, you are going to have to lift your game a little bit, are you not, if you are going to achieve the objectives that the human services review recommendations raise?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I cannot physically create a building that does not exist on the ground. If there is no physical building on the ground we cannot actually create that building. A youth service

corrected

of the type--

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Then you should not recommend that it should be relocated surely?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No, we absolutely should, because that has not changed. It is appropriate that that service be relocated. We have articulated that very clearly in the government submission, but to do it without actually having the information out of the human services review would have been absolutely not prudent.

**CHAIR:** I notice there is a lot in the report about the five youth centres and the lack of cooperation between them.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** I was just about to ask question 6, Chair.

**CHAIR:** I thought you were not going to ask it, I am sorry.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Yes, so you just thought you would interrupt as usual.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** In the human services review there was a number of recommendations about youth services and you talked about establishing a youth task force, but your government submission says that there is already a youth task force in existence with the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Program. What I would like some clarification on is whether the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Program youth task force is operational; if not, why not, and, if the review talks about establishing a task force, what does that say about the Redfern/Waterloo partnership youth task force?

**Mr RAMSEY:** There was a youth task force in place. One of the priorities that we identified that the task force would need to address is the outcomes of the human services review. We said this very early in terms of the terms of reference. We have been just literally waiting for the outcomes of the human services review for exactly the reasons you said. We knew there would be a significant number of recommendations flowing out of the human services review around human services and the task force.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Does the task force exist or not?

**Mr RAMSEY:** The task force is in suspension. We have not convened it again, waiting for the results of the human services review.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** If the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project was to have benchmarks, not that it did, but if it was to have benchmarks, every answer virtually that you have given us is we cannot say that, we cannot do that, because we have to wait until the human service review came out, yet the Carr Government has re-funded the Redfern/Waterloo Partnership Project to the tune of \$2.5 million for the next two years. Every answer has been "we have to wait until the human services review comes out".

**Dr GELLATLY:** The amount of work that has come out in terms of the legislation that is now before the Parliament, the activities of the human services review, if I was looking at the outcomes and the money that has been spent on this partnership project and the dedication of the people on that project, I would say categorically it was well spent.

I was getting phone calls over the long weekend at 11 pm every night when they were out on the ground, working with the police, working with the Aboriginal community leaders. I do not need a whole lot of performance indicators, a lot of which do not mean anything, to know that this has been money well spent. The things that have happened, the responses that have come out from the inquiry, and the establishment of the authority, where it is going, the complexity of this issue, I think it has been a great investment. We do not need those fancy performance indicators to know--

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** NGOs have to have them nevertheless. The human service review did not make many recommendations about Aboriginal services. I noticed from your announcements over the last few weeks that there has been an absence of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Dr Refshauge. I just wonder about that. Apparently there was a lack of contribution from some of the key Aboriginal services to the review and what is the Government going to do to address service delivery for the Aboriginal community?

**Dr GELLATLY:** As I mentioned before, following ATSIC and the way the Commonwealth is going, it is establishing what they are calling community working parties, and they are trying to establish one around Redfern/Waterloo which we would like to use as the main community interaction group, so that the Federal Government and us are working with the same group, because as we have mentioned, it happens all around the State and it gets very complex about who you are dealing with. There is certainly the intention if that community working party is set up, that would be the body that the partnership would interact with.

Secondly, we have an identified position, a senior project manager, working on a relationship and capacity building with the Aboriginal community in Redfern/Waterloo and that position will be funded and it is being recruited now, an identified position to work in the project and work on the ground with the various organisations.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** The human services review states "some services are in urgent need of more detailed review and recommendations on these have been provided to the Government". Given the urgency of the need for the review of those services, can you tell us what is being done to address those concerns?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I will take this question on notice and I will answer but I will take the question on notice because literally we received only these questions, and we have tried to gather quickly since we have received them the responses, but I am happy to give you a detailed response on that.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Take that on notice, but for the purposes of some sort of answer here, is that just going to get caught up in the process that you will be involved in next May?

**Mr RAMSEY:** No. There is an intentional strategy to address those urgent needs and I am happy to articulate what that strategy would be, but seriously I just have not had time.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** I was surprised that Disney came up with a sum of only \$8 million to \$10 million being directly invested. Can we have the details of how those funds are being disbursed? I do not think they are in the report.

**Mr RAMSEY:** We can get the information. Can we take that question on notice as well?

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Of course.

**Mr RAMSEY:** We can find out how they actually identified that. It is important also--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** And the \$35 million to \$40 million.

**Mr RAMSEY:** That is what I was about to say.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Just so that we have an understanding. The eight to 10 looks as though it is not even equal to Bob Carr's travel bill for the year. It surprises me it is so small.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Can I also qualify though that Morgan Disney in their report say that they are not confident. It is an estimate and that is really important.

**CHAIR:** Does it include the services that were not participating in the review?

**Mr RAMSEY:** I will have to take that on notice and we will clarify that. What we will clarify is exactly how Morgan Disney arrived at the \$8 million to \$10 million and that \$35 million to \$40 million and we will give you information on what was included in that and what was excluded, if there were exclusions, and we will give you the qualifications that may exist and any limitations they may have in terms of them developing that figure.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Can I ask you about the jobs plan, if you can tell us anything about it?

**CHAIR:** That is question 14 and it has a few sub-questions on this. Some of them have been asked before.

**Dr GELLATLY:** There is a number of things that are tied up and it will obviously depend on what the authority and the Minister do in that area, but we are looking at increasing - the additional jobs would come through increasing the supply of employment and enterprise development land in Redfern and Waterloo, and you would be aware that the Australian Technology Park is intended to become part of the authority and the issue of looking at Government procurement in terms of contracts to create Aboriginal training employment opportunities, and working with local and Commonwealth Governments to set employment targets for any new developments in this area.

The concept has been floated of an Aboriginal business hub to attract Aboriginal craft and business enterprises to the area and create jobs, and exploring ways in which human service organisations could employ local people as well.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** That is just a press release really, it is nothing more.

**Dr GELLATLY:** At this stage the concepts have been looked at and now they are to be put into practice.

**CHAIR:** Is there any particular method under consideration for involving the Commonwealth Government?

**Dr GELLATLY:** As I said, we have had early discussions and we will continue those over the next few months.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** There has been some concern expressed recently in relation to the City of Sydney and the withdrawal of some funding to NGOs in the Redfern/Waterloo area. How would that impact? Given that the City of Sydney is supposed to be a major player in what happens with this process in the future, how would that impact, or would you be looking at any changes that may have occurred in funding to local organisations in recent times?

**Mr RAMSEY:** To be perfectly frank I am not aware of that issue. Again, can we take that on notice?

**CHAIR:** We were given a couple of examples in relation to positions under or coordinated by the legal centre, where funding had come previously from South Sydney Council and we are not quite sure, I do not think, if it is part of a problem stemming from the merger which has not been sorted out yet, or whether the City of Sydney has made a deliberate decision not to go on funding.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** There was concern expressed about some positions in NGOs that had been funded for a substantial time and that with the City of Sydney now being responsible for the area that that funding had not been forthcoming in recent times or may not be in the future, and that obviously would impact on some of the human services and it may not show up in the review, so I think that would be a concern if that is happening, or happens in the future, about part of the role of the City of Sydney in providing funding for services in the area.

There has been evidence about the fact that the two communities of Redfern and Waterloo see themselves as very different with some different concerns and obviously different issues. In terms

of what is going to happen with the human services review and also—

**CHAIR:** We skipped over that. That was number 17 in our original list.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** I realise that you may not be able to necessarily make comment on the bill that has been introduced, but in terms of the information coming out of the human services project and also what is being mooted for the future, will those perceived differences by the community be taken into account with the planning process that is occurring in the first half of next year?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Absolutely. They are different communities and I think we have acknowledged that all the way through. If you look at the--

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** No, you have not.

**Mr RAMSEY:** We have in our submission.

**Dr GELLATLY:** In the original submission in the break-up of the population groups. That is totally different. It was acknowledged in our original submission.

**Mr RAMSEY:** It is absolutely in our submission that we acknowledge that there is a difference between the two communities and the classic example is that Waterloo has a high population of public housing tenants. It has a highly culturally and linguistically diverse community. I think it is somewhere around about 40 per cent. It has double the population of Aboriginal people than are in Redfern. It has some absolutely distinct features around it which do not apply to Redfern. Equally, Redfern has some particular issues around it which do not carry through to Waterloo.

In our planning processes we absolutely need to take those differences into account. We need to make sure that whatever services are put in place and whatever answers are put in place for Redfern and Waterloo, that they take that difference into account, because what you want to do is build on the strength of both communities and keep those differences, because that is what makes these communities unique, but you need also to address their needs.

Some of the things that we have done in the past have acknowledged those differences. So if you look at the culturally and linguistically diverse family counselling service, that was specifically obviously more directed towards Waterloo than Redfern, and it acknowledged that difference.

The street team works across Redfern and Waterloo, but there is acknowledgement that there is differences in the way it operates between those communities, but I am happy to go away and give you a more detailed answer on that one.

**The Hon. KAYEE GRIFFIN:** I think that one of the issues that has come up in this inquiry related to perhaps the people who live in the tower blocks in Waterloo and some of the issues that they perceived in relation to community safety and some of the other issues that might relate to aged services and so on, and some of the services that they saw were very important to that particular area, as opposed to necessarily some of the other issues that other people had spoken to the Committee about.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Absolutely. I think there are issues which have been raised by, for instance, the Waterloo Neighbourhood Advisory Board which are clear issues around the particular needs of people in those high rise places in Redfern and Waterloo. Our planning processes and our answers absolutely must take into account those needs.

**CHAIR:** You will take on notice giving us some more feedback about those differences?

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Question five in the additional questions, the human services review identifies service integration as a critical issue, yet a number of inquiry participants warned against a simplistic assumption that service coordination and

collaboration was poor. They suggested that NGOs have been doing this reasonably well. On the other hand, many participants pointed to poor collaboration on the part of Government agencies such as DoCS. One witness told us that their service regularly collaborates with others in relation to events, ongoing program, shared clients and so on, but they were not asked about this in the comprehensive survey they completed for the human services review. What do you make of this varied evidence before the Committee? The review observes a "culture of disrespect" which is "almost endemic" in the human services system in Redfern and Waterloo. What do you believe are the root causes of this culture?

**Dr GELLATLY:** Can we take that on notice?

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Can I put it to you that groups that are very stressed tend to fight amongst themselves if you make them compete for funds; organisations that become dysfunctional or about to get redundancy or whatever tend to fight amongst themselves. That would be a suggestion that comes to mind.

**Dr GELLATLY:** We will take that on notice.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Could you give some specific examples of what better integrated services would look like? That is the second part of that question.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Absolutely, but given the complexity of the question, we will give you a response to the question.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Could you give some specific examples of what better integrated services would look like? Are "coordinated collaborative models of service" (page 26) always appropriate?

**Mr RAMSEY:** We will take it on notice.

**CHAIR:** Kayee started to touch on question 10. You might want to go on with that because it is another one in relation to the role of bureaucracies. Kayee took up part of it in relation to the City of Sydney involvement, but it includes also the State and Commonwealth.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Clearly, the cooperation of government agencies will be critical to achieving reform, given their role as direct service providers as well as funders, and the review is critical of them on a number of counts, including in relation to accountability and planning. As we all know, it is tremendously difficult to change the culture and mechanisms of bureaucracies. How will you ensure that the relevant State Government agencies are committed to the task and how are you planning to work with the Commonwealth and local Governments, particularly as they are not mentioned in the Morgan Disney review.

**Dr GELLATLY:** I think it is a fair question and we now have an active minister for the area who will, I am sure, help us bang a few heads together. We have a cross group of CEOs in the human services area that are very active and have been working well together and I have no doubt we can sit down and work with them, but admittedly, even getting agreement at the CEO level does not mean it happens all the way through organisations.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Isn't this exactly the Government's strategy always, to put more layers on top? You keep putting more layers on top and ignoring the layers at the bottom, the whole thing is always top down. Redfern-Waterloo was perceived as part of the Premier's Department, another layer of money going to bureaucrats while the bottom starved. Is this not just another layer on top? Really it is the same strategy and the people on top - first it was Mr Ramsey and now it is Frank Sartor - are the ones who have to fix it. Isn't this the old god from the sky attempt to fix it with wonder boys, as it were?

**Dr GELLATLY:** I think it is a serious attempt to try to get the coordination and the drive behind to fix it. I mean there is no simple solution and it is being worked on from a number of fronts,



as we have talked about up-front in our submission, and I think we are not establishing any new group of CEOs, there is already a human services cluster. The fact that there is a minister now solely focused on that place recognises that the Government is obviously indicating that that is an important issue to get things solved there and it just gives more impetus if a minister has that as a specific responsibility.

**The Hon. Dr ARTHUR CHESTERFIELD-EVANS:** Apart from water, electricity and cancer, which he might do in his spare time.

**Dr GELLATLY:** We cannot comment on his abilities.

**Mr RAMSEY:** We will answer this more comprehensively, but in terms of Commonwealth and local Government it might be worthwhile to make a brief comment about that: The Commonwealth Government agencies at a New South Wales level have indicated a strong willingness to get involved in this project and they want to be involved in the planning and so forth and we will be meeting with them shortly to see how we can actually facilitate working together. Having said that, we have worked cooperatively with the City of Sydney Council on a range of issues. In all honesty, and again I just use this as one example simply because it is current in my mind, the level of cooperation that we achieved between the State Government and the City of Sydney Council around the planning and implementation around the knock-out was phenomenal. It seriously was incredibly coordinated. There was a strong willingness from all parties to deliver a good outcome and the City of Sydney Council absolutely should be commended for what they did, but it was actually very much a partnership arrangement. I think we can build on those relationships that we have with the City of Sydney. I think we can build on the relationships we have developed and are developing with the Commonwealth. Again, we will give you a more comprehensive answer, but I think that we are already heading in the right direction with them.

**CHAIR:** We have had one letter I think from the Commonwealth, perhaps just as they were coming out of caretaker mode, but obviously it has been quite difficult. If it would not breach any confidentiality, it would be useful for us to get on notice some information about the cooperation from the Commonwealth that you are talking about. Given the deadline for our report and the fact that the election intervened, if it is possible to give us some information on that it would be helpful.

**Mr RAMSEY:** I am happy to give you information on where we are up to in terms of the Commonwealth and some of the work that we have actually done.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** Can you give us an update on the Mou between police and health on the needle services? Are you driving that?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Could I take that question on notice? I am totally blanked out on that, I apologise.

**The Hon. GREG PEARCE:** What role does the New South Wales Department of Aboriginal Affairs play in what you are doing?

**Mr RAMSEY:** Again I will take that question on notice and give you a more comprehensive answer, but we have had a very close relationship with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

**Dr GELLATLY:** We are in continual discussions with the director general and her officers about this.

**The Hon. ROBYN PARKER:** Has she been to Redfern more than twice now?

**Dr GELLATLY:** You would have to ask her.

**CHAIR:** We are over time. I think we can identify the new questions that we have not dealt with and it may be that some that we have dealt with, on reflection, may need more detail, so we

corrected

might go through the transcript and get back to you. I do not know whether it would be reasonable to ask for as much information as possible within a week or two, given our deadline, but perhaps that could be negotiated with Julie. Obviously we are anxious to get as much as possible as soon as possible.

**Mr RAMSEY:** Can we discuss it with your secretariat, if you are agreeable, and we will work out a suitable time?

**CHAIR:** Yes, even if we could receive some material earlier and wait longer for other material, that would assist us.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**(The Committee adjourned at 4.10 p.m.)**