

LEWINGTON, Jana

From: HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth
Sent: Monday, 22 October 2012 8:39 PM
To: JOHNSTON, Mathew; ANYON, Bridget; PURDY, Lara
Cc: HUME, Emily; CANTWELL, Kai; STRAPP, Eliza; BARFOED, Liz
Subject: RE: Follow-up meeting with ^{s47F} [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Security Classification:
 For Official Use Only

Thanks Mat – this is useful ^{s22}- irrelevant information
^{s22}

Hope you are enjoying your experience out there- sounds fascinating!

From: JOHNSTON, Mathew
Sent: Monday, 22 October 2012 8:31 PM
To: ANYON, Bridget; HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; PURDY, Lara
Cc: HUME, Emily; CANTWELL, Kai; STRAPP, Eliza; BARFOED, Liz
Subject: Follow-up meeting with ^{s47F} [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Hi All

We had a productive follow up meeting with ^{s47F} - personal privacy
^{s47F} at the end of last week and I have managed to pin ^{s47F} down on ^{s47F} proposal and also cleared up some
 misunderstanding (on ^{s47F} behalf) ^{s22} - irrelevant information I decided to compile
 in a word doc the notes from each consultation rather than sending through multiple emails as this makes it easy for
 the others to input and to draw out messages for the feedback factsheet.

Here are my notes from the follow-up meeting, I hope they assist:

- ^{s47F} proposal is very similar to VIM in terms of the percentage of payment to be set income managed and the lack of a trigger that may mean a person would become compulsorily income managed. However the proposal differs in that ^{s47F} proposal would involve the community volunteering to have their family allowance payments (for example FTB etc) to be income managed 50/50 on the basis that these payments are for the benefit of children. ^{s47F} proposal would not include the income management of other payment types (for example Newstart Allowance). This would also involve making the BasicsCard available to people in the community who are not in receipt of an income support payment but who do receive family allowance payments.
 - Following questioning, ^{s47F} distinguished family allowance payments from income support payments like Newstart ^{s47F} believes these should be spent in the best interests of children and that is their intent, as opposed to other payment types.
 - I confirmed that this is not currently possible under the VIM and suggested that it is not only these payments that should be spent in the interests of children or families but also to ensure individuals are able to care for themselves and participate in society.
 - We also confirmed that FTB/family payment lump sum payments would be income managed 100% under VIM in addition to the 50/50 of the main income support payment.
- ^{s47F} suggested that once people volunteer they stay on income management for twelve months at which point it be renewed. This element arose under the misunderstanding of the requirement that should a person volunteer for income management they must stay on income management for 13 weeks. ^{s47F} had interpreted this to mean that a review of how a person is tracking on income management is required every three months. I clarified that this is not the case and that this is a minimum requirement for a person to stay on to get used to income management.
- ^{s47F} does not see the need for the trigger based mechanisms if the community were to volunteer en mass. ^{s47F} preference is for a community based approach to income management, tailored to suit the

situation of people in the Ngaanyatjarra Lands. However, this view is largely based on the situation in Warburton and discounts the benefit the trigger mechanisms could offer in other communities, particularly in terms of child protection and vulnerable persons. A number of communities noted that there are people with intellectual disabilities and mental health issues that make them targets of humbugging and that older people are particularly susceptible to financial harassment.

- ^{s47F} located ^{s47F} views in terms of a community social contract, whereby individuals have a responsibility to spend family payments/bonuses in the interests of children AND also as a contract with the community that they will look after children and their families.

s22 - irrelevant information

s22 - irrelevant information For example, older people are keen to go on VIM as a means of protecting against financial harassment and humbugging and young mothers have told us they would find it useful too in reducing the incidence of family/domestic violence where partners may spend all the family money on gambling and drugs.

I hope this helps! More notes to come (in a consolidated form).

Mat

From: ANYON, Bridget

Sent: Monday, 22 October 2012 9:29 AM

To: JOHNSTON, Mathew; HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; PURDY, Lara

Cc: HUME, Emily; CANTWELL, Kai; STRAPP, Eliza; BARFOED, Liz

Subject: RE: Ngaanyatjarra Lands Consultations - 15 October 2012 - Tjirrikali and meeting with ^{s47F} - personal privacy
[DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Thanks a lot Mat - interesting to see similar themes emerging in Ng Lands and APY! No doubt you will have seen Kai has already been busy incorporating into briefing notes.

Interested to hear how you went with ^{s47F} re ^{s47F} views as well ? ^{s22} - irrelevant information
s22 - irrelevant information

Ta
Bridget

From: JOHNSTON, Mathew

Sent: Tuesday, 16 October 2012 11:39 AM

To: HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; ANYON, Bridget; PURDY, Lara

Cc: HUME, Emily; CANTWELL, Kai; STRAPP, Eliza; BARFOED, Liz

Subject: Ngaanyatjarra Lands Consultations - 15 October 2012 - Tjirrikali and meeting with ^{s47F} - personal privacy
[DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Hi Everyone

Here are my rough notes from the first day of consultations on the Ng Lands. Merle Ann, Jen and I will be pulling together a consolidated report but in the interim I thought you would find this interesting ☺

One of the main things to note ^{s22} - irrelevant information is that ^{s47F} is supportive of VIM and that it will cover off most of his concerns from his paper, except that he wants people to be on for 12 months once they volunteer...

First stop: ^{s47F} - personal privacy

- People were on the whole positive about income management and thought that it would be beneficial for their community.
- The consensus was that it would be particularly useful for young people and assisting with addressing humbugging in community and significant issues raised of what occurs across the lands
- ^{s47F} particularly supportive of income management.
- Some of the ^{s47F} were a bit sceptical and seemed concerned about the amount of money, or percentage of income, that is subject to income management for each measure but following further consultations understood how IM worked, including where BasicsCard fit in. BasicsCard was very popular, particularly in assisting people to spend their money on food rather than cigarettes or drugs.
- ^{s47F - personal privacy} were new to position of CDA to the community and were both supportive of income management, particularly as a strategy for addressing humbugging.
 - ^{s47F} gave an example from earlier in the day at the community store where ^{s47F} were shopping for groceries and ^{s47F} was keen to buy food but ^{s47F} kept harassing ^{s47F} to buy cigarettes only. In the end ^{s47F} said ^{s47F} acquiesced and they bought cigarettes but no food.
- Overwhelming support for BasicsCard, with some members being familiar with it from the NT, although there was some concern from past experience about people acquiring passwords, everyone was supportive once it was explained that:
 - They retain control over who uses the card
 - It is relatively simple to re-issue the card and change PINs
 - That it will ensure that money is put aside for food and other essentials and in some people's experiences has assisted in them saving for more significant purchases (eg, washing machine)
- Drugs a big concern on the lands, including drug runners from Kalgoorlie across the lands
 - ^{s47F} told me a story about ^{s47F} Warburton who would spend a lot of money on gambling and gunja to the point that they wouldn't have enough money left to buy food which caused violence between community members.
- At the end of consultations the majority of people (including ^{s47F}) were keen for income management to be introduced to the Ng Lands and wanted to know when it would come.

Second stop: Warburton, dinner meeting with ^{s47F - personal privacy}

- We had dinner with ^{s47F} to discuss IM and ^{s47F} views ahead of community consultations in Warburton on 16 Oct.
- ^{s47F} confirmed that the community is supportive of, if resigned to the fact, introducing IM to the Ng Lands.
- ^{s47F} sighted that BasicsCard infrastructure has been in Warburton for a number of years and that BasicsCard is popular in the community.
- We were able to confirm with ^{s47F} proposal for VIM in the Ng Lands. Essentially ^{s47F} is supportive of VIM (less so of Vulnerable and CP) and ^{s47F} thinks that as a community people should decide to volunteer for IM and "be done with it".
 - However, ^{s47F} thought that once you volunteer you should be on IM for 12 months. I confirmed what this meant in terms of current VIM requirements which says that once a person volunteers they need to stay on it for 13 weeks but after that time they can decide to leave. ^{s47F} thought that this was "messy" and that it would be better for people to stay on for 12 months and that after that time their position be reviewed.
 - Many other aspects of his proposal ^{s47F} thought were covered by current VIM arrangements. It seemed to me that what ^{s47F} was less keen about were the two compulsory measures particularly in explaining to people how income management operated ^{s47F} thought the Vulnerable Measure particularly was confusing for people as it didn't seem overly different to VIM. We explained the differences and some of the reasons why someone may be referred under the Vulnerable Measure. ^{s47F} also thought that CP was so low in take-up as if the situation at home was so bad to warrant CP referral to IM then the CP worker may be looking at whether the child should be removed. We explained that this isn't always the case and that a social worker may decide the CPIM would be a better first step/option for the family in stabilising their situation.
 - ^{s47F} was still of the view, however, that it would be better for the community to decide as a whole to volunteer for IM rather than be concerned with the trigger based mechanisms.

- ^{s47F} did think that the overwhelming majority of people would be in favour of IM and particularly BasicsCard.

Hope all is well back in Canberra! I will be in touch again after consultations in Warburton today.

Cheers,
Mat