

LEWINGTON, Jana

From: JOHNSTON, Mathew
Sent: Tuesday, 9 October 2012 9:08 AM
To: CANTWELL, Kai
Cc: HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; STRAPP, Eliza; ANYON, Bridget; PURDY, Lara; HUME, Emily
Subject: RE: Kalgoorlie Update - Day 1 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Security Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Thanks Kai!

These are very useful tips, I will bring out some more history so that we have that covered. Thanks for your feedback and advice for the presentations. The views below are quite interesting—particularly some of the views from ^{s47F - personal privacy} It is good that ^{s47F} were involved!

Thanks again!

Mat

Mathew Johnston
 Assistant Section Manager
 Policy Section
 Welfare Payments Reform Branch
 Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
^{s47F - personal privacy}

From: CANTWELL, Kai
Sent: Monday, 8 October 2012 4:40 PM
To: JOHNSTON, Mathew
Cc: HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; STRAPP, Eliza; ANYON, Bridget; PURDY, Lara; HUME, Emily
Subject: RE: Kalgoorlie Update - Day 1 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Matt,

A few other things for you for next week and the week after:

^{s22 - irrelevant information}

I just made sure I jumped in with plenty of interesting facts and handed over to people when they looked like they wanted to talk.

I also drew up an example of how IM works. I use this everywhere I go and you can see people clicking and starting to understand. So it's probably a really good idea to do this if people are interested in the mechanics (which I am sure they will be).

Finally – I think the thing that is missing off the presentation is a bit of history. It's really important and all the questions tend to lead back to the history, so if you cover it at the start, it helps.

Kai Cantwell

PLACE-BASED IMPLEMENTATION | WELFARE PAYMENTS REFORM

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILIES, HOUSING, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS
P | 02 6146 2984 F | 02 6244 7100

s47F - personal privacy

W | www.fahcsia.gov.au

From: CANTWELL, Kai
Sent: Monday, 8 October 2012 1:29 PM
To: JOHNSTON, Mathew
Cc: STRAPP, Eliza; HEFREN-WEBB, Elizabeth; HUME, Emily; PURDY, Lara; ANYON, Bridget
Subject: Kalgoorlie Update - Day 1 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Guys,

This is just a quick update from my notes only – we will do our (consolidated) write up later this arvo.

We had a session in the Kalgoorlie ICC this morning.

s47F - personal privacy

Overall the views were pretty positive.^{s47F} people who were vocal about the negatives of IM were^{s47F}
s47F - personal privacy saw IM as an attempt to change aboriginal Culture, but their
arguments were more about things that were not IM related, but bigger picture. Jen and I had to steer the
conversation away from CDEP and Community Councils a number of times.

s47F advised that the councils used to income manage people though CDEP, but this is now not able to be
done as not many people participate in CDEP anymore^{s47F} advised that while^{s47F} might see IM as a good thing, the
communities will not.^{s47F} and s47F - personal privacy raised the issue of the Family / collective
group culture, where everyone is responsible for each other, and that IM would make them all individuals. I
reinforced that the ISPs are for individuals and families, and the discussion focused on how IM does not have to stop
this supporting culture.^{s47F} suggested that the best way to make IM appear non-discriminatory would be to do it
across the board (National & all ISPs).

Both^{s47F - personal privacy} could see some benefits of IM, but^{s47F} was very protective and kept
linking back to how everything is always trialled on aborigines, and how the govt is trying to change their culture.
s47F said that it would be better to see people change their ways without IM. The^{s47F} had some very
positive views about how IM will be able to teach people the value of money.^{s47F} said that it would be good to have
in Kal.

^{s47F} was very positive and told many stories about how ^{s47F} had witnessed IM working, and the wonderful things it can do.

^{s47F - personal privacy} said that it will help them to ensure people are up to date with their rent, and it will help their tenants to prioritise their money. When asked by ^{s47F} they also advised that it may help people to find long term tenancy.

All participants had a very strong view on the locations that IM should be implemented. Some were of the view that IM should be trialled in NG and Laverton and then progressively rolled out to the entire goldfields, while others believed that IM should be across the entire Goldfields from day 1, but all agreed that should it be rolled out, it should not be limited to NG and Laverton. Probably the biggest reason for this view is the transient population, which was discussed at length.

This lead to the opposite view of the NT, where there was some concern that people (from Leonora and Kal) would lie about their address to get **onto** IM 😊.

I got the impression that some people in the room did not see this as a genuine consultation. and it felt like they thought that this was a token consultation ^{s47F - personal privacy}

Will keep sending stuff whenever I get the chance to access a computer 😊

Thanks,

Kai Cantwell

PLACE-BASED IMPLEMENTATION | WELFARE PAYMENTS REFORM

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILIES, HOUSING, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS
P | 02 6146 2984 F | 02 6244 7100

^{s47F - personal privacy}

W | www.fahcsia.gov.au