Thank you, Elizabeth. That's lovely to be here with you all this afternoon. I'm seeing so many familiar faces, so it's always a little bit like old homes week. I'm really pleased today to be joined by our fabulous panel to continue the discussion that we've been having on the findings and recommendations of the NDIS review.

I'm sure like me, uh, all of our panel have been busy, pouring over the report, and nothing like a weekend, with an NDIS review report and possibly a glass of wire, but I didn't confess that, okay. Um, and getting in touch with the detail behind the 26 recommendations, and 139 actions, I think having a chat with people in the grey give just generally, you know, I think it's clear to me from the report that the panel had actually accepted people with disability and the sector throughout the review.

And I think that's not just been to the issues that we've raised many of which have been really long-standing. But also to some of the ideas about how these can be addressed, what's the solutions are to those issues? I'm throughout the NDIS review, our members and India's have asked the panel to avoid the tinkering around the edges that we've seen previously.

And to, instead focus on some of the fundamental forms required for the NDS for the NDIS to be the best, it can be. Up, whether we agree with every proposal, whether we think the details right whether we would have liked to have seen more or less, I think we can agree in Bruce and Lisa and the rest of the panel really rose to that challenge.

They're provides providing a comprehensive range of recommendations. That do provide a roadmap and some chart a chart, I think, for a way forward for government and the sector On that note. Um, I'd like to go over to all of our panels that their thoughts for their first reflections and I'm going to kick off with the same question for all of them.

We've got the lovely eld down in front of us. We are looking a little bit down here. It's just so that we can see else as well. Um, so from each of your perspectives, You've been engaging with the NDIS review, like we have since it began. In the context of the report and the work that the three of you have been doing today.

What are your initial reflections? We're going to start mark, then we're going to go to l and they will finish up with you. So over to you mark. Thanks so much. Um, firstly, thanks for the opportunity to have this discussion. I've been lying awake at night, thinking about the report and it's nice to Have fast people to discuss it with.

It's very therapeutic. My mind and visible reactions. Uh, some excitement. Some harp. But also a fair amount of anxiety. Um,

I'm really, I think I'm very pleased with how grounded in an honest view of The problems. Um, the report Clearance. And I can say, A lot of compatibility in the recommendations, the type of things I've been. In favour of, Um, as as I'm reading I'm finding my Mind inevitably and I read the same recommendation.

Guys smiling, personal situation. And I have that thought, hang on. What this actually mean. For me personally, I think a lot of participants Well, as that's where digesting the review and having a discussion of the next Um, next file. We'll have that thought and providers of thinking, hang on, what specifically does this mean for?

For now organisation. So, To the anxiety comes from. How in the implementation? Will this actually look? Yeah, thanks mark and I think we can safely say you've found your peeps here. Like you know we're all really into discussing what's in the NDIS review. So feel free over to you L.

Thanks everyone and thanks for having me with you here today. And yes, I feel like I've definitely found my other people who have been spending the weekend reading the reviews so um look for me was really important that the review really tackled one of those big unfinished businesses from the productivity Commission, 10 years ago, which is the foundational supports.

Is that new piece of jargon that we're all going to be very familiar with very shortly. Um, but it is that that kind of infrastructure for disabled people outside of their individualised support plans in the NDIS, and it has been not only undone over the last 10 years, but almost in lots of cases, got worse for so many of us where those individualised supports, there's like nothing else and I'm not going to use lifeboats or oasis or anything of that like that.

Um, but I think that the national cabinet agreement in particular the day before um was so critical to how we can take the review forward and particularly around building a broader land

Many of us outside of individualised supports for those in Southside, the NDIS is just nothing. And so it has made it extremely difficult to engage with the world. And so I think that that's really a really important part. I think someone who talk later about some other changes to access and planning and budgeting which I think are also really important.

But I want to also play that um they mostly listen to people with disability and I like that there were three times as many engagements with disabled, people as their work with the original productivity commission review. I know that Dana has ended our members worked incredibly hard over the last year and many of the other disability.

Representative organisations did the same to make sure that not only disabled people like me. Got heard but disabled people who living close settings in places that they don't often have their voices heard. And the review did work really hard to listen to a really wide range of disabled people and I like that there is a lot of attention page to building an infrastructure for First Nations.

Disabled, people in particular and I think that would be incredibly important. I also just want to flag that that like mark said there is significant anxiety around some key aspects of the

For people their shared supports and what that will look like in practise and then how things like choice and control will be preserved to particularly for people who Employ their own support workers. So I just want to flag that but I'm really glad to see things like unregistered seal in particular, getting a, kind of significant attention, um, around the urgency of dealing with that and making sure that there is some alignment between the review and the disability or commission and I know that the review actually went further than some of the recommendations in.

They're all commissions say is around restrictive practises for example and so I was really pleased to see that. I've just had a little reminder for us. All if we could just speak a little bit more slowly. So this is a case of doing as I say, not as I do, because I do have a very ten attendance set to kind of go help a leather.

So, just a little reminder to speak a little bit more slowly for all of us, and I'm going to hand over to you now. Here, Thanks very much like the other side. I thought dangerous review report was good. I think it was pretty faithful to the original design of the NDIS and sort of trying to put power and choice control to people.

Um, I quite liked quite a few things. So one was the push to quality, and that I do that, we should be trying to understand outcomes and how it's making a difference. Um, rather than just sort of just volume, I think sort of that came through in the report.

Um, I do think that when you talk about individualised plans table plans, there is a need for sort of that functional assessment. Um, and so that was obviously in the report and I think we can't have good plans without a good understanding. So, I think those two do their go together quite well.

Um, I really liked the emphasis on fairness and equity in the report too. So sort of on the data guy. So we look at a lot of sort of NDIS data. And it's very hard to tell why some people have very large packages and why some people don't in many cases, I'm sure it's the right decision because there's some underlying need that hasn't been affected and data but it's been tailored for Um, but sometimes and I think if you makes this point, is that, sometimes those different as digesting consistencies in how the NDIS is applied, at the planning stage or other bits and pieces.

Um, so I do like that as something to probably needs to happen as well. Um, and there's a data guide. You like the emphasis on sort of measurement and data and outcomes, and I think that that's sort of there as something that you do need for ongoing sort of monitoring of How you going?

Um, Lots of things to make people nervous as well. Certainly to pay some change as a hard one. And comes back to that Goldilocks question. I think we had before that. Um, a lot of things aren't quite urgent. Um, but you can't go too fast. Thanks you. Um, so we've just got the top of mine first reflections from our panel or from very different perspectives.

I'd like to invite you as we're going. Along to add some questions as well for at for us to. I'm ask our panel to explore and you can do that by the live stream under the q and a tab. So please take you opportunity to ask some questions and we'll get to some of those as soon as we can.

You touched on outcomes and I'd like to stick with you for a minute. Um Taylor fries, she said you're a data guy and you're surrounded by data guys. And girls I imagine um About, you've done a lot of analysis and I'm just wondering about You know what? You're actually singing in terms of the numbers and what they're telling us about the results of investing in better supports and inclusion more generally.

So I know you've done some work for the wrong commission. You've also done a report that is up on the NDIS review website, which is around quantify and costs and benefits of the NDIS. Um, so really interested in your thoughts on investing in better supports inclusion, more generally and gee and how do you think the recommendations from the reviewer balancing?

Those two sides of the same coin? Thanks very much. Um, I'll try and cover a lot of ground quickly and hopefully not scared too many people but we did a report for the world commission and it was around the economic cost of violence abuse neglect and exploitation of people with disability.

Um and so one reason you do, those reports is to come up with a big number and we came up with a big number. So 46 billion dollars per year but the real

You have this sort of male treatment and one thing that was quite interesting was that the two-thirds of that figure wasn't related to interpersonal mouth treatment. So people sort of been subject to violence or the like, but it was actually systemic factors. So systemic issues in health or injustice or an employment, or in disability services, that meant that people were actually really suffering.

And there was economic harm attached to that as well. I think that in Scary, but encouraging, that means that at a policy level, there are things that can be done to improve the picture. I'm such a big number and for what it's worth bigger than the cost of the NJIS.

We did another review for the NDIS review and that was around the net costs and the benefits of the NDIS. Um, so A tough question on the net cost side, maybe that's the easier side where we were able to say, well of the 35 billion dollar cost of supports in the NDIS roughly half of that is new money.

That wouldn't have been there under legacy schemes. Um and of that maybe half goes to additional supports to people who used to get support under legacy schemes and the other half goes to people that do not have support before. Um, so understanding that is useful on the benefit side, I'll be really looking to employment and education and health and trying to understand in what ways people's lives are better. Both people with disability and their families and carers.

A little bit different if people are familiar with the per capita report, which was very much an economic growth sort of argument. So how much does the NDIS contribute to that growth. But we are a really sort of focusing on outcomes for people with disability and their families and carers.

Um, and we found something certainly. So subjective will being was a little bit higher and that was actually the bulk of the benefit that we're able to measure. There was some small games in reduced hospitalisation, some small games in employment but both Um, and beyond that, a lot of things were actually quite part to measure.

So we the found nothing. Um and in some cases that's because the data is not there in some cases, it's because of time factors. So people who are getting early interventions supports, maybe we don't see those benefits yet, but it does suggest that some combination of sort of making sure we are sort of banking outcomes for the money that is being spent as well as actually, making sure we can measure those.

Well, I think, um, will mean that we can do a better job next Yeah, thanks to Evan, I do think that's important, isn't it? You know, it's kind of one of the things about how do we get better at actually measuring that and changing some of the narrative, I think around cost and Benefit more broadly.

And I think you were saying, you know, in terms of measuring those director outcomes but that broader benefit in terms of well-being community, Community capital, those kind of things. Um, mark, I'm going to ask you a question, a bit about innovation, but I know in your report, you know, you did talk a little bit about the importance of kind of, you know, keeping the community really engaged with the NDIS and they're real that they're overwhelming support on that.

And I guess being able to have some of those discussions or those conversations about, yes, there's a cost but man there's a benefit are important. So, um, so if you could just touch on that and then I might just quickly come back to you for a question around innovation.

If that's okay. Yeah. I think part of the genius of the initial Engines campaign. You every Australian counts campaign. Is, is that concept of the NDIS is. There for people who currently have a disability, but the subtle kind of message behind. It is cover all the way either.

We any of us could Acquire a disability in the future. Or. If life hadn't gone differently. Um, anyone could have been in the situation where they had disability all there or their someone in their family had a disability And, I think when the discussion is anchored in that, Sense of what would I want?

If I were on the other side of this. Um, That really unlocked something quite special. And do feel like the That's some signs that the General Australian culture to disability has changed a bit. Um, As a result of that campaign and as a result of what the indices done, whatever over the last few years.

Um, Uh, But I forgotten the main points. A question? No, no that's perfect. I think it is about that you know thinking you know what would I want? What would that look like for me or my family member is really? It's really powerful. And I think we you know going back to some of that discussion, you know, it's important.

Um what I was going to ask you a little bit about was just um, innovation. So you know, providers tell us that regulation and pricing. It's in our state of the sector report has been for a number of years. I just not conducive to innovation, um, and you do talk a little bit about, you know, that they do, go hand in hand, you know, we've got sustainability in innovation, hence, the theme of the conference.

Um just wondering what you think what you think is needed to support innovation or incentivise that and following on from that is how do you see the recommendations in the report or at least some of the recommendations in the report addressing that or and thinking about what might those incentives look like?

The um, the point about sustainability and intervention, obviously, if this game collapsed. Um, there could be no innovation, but There is in in business world which I'm not really a part of you hear people talking about business confidence when the politicians perspective, that's the most important. And the most important things, the businesses feel confident Um, Right.

I think we can talk and we could talk about that a bit more in terms of people with disability and families. As well, in terms of, Uh, arrow. Even innovation and our willingness to suggest innovations that we'd like to see happen. And to trial new models and housing models of support.

I think it's Not so much about creating incentives for innovation, and from participants perspective. That's intrinsic. Incentive to want to. Make the most. Of the life you have make the most of the abilities you have. And, And participate in the in the way you want to. Discipline. Don't need much more incentive than that.

Up the NDIS I think has as it is currently created perverse incentives. Where the? The feeling of create my plan be ripped out from underneath me. If I'm seeing to be improving or if or you know doing more. Or. Do I need to save my energy instead of trialling Different models of support.

I need to save my energy for the plan of view fight. I think that. Severely. Undermines. Um, How willingness to try some other things. So in this new design, Um, I think there's the separation of. Um, the allocation of funding and the working out of How do I put it back to the best use for me?

Seems to be the idea of separating that, Um, I think that's a really good. Good idea. And a fundamentally important thing we've got to be careful that other perverse incentives don't sneak in. Um, Many of the things that I'm now think a big problems I was a big supporter of about 10 years ago and it took me by surprise how things played out. So take everything I say with a grain of salt.

It's funny you say that and most people in the room would know of Doug Hurd I've also had him reflect on similar things. What we thought we were getting ended up into something a little bit different and there's a whole range of reasons, like that's happened. Um, that's a perfect segue to you. I was hoping that you could talk a little bit about, you know what, you think those changes to access budgeting and planning processes like might mean for participants and for the providers that support them in like um, practical terms.

So, uh, we know that the review came out early with some ideas around that but just interested in your reflections and also, what you wanted to pick up on any of that innovation discussion that um, mark was just leaving us off on. About a project I did last year about employment for people with intellectual disability and something that people said disabled, people and their families in particular, said a lot of was we keep trying to innovate, but the NDIS is doing everything they can to stop us.

And it was a really key thing around the state honour engagement that we did where they would try to do things around micro enterprises and a whole bunch of really creative solutions around employment for people with very significant support needs. But the NDAS would say, well now you don't need employment supports anymore and the whole thing would fall apart.

So I think the changes to the access and planning um, have been thought about with thinking about some of those examples and how to give people with disability and their families, a bit more trust and a bit more creativity with their plans and look a period of time. I was part of the co-group, which was tasked

From the beginning think of something completely new. And I'm not sure we succeeded in doing that, but We certainly did try and take it. Would we could make a perfect system. One that worked for us in and for as many people is disabilities, we could think of, um, how do we design that?

So I think the navigator role really came from that of having someone who could be a champion of people with disability who was outside the provider system and providers, absolutely provide services and that's fine. But in terms of navigation information someone independent to talk to that was really talked about particularly from people in the intellectual disability and families that they just didn't have anywhere to go to find out what was best and what was, you know, new because as Mark said, sometimes when people come into disability, it can be because the worst thing in the world has happened to them and their families.

So to be time of shock and trauma. And so finding information is really important. Um, so that was really good with the access.

To it a large number of people in the last week, I was one of the people who fought the hardest against independent assessment. So the idea that I would ever sign off, Something that looked or smelled like independent assessments it's not correct. So to really make the assessment process, much fairer, much less dependant on having the right words or the right reports or being able to access a diagnosis or any of those things that are increasingly challenging and a particularly challenging in regional areas and profound families, who are come from low, socioeconomic background and we know that the NDIS is absolutely life-changing for people in those circumstances.

If they can get in. To be separate. So for people to have a broader package of supports that is not done by the Nation, you know, this particular thing can only spent on this at car spent on anything else because people talk to us a lot about that, creating really significant challenges as they were going forward.

So, Part of the whole access conversation is also about. Do you need an individualised support plan or you know, in our idealistic world that we get to in five years time we'll have foundational supports available. Why it's lively the community? Uh, be, you know, able to meet your needs and meet your needs of your family member.

And that's part of Access shouldn't just be about in or out and you know, that hard line between the in the NDIS or out. But actually about what's sports. Do you need and how do we best need your needs? Particularly for kids and I think that's one of Core changes around this that I'm most pleased about.

But it really starts to erase those really hard edges between support and no support that, of course, so much harm. Yep. Thanks ill. I mean when we were chatting beforehand, just to take you back to that budgeting and flexibility. Um, Recommendations, I instantly when I've been speaking with, with people that's been one, that's one of those that's been created with us.

Oh, oh, how does that work in practise somebody? Whether you want to talk a little bit more about that? Because I think, when we were preparing for the session, you were talking a bit about how that relationship, Negotiation discussion might play out between people with disability seeking services and the providers that they're approaching and working with around that.

Yeah, and I think it's something that I know mark, if you're in your report with some stuff you talked a lot about, how do we build capacity of your people with disability and their families to feel like they're in control of their budgets? And that it belongs to them and they have a sense of ownership over it to be able to then Turn decisions about it.

So to be really You know, you know, my feelings about being consumers in the marketplace but to be in that position of having a bit more power to be able to go out and say, yes, I want this service. No, I don't want this service. I have a range of options and I can have choices that will actually deliver me the kind of life that I want.

Instead of whatever it is, now just being that those kind of really granular sort of line items You get presented with with a really quite narrow r. Providers that you could actually go to. And so I think that This was part of the original design where it is the design of a lot of individualised funding systems.

It was part of the original calls from the attended care coalition in the 1990s, in Australia. Like there's been a really big push from disabled people like families to have these ownership and power sitting with them as part of how we develop this and it hasn't realised for many people, for some, it has.

But for most people in the NDIS that hasn't been realised. And so I do think that these changes if we do it properly, and there is quite a lot of in there around supported decision, making about building capability in capacity in people with disability and families. And those independent information, of course, I would be doing my job.

If I didn't say more money but advocacy and making sure that there is that sort of independent, you know, sort of ecosystem around them to guide people into doing that. And I think there's been some good mention around peer support and some of that as well, which is the again, one of those missing pieces that was part of Activation design.

Yeah, thanks. So I I'm going to stick with you and then got a question around, I'm going to come to you with another question around outcomes, if that's okay. Um, Just wanted to talk a little bit about how you see the recommendations generally, uh, moving us from a focus on that quantity of support.

So, you know, we've definitely heard from providers that, you know, it's a very transactional system that we've got now. There's so much focus on hours input not enough on outcomes. Hence becoming to in a minute here. What have you think they're going to move us into that different focus more on the quality of what people are receiving?

It's a really good question. I mean I think what is quality support is not that actually that difficult question. We kind of know what that is. There has been plenty of research. People with disability know what good quality support looks like we have the entire disability role commission. That's made some really strong recommendations about that.

So I don't think it needs to be a mystery about what quality support actually looks like and what people with disability particularly people with an intellectual disability uh keen to do you know, a lot of and a lot of the time. It is just what everybody else wants to do too.

It's to live in the community to do the kinds of things that they want to do. Have a job, leave it a house that they have control over. And as people we need to introduce ability of said to me, you know, be able to make a sandwich if I'm hungry.

If three o'clock in the morning. And, you know, that is a really good indicator around choices as they say, choice and control. The pricing paper that was put up by the review. And, you know, the review itself was really clear that in the current system, there isn't any mechanisms to Um, providing city to providers to do that.

And if in fact, the incentives exist in the opposite direction. So the more support that someone can get, that's better, whatever quality it is. There is no differentiation. So I do think that we need to engage people with disability first and foremost and their families around. What is that quality?

And then how do we actually deliver it? And I think we, you know, to be frank think we should start with. Intellectual disability because today they have experienced the least quality, you know, in terms of services and the lease qualities in terms of outcomes, You know, you just had the four and a half years of the disability royal commission making really strong findings about what life is like, under the NDIS for people with the most complex sport needs.

And we need to make sure that that they're not still living lives. You know, that a secretary for the community in another 10 years time. So, um, I think there would be really helpful. To work with people with an intellectual disability around, how do we design that and do that?

And some of that is going on right now, and I think that, providers who are working with peer support organisations working with people who've lived in institutions and group homes, all their lives about what is home look like for you and what do you want to live and how do you want to do that?

And I think those kinds of Chips where people with disability and families and providers work together to say, how to do this. And how do we This kind of new way of doing things, I think is absolutely the way. Yeah, yeah, thanks. Thanks, hell. Um, I'm just going to leave right on to you before.

I lose my train of thought I was just interested in. So, you know, we're talking a little bit about, you know, lots of one-to-one quality discussions and what's working for individuals? Have we scale that up? So if we're like embracing what, you know Bruce and Lisa were talking about in terms of you know you listen you adjust you measure and then you do it better.

Have we kind of start to measure some of that and turn that into that kind of continuous improvement that we all want to see and if we're trying to help people make decisions about you know, about the supports that might be the best quality best value for them, deliver the best for them.

What's how do we measure that and how to get that info out there? Just a very a small question for you here. You cannot thank you for that one later, I think. There's always challenges and like, It's easy to say oh we should just click better until it do it better and I am very conscious but sort of that's red taping burdened on providers and other people that Such data.

So you do have to balance that with actually doing the work that needs to be done, but I think in general, there's the opportunity to have tighter relationships between the goals and the needs of participants, the spend that's attached to that and then the outcomes achieved. So it's not something that I've seen done super world today.

That's sort of, actually, sort of being out articulate. These are the people that had particular education goals and employment goals, or other types of goals, these are the specific. That and these were the outcomes that are cheap, but that Sort of the nirvana state where you can actually be sort of boat demonstrate the value that providers are adding.

But also I guess, sort of building that evidence-based about what works and sort of sort of been sort of doing more of what seems to work. Um what are the other big challenges in outcomes and it I guess it probably is heightened because the emphasis some foundation supports is that currently that the main System for the NJIS is within the NEIS, serial survey of Um, and This this has challenges when you want to see what an outcomes like the people in the NEIS and not in the NDIS.

Yes. And that question, I think will become more and more relevant over the coming years. Um so does actually mean you need to sort of broaden how you think about outcomes? There's been a bit of a push with the Australian disability strategy had to turn outcomes framework. There's the national disability data asset which is hoping to sort of pull together different types of information.

Um, so if you do that, well, I'm reasonably optimistic. It can be done. Well, you'll actually be able to see sort of outcomes that you weren't able to see before, as well as do that comparison. And in terms of a new outcomes actually sort of being able to see improving comes or improved employment, or better outcomes with the justice sector.

I think a lot of those types of questions are not sort of well understood Thanks. Thanks you. Um, Sort of a little bit kind of similar, but by going to you mark, um, Just, you know, overall, you took a in particularly, in the report that I'm referring to, you know, you and your colleague, Dr.

Simon Duffy took a really holistic and optimistic view, um, of the NDIS, and the potential is opportunities for reform. I think one of the things that struck me and it does go a little bit to those outcomes questions, and some of the things that, you know, you and you, you and your colleagues found particularly in terms of the rural commission report.

And, you know, systemic maltreatment and the, you know, making changes in systems and what that could achieve for us. Um, You. And, um, so I've been talked a little bit about how we can afford implementing what you call downstream solutions to upstream problems. Um, my ask you to talk a little bit about what you meant by that and then just whether you think the recommendations are going to the heart of those issues.