

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL LEGAL AND SOCIAL ISSUES COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Children Affected by Parental Incarceration

Melbourne—Monday, 9 May 2022

MEMBERS

Ms Fiona Patten—Chair

Dr Tien Kieu—Deputy Chair

Ms Cathrine Burnett-Wake

Ms Jane Garrett

Ms Tania Maxwell

Mr Craig Ondarchie

Ms Nina Taylor

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Dr Matthew Bach

Mr Rodney Barton

Ms Melina Bath

Ms Georgie Crozier

Dr Catherine Cumming

Mr Enver Erdogan

Mr Mark Gepp

Mr Stuart Grimley

Ms Wendy Lovell

Mr Tim Quilty

Dr Samantha Ratnam

Ms Harriet Shing

Mr Lee Tarlamis

Ms Sonja Terpstra

Ms Kaushaliya Vaghela

WITNESSES (*via videoconference*)

Ms Alison Churchill, Chief Executive Officer, and

Ms Marisa Moliterno, Program Manager, the Miranda Project, Community Restorative Centre.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone. Thank you for joining us. As I am sure you know, this is the Legal and Social Issues Committee's Inquiry into Children Affected by Parental Incarceration.

We are being joined for this session by the Community Restorative Centre, based up in New South Wales. With us today is Ms Alison Churchill, who is the CEO, and Ms Marisa Moliterno, who is the Program Manager for the Miranda Project. Marisa and Alison, thank you so much for joining us.

If I could just let you know that all evidence taken today is protected by parliamentary privilege. That is provided by our *Constitution Act* but also by the standing orders of our Legislative Council, and this means that any information that you provide during this hearing is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you say during this hearing, but if you were to go elsewhere and repeat the same things, you may not have the same protection for those comments. Any deliberately false evidence or misleading of the committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament.

I am not sure whether you can see, but we are recording today's session. We have AV, but we also have our parliamentary Hansard recording. You will receive a transcript of today. I would encourage you to have a look at it and make sure we have not misheard or misrepresented you. Ultimately that transcript will make its way onto the committee's website and will form part of our report.

Again, we are all very grateful for you making the time to meet with us today. We received your submission, so we are very interested in the work that you are doing and the outcomes that you seem to be achieving. Marisa, I will open it up to you for some opening comments before we have a committee discussion.

Ms MOLITERNO: Thank you. We have prepared a small presentation, so I will share that if that is okay.

The CHAIR: Lovely.

Visual presentation.

Ms MOLITERNO: Thank you. I would just like to start by first acknowledging that we are on Aboriginal land, land that was never ceded. I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands, Aboriginal elders past and present and all Aboriginal people who may be with us today. I am calling in from Gadigal Wangal land. I would like to also acknowledge the over-representation of First Nations people in custody and the over-representation of First Nations young people in our out-of-home care systems, which is particularly relevant to today's discussion.

We have got me as Program Manager and Alison as the CEO of the Community Restorative Centre here today, and we will be talking predominantly about the Miranda Project. Just to give you some kind of background about who we are and what we are, CRC is the lead NGO in New South Wales providing specialist support to people affected by the criminal justice system and their families, with a particular emphasis on the provision of post-release and reintegration programs for people with multiple and complex needs on release from custody. CRC as an organisation has been around for over 70 years in different contexts, and we have a number of programs. However, all those programs aim to reduce recidivism, break entrenched cycles of criminal justice system involvement and build pathways out of the criminal justice system.

The Miranda Project specifically works with women anywhere along the criminal justice continuum, so from the beginning when there is a risk of involvement with the criminal justice system or a risk of incarceration to on bail or on community orders to people on remand seeking bail options or women who have been sentenced who are seeking that through release and post-release support. We specifically work with women who are also victims of or at risk of family and domestic violence, with a particular focus on diverting women away from the criminal justice system and away from incarceration.

We do recognise the over-representation of First Nations women in custody, the higher rates of victims of intimate partner violence and violence overall, higher rates of mental illness, higher rates of cognitive impairment and higher rates of mothers in custody, so we are really considering those in our support services and our delivery options. We particularly recognise women's resistance to violence and how the pathway from victimisation to criminalisation and those resistances to violence really impact on people's incarceration.

Just to give you a bit of background to the project itself, because it has evolved in multiple contexts to get to where it is today, it originally came from the knowledge, the expertise and the passion of women involved in the Women's Advisory Council. Then it utilised the CRC model of support, and that has been developed for a longstanding period of time and kind of improved along the way as it has gone. It is really a long-term relational outreach model of support that addresses the social determinants of criminalisation. Then we incorporated the learnings gained from visiting women's centres in the UK, so that was really about embedding specialist workers in the women's centres, with multiple services co-located to holistically support a woman. And then we have kind of, I suppose, developed that further and continue to develop it.

We have really been informed and driven by people with lived experience—so listening to First Nations communities, listening to people who have lived experience of incarceration and their families and listening to the people we support—to continue to develop and evolve that program and, with that, the implementation, review and adjustment of the model in practice as we go. More recently we have incorporated response-based practice as a domestic violence response and violence response to supporting people. At the moment the model of support is that we currently have five case workers full time and myself as the Program Manager, and we actually have kind of multiple pockets of funding streams. At the moment we have four funding streams to provide those supports. Each of those funding streams has a slightly different tweak to it, but the core work is the same work. It is providing that specialist, holistic, trauma- and violence-informed casework and case management based on a long-term relational outreach model of support—that CRC model of support—co-located with a women's health centre that provides safe social space for people to drop into, with access to groups and psycho-educational, social and recreational activities supported by specialist criminal justice and domestic and family violence workers from the Miranda Project team.

So programs are open to everybody in the community. All women in the community can access that centre; however, it is designed specifically for women involved in the criminal justice system. By being in a women's health centre it is also co-located with services which we have ease of access to, so specialist domestic and family violence services, health and wellbeing services, which we can really kind of connect women into for that mainstream service support. And that is another part of the program—really building those strong referral pathways for women with mainstream services, working to break down those barriers to mainstream services and connecting women back into the community. And that comes along with advocacy—advocacy for women involved in the criminal justice system on that really localised level of advocacy for frontline workers interacting with other services and breaking down those barriers again, and then we have specific work on systemic change by the advocacy, research and policy unit of CRC.

I heard that there was particular interest in the section 26 diversion that we have been doing, which is one component of the project which is a more recent component, so I have just put a little bit of extra information around that, and hopefully that is what you were after. The section 26 diversion is a pilot project that we have done in collaboration with the department of communities and justice. It is utilising the external leave program under section 26 of the *Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999* for women with caring responsibilities so women can have leave from custody to reside within the community to care for their children. The way this process works is that corrective services identifies a woman who could be eligible for this program, writes a submission to the commissioner, and once that is approved we can begin the section 26. CRC's part of that program is that we provide the community-based support for the women on the section 26 for the duration of the section 26 and support that transition into parole. Once the section 26 is concluded, if the woman is still wanting support—which at this stage all have—we can continue that support and follow that CRC model of reintegration support. The women are classified as inmates and are the responsibility of the governor of the correctional facility that they are classified to, so they are still classified as inmates, just on an external leave program. The women are bound by conditions of leave which have overarching requirements, and then there are additional requirements to meet their individual needs and kind of match their case plan.

Just to give you some outcomes of this specific cohort—as I said, it is very new; we only started late last year—five women have successfully completed a section 26 order and transitioned to parole. Two of these women

have since completed their parole for the first time ever, and these are women who have had multiple incarcerations, breaches of parole, breaches of community orders, and this is the first time they have ever actually successfully completed a parole period. The five women have come from varying backgrounds, demographics and classifications. We had two women who were First Nations women; one woman who was a culturally and linguistically diverse woman, who had very limited English going into custody; and three of the women had multiple incarcerations and had a longer incarceration history. Two of the women had first-time incarcerations but quite severe charges. Of these five women, six children were either able to remain in the care of their mother or be restored to the care of their mother, including two children who would otherwise have been removed at birth. All six children no longer have an active DCJ file as a result of this support. There have been an additional 10 children who do not reside in the care of their mother but have had increased access and connection to their mother since the mother has been returned to the community.

Just to give you a gauge of time frames, in the section 26 duration we have had between 21 and 75 days on a section 26 with an average of 41 days, and for these five women corrective services have saved over \$83 000. That is based on a \$338 per day calculation that corrective services have provided, and that saving is excluding the cost of the care of the children should they have been removed, so excluding the cost of the out-of-home care system—this is purely from a correctional basis. There have been an additional three women under the section 26 program that CRC has supported who were not section 26 because their submissions were not progressed to a full section 26 for various reasons; however, as CRC had begun working with these women we sought permission to continue to support these women into the community, and we have done so. So that is the section 26 part.

The overall Miranda Project outcomes—so we did do an evaluation in 2020 with qualitative and quantitative data evaluation. Just to give you some kind of client feedback highlights just to show the success of the program and some elements of the evaluation, we had increased rates of women remaining in the community; increased safety, housing stability, financial wellbeing and compliance; increased positive opportunities for women in contact with the criminal justice system; increased engagement in mainstream services for women who previously faced barriers to support; increased social connection and kinship connection; and it was shown to be best practice for integration for women survivors of violence in the criminal justice system.

I have got some basic statistics there. We have got quite a high percentage of First Nations women being involved in the program even though it is in mainstream service, although we do have First Nations women on the team of caseworkers and women with lived experience. So the kind of statistics matches the statistics of women in custody in terms of mental illness. Sixty per cent in that first evaluation were mothers, and 81.5 were mothers in the second part of the evaluation. And we had quite high rates of women remaining in the community, from 86 per cent upwards.

Just on a final note, I suppose of the whole of CRC—so Miranda Project is but one program of CRC. CRC has a range of programs supporting people involved in the criminal justice system, including other programs specifically targeted to women as well. An evaluation was done on all of the AOD and reintegration programs, completed in conjunction with UNSW, to ensure of the empirical validity and comparative analysis of BOSCAR statistics, and the evaluation outcomes were really quite positive. With CRC's model of support, following engagement with the CRC transition programs, there was a 65.8 per cent reduction in the number of days in custody, a 62.6 per cent reduction in custodial episodes and a 62.1 per cent reduction in proven offences. Those are quite good outcomes, I suppose, for a program to deliver and something we are quite proud of.

So I suppose we look at this from a human perspective on that. The more people we support to remain in the community—there are more mothers in community, there are more family members in community. It is a supporting community in healing and growing. But from a numbers perspective there is also an incredible economic benefit. So the 275 new clients over a three-year period saved the criminal justice system up to \$16 million, and the cost to run those programs is nowhere near that amount. So it also has a cost saving to the government and to the corrective services industry.

And that is us in a quick nutshell. So hopefully I did not speed through, and apologies for my croaky voice. But yes, thank you.

The CHAIR: Marisa, thank you. Thank you very much. That was very clear and concise, and you managed to get an awful lot of data and information to us in a very short period of time. So that really was terrific. I think the programs that you are offering are really quite extraordinary. I might just start with that specialist s26 program. I was just interested in the duration. So you were talking about that the duration was between 21 and 75 days. Now, how do you determine that time and the fact that then people would be involved in the program for 41 days?

Ms MOLITERNO: So that is really defined by corrective services. So corrective services would identify a woman who was eligible for a section 26, and the period of their support was from the time that their submission was approved, and they were released on the section 26 leave program until their parole date started. So while these ones have been in varying stages, depending on when there were identified by corrective services and approved by the commissioner to be on a section 26, we have been told that there would be the likelihood of much longer section 26 applications in future.

The CHAIR: Yes, so it seems like these particular women who have been part of the pilot were actually getting close to parole. So this was sort of a couple of months prior to parole that they were being given a section 26.

Ms MOLITERNO: That is correct. So the first two women were actually—one had just given birth, and if she had not gone on a section 26 the child would have been removed for a period of time. So that kind of, I suppose, instigated one of them. And then the second one again was a pregnant woman who was able to be released a couple of weeks prior to her delivery date so she could be supported to be settled in the community prior to her giving birth to the child. So I suppose there have been elements which have kind of accelerated corrective services to identify a particular woman.

The CHAIR: It sounds terrific. Alison, I think the whole CRC program and the objectives behind it are really fantastic. Certainly I am sure we have got some organisations here, but I do not think they have the same breadth as you do.

Just in looking at some of the recommendations that you made to us, one was around family visits. We have heard as well down here that a child might be off to see their parent, and they get there and the visit has been cancelled as a disciplinary action. You touch on this in your submission—that more should be done to ensure that children are not prevented from visiting their parents due to disciplinary action. Are you aware of any facilities that have stopped doing that?

Ms CHURCHILL: Within New South Wales? I think in some of the minimum-security women prisons there are attempts to reduce visits, particularly visits with children, as a form of punishment. There are discussions about it. Corrective Services in New South Wales are looking at a whole new women's pathway. I chaired the Women's Advisory Council on Corrective Services, and actually we have got a meeting tomorrow where this particular issue may come up—it is under review.

Certainly there is a small unit called Jacaranda Cottages that is based at Emu Plains. Actually that has just closed. It closed during COVID, but hopefully it will reopen really soon. They are certainly looking at expanding the beds available across the system in New South Wales for women to have young children present, where the intention would 100 per cent be not to use visits as punishment. As a broad policy right across the system I do not think we have quite got that far, but there are discussions about it, which is going in the right direction.

The CHAIR: Yes. One of the other recommendations was that when a prisoner is being moved the governor or the prison manager should provide a family impact statement, and I think that is a very interesting idea. I just wondered if you could maybe explain to us a little bit further what you think would be in that impact statement and what the governor would need to consider.

Ms CHURCHILL: Good thinking. I was not kind of prepared for this.

The CHAIR: No, that is all right.

Ms CHURCHILL: Well, look, I think incarceration and the loss of contact with a parent or significant carer impacts children very differently. Also, depending on where children are in care or who they are in care with,

they may not also be able to have a voice to accurately describe the impact, or it might not be safe for a child to actually state out loud that they would like to have contact with a parent or caregiver in prison. Particularly for women, they have often borrowed money from mothers or grandparents. They have burnt their bridges, and many families are angry with the woman that is in custody. And so for children to have a voice very openly around how they express the need and the want to see somebody that they know is actually not the most liked person in their household can be a challenge. Certainly there are organisations like SHINE for Kids. It would require a supportive conversation, I think, where the child is able to have a voice, and where possible, a private voice, and where there are some clear subtleties in how that child is advocated for within the situation in which they are being cared for. I do not hesitate for one minute to think that it is a really simple process, but I think it is an area that is greatly ignored. In New South Wales there is only one caseworker funded across the entire state to support families—and that is a part-time position—and CRC has the privilege of having that position. Certainly I can only speak for New South Wales—and there is one organisation, Shine, which I know you have also now in Victoria—but really that is the sum total of the focus around community service provision to children and the families that support them. Looking at overall wellbeing, trying to ascertain whether children have been primary, secondary or tertiary victims and if there is a way for some kind of parent-child reconciliation work, I think there are a number of strategies, but it is not a simple thing to address.

Ultimately in its most superficial way I think that the first cab off the rank would be where it is not so complex and where the carers of the children that are in the community are all happy, along with the child, for the child to have regular access to the mother or the father in custody, but where a move would impact that greatly. That could be a really simple way to start the process, where a governor or the commissioner could hear the impact of at least the ones that are more clear cut.

The CHAIR: I do not know about New South Wales, but I would be interested. In Victoria when we have asked the question at the correctional facilities that we visited, ‘How many parents are here?’, generally people kind of scratch their head and go, ‘Oh, well, I mean, a lot, really’. And I go, ‘Well, do you record that?’. And they go, ‘Oh, yes, we record it. We don’t know, but it’s recorded’. Is that data something that you have been able to elicit from corrections services?

Ms CHURCHILL: At different times and at different qualities. Probably 10 years ago the then Women’s Advisory Council advocated for specific—almost like census data—really clear demographic data to be collated and provided, and it was. But it has actually fallen away over the last few years, and that was discussed at our last WAC meeting, saying, ‘We want that data back’, because they collect it. Corrections services, when women are coming in or when men are coming in, ask how many children have been in their care. They gather the information or they ask the question, but they do not collate a lot of it. So, is it there? Yes. Is it readily available? No. Can it be? It can be, because it has been before. There is definitely an optimistic—well, I find it optimistic—and quite innovative or new appetite for looking at diversion, reconciliation, if not restoration, between mothers and children and trying to reduce the women’s prison population, and therefore when people are calling even within the department for more information—

The CHAIR: It has been well received.

Ms CHURCHILL: Yes. Certainly the resistance of a decade ago, let us say, seems to have waned, which is great.

The CHAIR: That is great to hear. Apologies, I have been using up a bit more time than I should have been. I will go to Cathrine then Rod and then Nina.

Ms BURNETT-WAKE: Thanks, Chair. Thank you, ladies, for coming along and speaking to us today. I am really interested in the section 26 pilot, the project pilot. I know that not too many women have gone through it yet, but there appear to be great benefits—qualitative and quantitative and fiscal benefits too—from running through it. Now, I understand that two of the women—one of them was about to give birth and one had given birth. If the program was to be expanded and continued, what other sort of eligibility criteria would there be other than having just given birth or being about to give birth for women to be able to access a section 26 release?

Ms MOLITERNO: From my understanding, a woman has to have caring responsibilities. Some of the women already had children that they needed to return to care for or had children in their care at Jacaranda

Cottages in the women and babies unit, and there is some legal process which I think has caused some of that, I suppose, slowness in the number of women we have had, because they have had to see what the appetite has been legally to be able to support these women to go on a section 26. So there are some legal parameters around if the nature of their caring was considered at the time of sentencing and a number of other factors that have played and that corrective services have looked into in assessing if a woman was suitable, in addition to that caring responsibility.

Ms BURNETT-WAKE: Okay. I know that you said you have done some evaluation of the project, but when is it due to end, and is it likely to be adopted, to carry on as a permanent fixture?

Ms MOLITERNO: We have only done some brief evaluation at this point. The evaluation data that I provided was around the Miranda Project as a whole. That section 26 has only been in operation since late last year.

Ms BURNETT-WAKE: And when does that—

Ms MOLITERNO: The funding formally ends in June this year. However, we have got some, I suppose, indications that there is appetite to continue the program.

Ms BURNETT-WAKE: Okay. Great. Appetite to continue—

Ms CHURCHILL: At this moment it looks like we may receive another two—well, an additional one, so two. It still has to be signed off, but two workers specifically focusing on section 26. There is definitely appetite to continue to watch and learn, because this is very new; it is the first time. This legislation has been in place for many years, and they utilised it to establish the mothers and children unit within the jail. But there are a handful of women that have been released, probably a decade ago, under this legislation. This is the first time there has been a risk appetite to be able to step into it, because it is a complex process where women are technically in custody but they are being released into the care of a community organisation prior to going on parole, and so they are in a bit of a correctional void, if you like. They are not sentenced to be within our care, so it is a strange process that we are all learning and sharing and working on together really closely to try and iron out what the hurdles are, what the obstacles are and what the things are we have not thought of at both ends and legislatively, because that has not been done before. At the moment the idea was to focus on reasonably low risk women, although we have had a couple that have sort of flown in the face of that. So it is a little bit steady as we go just so that we can get all of the paperwork in the prison organised. For instance, one of the first women that was released needed to apply for Centrelink because she was in the community, but in actual fact she had not been officially released because she was still within our care. So we are working with the department. With every new woman that comes out, we are suddenly going, ‘Oh, yes. We haven’t thought of that’. So it is very steady as it goes, which is why I think it will be extended. But, you know, it is ‘Isn’t this interesting. This really looks like it’s got great potential’. But it is still kind of ‘watch this space’ on how it develops, and yes, there are quite a few things to learn.

Ms MOLITERNO: And writing the policies and procedures as we go—they are in development along with the project itself.

Ms BURNETT-WAKE: Okay. I look forward to watching this space. Sounds like a great project. Thanks.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Rod.

Mr BARTON: Look, I was just going to ask exactly the same things about section 26 and the eligibility in the longer term in regard to level of offending. Is there a line in the sand if you have got something where you would be incarcerated for more than a period of time—say, five years or three years or one year? Where is the line in the sand?

Ms CHURCHILL: I think ultimately that line will be determined by Corrective Services. As you would know, by the time a woman enters the prison system, whether they are deemed to be high-risk offenders, we know that they often have multiple needs and have a complex range of issues that need to be addressed in order to keep them out. At the moment they are focusing on people with multiple complex needs or the intersection of multiple needs but not necessarily high-risk offenders. I think we will have to just see how it works. I think all indications are for us, for all of our other programs that are not section 26, if you address disadvantage, you

provide people with safe, secure housing, you enable women to engage with children and men to engage with children or connection to family and you create identities outside of the prison system and pathways away from the prison system, it tends to be effective.

I think one point of interest with this project, though, that has come up and that we have been in conversation with Corrective Services about that might be noteworthy for this inquiry is around: I do not know whether corrections—I probably should know but I am not sure—has the same intensity of programming based on the risk-need-responsivity model, looking at criminogenic risk factors in Victoria, as we do in New South Wales. I do not know if that is something—no? Okay.

The CHAIR: I do not know, Alison. No.

Ms CHURCHILL: Okay. I think this does reflect the system to some extent in Victoria, but corrective services across all jurisdictions within Australia talk about having a limited period of time to be able to initiate programs that might have an impact on somebody's offending, and they tend to be focusing on CBT. They call them criminogenic risk areas—like impulsivity, communication skills, drug and alcohol programs et cetera. A lot of the women that we talk to say, 'That's great, but actually we're quite traumatised. We've lost our children, we're in prison and we're not ready. We can't hear what you're telling us, and actually we need trauma counselling and we need assistance before you start giving us these programs'. One of the highest reasons for Indigenous women to be in custody in New South Wales is failing parole. They are called justice orders—and that cycle of women going in and out but breaching their justice orders. Speaking to the women that we work with, they are saying actually they are just not ready because they are still traumatised by whatever it is—whether it has been escaping domestic and family violence, drug abuse, trauma, childhood abuse. They cannot hear the programs that they are being told to sit in. Within Corrective Services in New South Wales they talk about the need for people to be responsive to programs, but at the same time what the women are saying is, 'We need counselling in order to be ready to hear what you've got to tell us'.

What has been interesting about the section 26 is that at least two women that have been in multiple times and have never managed to successfully complete their parole have said that what was really useful was having the support between coming out of prison and transitioning to parole so that they could actually get their medications, settled with their children, their housing secure, deal with all those interruptions—you think it is secure housing, but actually you are back in a domestic violence scenario—addressing all of those issues before parole started. And they were assisted with a community organisation—well, CRC—to actually engage with parole effectively so that they have managed to complete those orders. That is becoming quite a focus for corrective services in New South Wales now, particularly around women's ability to engage with children. You actually need to be quite well to do that well—and mentally well—and parole often cannot provide that. It is not intended to provide that. So this sort of intersection between prison and parole starting—there is quite a lot to it in relation to 'watch this space' but particularly in relation to how it assists the maintenance of that sort of mother-and-child relationship.

The CHAIR: Yes—so many demands when you come out of prison, and those demands of parole and all the rest of it on top of each other, yes. It would be very hard to take everything in. Nina, thank you; Nina is being very patient online.

Ms TAYLOR: It is all good; it is good listening. Thank you for the very detailed report at the outset. That was very, very helpful. Noting that the CRC seems to be an organisation that is unique to New South Wales, I was just wondering if there were similar bodies in other states. I know that Shine was mentioned, and I am just interested to see on that matter.

Ms CHURCHILL: In Victoria you have VACRO. VACRO, similarly to CRC, you know, sometimes grows and shrinks in response to the tide and funding and policy changes, but VACRO has been around for—I do not know—at least 100 years or something, chipping away in the background. And in South Australia there is OARS, which also does work very similar to us. And in Western Australia—actually it has just merged; it used to be called Outcare. I would be happy to provide some of the organisations. I think what is interesting, choosing those organisations, because you do have Mission Australia and in Victoria you have ACSO, which became really huge—I think there are a few organisations like CRC in the different states that are not actually trying to become the supermarket deliverers of programs. We are actually really trying to work with the groups that absolutely nobody else really wants to work with. In order to come onto our programs you need to have

complex issues, you need to have minimum supports, you need to be at quite high risk of reoffending—a slight exception with the section 26 one. Usually if you tick those boxes with some of those larger supermarket deliverers of services, they are the reasons why you do not get the support. I think we joked a few years ago about not wanting to be supermarket deliverers but wanting to be boutique and to learn how to do it and work with the departments, whoever they are, to really build on a model that we can then share and use as advocacy to government of different ways to hopefully create some sort of systemic change through service delivery. So there have been organisations that come and go or come and become massive, become really large, and their focus shifts from that core work. So when I named the ones that I was naming it is because they kind of stayed really at that almost pointy end, the more complex end in a genuine sense, rather than just trying to become bigger. I am happy to let you know who those services are, in my opinion anyway.

The CHAIR: Yes, thanks, Alison. I think any information would be really welcomed. This committee has been speaking to VACRO for the last four years, but VACRO does some great work and I am sure they are watching the work that you are doing with great interest too.

Ms CHURCHILL: We need to all meet. With all things COVID and changing CEOs we are a bit out of touch with each other, but over the years we have had a very collegial sharing-of-resources relationship.

The CHAIR: Brilliant. Thank you, Alison and Marisa. That was really fantastic, and your submission also was great, showing us things that work, which I think is really important. We want this report to actually be productive and useful, so thank you for providing us with some great direction in that way.

As I mentioned, you will receive a transcript of today. Please have a look at it and make sure that we have not misheard you or misrepresented you. Thanks again for giving your time, and thanks again for the work that you do. The committee will take a short recess just to reset, and we will be back at 3.20.

Witnesses withdrew.