



Submission for the development of The Not-for-Profit Sector Development Blueprint

Introduction

Please accept this submission on behalf of Parkerville Children and Youth Care (Parkerville CYC). We welcome the opportunity to provide feedback on the principles and priorities of a national blueprint for Australia's not-for-profit (NFP) sector. We have responded to a variety of questions across the topics.

Our holistic support to children, young people, and families

Parkerville CYC is a For Purpose organisation that supports children, young people, and their families to build skills and capacity, address the impacts of trauma and adverse childhood experiences, and develop capabilities that will enable them to be the best versions of themselves. We see a future where Western Australia is the safest place in the world and all children, young people, and their families feel safe to dream, to thrive, and to reach their fullest potential. We have been working alongside vulnerable children, young people, and their families for 120 years, and every year, we support more than 13,000 people across WA through our therapeutic, out of home care, youth, and education services. The future of those we serve depends on what we do in the present to support them to reach their potential.

Our Values



Bold and Courageous

We stand up for what is right and assist to amplify the voices of the children, young people, families and communities we support.



Curious and Humble

We search out information and data that will help us remain at the forefront of all that we do.



Caring and Respectful

We acknowledge and embrace the diversity and individuality of everyone we meet and all those we serve.



Hopeful

We believe in the power of positivity and are optimistic about change, having faith that together we can overcome any challenge we may face.



Truthful and Accountable

We are committed to being open, honest and taking responsibility for our actions.

Our Purpose

Our purpose as an organisation is to support children, young people, and their families to build skills and capacity, address the impacts of trauma and adverse childhood experiences, and develop capabilities that will enable them to be the best versions of themselves.





Parkerville CYC's services

Therapeutic Services

- **Multi-agency Investigation and Support Team (MIST):** co-located, multi-disciplinary, trauma-informed model to reduce harmful impacts of trauma from abuse. It is WA's first truly integrated child sexual abuse (CSA) response, with Child Advocacy Centres in Armadale (2011) and Midland (2019). MIST's core principle is to reduce instances of children having to tell and re-tell their story, and coordinate services (including Police) to wrap around the child and family, through collaborative relationships and knowledge-sharing.
- **Therapeutic Services:**
 - **CSATS:** We provide a Child Sexual Abuse Therapeutic Service (CSATS) in a regional area of WA.
 - **PACTS:** We also provide a Parents and Children's Therapeutic Service (PACTS) in a northern Perth suburb. 84% of children and young people receiving a service had experienced child sexual abuse.

Out of Home Care

- Parkerville CYC cares for 126 children and young people across foster care, family group homes (FGH) in the Metro area and in the Murchison. We also run an intensive residential program for young people aged 12-17 currently under the care of the Department of Communities (Belmont Youth Program). We are implementing an innovative, award-winning new model (Our Way Home) – radically personalised shared care: focusing on the needs and desires of each child, and deliberately seeking to establish, maintain and deepen connections between children and their families.

Education Services

- **Child and Parent Centres (CPCs):** Parkerville runs two CPCs in Perth, servicing 12 primary schools in vulnerable communities. The centres work to create an entry point into the school system and help with school readiness, but importantly they focus on increasing family capacity and help them provide appropriate developmental experiences and a happy, healthy home.
- **Education Employment and Training Program (EET):** For young people at extreme educational risk due to trauma, mental health, family issues

Youth Services

- **Support and Community Services (SACS):** service for families with children aged 4-14 that are experiencing homelessness, or at risk of homelessness and living in supported accommodation.
- **Moving Out, Moving On (MOMO):** service for young people aged 15-21 who are experiencing homelessness, or at significant risk of homelessness or transience.
- **Reconnect:** a diversion and early intervention service for families with young people (12-18) at risk of homelessness or family breakdown.
- **Yong Women's Program:** medium-term accommodation and support for young women (including those with children) aged 16-25 experiencing or at risk of homelessness, or who need help to live independently.
- **Armadale Youth Accommodation Service (AYAS):** short-term crisis accommodation for young people experiencing/at risk of homelessness.

2. The Not-for-profit sector in Australia	2.1.1 What is your vision or aspiration for the NFP sector over the next 10 years?	We aspire to see the NFP sector as community capacity builders as well as service providers: intervening early by using asset-based community development approaches and working collectively in a true place-based manner, to reduce the flow of people into crisis services. This would maximise local community skills, knowledge and assets to deliver integrated services that are accessible and reduce locational disadvantage.
	2.1.2. What core values and considerations should guide a 10-year vision for Australia's NFP sector?	Parkerville is guided by the following values, which we believe can and should – in some iteration – be reflected in the sector's 10-year vision: - <i>Bold and Courageous:</i> We stand up for what is right and amplify the voices of the children, young people, families, and communities that we support. - <i>Curious and Humble:</i> We search out Information and data that will help us remain at the forefront on all that we do. - <i>Caring and Respectful:</i> We acknowledge and embrace the diversity and Individuality of everyone we meet and those we serve. - <i>Hopeful:</i> We believe in the power of positivity and are optimistic about change, having faith that together we can overcome any challenge we may face. - <i>Truthful and Accountable:</i> We are committed to being open, honest, and taking responsibility for our actions. To this, we would add: - <i>Collaboration for place-based outcomes and collective impact.</i> As non-statutory organisations, NFPs have the capacity to walk alongside communities, and to support communities to build their own capabilities and strengths. This vital social capital work should be better acknowledged as a collective good, and at the core of the sector's work.
3. Measurement, outcomes and quality of services	3.1.2 What good examples of codesign have you been involved in which could benefit sector practices? Why do you think they have worked?	<i>Our Way Home</i> In November 2019, Parkerville invited the Innovation Unit to partner with us in developing a new approach to out-of-home care, recognising that radical transformation is required to improve outcomes for children, young people, and families.

The subsequent 9-month co-design process engaged over 200 stakeholders, including children, young people and families, people with lived experience in care, carers, other service providers, academics and experts, and Aboriginal elders and communities, including local survivors of the Stolen Generation. It resulted in *Our Way Home*.

The *Our Way Home* co-design process brought people together around shared challenges, and helped professionals from across the system to unlock and bring with them a new mindset to their work. This involved significant cultural change, but quickly generated solutions.

Our Way Home proposes a significant departure from out-of-home care as it is currently delivered across most of Australia. It recognises that long-term impact lies in strong families and cultural connections. Every child's journey is personalised to their unique circumstances and needs, directed toward restoration in the most suitable way.

- The model gives children, young people and their families involved with care systems more choice and control. It aims for radically personalised 'shared care' relationships between carers and families – recognising families as equal partners. Key features of this model include:
 - A new role (Family Link Worker) to support relationships with families, to start healing journeys, facilitate connections, and act as bridges in complex relationships.
 - An elevated role for Aboriginal Practice and Culture Leads in finding family who had long since disconnected.
 - New practices, including 'Bridge Spaces' - planned, facilitated meetings between carers, families and children that create conditions for relationships to flourish, and for conflicts to resolve.
 - A creative tool kit (My Plan Kit, Voice Boxes, Connection Cards) that enables the voices of children, young people, and families to influence decision-making.
 - Practice Guides and Videos, to support the adoption of new mindsets and practices amongst the team at Parkerville. These are open sourced for wider adoption of methods across the system.
 - New leadership and support structures. Shared care is complex work, requiring significant mindset shifts and new practices. New support from leaders allows the reflection space to develop skills and overcome anxieties.

In September 2023, *Our Way Home* was recognised as an example of design excellence, receiving a prestigious Gold Winner award at Australia's International Good Design Awards; meeting rigorous criteria focused on good design, design innovation, and design impact.

Parkerville and the Innovation Unit were commended for the extensive breadth and depth of engagement across the design process to reframe and redesign out-of-home care services, transforming the experiences of children in care and their families.

		We believe that it was this intentionally open, radical, and truly inclusive approach to co-design that created – and continues to create – meaningful impact. Early evidence has demonstrated that children coming into our care are staying connected to the people who are important to them, or are rebuilding lost connections, even in cases with little to no previous contact or situations where families had given up hope. It is creating space for families to heal and make positive changes in their lives, and personalised care and family contact is resulting in behaviours and actions from children that signify positive long-term outcomes. It is important to stress, however, that this process of co-design (and commitment to implementation) required Parkerville to make a significant financial commitment, based on our conviction in the imperative need to transform how we provide out-of-home care as the right thing to do – uppermost, for better outcomes for children and young people in our care (and their families), better for wider community impact, and better for longer-term financial savings to Government. Given ever-increasing emphasis in funding, tendering and commissioning processes on service co-design, it is important to stress the importance of <i>meaningful</i> co-design – including being clear about the limits and when it is (and is not) appropriate to co-design, the commitment from all participants as equal partners, and recognising that meaningful <i>consultation</i> also has a vital place where co-design is not possible or suitable.
	3.1.3 What would an outcomes focused approach look like in your area(s) of work? What would be needed to move towards this and what unanticipated consequences should government and the sector consider?	Parkerville has been undertaking significant work to create and implement an outcomes-focused culture and practice in everything that we do. We recognise the value of this for accountability (internally, to those we serve, to Government and other funders and stakeholders), for continuous improvement, and for evidence-based service delivery and decision-making. We also recognise the value of an outcomes-focused approach for helping to create clarity and common ground in what for many organisations – including Parkerville - can appear to be a rather complex service delivery environment; i.e., multiple programs and service streams, often with intersection points, but frequently artificially siloed by funding and commissioning conditions. Establishing core outcomes pillars that sit across all programs and speak to organisational purpose and values, enables us to keep our core mission at the centre. However, outcomes measurement must be better recognised by funders as an administrative cost both in time and money. Its successful implementation requires investment in systems and training, and information gathering adds an operational cost for staff to collect, record, and analyse the outcomes data. This is undoubtedly a worthwhile

		cost, but is frequently one that is borne by the organisation, and not by funders as a recognised essential part of service provision. Further, much value would be gained with greater information-sharing to track outcomes, particularly from Government. It is often the case that the needs of those we serve are such that outcomes will only become clear longitudinally. A lack of information-sharing capacity restricts opportunities to use data effectively for planning, reporting, and responding effectively to need.
	3.1.4. What role(s) should government play in helping NFPs become data capable and informed by evidence?	A significant help in this space would be recognition of the cost of software, staff with specialist skills (business/data analysts), and training staff to become data capable. It must also be recognised that it takes time – and therefore resources - to deliver on quality data. As noted above, there is great value in showing longitudinal outcomes (particularly in our context: showing the longer-term impacts of intervention in childhood and adolescence into young adulthood and beyond), and exercises like Within-Subjects design can provide robust evidence with which to shape services and inform policy, in a way that reliance on self-reports alone cannot. Building robust data requires significant investment internally, and in resourcing research partnerships with external agencies to provide independent analysis/evaluation and perspectives.
	3.1.5. Could common resources or platforms support the technical aspects of outcomes measurement? What might these look like?	The creation of collaborative, comparative data sources and evidence platforms is hugely beneficial for evidencing the practices and approaches which impact positively on outcomes. For instance, 100 Families WA represents a unique collaborative action research project; with the creation of a fully downloadable, multi-format evidence base that can be used for the direct or indirect benefit to families experiencing disadvantage. Certainly, it would be of significant value to have common, agreed-upon data sets that can be customised by individual organisations, according to nature and need. This requires collaboration and resource pooling, particularly for smaller organisations without in-house support.
4. Policy, advocacy, communications and engagement	4.1.1. How can the role of advocacy by NFP organisations be better embedded and preserved in policy and legislation?	Systemic policy advocacy by NFPs is essential to the development of robust, evidence-informed policy-making; and more than that, contributes to the practice of core democratic principles of consultation and participation. NFP advocacy uses evidence generated from frontline practice and from direct engagement and/or consultation with those we serve, to show the gaps, challenges, and disadvantages in policy as it translates on the ground, and contributes to discussions about creating systemic policy and social change. This vital work is, again, a cost to NFPs that is rarely met by funders, particularly (given NFP systemic policy advocacy tends to challenge Government policy and practice) Government. Larger organisations may be able to more

		comfortably absorb the cost, given the strategic value of advocacy. For smaller organisations, this financial output can be harder to account for and advocacy more ad hoc and/or necessarily smaller-scale and targeted. To better embed and preserve this function, Government must acknowledge more clearly that NFP advocacy is not a 'nice to have' or a tick box exercise, but fundamental to evidence-informed and accountable policy-making, and therefore a common good that should be intentionally resourced (alongside, as noted above, outcomes data as a vital way in which NFPs evidence their policy advocacy). The <i>types</i> of advocacy must also be considered: better embedding and preserving NFP advocacy is important in itself, but real value comes in breadth, depth and diversity of NFP engagement. Given the barriers that smaller organisations face, policy-makers must work to intentionally, routinely, and flexibly engage with the breadth of the NFP sector to ensure a robust and evidence-informed dialogue; not relying primarily on input from larger and/or better-resourced organisations. This diminishes advocacy's legitimacy, and fails to hear the voices in our community which most need to be heard.
	4.1.2. What mechanisms are needed so that the expertise of the NFP sector is better used in designing policy and services?	Following from the above, consultation and co-design mechanisms must seek to engage the breadth and depth of the NFP sector. Significant specialist knowledge and practice excellence lies in organisations that may not have capacity to engage in traditional policy advocacy, and failing to seek out or enable their participation is a loss to the design of policy and services. We also note the criticality of a translational approach: ensuring that policy does not dictate practice, or (linked to above point) that advocacy dominated by 'usual suspects' does not dominate policy consultation. Multiple mechanisms - designed to creatively, flexibly, and meaningfully engage the sector in its scope and diversity – must be led by the need to create an interactive organism that translates policy into action. This might include case study driven-development, better resourcing of service evaluation, and case study-driven renewal i.e., policy-making is responsive to impact on the ground, and translates into meaningful action or outcome for the people for whom it is intended.
	4.1.3. What could NFP organisations and networks be doing better to ensure their systematic advocacy directly involves the people and communities they serve?	Advocacy is (or should be) fundamentally about ensuring that under-served communities have a voice in the policies that impact their lives. Cultures and practices of co-design (where possible) and regular consultation and feedback must be at the core of service design and delivery. By doing so, NFP organisations can much more effectively and meaningfully incorporate systematic advocacy as part of this practice as usual. We also note the issue of locational disadvantage as a barrier to community involvement in systematic advocacy: too often, organisations (NFP or otherwise) directly serving people and communities are separate from/inaccessible

		to those that need them the most. This is not always a regional/remote issue – although this is the starkest. We see in Perth that core services are often centralised in the CBD or West Perth, creating a structural access barrier for vulnerable and/or disadvantaged communities. This is a failure of effective policy, but also a barrier that NFPs can work to address, for instance, through more intentional place-based approaches.
	4.1.4. How could the assets of the sector for example, the research expertise of larger organisations, including public universities be better used to build the evidence base for systemic advocacy and reform?	Many NFPs, especially smaller ones, struggle to resource and/or access research grant bodies, despite doing work that has critical value for research and praxis. Meaningful partnership between community organisations and researchers, and/or supporting services to direct resources into research, would be welcome as part of addressing this challenge. Services and community organisations face challenges with accessing research funding, having the infrastructure to get research off the ground, resourcing the necessary changes to data collection and monitoring that embeds research and evaluation capacity, and therefore being research ready. Nevertheless, the benefits are significant: proper resourcing of practice-based, embedded research would help to produce a cogent and grounded evidence base, to support the ongoing development of the best possible services for children and families. Indeed, grants often call for partnership between research institutions and frontline NFPs. In practice, it requires a culture shift for research institutions to engage in true partnership; frontline organisations are often approached to participate in research, but the practice can feel extractive: we are (seen as) ‘gate-keepers’ to accessing the people we serve, and it can be rare that NFPs are involved in research design. In particular, universities could be much more intentional (and/or, required by their funders to be so) in their research collaboration – seeking to build partnership from the earliest stages, embedding it in project delivery, inclusion and recognition in research outputs, and – critically - supporting efforts to embed research capacity in NFPs (one example, in Parkerville’s context, could be resourcing efforts around young people as peer researchers).
5. Philanthropy and volunteering	5.1.3. How can philanthropic and volunteering resources be effectively targeted to community needs?	In the first instance, we would ask: should it be a philanthropic responsibility to address community needs? A core function and responsibility of Government should be upholding a spirit of service and ethic of care in its public services. Philanthropy should be an added bonus, rather than designated source, particularly because philanthropists tend to fund causes that resonate for them. If Government used its resources to better meet community need (through prevention, early intervention, and in crisis response), philanthropy could be greater utilised to fund innovation, or more rapid/experimental responses that are harder for Government to achieve.

	5.1.4. How might the sector adapt to more direct forms of giving and volunteering?	The exercise of social capital and civil society engagement in the work of NFPs fundamentally relies upon people <i>choosing</i> to be engaged, to participate, to donate. However, research and organisational data shows that volunteering has not fully recovered from the impact of COVID-19, and that formal volunteering participation rates have declined.¹ Outside the COVID context, volunteering has been undergoing change over the last decade, with a consistent trend of fewer volunteers, and those that there are prefer specific, targeted opportunities that meet their needs. Therefore, whilst there are no doubt shared learnings and innovative practices to support the sector to adapt, there is also a larger piece that recognises the need to make a significant investment in demonstrating that if one part of the community struggles, the whole community struggles. We would also highlight that for organisations working in or allied to child protection, the risks of more direct volunteering are too high. The trauma behaviour/responses of children and young people who have been abused and/or suffer complex trauma can create more risk; bringing volunteers into that context (i.e., direct engagement with children and young people) is not suitable at baseline. Voluntary contribution to the organisation that has no child/young person contact can be managed, but is resource-intensive.
6. Governance, organisation and legal environment	6.1.3. What does the sector need in its boards to be effective?	In sectors like ours, delivering direct services to those affected by trauma, abuse, and/or disadvantage (and with specific needs and operational conditions related to work with children and young people), of great need and value are brave individuals who understand the personal and professional risks of their involvement, relative to the relevant legislation and to the organisation's own exposure to risk. Given this, particular professional experiences can add necessary skills and knowledge, such as law, finance/accountancy, policy-making and Government and philanthropic connections – but above all, demonstrated commitment to strong governance. The compliance obligations for many NFPs delivering direct services are incredibly (and necessarily) high; Boards must be able to hold fast to why they committed to the organisation whilst holding a high burden of risk, in what can be highly stressful and high-risk governance conditions. Financial compensation for NFP Boards should be a serious consideration, albeit one that the vast majority of NFPs themselves cannot provide.

¹ See ABS statistics: <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/household-impacts-covid-19-survey/mar-2021#voluntary-work-and-unpaid-help>, accessed 18th December 2023; and Volunteering Australia (2021) *Volunteering and the ongoing impact of COVID-19*

7. Leadership and staff development	7.1.1. What should the priorities be for future leadership in the sector and developing the sector's paid workforce and volunteers?	We see significant value in an investment in leadership itself: in rigorously developing management skills, strategic thinking, and the ability to understand the organisations that they run with depth and analytical insight. This provides a strong foundation from which to develop the sector's workforce and volunteers, built on a robust skill set and deep knowledge. As with many necessary resources referenced in this submission, an approach of this kind requires an ongoing financial commitment that many NFPs struggle to meet. We also note the need for approaching sector workforce learning and development needs with flexibility and responsiveness. Often, training that is confined to a 'classroom', and/or training that is off-the-shelf and of fixed content, is less relevant or appropriate for professionals (and volunteers) serving communities with complexity of need and vulnerability. Targeted, tailored approaches to learning and development that put theory into practice (and vice versa) are often more suited. However, sector collaboration is needed to better recognise this more praxis-driven approach, which may rarely be reflected on recognised certificates. This includes integrating it more effectively into career progression and succession planning.
	7.1.3. How can we make employment opportunities attractive and build career pathways to develop the paid NFP workforce of the future?	There is a fundamental challenge for the NFP sector with remuneration and employment security, given the frequent short-termism of funding cycles. Successfully bringing qualified and suitably experienced people into the NFP sector is only made more challenging when commissioning and funding cycles tie NFPs to the use of fixed-term contracts. 5-year funding cycles were intended to address this challenge, however without appropriate CPI increases, organisations generally find that cost of living increases outstrip wage increases. As such, employment opportunities are offered as either fixed term, or lower paid. This leaves organisations in a state of perpetually going backwards financially, and having to make difficult decisions about contract deliverables, including whether and how to maintain staffing levels. Ensuring that the CPI kept up with cost of living and wage increases would enable organisations to keep up, and retention and development strategies would centre on paying the market rate.
	7.1.4. How might the sector make more of its 'for purpose' status to attract and retain paid and volunteer workers?	As noted above, when annual funding increases do not keep up with the cost of living, it adds additional challenge to attracting and retaining staff. Nonetheless, people leaving corporate or other non-NFP sectors do so knowing that they will likely have a lower salary or less secure contract conditions. They do so, fundamentally, for the purpose of the work, and often (we



		find) stay. Whilst it is challenging for NFPs to compete in terms of incentives and salary offer, it is critical to build a clear organisational identity founded upon effective leadership and governance, and a comprehensible purpose, vision, and values that translate clearly across the organisation and speak to the community that the NFP serves. The ability to demonstrate the organisation's impact on working to achieve its purpose is also a notable contribution to attracting and retaining staff. That is, being able – through an outcomes-focused approach and systemic advocacy, among other factors – to evidence that the organisation is creating meaningful positive outcomes in the lives and wellbeing of those it serves supports a belief in the work: that it has meaning, purpose and impact.
8. Government funding, contracting and tendering	8.1.1. How should government improve the way it funds and contracts charities?	As noted above, a culture of short-term funding, and long-overdrawn or overdue commissioning processes (sometimes years overdue, as in the recently concluded out-of-home care commissioning process in WA) foment instability and uncertainty for organisations and their staff. At the least, Government should keep up with cost of living and wage increases. The NFP sector is not for profit, but it is also not for loss. NFPs require some degree of surplus-generation to future-proof the organisation. Existing with little-to-no reserves and near-constant hand-to-mouth does not best serve the community, or the staff left in constant fear of job loss. From a retention perspective, if there is low-level anxiety about wage level or job security and something changes in an individual's personal circumstances (mortgage rate increase, a new child, healthcare costs), they start looking for employment elsewhere.
	8.1.2. How could government funding, tendering and contracting drive a good balance of collaboration and competition to support innovation in the NFP sector?	Our position is that you do not need competition to support innovation in the NFP sector: organisations should be funded directly to do this, recognising that NFPs doing direct work with communities have many of the resources (knowledge and skills, relationships, community trust) to develop and test innovative practice, but lack the financial means to embed or scale such activities. Creating competition through restricted funding opportunities does not create the conditions for innovation, it dissuades organisations from trying new things, challenging service or practice orthodoxies, and sticking to ways of working because the risk of innovating is perceived as too high. Rather, the risk must be embraced: Parkerville's <i>Our Way Home</i> model began with \$100,000 of the organisation's own money, and a belief that change was essential – the outcome was not guaranteed. Challenging conventions of out-of-home care provision was a calculated risk that Parkerville accepted; we have not held the 'competitive edge' to ourselves, but rather made all materials and intellectual capital open access. By so doing, our hope is that in the absence of a more open Government approach to funding innovation, that the sector

		will embrace willingness to innovate, and to see that not as a competitive advantage, but rather a common good to be shared and built upon.
9. Information Technology, communication and marketing	9.1.2. How might the sector aggregate support to maximise the digital capabilities of smaller organisations?	At an organisational level, data capability requires having in place staff roles and skills, technologies, and data management practices and processes to fulfil organisational need with regard to data - including technical components like software, hardware and database systems. This can be incredibly challenging for smaller organisations to achieve in part, let alone in its entirety. There are possibilities with larger NFPs acting as auspice organisations or incubation hubs to support smaller organisations without being taken over or subsumed into the former's operations. This facilitates smaller organisations to survive and adapt. This should be further encouraged at the sector-wide level: larger NFPs are the black and white of the sector; smaller organisations provide the colour. A healthy NFP sector able to effectively serve the community needs all the hues, not just the monochrome. Given the criticality of being digital-capable, efforts to support and upskill smaller organisations must be done collaboratively and flexibly.
	9.1.3. What is needed and what is the sector's role in advocating for digital inclusion and participation of citizens and communities?	We point to the WA Digital Inclusion Project as an example of best practice in this regard. It endeavours to improve digital inclusion across the community sector, by equipping frontline workers with digital skills and knowledge that they can share with those they serve, supporting them to gain independence online. Engagement across the breadth and depth of the sector means that the Project can reach digitally-excluded community members through a support worker that they trust, and build their confidence, empowering them to improve their own digital skills and knowledge. This is a true multi-sectoral partnership, bringing together the NFP sector, Government, corporate, and philanthropic partners. As the stakeholder with (likely) the most trust in the community, the sector has a vital role in facilitating and assuring inclusion and participation.
	9.1.4. How can governments streamline digital systems requirements and support efficiencies for NFP providers?	In the first instance, we would like to see Government streamline themselves and their systems: as things stand, there is little continuity or harmonisation across Government data and digital systems or approaches, and significant access challenges and data gate-keeping. Streamlining these systems would likely have a notable trickle down effect for NFPs and others.



Contact details

For further enquiries on this submission please contact:

Dr. Sarah Priest

Senior Research, Policy and Project Officer

Sarah.priest@parkerville.org.au

0424 273 663