

# Independent Review of Homes Tasmania

## Foreword

In accordance with the terms of my contract with the Tasmanian government I am pleased to submit this review of Homes Tasmania to the Minister for Housing, Planning and Consumer Affairs.

Housing supply and support for people at risk of or experiencing homelessness are significant challenges facing all governments. The problem is not new. Traditional approaches to the funding and management of public and social housing and homelessness support have not kept pace with growing demand and the increased cost of housing.

The establishment of Homes Tasmania as a statutory authority with a skills-based board and broadened remit across the housing spectrum was a significant initiative and break from past practice. The authority has been operating for just over two years. A statutory review of the operations of the *Homes Tasmania Act 2022* is due in late 2026. At this mid-point, it is timely to check in on the new arrangements to ensure they are working as effectively as possible.

I am honoured to be trusted to undertake this targeted review of Homes Tasmania. I am also grateful to the many individuals and organisations that have met with me to share their views on Homes Tasmania's role and responsibilities, its reporting and accountability performance and engagement and collaboration with stakeholders. Everyone I spoke to recognised the importance of social and affordable housing and of supporting vulnerable people to access accommodation or other support. They want the arrangements to work.

In particular I thank the board and staff of Homes Tasmania for their genuine engagement with this Review. I also extend my appreciation to the staff of The Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of State Growth who provided me with administrative support.

I commend the findings and recommendations of this Independent Review of Homes Tasmania to the Minister for his consideration and action.

**Margaret Crawford PSM**

**7 April 2025**

## Background and context

On 24 February 2022, the Tasmanian Government announced that it would create a new statutory authority to increase housing supply, deliver more affordable homes and units, and deliver the stock of houses and the services needed to meet growing demand. The new authority would replace the Housing agency, located as part of the former Department of Communities, and consolidate efforts across government that deliver housing services and access to, and the supply of, social and affordable housing.

In his state of the state address to parliament on 1 March 2022, then Tasmanian Premier Peter Gutwein also announced a 10-year \$1.5 billion housing package to deliver a total of 10,000 homes by 2032. The Premier tasked the proposed new authority and its board with delivery of this package.

That statutory authority was Homes Tasmania, which was established on 1 December 2022 by the *Homes Tasmania Act 2022* (the Act), replacing the *Homes Act 1935*, in its entirety. The purposes of the Act are as follows:

- a) to increase the opportunities for eligible persons, and persons on low or moderate incomes, to satisfy the basic human need for housing by living in safe, secure, appropriate and affordable housing;
- b) to –
  - I. enable the provision of housing assistance and housing support services; and
  - II. facilitate the provision of community support services – so as to assist in the economic and social participation of persons who, without such provision, may be restricted, in whole or in part, from economic or social participation in society;
- c) to encourage the development and implementation of short-term, medium-term and long term strategies to increase the opportunities for eligible persons, and persons on low or moderate incomes, to live in safe, secure, appropriate and affordable housing;
- d) to facilitate the ownership, leasehold, or occupation, of residential premises by eligible persons and persons on low or moderate incomes;
- e) to encourage the development of flexible and innovative financial arrangements that facilitate the ownership, leasehold, or occupation, of residential premises by eligible persons and persons on low or moderate incomes;
- f) to enable the strategic acquisition of land, and land and premises, primarily for the development of housing for, or the provision of housing to, eligible persons and persons on low or moderate incomes and to promote the planning of the development of such housing having regard to the desirability of ensuring integrated, liveable communities;
- g) to promote an efficient and effective system of administration of housing services, housing support services and community support services;
- h) to assist in ensuring the existence of a viable and diversified sector for the provision of housing assistance and housing support services;
- i) to ensure appropriate transparency, scrutiny and direction of the performance and exercise of the functions and powers of Homes Tasmania.

With the expertise of a skills-based board, broadened remit and the ability to partner with community housing associations and the private sector, Homes Tasmania was intended to play a lead role in implementation of the overall housing supply. The new structure was to allow for more innovation, more efficiency and faster development to get homes on the ground.

The staff of Homes Tasmania, around 180, were largely transferred from the former Department to the new authority. The capital assets of the former department were also transferred into Home Tasmania.

Since then, the demand for social and affordable housing and homelessness services has not abated and numbers on the housing register have increased, along with the time it takes for priority applicants to be housed.

In this context, on 31 July 2024, Mr. David O’Byrne MP, member for Franklin, moved a motion in the parliament, which among other things called “...on the government to urgently review Homes Tasmania, with a view to bringing responsibility for social housing construction back into the heart of government with oversight by Cabinet”.

On 22 November 2024, in response to the parliamentary motion of 31 July 2024, Premier Jeremy Rockliff MP appointed me to undertake an independent, targeted review of Homes Tasmania.

The Terms of Reference require this review to focus on roles and responsibilities; reporting and accountability; and engagement and collaboration with stakeholders, including the Tasmanian building and construction sector in relation to procurement arrangements.

Specifically, the review was asked to consider the following matters:

- a) The effectiveness of the governance structures and processes of Homes Tasmania in supporting the delivery of the Tasmanian Government’s agenda for housing and homelessness, including, but not limited to Homes Tasmania’s approach and strategies to facilitate rapid social and affordable housing development.
- b) The capacity of these structures to provide clear direction and facilitate timely and efficient decision-making by the Homes Tasmania Board and the Minister for Housing, Planning and Consumer Affairs.
- c) The transparency and effectiveness of reporting mechanisms, including public reporting on the performance of Homes Tasmania.
- d) The role of Homes Tasmania in delivering housing, homelessness and crisis accommodation and services to eligible persons and those in need, specifically including:
  - a. children and young people; and
  - b. women and children exposed to family, domestic and sexual violence
- e) The extent to which Homes Tasmania effectively engages with the building and construction sector, the rental sector, private property developers, and infrastructure and utility providers, Australian Government agencies, and potential institutional investors or partners.
- f) Any other matters relevant to governance, reporting and accountability of Homes Tasmania in delivering improved housing and homelessness outcomes in Tasmania.

## **Approach to the conduct of this Review.**

The methodology for this review has predominantly involved targeted engagement with key stakeholders and individuals (listed at appendix 1). In addition, I have reviewed documents describing the establishment of Homes Tasmania, including the Hansard records, the government’s Tasmanian Housing Strategy 2023-2043 and Action Plan 2023-2027, and annual and corporate reports of Homes Tasmania. Additional research on housing supply and policy at a national and Australian jurisdictional level has provided more context to the challenge of housing supply.

The *Homes Tasmania Act 2022* S.114 (2) requires that a statutory review of the operation of the Act be carried out in late 2026. Further, it is understood that the Department of State Growth (the Department) will shortly commence a review of the financial arrangements and adequacy of funding for Homes Tasmania. This will be a timely addition to the insights provided by this report.

## Overall Conclusion

In 2022 the Tasmanian government took a bold decision to establish a statutory authority to tackle the persistent problems of housing supply and homelessness. This innovative model was designed to bring together government programs focused on the continuum of housing supply, from crisis and social housing through to land supply and affordable rental and home ownership for key workers and people on low or moderate incomes.

The stated intent of the new authority, Homes Tasmania, to be more agile, commercial, and innovative, was mostly met with support from private sector and non-government housing providers.

Two years on stakeholder views have shifted. The promise of innovative, flexible partnerships to speed up the supply of housing has not been delivered. The added value delivered by the skills-based board has been questioned, along with whether government expectations of the organisation and controls imposed on its operations have set it up for success.

This Review has found that the current arrangements have not been as effective as hoped for, in part, for reasons outside the control of the authority, its board and staff.

The policy and program response to housing supply and homelessness is complex. Governments at all levels play a role in tackling the range of factors that negatively impact new housing supply, like the availability of serviced land, the high cost of construction and labor shortages, long planning approval lead times and community opposition to new development, especially high density developments.

That said, Homes Tasmania is hamstrung by duplicated and confused decision making and accountability between the responsibilities of the board, and the Minister's accountability to the parliament for the performance of the authority. Fundamentally, while the *Home Tasmania Act 2022* would suggest the authority is governed by its board, current practice, culture and behaviours make the Board's role more advisory in nature.

These tensions in the authorising environment, coupled with funding uncertainty, impact the authority's ability to communicate detailed delivery plans and to partner effectively with local councils, the building and construction industry, and with community housing and homelessness organisations.

How can things be improved? First, recognise that housing supply and homelessness support are best served by long term policy consistency. It is important for governments to "stay the course." While there are always opportunities to do things better and partner to get greater leverage, it also needs to be recognised that the provision of housing for the most vulnerable in our community requires some form of government subsidy. The proposed review of the finances of Homes Tasmania by the Department of State Growth will make an important contribution to policy considerations surrounding Homes Tasmania.

It is crucial the government urgently clarify whether the Board of Homes Tasmania is to remain a governance board, empowered to manage the authority, consistent with government policy, but at arm's length from the Minister. The alternative is to argue that the current housing and homelessness challenges are so pressing that the government needs more direct control of the operations of the authority. If it wished, the Government could still capitalise on the knowledge, skills and experience that the board members bring but in an advisory capacity.

Either way, it should be made explicit that strategic housing policy is a responsibility of the government. The high level policy development function should sit with the Department of State Growth. The Department should be charged with working with Homes Tasmania to develop a medium to long term strategic asset development and management plan that makes clear the mix of housing types, locations, and quality the government wants delivered to meet its target of 10,000 homes by 2032.

This plan should also make delivery roles and responsibilities clear so that private developers, builders and community housing providers have greater certainty to plan their own responses.

In this context, Homes Tasmania should focus on operational policy and delivery. Generally, the staff of Homes Tasmania are hardworking and committed. They have a good understanding of the housing and homelessness sectors in Tasmania. With the help of the diverse experience and skills the Board brings to the organisation, it should be empowered to get on with the job.

To this end, the government should reconsider what relief can be provided from current policy constraints to enable Homes Tasmania to partner more effectively to codesign solutions to the Tasmanian housing challenge.

Finally, the government should lead a broader conversation with the Tasmanian community about the need for more diverse housing, including increased density and multi-unit developments, to meet changing demand and access to education, employment, services and infrastructure.

## **Summary of Recommendations**

1. Complete the planned Review of Finance of Homes Tasmania
2. Regardless of the quantum, provide certainty to Homes Tasmania regarding the funding envelope they can work within
3. Consider a suite of authority specific modifications to the Treasurer Instructions, and other restrictive policies, that limit Homes Tasmania from engaging in innovative partnerships to deliver new housing
4. Require Homes Tasmania to report on any departures from Treasurer's Instructions or public policy requirements
5. Urgently clarify whether the Board of Homes Tasmania is a governance board, empowered to manage the authority, consistent with government policy, but at arm's length from the Minister, or whether the government needs more direct control of the operations of the authority
6. Be clear that strategic housing and homelessness policy is the responsibility of the Department of State Growth
7. In developing strategic housing policy, the Department should advise the Minister on the best mix of housing types that should comprise the 10,000 target, including the mix of infield or greenfield development, and the Minister, the Department and Homes Tasmania should clearly indicate the government's housing preferences to the sectors engaged in housing development.

8. Be explicit when reporting additions to housing supply compared with the purchase or rental of existing properties (noting the current Dashboard does show new build compared with existing homes under the “My Home” shared equity program)
9. Consider adding more metrics in Homes Tasmania Dashboard showing the population cohorts seeking and receiving assistance
10. Deliver the asset management plan to redevelop and reprofile aging assets in the Homes Tasmania portfolio, flagged in the Action Plan to be completed by 30 June 2025
11. Prioritise investment in tools and technology to support better reporting on asset projections and project management.
12. Assess the risks associated with funded staff to client ratios
13. Ensure the Homes Tasmania board is comprehensively briefed on the risks associated with the findings of the Commission of Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care
14. Be clear about who is responsible for meeting accommodation standards for properties housing clients with a disability and older adults requiring property modifications to age in place
15. Pursue the slated review of the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.
16. Finalise the builder panels as soon as possible
17. Continue to regularly meet with sector participants and provide greater clarity about escalation and decision making processes
18. Consider the development of a Direct Dealing (unsolicited Proposal) Framework to govern unsolicited proposals and co-design with industry participants.
19. Continue to pursue the initiatives outlined in the Action plan that are the responsibility of other parts of government
20. Lead a conversation with the Tasmanian community regarding the need for and benefits of new types of housing in Tasmania.

## Findings against the Terms of Reference

*a) The effectiveness of the governance structures and processes of Homes Tasmania, including, but not limited to, Homes Tasmania's approach and strategies to facilitate rapid social and affordable housing development.*

## General Conclusion

The promise of flexibility, innovation, and speed to deliver has not been met by the establishment of Homes Tasmania as a statutory authority at arm's length from government. A number of factors contribute to this assessment, many not within the direct control of Homes Tasmania.

A lack of certainty of funding and public policy constraints imposed on the organisation, were sighted as impacting Homes Tasmania's ability to innovate and achieve leverage through creative partnerships with other housing providers.

The internal governance structures and processes within the control of organisation and Board are not working optimally to set Homes Tasmania up for success.

### Constraints outside Homes Tasmania's direct control

#### **1. Funding**

Access to funding or lack of certainty of ongoing funding is often sighted as a key reason Homes Tasmania is slow to commit with authority to new projects, to grant programs, to partnership agreements, to funding bids and long-term development plans.

In the Homes Tasmania January 2025 Dashboard, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) makes explicit that Homes Tasmania was set up to be commercially focused, with access to debt funds in the form of direct borrowings from TASCORP and interest guaranteed by the Treasurer through appropriation. Homes Tasmania had accessed \$266 million in borrowings up to 30 June 2024. The 2024-25 State Budget allows for further borrowings up to \$454 million by 30 June 2028.

As previously stated, the Department of State Growth intends to conduct a Financial Review of Homes Tasmania. This is needed to properly understand the existing arrangements to ensure that value for money is being achieved and that the funding arrangements are sufficient to meet the government's targets for housing development and homelessness services. This may also be an opportunity to address the outstanding matter raised by the Auditor-General for Tasmania who has reported that without guaranteed ongoing funding from government, Homes Tasmania is not a going concern.

Deferring to the planned Department of State Growth review, this report has not attempted an analysis of the adequacy of funding to Homes Tasmania. What is clear though is that adding to the stock of housing, particularly social housing, is a long-term challenge not well suited to annual budget appropriations. A level of confidence that the agency is authorised to make commitments in at least the medium term is fundamental to the success of the model.

## **2. Capacity to use leverage to add to the supply of housing**

It follows that the ability to use leverage to maximise supply within the announced \$1.5 billion envelope requires Homes Tasmania to bring something to the table. If not funding, then land, or property transfers or leases are necessary to contribute to the partnerships essential to deliver new housing. Community Housing Providers (CHPs) consulted for this review noted with some concern that there were no further grant programs on offer at present. They were further disappointed that Homes Tasmania failed to secure funding as part of the first round of the Commonwealth Housing Australia Future Fund (HAFF).

In the past, the transfer of stock to CHPs has been effective in increasing property numbers. Current policy favours management leases over the transfer of title to government owned land and property. The income stream derived from the rents of managed properties is intended to be applied to meet borrowings for new supply. CHPs argued that scale was a prerequisite to enable this model, and that their capacity to leverage the stock under their management is constrained by the long-standing maintenance liability attached to transferred properties. The average age of social and other housing owned by Homes Tasmania is 38 years, with around 37% over 40 years old. This means that maintenance and modification costs are high, and the configuration of properties is not always suitable to today's client mix.

Much has been spoken about the potential for institutional investors to partner with Homes Tasmania on housing supply. This type of investment has promise but is not well developed at this time. In discussion with interstate housing authorities the view expressed was that institutional investors are still cautious about housing, especially social housing projects, due to the low estimates of rental return. They also expressed the view that institutional investors preferred large scale, multi-story developments. This may not be practical for Tasmania in the near time.

## **3. Public policy controls imposed on the operations of Homes Tasmania**

The Act, and Statement of Ministerial Expectations (the Statement), impose certain limits on the operations of Homes Tasmania and its board. Both require that Homes Tasmania act in accordance with the Treasurer's Instructions and guidelines. Amongst other things, these include procurement rules requiring the use of qualified suppliers and competitive tendering processes.

Arguably, Homes Tasmania is more constrained than the former Director of Housing who was exempt from the Treasurer's Instructions. The board and authority staff report frustration and delays related to securing modifications to the Treasurer's Instructions they deem necessary to ensure Homes Tasmania has the capability and capacity to innovate and deliver on the government's Housing Strategy.

The Act and Statement also make clear that the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and staff are subject to the *State Services Act 2000* and must adhere to any government policy guidelines relating to senior executive remuneration. Board members argue this limits the organisation's ability to secure the capability it needs. An oft cited example was the many months it took to gain approval to recruit and appropriately remunerate a chief financial officer. The skills needed to manage a portfolio valued at around \$5.5 billion in 2023-2024, with a remit to enter into commercial arrangements with institutional investors, developers, local councils, the federal government and CHPs, among others, are difficult and expensive to secure. They do not normally sit within traditional government departments.



Another constraint imposed on the organisation is the requirement to use the services of the Crown Solicitor for legal advice, and the Office of the Valuer General for valuation services. The current volume of applications under the “My Homes” shared equity affordable housing program is said to be beyond the capacity of these Offices to service without lengthy delays.

Treasurer Instructions and the other policy provisions that the government imposes on Homes Tasmania are designed to meet the principles of good public administration. They provide protections to ensure a level playing field for project proponents, make the award of contracts transparent and accountable, ensure consistent employment conditions and manage risk.

However, they place limits on the board’s freedom to act and can make procurement processes appear unnecessarily complex and onerous. While the rules can be varied, seeking the necessary modifications from the Treasurer is resource intensive and takes time.

Reportedly, the largely corporate sector board members have struggled to accept the constraints associated with being a government board and claim these have limited their ability to innovate and engage with the sector on development proposals.

The right balance needs to be struck between legitimate public policy considerations and empowering Homes Tasmania to innovate to meet the supply targets and timeframe that has been set.

### Internal governance structures and processes

#### **1. Organisation capability**

When Homes Tasmania was established, staff from the previous Department were transferred to it, along with the systems, policies and processes then used. These continue to operate within Homes Tasmania.

Feedback regarding the staff within the authority is generally positive. They are hardworking, committed and deeply knowledgeable about traditional programs like public and social housing provision and management, and the specialist homelessness service system. Now that Homes Tasmania has a broader remit encompassing affordable housing, build to rent and key worker housing programs, and as a land developer and commercial partner, there is acknowledgement that management needs to build capability in these areas.

A strength of the new model is that skill gaps can be supplemented by the collective knowledge and experience of a skills-based board. The current board has a good mix of experience, skills and capability, especially in areas of corporate governance, urban planning, commercial acumen and property development. Like the staff of Homes Tasmania, board members are hardworking and committed. Possibly unfairly, they are criticised for not having sufficient understanding of the “ways things get done in Tasmania”, or how the local construction, social housing and homelessness sectors operate here.

Board members expressed dissatisfaction with the level of support they receive from the staff of the authority. They viewed staff as primarily public servants, comfortable with reporting to government but less well versed in supporting a board. They argue that their ability to contribute is hamstrung by lack of early engagement, particularly on strategy and funding and budget proposals. They feel that the skills and experience they bring are not being optimised.

## **2. Corporate support and tools**

A capability gap relates to corporate support functions in the new organisation. Corporate services taken for granted in government departments were stripped from Homes Tasmania when it was established as a stand-alone statutory authority. Services like risk management, internal audit and governance, technology services, and human resource management are now provided via shared service arrangements. This makes sense for a small agency- it would not be cost effective to directly employ these resources- but it can mean that Homes Tasmania does not get priority over other department priorities. As previously stated, critical resources like Crown Solicitor and Valuer General services are also shared with others and can cause delays.

A major frustration for the board stemmed from the lack of clear reporting on financial projections, the capital program, project status and risk. These matters are managed through a series of spreadsheets, and it is challenging to present a coordinated view in the absence of more sophisticated technology tools.

It is likely that the lack of tools and systems adversely impacts the quality of business cases and support for funding proposals submitted to Treasury and the Commonwealth for approval. It has also been suggested that Homes Tasmania staff are inherently risk averse, reluctant to push the envelope, limiting action and further slowing things down while they seek approval from the Minister or his office.

### **What should be done?**

1. Complete the planned Review of Finance of Homes Tasmania
2. Regardless of the quantum, provide certainty to Homes Tasmania regarding the funding envelope they can work within
3. Consider a suite of authority specific modifications to the Treasurer Instructions, and other restrictive policies, that limit Homes Tasmania from engaging in innovative partnerships to deliver new housing
4. Require Homes Tasmania to report on any departures from Treasurer's Instructions or public policy requirements.

## Findings against the Terms of Reference

*b) The capacity of these structures to provide clear direction and facilitate timely and efficient decision-making by the Homes Tasmania Board and the Minister for Housing and Planning.*

### General conclusion

Good organisational governance requires explicit purpose, agreed strategy and a plan to deliver, measurement and reporting; and clear roles and accountabilities to deliver on these elements.

The Act provides clear legal authority to the board of Homes Tasmania to manage the operations of the authority. The Statement of Ministerial Expectations provides additional guidance to the organisation. Some commentators thought that the directive nature of the Statement was in conflict with the Act. Government announcements have not always been in total alignment with the Housing Strategy and the majority of stakeholders consulted felt the Action Plan lacked the detail needed to hold Homes Tasmania to account and provide the supply roadmap demanded by private sector and not for profit partners.

While the Act is clear the CEO reports to the board, she is also a public servant with obligations under the *State Services Act 2020*. This means the CEO, and staff of the authority, have two masters. Responsibility for the functions of policy development through to responding to constituent inquiries are also duplicated with the Department.

The inherent tensions in these arrangements mean they fail to provide clear direction and do not facilitate timely and efficient decision making by the board nor the Minister. This causes frustration for the board, the Minister, the Department and authority staff. Confused and often duplicated decision making has the effect of slowing everything down and reducing trust between the parties.

### Clarity of strategy

#### **1. The Homes Tasmania Act 2022 (the Act)**

The Act provides Homes Tasmania with a very broad remit across the housing and homelessness system, from the crisis end of the spectrum through to facilitation of affordable rental and housing ownership for key workers and low or moderate income earners. The broadened, system wide focus was a departure from the former housing agency's more narrow focus on public and social housing and homelessness services.

This broadened remit is embraced by staff in the authority. Stakeholders consulted for this Review recognised the connections and pathways across the housing continuum. Concerns were expressed regarding Homes Tasmania's role in strategic policy development. Other stakeholders questioned whether the organisation was able to perform effectively on so many fronts.

#### **2. Statement of Ministerial Expectations (the Statement) February 2023**

When introducing the Homes Tasmania Bill to the parliament the then Minister stated that the board will be directed through a statement of Ministerial expectations. He said "I intend to hold the Board and Executive Management of Homes Tasmania to account for delivering against my expectations..."

It is not unusual for Ministerial owners of government enterprises and statutory authorities to provide clear statements of policy and priorities to be delivered. But in the case of Homes Tasmania, key stakeholders including board members, Ministerial staff and authority staff have different interpretations of the extent to which the Statement conflicts with the role of the board in setting direction and operational decision making.

The focus of Homes Tasmania staff in responding to government commitments and requests for information, beyond the functions, powers and delegations of the board prescribed in the Act poses a fundamental question; is the Homes Tasmania Board a governance or advisory board? It is neither “fish nor fowl” at present creating confused direction and accountabilities. This needs urgent clarification as it is not possible for the Minister to hold the Board to account if he is also part of the decision-making process.

### **3. The Tasmanian Housing Strategy 2023-2043 (the Strategy)**

One of the first expectations of Homes Tasmania was to lead the development of the government’s 20-year housing strategy. The new authority was charged with consulting with stakeholders on the development of the strategy, and following its launch, co-ordinate its implementation and monitor and report on progress and outcomes.

The Strategy is an aspirational document, and on its face is closely aligned with the Act and the Second Reading Speech that was read when the Bill was introduced. Stakeholders consulted in the Strategy’s development are complimentary of the process and content.

However, Homes Tasmania staff and board members complained that some government decisions and announcements were outside the scope of the Strategy.

### **4. Action Plan 2023-2027 (the Action Plan)**

The Strategy is supported by a four-year Action Plan intended to “...establish(es) a roadmap for state and local government, the private sector and ...not for profit partners to deliver the types of housing supply that Tasmania needs to ensure we are meeting the needs of our changing population.” (Minister’s Foreword to the Action Plan)

The then Minister also spoke of promoting thriving communities who could live close to employment and services and infrastructure.

This is the direction Homes Tasmania is trying to pursue by establishing design criteria and preferencing medium density and mixed development over broad acre estate development. Some industry stakeholders are critical of this approach arguing it is expensive, slow, and not well received by Tasmanian communities.

### **5. Lack of shared understanding of direction**

The Strategy and Action Plan provide an overview of the types of housing and accommodation that count towards the delivery of 10,000 homes by 2032 and describe a number of existing programs that contribute to this target. However, beyond these existing funded programs the plan and mix of housing types is more opaque and there are a range of views on the segments Homes Tasmania should prioritise.

Stakeholders consistently complained that there was no clarity on:

- the types of housing that will make up the 10,000 target, in particular the mix of social housing relative to affordable housing
- the timing of land releases to construct homes to meet the target
- the level of funding available to support construction
- who Homes Tasmania will partner with to build new homes
- whether existing Homes Tasmania owned properties managed by CHPs would be leveraged for additional stock
- whether Homes Tasmania will redevelop its own land and properties for urban renewal
- whether priority will be given to infill, medium density development over greenfield house and land projects.

High profile projects like the purchase of the Fountainside Hotel to house health workers has generated debate on whether Homes Tasmania should have a focus on key worker housing. The viability of “built to rent” projects is another area of debate. And the extent to which Homes Tasmania participates in the “My Homes” shared equity program is also seen by some as detracting from the urgent need for more crisis and social housing.

Varying views have even been expressed about the long-standing policy approach of transferring public housing stock to CHPs for management. Some argue that more management transfers should occur to maximise opportunities for leverage. Others claim this sector is less accountable for housing the most vulnerable Tasmanians even though they must allocate available homes to priority applicants on the Housing Register.

These debates are all healthy at a time when housing supply is so problematic. However, the lack of clarity about future priorities and strategies is the major source of frustration for the range of partners Homes Tasmania works with.

### Clear accountability, roles and responsibilities

#### **1. Perceived conflict of interest in the role of Homes Tasmania and responsibility for government policy development**

The broad mandate to oversee the entire housing system in Tasmania was a bold innovation, but it does raise some issues related to inherent conflicts in the model.

Specifically, the authority has responsibility for policy development, for housing ownership and management, for funding other housing and homelessness providers and for regulating their activities. This leaves it open to allegations of bias and criticism of favouring its own projects over others.

This Review found little real evidence to support these assertions. However, it is unusual to make a statutory authority responsible for government policy. Staff in Homes Tasmania have a deep understanding of the housing and homelessness system, particularly at the crisis and social housing end of the spectrum. It is appropriate for the Department to tap into this expertise but the job of high level policy and strategy for housing in Tasmania sits more comfortably and appropriately within a government department, reporting directly to the responsible Minister.

This should be an easy adjustment to make. However, it is important to ensure that Homes Tasmania retains a capacity to develop operational policy for application by the agency.

## **2. Confused accountability and duplicated decision making**

There is duplication and confusion surrounding reporting and approval processes. The Act is clear that the board is required to establish the annual performance obligations of the CEO who is responsible to the board for the general administration and management of Homes Tasmania.

The Act also makes clear that the CEO is appointed by the Premier under the *State Services Act 2000*. This provision means the CEO is a public servant with obligations to serve the government of the day as well as her board. In practice, this takes the form of regular meetings with the Minister and his staff to report on strategy and progress against government targets. It also means supporting the Minister to respond to constituent correspondence and the provision of information to the parliament. So in effect, she has two masters.

The staff of Homes Tasmania are also appointed under the *State Services Act 2000*. Many are long serving public servants familiar with responding to the requirements of the government of the day. They are comfortable operating within the confines of public sector management and prioritise this over responsiveness to the board. One staff member commented “the internal red tape within the organisation and its many governance levels is not an efficient or effective way of doing business”.

Correspondingly, board members generally feel that they are not well supported in their role. They have questioned the timeliness and quality of reports received but are reluctant to repeatedly ask for rework. And time pressures mean they have had limited opportunity for meaningful input to funding proposals and budgets. Instead, they are presented with ‘fait accompli’ submissions for their sign off.

The usefulness of three subcommittees established by the board in accordance with the Statement of Ministerial Expectations, have also had mixed reviews. Roles and accountabilities of the committees are not well understood, and agency staff argue they are an overhead that does not add value. Board members have also commented that volunteer members are not appropriate for governance subcommittees, and the subcommittees more focused on providing advice do not feel their advice is actively sought.

## **3. Inherent tension between the role of the Board and Minister in government authorities**

Very fundamental questions were raised during consultations for this Review. For example, it was not clear when the board was authorised to act without the Minister’s approval? And where staff were delegated to act without board or Ministerial approval. The role of the Department in the provision of advice and in responding to housing and homelessness service requests or complaints was also unclear. At present, it seems that everyone is doing everything!

A lack of clarity as to the respective roles and responsibilities of Ministers, departments, and statutory authorities is a recurring concern raised in the literature. For example, an article by B Saunders titled “The Agency Problem in Public Sector Governance, Melbourne Law School, 2022” argues that while Ministerial responsibility for statutory authorities is more remote, they retain substantial powers, like the power to appoint board directors, give directions and impose general policy requirements which must be complied with. Ultimately, Ministers are accountable to the parliament for the performance of statutory authorities.

This tension is obvious in the governance and operations of Homes Tasmania and is the source of frustration, time delays, and inefficiency. In theory, the Minister is responsible for broad

government policy, the budget and the setting of performance targets. The board is responsible for designing and delivering the organisation strategy and programs to deliver the government's strategic intent.

This broad-brush role definition is too simplistic. In practice these roles overlap and are very dependent on trust and open communication between the parties. Trust and effective communication take time to mature. They are not strongly embedded in the operations of Homes Tasmania, the Minister's Office and the Department.

### **What should be done?**

5. Urgently clarify whether the Board of Homes Tasmania is a governance board, empowered to manage the authority, consistent with government policy, but at arm's length from the Minister, or whether the government needs more direct control of the operations of the authority.
6. Be clear that strategic housing and homelessness policy is the responsibility of the Department of State Growth
7. In developing strategic housing policy, the Department should advise the Minister on the best mix of housing types that should comprise the 10,000 target, including the mix of infield or greenfield development, and the Minister, the Department and Homes Tasmania should communicate the government's housing preferences to the sectors engaged in housing development.

## Findings against the Terms of Reference

*c) The transparency and effectiveness of reporting mechanisms, including public reporting on the performance of Homes Tasmania.*

### General Conclusion

A number of effective mechanisms are in place to provide transparent reporting on the activities and performance of Homes Tasmania. In particular, the Homes Tasmania Dashboard is a good tool to report progress in meeting targets set by the government. It attracts some criticism surrounding the counting rules and assertions of optimism bias (spin).

Legitimately, shelter and specialist homelessness service providers are critical of the Dashboard's focus on supply and call for a broader range of metrics. Other commentators call for access to the source data rather than curated content.

Generally, this Review considers that public reporting mechanisms are effective and transparent. The gap relates to clear communication of the plan for future programs and the development pipeline.

#### Public reporting products

##### **1. Parliamentary Scrutiny, Annual Report, etc**

The key mechanisms to provide public transparency and reporting on the performance of Homes Tasmania include its annual report and monthly dashboard reporting. These are further supported by parliamentary scrutiny through special inquiries and budget estimates. For example, the Legislative Council Government Administration Committee 'B' resolved to conduct a short inquiry process on the Homes Tasmania Annual Report 2022-23, including scrutiny of the Annual Financial Statements (as at 30 June 2023) and progress of its key priorities. Public Hearings were held on 9 July 2024 and 2 August 2024. Further, staff of Homes Tasmania support the Minister and provide evidence to the House of Assembly Estimates Committee B.

Homes Tasmania Annual Reports clearly meet the requirements detailed at S. 26 of the Act, including reporting on performance against the targets to be met in achieving its objectives, policies, programs and financial plans.

Although Homes Tasmania is now classified as a Public Non-Financial Corporation, Part 4 of the State Budget nevertheless includes an outline of its role and financial information including key deliverables, relevant election commitments, performance information and detailed budget statements. Some stakeholders argued that as an accountability document to the parliament, this lacks the detail included in budget papers relating to the former Departmental housing agency.

##### **2. The Dashboard**

The Dashboard reports on Homes Tasmania's performance, including the delivery of commitments under the Action Plan 2023-27. Most commentators thought the Dashboard was informative and had been improved over time. It reports the number of completed homes at the end of each month, broken down by category- crisis units, social housing and supported accommodation, affordable rentals, affordable home purchases and affordable residential lots.



It also reports the current pipeline of projects in these categories and projects at the concept stage. Importantly, the monthly report also updates the number of applicants on the Housing Register.

Criticism of the dashboard largely relates to confusion regarding the counting rules and some lack of trust in the underlying numbers. The inclusion of vacant land as contributing to the government's 10,000 homes target received most criticism and has led to scepticism of the efficacy of reporting more generally. Including existing properties purchased as going towards targets, rather than new build housing, has added to the lack of trust in the numbers.

In its commentary on the Dashboard, Anglicare Tasmania points out that "... not all projects counted toward the 10,000 homes will contribute to the net increase in housing supply needed to address the housing crisis." Their report "Housing Connect Front Door Service Snapshot" October 2024, explains that private rental incentives and rapid rehousing schemes generally do not add to the stock of housing. They call for Dashboard reporting to make clear the number of properties in the affordable rental portfolio which provide new long-term housing.

Some stakeholders, particularly shelter and homelessness service providers, and some CHPs, complain the Dashboard is too focused on supply and needs to report other relevant metrics, for example, the breakdown of people sleeping rough, of applicants with special needs like mental health, substance dependency, disability and women and children escaping domestic violence.

### **3. Transparent communication of the plan for future programs and the development pipeline.**

The Dashboard now includes a high level table that shows "forecast delivery" to meet the 10,000 target. However, the Action Plan lacks detail on funding to the sector and on how and when the 10,000 target will be achieved. Homelessness services and housing development require long term planning and it is costly and ineffective if information is "drip fed" on an annual or opportunistic basis.

CHP's say they are operating in a planning vacuum without clarity on the level of funding available to them, certainty about the intended use of Homes Tasmania stock managed by them (maintain, re-develop or sell), whether there will be further title or management transfers and generally what opportunities there are to partner with Homes Tasmania to increase supply.

Similarly, representatives of the property, development and building industries are asking for a pipeline of projects to assure their future viability and to have confidence to invest in labour and equipment. These sectors expressed enthusiasm for working with Homes Tasmania to support the residential housing market and provided examples of giving up other contract opportunities while awaiting Homes Tasmania decisions and/or Commonwealth Government funding outcomes.

A contributing factor in Homes Tasmania's failure to communicate future plans is that senior staff and board members are not generally authorised to speak publicly. Further, some concept projects are likely to impact current tenants who are entitled to be properly engaged on redevelopment plans prior to public announcements. Also, future proposals are often subject to commercial in confidence provisions and funding approval.

#### 4. The Housing Register

During consultation with stakeholders the role and accuracy of the Housing Register was raised. Assessment of its quality is outside the scope of this Review, but the Register is relevant as it is often used as a measure of the extent of homelessness and the performance of Homes Tasmania in meeting demand for housing. As a measure, it has some limitations. Experience has shown that the number of people applying to access social housing can increase when supply increases. This seems counterintuitive but may reflect the level of latent demand for housing support. New applicants may feel that more supply means it is worth getting on the register in the hope of receiving housing assistance. Processes to confirm applicant intent and eligibility every six months help to improve the accuracy of the list. And the focus on housing priority applicants is also a better measure.

##### Internal reporting mechanisms

The authority's reporting mechanisms to advise and support the board and Minister are not well regarded. Members of the board complained they could not get clear advice concerning the planned pipeline of projects or the status of work in progress against budget. The authority is working off spreadsheets to report on its finances, the capital program, its operations and cash flows, including contract commitments and ability to meet obligations. The board does not have confidence in the data and evidence behind budget and funding bids.

The Minister meets regularly with staff of Homes Tasmania to get updates on progress and particular projects. It is not clear whether these meetings satisfy his expectations for a constructive conversation on strategy, performance, organisational risks and challenges, and future directions.

The staff of the authority are equally frustrated they lack clear budget information about the timing of access to debt through TASCORP and visibility of government funding beyond the forward estimates. From their perspective, this is a major obstacle to open communication and committing to the pipeline of projects everyone is calling for.

#### What should be done?

8. Be explicit when reporting additions to housing supply compared with the purchase or rental of existing properties (noting the current Dashboard does show new build compared with existing homes under the "My Home" shared equity program)
9. Consider adding more metrics in the Dashboard showing the population cohorts seeking and receiving assistance
10. Deliver the asset management plan to redevelop and reprofile aging assets in the Homes Tasmania portfolio, flagged in the Action Plan to be completed by 30 June 2025.
11. Prioritise investment in tools and technology to support better reporting on asset projections and project management.

## Findings against the Terms of Reference

*d) The role of Homes Tasmania in delivering housing, homelessness and crisis accommodation and services to eligible persons and those in need, specifically including:*

- i. Children and young people: and*
- ii. Women and children exposed to family, domestic and sexual violence.*

## General conclusion

In this area, little has really changed from the previous Departmental agency. Largely, Homes Tasmania employs many of the same staff and manages the same support programs. Stakeholders argued strongly that what has changed is the level of unmet demand. The lack of exit points means more people are staying longer than approved support periods. The sector also argues that the level of funding does not adequately meet staff and client safety requirements.

The level of risk associated with accommodating children and young people deserves heightened attention post the Commission of Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care. Housing clients with a disability and older people also require that properties meet appropriate standards and stakeholders report some confusion over accountability for meeting these obligations.

### **a. Unmet Demand**

The overwhelming feedback of representatives of the shelter and homelessness support agencies was that demand for assistance was far outpacing available service responses, be that accommodation or other support. This problem is not attributable to the structure and operations of Homes Tasmania. But it is impacting the service response to vulnerable groups including children and young people and women and children exposed to family, domestic and sexual violence.

A particular grievance relates to the funded ratio of staff to clients in youth refuges and other settings. Sector representatives believe current funding creates a staff safety risk and argue the arrangements do not meet child safety standards. Further, the lack of exit points leads to extended stays in short term accommodation. This makes the service response non-compliant with the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997* requirements.

When pressed about any changes noted since Homes Tasmania was established as a statutory authority, some stakeholders expressed a view that the broader remit of the authority meant it was now more focused on supply, especially supply of affordable housing, at the expense of the more traditional areas of public and social housing and homelessness services. Some frustration was also expressed regarding the channels to escalate issues and the lack of responsiveness to concerns raised.

The Review also heard criticism of responsiveness more generally, citing some frustrations related to aboriginal housing and property maintenance requests. These matters do not relate directly to Home Tasmania's status as a statutory authority. But this feedback presents an opportunity to improve customer service.

Staff within Homes Tasmania demonstrate a good understanding of demand for crisis and homelessness services and a strong commitment to the agencies that provide support to

vulnerable clients. They use a grant management system owned by the Health Department and report to the board on the “funding deficit” and system reform initiatives, like the new Practice Framework linked to a common IT system, requiring providers to adopt prescriptive requirements for making referrals and classification types.

#### **b. Housing Connect and the housing register**

The Housing Register was described by some specialist homelessness service providers as a very blunt tool for allocating services to people in need. This is because the needs of priority clients and the available service offerings are variable, resulting in a mismatch between client and service offering. In other words, it lacks nuance.

This commentary should not detract from the benefits associated with the Housing Connect program, the single front door for the provision of support and accommodation responses to priority clients in need. A statewide allocation tool is the fairest most effective way of allocating scarce resources to those most in need. Sector representatives were critical of representations received to prioritise some clients over others, arguing this incentivises the wrong behaviours. They all supported the efficacy of the tool to support fair outcomes.

#### **c. Response to Commission of Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care and NDIS clients**

The Commission of Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care did not make specific recommendations to Homes Tasmania except the general obligation to report. Specific obligations apply to any organisation that provides accommodation for children and young people. Accordingly, Homes Tasmania needs to review their grants program guidelines and compliance requirements to ensure funded bodies meet their obligations. Staff advise that the board has not asked to be briefed on this work and the Commission of Inquiry work is not identified as a risk on the strategic risk register.

Homes Tasmania also owns properties that house people that receive funding from the NDIS. The Review heard some criticism of Homes Tasmania’s responsiveness to requests for modifications to their properties to meet the minimum accommodation requirements to support people with a disability.

### **What should be done?**

12. Assess the risks associated with funded staff to client ratios
13. Ensure the Homes Tasmania board is comprehensively briefed on the risks associated with the findings of the Commission of Inquiry into Children in Institutional Care
14. Be clear about who is responsible for meeting accommodation standards for properties housing clients with a disability and older adults requiring property modifications to age in place
15. Pursue the slated review of the *Residential Tenancy Act 1997*.

## Findings against the Terms of Reference

*e) The extent to which Homes Tasmania effectively engages with the building and construction sector, the rental sector, private property developers, and infrastructure and utility providers, Australian government agencies and potential institutional investors or partners.*

### General conclusion

Homes Tasmania has a broad range of government, community and private sector stakeholders which it works hard to meet, listen to and communicate with, in addition to the formal board subcommittees that have been established to provide a broader range of views and advice. Views were mixed regarding the effectiveness of this engagement. Most were positive about the level of consultation that occurred in the development of the Government's Housing Strategy, 2023-2043. There was also strong praise for the responsiveness of frontline staff, the key contacts for much of the on ground, routine work of local CHPs, shelter and community organisations, and the building and construction sectors.

Again, the performance gap identified related to Homes Tasmania's ability to resolve more complex matters often related to future plans for funding, property maintenance or renewal, and the pipeline of future projects. Some stakeholders also commented that their level of confidence in Homes Tasmania has diminished over time and that the agency was retreating and becoming more competitor than partner.

#### 1. Board visibility and agency responsiveness

The general view is that the Homes Tasmania board is "invisible". This is not unexpected as it is more normal for the CEO and senior staff to be the face of an organisation. Perhaps the scale of Tasmania creates an expectation that stakeholders would "know" or have direct contact with board members. In this case, the complaint is exacerbated by a perception that members are largely from the "mainland". In fact, at its establishment there were equal numbers of local and interstate directors. The newly appointed Chair is also from Tasmania which may go some way to addressing criticism. Clearly, the knowledge and skill of the board, rather than their provenance, should be the criteria for appointment.

Homes Tasmania is most familiar and comfortable engaging with traditional stakeholders from the CHP and community sectors. Very little has changed from the previous organisation in this regard. Perhaps the heightened demand challenges facing the sector contribute to a view that Homes Tasmania is not as responsive as it could be. Non-routine, complex questions escalated within Homes Tasmania are difficult to resolve and there is limited visibility of the status of queries or the decision-making process.

#### 2. Communicating the plan

Most criticism focused on the apparent lack of a clear strategy for meeting the growing demand pressures facing housing and homelessness service providers, and what these sectors perceive as a reluctance by Homes Tasmania to collaborate on solutions. CHPs referred to the lack of a shared plan or further grants program as major impediments to working together to get the best outcomes from available resources. In this context, some feel like Homes Tasmania is more competitor than partner.

### **3. Engagement with the building and construction industry**

The property, building and construction sectors also have good access to staff in Homes Tasmania, although they sense some understandable reluctance on the part of Homes Tasmania to deal directly with individual companies to avoid any perception of bias.

Like CHPs, they are frustrated by the lack of a clear plan of action to build more houses. They expressed an eagerness to partner with CHPs and Homes Tasmania on residential construction projects, especially at times when the market was otherwise constrained. But they felt the opportunity to do this has been missed due to lengthy delays in project approvals and tender processes. They foreshadowed that proposed large infrastructure projects that have been announced would exhaust available capacity.

### **4. Procurement requirements**

This sector was most critical of the “red tape” involved in working with Homes Tasmania, referring to the tender process to be placed on a builder’s panel and the design parameters that must be met for Homes Tasmania projects. These processes were seen as unnecessarily complex, onerous and costly, especially considering the time taken to finalise the panel tender process.

Homes Tasmania staff and board members are also frustrated having to rigidly adhere to procurement processes required under Treasurer Instructions. However, the staff disagree that the design parameters they ask suppliers to meet are excessive. They are committed to providing homes that meet the needs of vulnerable clients today and for the long term, reducing the need for costly modifications, for example, as tenants age in place. The current Statement of Ministerial Expectations requires that wherever possible Homes Tasmania should meet a “Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme 7 rating and a minimum Silver Standard under the Liveable Housing Design Guidelines”.

Senior staff also clarified that Commonwealth funding rules for medium density projects require the use of Tier 2 building companies. Townhouse and house and land package construction does not have this requirement. Two builder panels are being created to meet the alternate requirements. The panels are broadly supported but have taken a very long time to be formalised.

Transparent and thorough procurement processes adopted by government are designed to ensure contractors meet quality, safety and environmental standards, and provide a level playing field for proponents. These are worthy attributes. However, if speed to deliver is the overriding priority, then there may also be merit in developing a small subset of exemptions to enable Homes Tasmania to deal directly with proponents to meet supply targets. Homes NSW, for example, has developed a “direct dealing framework” to govern direct negotiations with industry. It is understood that Homes Victoria will shortly have a similar framework governing unsolicited proposals. Any departures from existing arrangements should be transparent and regularly reported.

## **What should be done?**

16. Finalise the builder panels as soon as possible
17. Continue to regularly meet with sector participants and provide greater clarity about escalation and decision making processes

18. Consider the development of a Direct Dealing (unsolicited Proposal) Framework to govern unsolicited proposals and co-design with industry participants.

## **Findings against the Terms of Reference**

*f) Other matters relevant to governance, reporting and accountability of Homes Tasmania in delivering improved housing and homelessness outcomes in Tasmania.*

## **General Conclusion**

Tackling housing supply and homelessness is complex and multifaceted. There is no silver bullet or quick fix. Homes Tasmania will inevitably be judged by delivery of new homes and numbers on the social housing register, when in reality many of the levers to improve these outcomes are outside the control of the authority.

Federal, state and local governments all play a part in responding to the housing supply issue. Policy and program measures include taxes and charges, labor and immigration policy, land release and planning reform, infrastructure development, industry facilitation, direct funding and partnerships.

One gap that state and local governments in Tasmania need to address is explaining to the community the urgent need increase density of the housing mix in Tasmania.

### **1. Shared accountability for improving housing supply and homelessness outcomes**

Inevitably Homes Tasmania will be judged by its ability to improve supply numbers and reduce the number of applicants on the housing register. Housing supply and addressing homelessness are complex challenges requiring a broad range of policy and program responses that are the responsibility of other agencies. Homes Tasmania's structure as a statutory authority makes little difference provided it can still influence and work constructively with other agencies with responsibilities set out in the Action Plan.

This Review found no evidence that there were barriers to effective collaboration. The administration of the Act transferred to the Department of State Growth in November 2024. The teams from Homes Tasmania and the Department are working constructively together.

The policy and funding constraints impacting Homes Tasmania have been canvassed above. A broader assessment of the performance of other agencies in areas such as planning reform and land management, infrastructure development, enabling the availability of suitably trained construction workers, and other measures to reduce the cost of housing, are beyond the scope of this Review but should not be understated.

### **2. Community Conversation on the need for greater density in the housing mix in Tasmania**

The proportion of separate houses relative to medium and high-density housing in Tasmania goes against national trends. The 20-year change in housing diversity is pictured on page 14 of the Housing Strategy 2023-2043. The number of separate houses increased from 85.5% in 2001 to 86.8% in 2021, compared to a fall from 74.8% to 70.3% nationally. The percentage of medium and high-density properties in Tasmania has declined over the same period against increases nationally.

The Strategy argues there is a growing demand for smaller, more accessible homes suitable for singles, small families, people living with a disability and older people. Yet residential construction is increasingly dominated by detached single dwellings, contributing to reduced affordability, urban sprawl, longer commutes, higher infrastructure costs and demand for services.

There are likely a number of factors that contribute to Tasmania's preference for traditional housing. Persistent amongst this is local community opposition to greater density and the entrenched stigma that has attached to public and social housing. Governments must take the lead in challenging this narrative and explaining the need for and benefits of greater housing diversity.

The Local Government Association Tasmania Housing Position Statement November 2024 calls on the state government to elevate agency prioritisation of regional strategic planning and lead a healthy, honest and positive conversation with communities about the type of growth needed in Tasmania. The Association also calls for the end to restrictive covenants that can undermine efforts to improve the availability of well-located affordable housing and help Tasmania's most vulnerable community members.

## **What should be done?**

19. Continue to pursue the initiatives in the Action plan that are the responsibility of other parts of government
20. Lead a conversation with the Tasmanian community regarding the need for and benefits of new types of housing in Tasmania.



## Appendix 1- Consultations

| Name                  | Agency   |
|-----------------------|--|
| Felix Ellis and staff | Minister for Housing and Planning and Consumer Affairs   |
| David O'Byrne         | Member for Franklin                                      |
| Vica Bayley           | Member for Clark   |
| Celeste Miller        | Deputy Chief of staff to Shane Broad, Member for Braddon |
| Mathew Healey         | Department of Premier and Cabinet                        |
| Simon Duffey          | Department of Premier and Cabinet                        |
| Craig Limkin          | Secretary, Department of State Growth                    |
| Andrew Smythe         | Department of State Growth                               |
| Denise McIntyre       | Department of State Growth                               |
| John Dawson           | Department of State Growth                               |
| Eleanor Paterson      | Treasury   |
| Craig Tipping         | Treasury   |
| Simon Verdouw         | Treasury   |
| Claire Lovell         | Department of Education, Children and Young People       |
| Dion Lester           | Local Government Association Tasmania                    |
| Michele Adair         | Former Chair Homes Tasmania Board                        |
| Ben Wilson            | Chair Homes Tasmania Board                               |
| Rob Pradolin          | Board member   |
| Ellen Witte           | Board member   |
| Kerry Adby            | Board member   |
| Tim Gourlay           | Board member   |
| Daryl Lamb            | Board member   |
| Alice Spizzo          | Board member   |
| Eleri Morgan-Thomas   | CEO Homes Tasmania                                       |
| Richard Gilmore       | Homes Tasmania   |
| Jessemy Stone         | Homes Tasmania   |
| Scott French          | Homes Tasmania   |
| Alex Schouter         | Homes Tasmania   |
| Lynden Penicott       | Homes Tasmania   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| General feedback requested via message to all staff | Homes Tasmania                                  |
| Matt Adams  | Chief of staff, Queensland Minister for Housing |
| Simon Newport                                       | CEO Homes Victoria                              |
| Rebecca Pinkstone                                   | CEO Homes NSW                                   |
| Belinda Witter                                      | individual                                      |
| George Elkhair                                      | Director  |
| Peter Wilson  | individual                                      |
| Colin Shugg   | Written submission- Brickworks                  |
| David Fisher  | Housing Choice                                  |
| Harvey Lennon                                       | Hobart City Mission                             |
| Bryan Lipmann                                       | Wintringham                                     |
| Cody Burdon   | Loreto Community Housing                        |
| James Norman  | Loreto Community housing                        |
| Louise Bieser                                       | Anglicare Tasmania                              |
| Liz Carney  | McCombe House                                   |
| Jamie Round   | Community Housing Ltd                           |
| Amandeep Narang                                     | Mission Australia Housing                       |
| Gavin Spence  | Mission Australia Housing                       |
| Andrea Witt   | Catholic Care                                   |
| Honni Pitt  | St Giles  |
| Adrienne Picone                                     | TasCoss   |
| Alexandra King                                      | TasCoss   |
| Jane Vitani-Black                                   | Karinya House                                   |
| Ros Atkinson  | Youth Family and Community Connections          |
| Shane Leonard                                       | Youth Family and Community Connections          |
| Siobhan Cure  | Jireh House                                     |
| Janet Saunders                                      | Hobart Women's Shelter                          |
| Kiera Kolabinski                                    | Mara House (Colony 47)                          |
| Krista Mills  | Wyndarra  |
| Sylvia McKennan                                     | Wyndarra  |
| Rosie Millikin                                      | Colville Place (Colony 47)                      |
| Rachel Veal   | Warrabee Women's Shelter                        |
| Cheryl Larcombe                                     | Warrabee Women's Shelter                        |
| Matt Denholm  | Pathways Tasmania (Launch Youth Shelter)        |

|                 |                              |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Kim Bomford     | Shelter Tasmania             |
| Ben Shaw        | NECA                         |
| Martin Blake    | Keystone                     |
| Stuart Collins  | HIA                          |
| Andrew Winch    | Civil Contractors Federation |
| David Clerk     | MBA                          |
| Michelle Tynan  | REIT                         |
| Rebecca Ellston | Property council             |
| Gina Gunn       | Property Agents Board        |
| Cynthia Butler  | Property Agents Board        |