

Appendix 2a: Questionnaire to inform the CSDA 'Needs Study' (States and Territories)

You have been nominated by your department to provide information in relation to a study recently commissioned by the National Disability Administrators: The effectiveness of existing funding to reduce unmet need for disability services and identification of any remaining shortfalls.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) is leading the project study team, which also includes members of Alt Beatty Consulting (Sydney and Armidale). The final report is due to the National Disability Administrators in April 2002.

Shortly after you receive this questionnaire, a member of the study team will contact you. One purpose of this initial conversation is to clarify any questions or problems that you may have in relation to the questionnaire and give you the opportunity to specify what further information you may need to assist you in providing the requested information on schedule.

Louise York (AIHW) and Marilyn Alt (Alt Beatty Consulting) will contact New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. Chrysanthe Psychogios (AIHW) and Dianne Beatty (Alt Beatty Consulting) will contact Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory. AIHW staff will focus on general questions about the effectiveness of the unmet need funding while Alt Beatty Consulting will focus on specific questions relating to the provision of financial data.

We will be contacting you in three waves:

- Marilyn or Dianne will contact you before 21 December 2001 to confirm receipt of the questionnaire, respond to any preliminary questions you have, and set up a telephone meeting with you in the week starting 14 January 2002 to discuss the financial data questions (sections 1, 2 and 5 of the questionnaire);
- Louise or Chrysanthe will contact you in the week 7–11 January 2002 to discuss sections 3 and 4 of the questionnaire and respond to any further queries you may have;
- Marilyn or Dianne will meet with you (by phone) in the week 14–18 January 2002 to discuss sections 1, 2 and 5 in detail and respond to any remaining queries that will assist you to finalise your jurisdiction's input to this study.

Should you need to contact a member of the study team, contact details are included below.

As the study team is required to prepare a draft report in February 2002 and the final report by April 2002, it is essential that responses to this questionnaire are received by the project team no later than **18 January 2002**. Please send your response by e-mail to louise.york@aihw.gov.au or by mail to Louise York, AIHW, GPO Box 570, Canberra, ACT, 2601.

We look forward to working with you to gather and analyse this important information.

Ros Madden
Head, Disability Services Unit

18 December 2001

'Needs study' contacts for jurisdiction questionnaire

Name	Phone	E-mail	Jurisdictions and area of focus
Louise York	02 6244 1187	louise.york@aihw.gov.au	NSW, Victoria and Tasmania – sections 3 and 4 of the questionnaire
Merilyn Alt	02 9953 3464	malt@bigpond.net.au	NSW, Victoria and Tasmania – sections 1, 2 and 5 of the questionnaire
Chrysanthe Psychogios	02 6244 1068	chrysanthe.psychogios@aihw.gov.au	Queensland, SA, WA, the NT and the ACT – sections 3 and 4 of the questionnaire
Dianne Beatty	02 6775 2257	diannebt@ozemail.com.au	Queensland, SA, WA, the NT and the ACT – sections 1, 2 and 5 of the questionnaire
Ros Madden	02 6244 1189	ros.madden@aihw.gov.au	Project manager

Questionnaire to the States and Territories to inform the CSDA 'Needs Study'

This study has been commissioned by the National Disability Administrators, to be completed in April 2002.

The objectives of the project are to:

- Assess the effectiveness of the unmet need funding in reducing unmet need for disability services by quantifying and describing additional services provided as a result of unmet need funding and, wherever possible, documenting the impact of these services for individuals receiving support. Effectiveness, in this context, refers to the degree to which stated funding objectives have been achieved.
- Identify any remaining unmet need for disability accommodation, in-home support, day programs, respite services, and disability employment services, to obtain an understanding of current shortfalls in services.

The outcomes of the project will inform discussion and negotiations regarding the third Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement (CSDA).

The full title of the study is: *The effectiveness of existing funding to reduce unmet need for disability services and identification of any remaining shortfalls.*

The study team will use a range of methods to gather information to meet the project objectives, including data analysis, literature reviews and discussions with peak bodies.

This questionnaire seeks information from all States and Territories that will be of key importance to the study. Information is being sought separately from the Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services (FaCS).

PART I—CONTACT DETAILS

A. Who is the key contact person within your jurisdiction in relation to this request for information?

Name	
Position/title	
Phone number	
Fax number	
E-mail address	

B. Please also provide the contact details for the officer handling the financial components of this request. If this is the contact person above, simply indicate 'as above'.

Name	
Position/title	
Phone number	
Fax number	
E-mail address	

PART II—QUESTIONS

The questionnaire begins with general questions about the new unmet needs funding, its objectives and effectiveness and moves to more detailed questions about policies and expenditure in your jurisdiction.

- Section 1 asks you to attach some general information about the way your jurisdiction has gone about identifying the types of services to which your share of the unmet need funding is directed. It also tries to identify what readily available sources of information may exist that will help in measuring and describing changes in services.
- Section 2 seeks information to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the new funding provided under the unmet needs funding arrangements. Again much of the information requested in Section 2 will require the attachment of descriptive material.
- Section 3 asks you to provide information about areas of unmet need that have not yet been fully addressed and any plans that are in train to address those needs in the future.
- Section 4 allows you to provide any other information that may assist the project team.
- Section 5 seeks detailed information about the way unmet need funding is being distributed among CSDA service types and clients in your jurisdiction.

Table 1 summarises unmet needs funding. **Funding figures provided by your jurisdiction in this questionnaire should add to the total unmet needs funding figures for your jurisdiction in table 1.**

Table 1: Unmet need funding offer: Commonwealth and State contributions

State	Commonwealth funding offer			State offer		
	2000–01 \$m	2001–02 \$m	Total over 2 years \$m	2000–01 \$m	2001–02 \$m	Total over 2 years \$m
New South Wales	16.84	34.45	51.29	93.41	119.308	212.718
Victoria	12.29	25.14	37.43	38.4	38.4	76.8
Queensland	9.155	18.73	27.885	9.0	18.0	27.0
South Australia*	4.045	8.28	12.325	6.0	6.0	12.0
Western Australia	4.905	10.04	14.945	9.5	15.97	25.47
Tasmania	1.315	2.69	4.005	1.5	6.132	7.632
Northern Territory	0.605	1.24	1.845	0.652	1.23	1.882
Australian Capital Territory	0.845	1.73	2.575	1.5	1.5	3.0
Total	50	102.3	152.3	159.962	206.54	366.502

*In addition, South Australia announced \$2 million in new funding for unmet need in 1999–00.

Notes

- Commonwealth approach to presenting new funds is used, i.e. second year is cumulative new money, from first and second years. Some States will express funding amounts differently in their own material.
- Updated November 2001.

Source: Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services, unpublished data.

1. 'New money': objectives and use of the 2000–01 unmet needs funding

The Commonwealth has provided copies of the 2000 bilateral agreements (which incorporate its funding objectives) as well as the most recent reports it has received from States and Territories about the use of Commonwealth funds.

1.1 In 2000–01, the Commonwealth provided \$50 million to meet unmet needs for disability services (focused on support of people with a disability with ageing carers) and the States and Territories provided a total of \$160 million to meet unmet needs, within their own priorities. In relation to your jurisdiction, can you distinguish the State's/Territory's own contribution to the unmet needs funding from its other disability funding (as identified in Table 1)?

YES: *If yes, please answer the remaining questions in the questionnaire in relation to this figure.*

NO: *If no, please provide estimates as to how these funds have been and will be used, and answer the remaining questions in relation to these estimates.*

1.2 What are your jurisdiction's objectives in relation to its contribution to the 2000–01 unmet need funding? Please provide:

(a) details of your funding objectives (including the source of statements); and

(b) your 2000–01 annual reports with passages on your objectives flagged and/or any other materials on those objectives.

1.3 What were the policy processes used for selecting service types in need and allocating both the Commonwealth and State/Territory unmet need funding?

1.4 Please describe your strategy for service provision for ageing carers.

1.5 For the use of new funding within your jurisdiction, please explain your:

(a) contract arrangements;

(b) costing models; and

(c) accountability arrangements.

1.6 Please provide copies of any reports and/or financial statements (preferably audited) that indicate the purpose and extent of expenditure of new State/Territory money for unmet need.

1.7 Please provide copies of recent annual financial statements or other reports that identify expenditure levels in recent years, preferably by service type.

2. Effectiveness of ‘new money’ and costs of services

- 2.1 Please describe any specific innovative projects undertaken as a result of the unmet need funding (e.g., new services hoped to be particularly effective based on literature or policy directions).
- 2.2 Please provide copies of, or references to, any evaluations conducted of these – or similar – services. Such studies may include evaluations of new service types or services similar to those receiving new funding. Please include, or provide references to, any information about the impact on individuals of receiving support funded with the unmet need funds.
- 2.3 Do you have specific data on costs incurred in providing these services to:
1. rural and remote communities?
 2. Indigenous Australians?
 3. people of diverse cultural or language backgrounds?

If yes, please provide details.

- 2.4 Are there any special features of your jurisdiction that should be considered in understanding cost differentials between jurisdictions, for instance:
- Higher costs (e.g., price of real estate);
 - Lower current provision levels;
 - Varying service types characteristics (e.g., staffing levels)
 - The balance between the use of Government versus non-Government service providers;
 - Demographic issues (e.g., age structure, geographic distribution and ethnic make-up of the population);
 - Changes in multiple service usage by clients;
 - Other factors that might influence the cost of delivering services.

Please describe and provide any supporting material.

3. Possible remaining shortfalls and methods of managing 'need'

3.1 Are you developing any other/new service delivery/funding models/contractual models, on which you expect to expend unmet need funding, but on which no unmet need funding has yet been allocated?

YES

NO

If yes, please describe the reasons for their development, their nature, purpose, target group, and the anticipated funding model (including minimum, average and maximum cost/funding structures).

3.2 Please provide a description of any coordinated registers of unmet need used in your jurisdiction, including:

(a) criteria for inclusion in the registers;

(b) criteria for prioritising in the registers;

(c) explanation of the items included in the registers;

(d) analysis of the data in the registers.

Please provide as much detail as possible.

3.3 Please provide a description of processes you have in place, or require funded organisations to follow, for assessing and accepting new clients into different service types.

Please attach relevant supporting material if appropriate.

3.4 Please provide any other qualitative or quantitative information or data held by your jurisdiction about unmet needs for disability services. This information may include information from:

(a) peak bodies;

(b) complaints;

(c) submissions to ministers;

(d) records of Hansard questions in Parliament, Parliamentary Committee discussions, etc.

In particular, please attach any analysis or any program thinking you may have done, which discusses or estimates the amount and type of remaining unmet need and how you would propose to meet these needs, should resources be available.

3.5 Please provide any information you hold about consultations with consumers addressing the issue of unmet need.

3.6 Please provide copies of, or references to, any projects related to unmet needs for disability services, carried out in, or by, your jurisdiction, of which you are aware. Such studies may include assessments of unmet need.

4. Other issues

- 4.1 The relationship between disability services and other support programs (for example, residential aged care, community care – including Home and Community Care (HACC), housing programs, etc.) impacts on the level of unmet need for disability support. Please comment on this relationship, including:
- (a) how disability services in your State/Territory relate to other support programs;
 - (b) what, if any, impact does the support of other programs have on the level of unmet need for disability services in your State/Territory; and
 - (c) processes, if any, in place to ensure that people with a disability and/or their carers get equitable access to the support of other programs.

Please provide any available supporting qualitative or quantitative material.

- 4.2.1 As per question 4.1, please comment on the relationship between CSDA-funded employment programs and the level of unmet need for disability support funded by your jurisdiction.
- 4.2.2 Please provide any other comments, which could assist the project team in costing unmet need and/or developing models for future funding. This question relates to the NDA requirement for the project team to formulate recommendations regarding appropriate costing models/approaches to assist in determining the costs of any remaining unmet need for disability services.

5. Detailed information about ‘unmet needs’ funding

Section 5 is asking you to provide detailed information about the way unmet need funding is being distributed among CSDA service types and clients in your jurisdiction.

- Section 5.1 asks you to identify **each** of the service types or program areas to which unmet need funding was directed and answer a series of detailed questions about the objectives of the funding, the way funding was allocated and the clients assisted.
- Section 5.2 asks you to summarise the distribution of unmet need funding according to each of the service types or program areas specified in section 5.1.

- 5.1 Please complete a separate response for **each** service type (or service type sub-category or service type aggregation/program) included in the answer to question 5.2. That is, please make copies of section 5.1 for every service type (or service type sub-category or service type aggregation/program) to which unmet need funding has or will be directed.

5.1(a) Service identification information

*The reference number below links service information provided for each service type/sub-category or program in question 5.1 to the financial data provided in question 5.2. It is assigned by you and should be used consistently in answering questions 5.1 and 5.2.

State/Territory	
Reference number (i.e., 1, 2, 3 ... use the same number in table 5.2)*	
Service type, sub-category or aggregation/program name	
CSDA MDS service type(s) (e.g., 4.01 – own-home respite) Please use national CSDA MDS codes as per the 2001 CSDA MDS Data Guide.	
CSDA MDS service outlet IDs (as per CSDA MDS data returns to AIHW)	

5.1(b) Did this service type, sub-category or program exist prior to the 2000–01 unmet need funding? YES NO, /..... / started:
(Tick one box only)

Please provide a brief description of what this sub-category or program aims to achieve:	
Please provide a brief description of what this sub-category or program offers clients:	

5.1(c) Estimate the proportions of funding that went to new clients and existing clients with unmet needs

New clients: % Existing clients: %

5.1(d) Is this service type, sub-category or program targeting (*tick all categories that are appropriate*):

Indigenous Australians	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
Australians from other culturally or linguistically diverse groups	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
People living in rural or remote areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
Other client group	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
A particular level of disability	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
Particular geographic area(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
Some other characteristic	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:

5.1(e) If this service type/sub-category/program is not specifically targeted, what proportion of your clients do you estimate are:

• Indigenous?	%
• From another culturally or linguistically diverse group?	%
• Living in rural or remote areas?	%

5.1(f) Please specify the number of clients assisted using the unmet need funding

As at	30 June 2001	30 June 2002 (estimate)
Number of clients^(a)		

^(a) If estimated please provide details of estimating method.

5.1 (g) The aim of this question is to measure the total quantity of service provided for this service type/sub-category/program. Indicate the measure of service quantity and the quantity for each year (e.g., number of hours, days, places, beds, programs etc.). *Please provide all the measures you use for this service type/sub-category/program. For instance, a sub-category/program may incorporate one or two service types and so will have one or two measures.*

Type of measure	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02

5.1(h) How is this service type, sub-category or program funded? *(tick one box only)*

According to prescribed funding levels per service	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
According to prescribed funding levels per client	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
By individual funding packages (i.e., by independent assessment of the individual needs and associated costs of each priority applicant)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, please describe:

5.1(i) If you provide funding by level of need, please complete the following table: *(if there is insufficient space, please attach a list)*

Level of need	Unit for which this funding is paid (e.g., per client, per service, per place)	Amount of funding per unit (\$ p.a.)	Average hours of support anticipated to be provided with this funding (if unit is not per hour)	% of clients expected to receive this funding level

Please briefly describe how you determined these funding levels:

5.1(j) Do you expect to try to continue to offer this sub-category/program in the same way to new clients if additional funds become available? *(tick one box only)*

- Yes. No *(please explain why not, or why variation from this model is expected)*

5.1(k) Please attach any expenditure and/or client data you may have compiled by geographic area, for this service type/sub-category/program, or for the unmet needs funding overall.

5.2 Summary of financial information on the use of unmet need funding
(see notes for completion below)

Reference number and name of service type/sub-category/program (from 5.1a) (e.g., 1/in-home respite for people with ageing carers)	Type of funding	Total existing funding for 1999–2000	Unmet need funding				Estimated full year recurrent costs (2001–02 prices) \$
			2000–01 actual expenditure		2001–02 projected expenditure		
			Commonwealth (\$)	State (\$)	Commonwealth (\$)	State (\$)	
	Capital funding						
	Other set-up costs						
	Recurrent funding						
	Capital funding						
	Other set-up costs						
	Recurrent funding						
	Capital funding						
	Other set-up costs						
	Recurrent funding						
Total unmet need funding^(a)							

(a) This total should be consistent with the total figure for your State or Territory (including Commonwealth funds) provided in Table 1.

Notes for completing table 5.2:

1. Please complete this table, which summarises your jurisdiction's current and projected application of the unmet needs funding. It also seeks expenditure on each service type/sub-category/program in 1999-2000 (prior to unmet need funding) to demonstrate whether the new unmet needs funding was used to complement an existing funding base or for a new direction.
2. Please report at the most detailed level possible.
3. Please use the reference numbers from this page for the individual service information sheets (see question 5.1). Please copy this page and extra copies of the questions in 5.1 if you have more than 8 sub-programs.
4. Where possible provide and/or estimate actual and projected expenditure under the Commonwealth/State unmet need funding arrangements for 2000–01 and 2001–02 and its estimated full-year recurrent cost. If you are unable to provide these figures by service type, please provide by service type sub-category or by service type aggregation or funding program. If you have only aggregated data on some service types, please note the service types that are included in the aggregation and attach estimates of their percentage composition within the aggregation.

(Note: For the purposes of this questionnaire, capital is defined as non-current assets with a value of more than \$10,000.)

Thank you for providing this information

Appendix 2b: Questionnaire to inform the CSDA 'Needs Study' (Commonwealth)

Cathy Ellis
Office of Disability
Department of Family and Community Services
GPO Box 7788
CANBERRA MAIL CENTRE ACT 2610

Dear Cathy

Questionnaire to inform the CSDA 'Needs Study'

We are seeking information in relation to a study recently commissioned by the National Disability Administrators: *The effectiveness of existing funding to reduce unmet need for disability services and identification of any remaining shortfalls.*

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare is leading the project study team, which also includes members of Alt Beatty Consulting (Sydney and Armidale). The final report is due to the National Disability Administrators in April 2002.

The attached questionnaire contains a range of questions about the Commonwealth contribution toward Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement funding in recent years, including 'unmet needs' funding, as well as questions about Commonwealth initiatives designed to effectively manage demand for services. The questionnaire contains similar questions to those asked of all States and Territories (the notable exception being the detailed financial questions asked of States and Territories).

*As the study team is required to prepare a progress report in February 2002 and the final report by April 2002, it is essential that responses to this questionnaire are received by the project team no later than **7 February 2002**. Please send your response by e-mail to louise.york@aihw.gov.au or by mail to Louise York, AIHW, GPO Box 570, Canberra, ACT, 2601.*

Please contact Louise York on 6244 1187 or me on 6244 1189 if you have any queries or expect to have any difficulty meeting the deadline.

We look forward to working with you to gather and analyse this important information.

Ros Madden
Head, Disability Services Unit

24 January 2001

Questionnaire to the Commonwealth to inform the CSDA 'Needs Study'

This study has been commissioned by the National Disability Administrators, to be completed in April 2002.

The objectives of the project are to:

- Assess the effectiveness of the unmet need funding in reducing unmet need for disability services by quantifying and describing additional services provided as a result of unmet need funding and, wherever possible, documenting the impact of these services for individuals receiving support. Effectiveness, in this context, refers to the degree to which stated funding objectives have been achieved.
- Identify any remaining unmet need for disability accommodation, in-home support, day programs, respite services, and disability employment services, to obtain an understanding of current shortfalls in services.

The outcomes of the project will inform discussion and negotiations regarding the third Commonwealth/State Disability Agreement (CSDA).

The full title of the study is: *The effectiveness of existing funding to reduce unmet need for disability services and identification of any remaining shortfalls.*

The study team will use a range of methods to gather information to meet the project objectives, including data analysis, literature reviews and discussions with peak bodies.

A similar questionnaire seeks information from all States and Territories. The information received from all jurisdictions will be of key importance to the study.

CONTACT DETAILS

Who is the key contact person within your jurisdiction in relation to this request for information?

Name

Position/title

Phone number

Fax number

E-mail address

QUESTIONS

- Section 1 asks you to attach some general information about the way your jurisdiction has approached the unmet need funding and related policies.
- Section 2 asks about trends in Commonwealth funding, contractual arrangements and cost factors.
- Section 3 seeks information to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the new funding provided under the unmet needs funding arrangements.
- Section 4 asks you to provide information about areas of unmet need that have not yet been fully addressed and any plans that are in train to address those needs in the future.
- Section 5 allows you to provide any other information that may assist the project team.

1. 'New money': objectives and use of the 2000–01 unmet needs funding

The Commonwealth has already provided the AIHW with copies of the bilateral agreements signed with each State/Territory. In this question, we are seeking any additional information that may be relevant to the project.

- 1.1 *In 2000–01, the Commonwealth provided \$50 million to meet unmet needs for disability services (focussed on support of people with a disability with ageing carers) and the States and Territories provided a total of \$160 million to meet unmet needs, within their own priorities. State/Territory departments have been asked to explain their strategy for allocating unmet needs funding to certain service types or client groups.*

What were the policy processes used for selecting service provision for people with disability with ageing carers as a Commonwealth priority for funding? Please provide:

- (a) details of your funding objectives (including the source of statements); and
 - (b) your 2000–01 annual reports with passages on your objectives flagged and/or any other materials on those objectives.
- 1.2 How does this funding relate to other Commonwealth programs for carers?

2. Other Commonwealth funding

Information about the levels of funding for all service types in recent years is being requested from jurisdictions to provide context about the environment within which the new 'unmet needs' funding has been used. Remaining questions are seeking information about the way funding has recently been spent on CSDA service types for which the Commonwealth is responsible.

- 2.1 Please provide copies of recent annual financial statements or other reports that identify expenditure levels in recent years, preferably by
- service type (e.g., open employment, supported employment, open/supported employment, other services);
 - State and Territory of location of the service;
 - numbers of clients (full-years totals and snapshot totals).

2.2 For this funding, please explain your:

- (a) contract arrangements;
- (b) costing models; and
- (c) accountability arrangements.

This is particularly relevant if new funding has been distributed.

2.3 Are there any special features of your jurisdiction that should be considered in understanding cost differentials between Commonwealth and State/Territory jurisdictions, for instance:

- higher costs;
- lower current provision levels;
- varying service types characteristics (e.g., staffing levels)
- the balance between the use of Government versus non-Government service providers;
- demographic issues (e.g., age structure, geographic distribution and ethnic make-up of the population);
- changes in multiple service usage by clients;
- other factors that might influence the cost of delivering services.

Please describe and provide any supporting material.

3. 'New money': Effectiveness and costs of services

The Commonwealth has provided copies of the 2000 bilateral agreements signed with each State/Territory as well as the most recent reports it has received from States and Territories about the use of Commonwealth funds.

In this question, we are seeking any additional information that may be relevant to the project. These questions have also been asked of the States and Territories.

- 3.1 Please describe any specific innovative projects undertaken as a result of the Commonwealth contribution of \$50 million (e.g., new services hoped to be particularly effective based on literature or policy directions).
- 3.2 Please provide copies of, or references to, any evaluations conducted of these – or similar – services. Such studies may include evaluations of new service types or services similar to those receiving new funding. Please include, or provide references to, any information about the impact on individuals of receiving support funded with the unmet need funds.
- 3.3 Do you have specific data on costs incurred in providing these services to:
 - rural and remote communities?
 - Indigenous Australians?

- people of diverse cultural or language backgrounds?

If yes, please provide details.

4. Possible remaining shortfalls and methods of managing 'need'

4.1 Please describe your strategies for managing 'need' in Commonwealth-funded service types.

e.g. What were the policy processes used for selecting service types in need?

e.g. Up-to-date information about the progress of, for example, the Case Based Funding Trial, Assessment and Contestability Trial.

e.g. Data about the interface between mainstream and other CSDA services with Commonwealth-funded CSDA employment services. (Note: The AIHW has not been able to access a copy of the 'Employment Interface' report or the data provided by the Commonwealth for that report. Any assistance you could provide (e.g., statistics about clients being referred back to Centrelink) would be appreciated.

4.2 Please provide a description of any coordinated registers of unmet need used in your jurisdiction, including:

- criteria for inclusion in the registers;
- criteria for prioritising in the registers
- explanation of the items included in the registers;
- analysis of the data in the registers.

Please provide as much detail as possible.

4.3 Please provide a description of processes you have in place, or require funded organisations to follow, for assessing and accepting new clients into different service types.

Please attach relevant supporting material if appropriate.

4.4 Please provide any other qualitative or quantitative information or data held by your jurisdiction about unmet needs for Commonwealth-funded disability services. This information may include information from:

- peak bodies;
- complaints;
- submissions to ministers;
- records of Hansard questions in Parliament, Parliamentary Committee discussions, etc.

In particular, please attach any analysis or any program thinking you may have done, which discusses or estimates the amount and type of remaining unmet need and how you would propose to meet these needs, should resources be available.

4.5 Please provide any information you hold about consultations with consumers addressing the issue of unmet need for Commonwealth-funded disability services.

- 4.6 Please provide copies of, or references to, any projects related to unmet needs for disability services, carried out in, or by, your jurisdiction, of which you are aware. Such studies may include assessments of unmet need.

5. Other issues

- 5.1 The relationship between Commonwealth-funded disability services and other support programs (for example, residential aged care, community care – including Home and Community Care (HACC), housing programs, etc) and the availability of informal care, impacts on the level of unmet need for disability support. Please comment on this relationship, including:
- (a) the interface between Commonwealth-funded disability services and other State/Territory-funded support programs;
 - (b) the interface between Commonwealth-funded disability services and the provision of suitable mainstream/generic services;
 - (c) the interface between Commonwealth-funded disability services and the availability of informal carers;
 - (d) what, if any, impact does the support of other programs have on the level of unmet need for Commonwealth-funded disability services; and
 - (e) processes, if any, in place to ensure that people with a disability and/or their carers get equitable access to the support of other programs.

Please provide any available supporting qualitative or quantitative material.

- 5.2 Please provide any other comments, which could assist the project team in costing unmet need and/or developing models for future funding.
This question relates to the NDA requirement for the project team to formulate recommendations regarding appropriate costing models/approaches to assist in determining the costs of any remaining unmet need for disability services.

Thank you for providing this information.

Appendix 2c: Jurisdiction staff

Jurisdiction	Project contacts
New South Wales	
Department of Ageing and Disability	Simon Watts Susan Krimmer
Victoria	
Department of Human Services	Chris Allen Glenn Foard
Queensland	
Disability Services Queensland	Clare O'Connor Alison Crisp Jodie Osborne
Western Australia	
Disability Services Commission	Charlie Rook Geoff Holloway Jenni Perkins Dana Bensky
South Australia	
Department of Human Services	David Caudrey Mike Griffiths Jo Perkins Segaran Murugeson
Tasmania	
Department of Health and Human Services	John Nehrmann
Australian Capital Territory	
Department of Health and Community Care	Ian Ross Tania Shaw
Northern Territory	
Aged and Disability Care Services	Damien Conley Eilish Kelly Helen O'Connell Leonie Warburton
Commonwealth	
Department of Family and Community Services	Cathy Ellis Rosemary Woldhuis Alan Landford Carl Princehorn

Appendix 3: Agenda and program for discussions on the need for CSDA disability services

Discussions organised through peaks were held in Canberra (26 February), Brisbane (5 March) and Melbourne (7 March). Background papers were provided.

The agenda focused on the two main objectives – effectiveness and unmet need. Participants were encouraged to raise any issues they wished, but also to consider both positive and negative aspects of both topics. Participants were offered a feedback sheet enabling them to send more detailed explanation or further examples to the study team, for a short time after the discussions. Notes were made of the discussions and sent back to participants for comment. These notes, once amended in line with comments received, were then used extensively in the report.

Agenda/program

Arrival and tea/coffee (9.45 a.m. to 10.00 a.m.)

1. Aims and overview of day, and introductions (10.00 a.m. to 10.20 a.m.)

Each participant introduces themselves briefly.

2. Overview of the study (10.20 a.m. to 10.35 a.m.)

Terms of reference, timing and the method being used (AIHW). The ‘new money’.

3. Questions and clarifications (10.35 a.m. to 10.50 a.m.)

4. Where has the new CSDA funding gone? What good has it done?

(10.50 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.)

Questions/issues for discussion:

- Service types, why chosen and their efficacy. ‘Good’, i.e., effective new service types.
- People receiving new services or funding: who and why chosen
- Processes: how was it done, who did it involve, etc.?
- Have the new initiatives for ageing carers been effective? In what way?
- Benefit/positive impacts for people who received services for the first time in 2000–01, or who had increases in service levels.
- Concerns about the use of money or ‘wrong’ priorities in who received new funding. Other impacts.

LUNCH 12.30 to 1.15 PM

5. Are there needs still not met and what is the evidence?

(1.15 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.)

Questions/issues for discussion:

- What types of needs may still be unmet?
- What people, if any, are missing out (includes current clients as well as people not currently receiving services)?
- What service types, if any, should be increased? What should be decreased? That is, should the service mix be changed?
- What is the evidence about any of this unmet need?
- What is the effect of any shortfalls?

6. Close

(2.30 p.m. to 3.00 p.m.)

Wrap-up and what next?

Participants

Canberra discussion session – 26 February 2002

Participants			
Fay Rice	Caucus/Head Injury Council of Australia	Kim Adams	Caucus/People First ACT
Dorothy Fox	Caucus	Kasy Chambers	ACOSS/YWCA
Alice Anne Macnaught	Carers Australia	Brian Corley	ACROD ACT
Ken Baker	ACROD National	Peter Bray	ACROD ACT
Margaret Spalding	ACROD/Koomarri Association ACT Inc.		
Study team members			
Ros Madden	AIHW	Phil Anderson	AIHW
Louise York	AIHW	Tim Beard	AIHW
Chrysanthe Psychogios	AIHW	Dianne Beatty	Alt Beatty Consulting
Xing-yan Wen	AIHW	Meryl Alt	Alt Beatty Consulting

Brisbane discussion session – 5 March 2002

Participants			
Judy Young	Caucus/Parent to Parent Qld	Kellie Caught	Queensland Council of Carers
Lorella Piazzetta	Multicultural Development Association	Chris Allison	Queensland Council of Carers/Parent/Carer
Helen Palmer	Queensland Council of Carers (QCC)/Parent	John Skelton	Qld Alliance of Mental Illness & Psychiatric Disability Groups Inc./Association of Relatives and Families with Mental Illness Qld Inc.
Sue Waite	ACROD Qld division	Matt Carrodus	ACROD/Lifeline Community Care
Anne-Maree Maguire	ACROD/Work Venture Queensland	Garry Davison	Job Match Association Inc.
Peter Mewett	Queensland Unmet Needs Campaign/Paraplegic & Quadriplegic Association of Queensland	Penny Beeston	Parent-carer/Paraplegic & Quadriplegic Association of Queensland
Felicity Maddison	Parent-carer, QCC		
Study team members			
Ros Madden	AIHW	Dianne Beatty	Alt Beatty Consulting
Chrysanthe Psychogios	AIHW		

Melbourne discussion session – 7 March 2002

Participants

Christine Scott	Caucus/VALID	Bill Skinner	South Gippsland Carers Group
Laurell Hall	Carers Australia	Rachael Kenward	Carers Australia
Julie Nankervis	Carers Australia/Carers Victoria	Jill Cameron	Carers Australia/Carer Links West
Mel Warner	ACROD	Diana Heggie	ACROD
Marsha Sheridan	ACROD	Mark Feigan	ACOSS
Ian Spicer	NDAC/NIDN	Jean Tops	Gippsland Carers Association
Margaret Ryan	One Voice	Michael Gourlay	Association for Children with a Disability

Study team members

Ros Madden	AIHW	Merilyn Alt	Alt Beatty Consulting
Louise York	AIHW		
