

Brief submission

If blank, no comment was made

Thank you for the opportunity to write in response to the issues paper. Firstly I would like to comment on the terms of reference "introducing competition, contestability and user choice" - these terms limit the scope of solutions that could be offered to the basic question of reform. Secondly the most vulnerable should not be exposed to profit based organisations. this already occurs in the aged care packaged care environment where (for example) a package of \$45,000 can be reduced by \$15,000 or more because of administration costs. Thirdly I believe privatisations fail and result in increased costs. there is a great amount of confusion caused to the most vulnerable by the rules and regulations that result and so they often avoid engaging with services - becoming even more vulnerable. Fourthly There is a loss of productivity that results from an uncertain funding environment - particularly across the largest four human services. So funding services for delivery on a three yearly basis would be one way to proceed (at the very least) Fifth - Funding local solutions to local problems, integration of care and early intervention may be sound solutions to cutting costs. by providing 'wrap around" care for vulnerable people supported by sound mentoring and support will save far more that by directly reforming (cutting cost).

Patricia Deering