

GOING HOME STAYING HOME REFORMS: *Consultation Report*

Department of Family & Community Services

October 2012

1 Introduction

On 10 July 2012, the Hon. Pru Goward, Minister for Family and Community Services launched *Going Home Staying Home* – a program to reform the specialist homelessness services (SHS) system in NSW.

The *Going Home Staying Home* (GHS) Reform Program builds on good practice and innovation in the specialist homelessness service sector and the NSW Homelessness Action Plan.

The reform aims to:

- Re-gear delivery arrangements to support a greater focus on an individualised approach
- Streamline access and improving intake, assessment and referral arrangements so clients get the right services at the right time
- Improve service planning and resource allocation arrangements
- Promote and supporting quality improvement in service provision using contemporary, evidence-based approaches to addressing homelessness
- Improve the structure, quality and contracting of services and ensuring that the sector has access to a skilled and stable workforce to deliver the types of services required under the reform.

At the announcement of GHS, Minister Goward released a consultation paper which put forward the case for reform based around five building blocks.

A series of 15 regional forums were held during July and August 2012. Forums were also held with the City of Sydney Homelessness Services Interagency (18 July) and the Premier's Council on Homelessness (29 August 2012), as well as a teleconference with Aboriginal Specialist Homelessness Services (24 August). In addition, 75 written submissions were received from peak bodies, individual SHS providers and other stakeholder that provided more detailed responses to the consultation questions (Attachment 1).

This report provides a high-level summary of the feedback from the Consultation Forums and the written submissions to inform the development of an initial Reform Roadmap. The more detailed notes from each of the Forums and the specific suggestions and recommendations in each of the written submissions will be used to guide the detailed development work on each of the reform building blocks.

2 Key consultation themes

Broad in principle support for service system improvement

There was broad in principle support for Going Home Staying Home (GHS)H)—recognising the opportunity to build on the existing strengths of the specialist homelessness service system and the innovative approaches that have already been adopted by local and regional services.

There is widespread support for:

- A focus on people not programs
- A greater focus on intervening early to prevent homelessness
- Better linkages and collaboration between SHS and mainstream services to address the full range of housing assistance and support needs
- A greater focus on outcomes rather than activities and outputs (recognising these outcomes go beyond 'sustaining housing').

At the same time stakeholders highlighted the risk of "reinventing the wheel" if the GHS)H process was not grounded in building on the individualised approaches and streamlined access arrangements that are already happening in local communities. There is significant stakeholder sensitivity to the suggestion that reform is needed because service providers are not doing a 'good job'—rather than using existing good practice to drive a more consistent and effective response across the state to clients who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

GHS)H is dependent on reforms in the broader homelessness service system

Universally, stakeholders highlighted that the GHS)H reforms can only be successful if they are supported by extensive reforms in the broader homelessness service system—particularly in relation to

- Improving access to more social and affordable housing—including priority access to social housing and private rental assistance
- Improving access to mainstream support—particularly for people with drug and alcohol and mental health issues; women and children experiencing domestic and family violence; and young people in the child protection, out-of-home care and juvenile justice systems
- Integrating access to the suite of additional service responses and products managed through other programs—in particular Temporary Accommodation funding managed by Housing NSW
- Realigning mainstream provider service models and priorities to reduce the risk of homelessness and provide better support for clients exiting homelessness
 - Addressing domestic, family and sexual violence
 - Improving education and employment opportunities for young people
 - Ensuring better service responses from employment support providers
 - Addressing inadequate case planning that allow people to exit hospitals, care, and correctional facilities into homelessness
 - Addressing Aboriginal overcrowding

Need to broaden the evidence base for the GHS)H reforms

Stakeholders highlighted the inadequacy of the evidence base presented in the Consultation Paper—particularly in relation to understanding SHS repeat usage, the level of current effort on prevention and post-crisis supports, and the outcomes for different client groups. While acknowledging that homeless people couldn't wait for "yet another report", it was essential that stakeholders were involved in broadening and validating the evidence base underpinning GHS)H. Further, stakeholders highlighted that the reform directions needed to be more solidly grounded in the innovative approaches already adopted by SHS over the last 10 years.

'One size doesn't fit all'

Stakeholders strongly supported maintaining the spectrum of service responses—to reflect the diversity of clients' needs, circumstances and preferences. In terms of the GSH reforms, this means that

- an individualised approach should allow for flexible, tailored responses—drawing on the full range of service models and interventions that are proven to be effective for particular client groups and in particular contexts
- streamlined access should support arrangements that are tailored to the specific needs of particular client groups and particular contexts
- a spectrum of service responses is required, including responses to provide safe and supported short-term shelter

Maintaining the diversity of service providers

Stakeholders highlighted the importance of maintaining a service system with a diversity of service providers. At many of the consultation forums, smaller organisations expressed concerns about either being “swallowed up by larger ones” or disappearing as competitive tendering processes rewarding efficiencies achieved through scale. These organisations wanted greater recognition of the valuable role of smaller organisations in cost-effectively addressing local and specialist needs—and their broader role in supporting inclusive communities.

Recognising the broader role of SHS in support other government priorities

Stakeholders highlighted that many organisations funded as SHS also deliver a broad range of other human services—either through government-funded programs or voluntary and fee-for-service arrangements. Importantly, many of these services support other NSW government priorities including reducing domestic, family and sexual violence, increasing the proportion of young people that finish high school or an equivalent qualification and reducing juvenile and adult re-offending.

Giving greater prominence to addressing Aboriginal homelessness

There was strong recognition of the need for the GSH reforms to give greater prominence to the specific challenges of addressing Aboriginal homelessness—and the importance of involving Aboriginal SHS and communities in setting the reform directions.

'Regional is not metro'

Stakeholders highlighted that the GSH reforms needed to give special consideration to the specific challenges of working in regional, rural and remote areas—and the danger on the reforms being 'metro-centric'.

Allocating adequate resources to achieve reform objectives

Stakeholders highlighted that the achievement of the reform objectives was ultimately reliant of adequate resources that reflected the complexity of the target population needs. While stakeholders were strongly supportive of increasing resources for prevention and early intervention, they highlighted that it was naïve to expect this to reduce the unmet demand for crisis and other accommodation services without significant additional resources for affordable housing and specialist support services.

Ensuring extensive consumer and sector engagement through the reforms

Stakeholders highlighted that the best way to mitigate the risk of poor reform design and implementation was to ensure ongoing and extensive consultation with those with the most 'skin in the game'—the consumers and the SHS providers. This includes listening to what consumers have to say about what works and doesn't work, and building on the existing expertise and knowledge within the sector.

SHS peak bodies also highlighted the importance of diverse expert input through the panel of experts to ensure evidence about the most effective responses to the specialist needs of Aboriginal people, young people and women and children escaping violence were fully considered at part of the GSH reforms.

3 Feedback on the reform building blocks

3.1 Individualised approach

Stakeholders were very supportive of the proposed focus on an individualised approach rather than a programs-based approach. The most important design elements were that the approach should be:

- Client-centred—ensuring ‘on-the-ground’ practices for implementing an individualised approach were centred around listening to clients and appropriately involving them in planning and delivering service responses
- Flexible—developing policy guidelines and funding arrangements that give service providers the flexibility to work to achieve the best outcomes for the client
 - Recognising the clients don’t come with a standard set of issues and don’t want predetermined packages
 - Recognising the broad spectrum of SHS and non-SHS services with a role to play in responding to individual client needs
 - Allowing greater flexibility to broker solutions for the client
 - Allowing greater tailoring of service responses to different client needs such as for young people, Aboriginal people and women and families escaping violence—without imposing fragmented service silos or assuming that early intervention will mean the same things for all target groups
- Portable—developing policy guidelines and funding arrangements that promote continuity of support as clients’ needs change or they transition to greater independence
- Connected—dropping artificial labels and boundaries like ‘crisis’, ‘short-term’, ‘medium term’ and recognising the continuum of responses within the specialist homelessness service system and the linkages to responses in the broader homelessness service system
 - Supporting partnerships between specialist and mainstream services—recognising that additional resources are needed to strengthen and enhance these collaborations
 - Expanding brokerage opportunities that encompass a diverse breadth of products and services (while recognising the limitations of brokerage where there is a lack of suitable services)
- Nuanced—emphasising that ‘one size doesn’t fit all’ and that an individualised approach must build on the evidence of effective practice in different contexts and for different target groups—particularly in relation to young people, women and families escaping violence, Aboriginal people and regional and rural communities.
- Responsive—ensuring service responses are delivered in an appropriate and non-discriminatory manner particularly for groups that experience stigma and discrimination in the wider community such as gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender (GLBT) client and people with HIV/AIDS

Stakeholder highlighted significant opportunities to build-on existing good practice where providers have adopted an individualised approach—for example:

- ‘Housing First’ / ‘Rapid Rehousing’ approaches which focus on providing long term housing linked to wrap around support

- TA Triage Models where clients in TA are assisted within 2-3 days of receiving TA assistance and assessments are done jointly by SHS and Housing NSW officers
- Assertive outreach
- Youth DRUM
- Preventing Evictions Tenancy Support Scheme
- Staying Home Leaving Violence

There was considerable discussion during some of the consultation forums and in the written submissions about funding arrangements for an individualised approach. There was a general concern about packaging funding purely on a client outcome or output basis with many arguing that smaller services would generate insufficient revenue to cover costs of service infrastructure and overheads.

Many stakeholders supported a mix of funding approaches that are linked to different models of service delivery and different delivery contexts. However, costing different models of service delivery for different cohorts is seen as a challenging process which must be done transparently. Some stakeholders expressed concern that the individualised approach building block did not make explicit the suite of service options or outcomes that will comprise the specialist homelessness service system—and how these link to the fundamental building block of access to sustainable and affordable housing.

Stakeholders highlighted further threshold issues, success factors and barriers that they believed were critical to address in implementing individualised approaches. These include:

- The lack of a coherent overarching framework to shape SHS responses to client's presenting needs—which has resulted in a service system that has evolved over time into a series of discrete and often siloed programs
- The lack of appropriate tools and guidance to ensure the individualised approach adopted for a particular client group and context aligns with the evidence-base about effective practice for this client group and context
- The importance of specialised knowledge and experience to ensure the 'right' decisions are made about the individualised approach for a particular client in a particular context
- The need to ensure that more flexible funding options do not become a simplistic 'individualised funding' approach that aims to create a market in service purchasing which puts at risk the very availability of the range of supports needed.
- The limitations of 'default' arrangements where support packages are linked to accommodation and funds are allocated on a bed/nights basis—while recognising that such arrangements may be highly appropriate in certain contexts
- The level of SHS funding is not sufficient to meet demand or the full range of needs for individual clients—restricting the effectiveness of an individualised (or business-as-usual) approach
- The lack of affordable housing and mainstream support options—restricting the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of an individualised approach.

3.2 Streamlining access

There was strong stakeholder support for streamlining access—building on existing good practice at the local and regional level—while ensuring the access system remained responsive to the needs of different client groups.

Stakeholders highlighted that the most important design elements for streamlined access were:

- Client-friendly access points—a range of access points that reflect the diversity of presenting needs, circumstances and mobility of homeless people and those at risk of homelessness
 - Recognising that there is no 'one size fits all' access point
 - Exploring options for centralised intake and coordinated referral, including a state-wide or regional telephone access point or regional 'one stop shop'—to free up SHS resources
 - Retaining options for clients groups to continue to use specialist access points where they are effective e.g. Yconnect phone line for young people; DV line for people escaping domestic violence. These access points combine the specialist knowledge and experience to appropriately respond to the presenting needs
 - Ensuring consistent triage arrangements at all access points to provide an initial assessment where you can engage with clients and determine appropriate SHS and non-SHS service responses
- Consistent assessment—tools and business processes to assess client's need and match them with the most appropriate SHS and broader homelessness service system response
 - Ensuring consistent criteria are used to assess need and determine the appropriate service response
 - Recognising the specialist expertise required to identify the appropriate service response
- Sharing client information—tools, business processes and protocols that allow service providers to appropriately share information about the things that are relevant to achieving positive client outcomes and that make it easier for clients as they move around the service system.
- Information about service availability—tools and business processes that provide up-to-date information about the availability of assistance and support, including an online services directory and systems that show real time vacancies
- Connected referral processes—tools and business processes for making and received referrals within the SHS service systems and broader homelessness service system.
- Joined-up access points—for example group models where mainstream and specialist homelessness service providers work together through a common regional intake and assessment system, which then links to common case management and support planning processes.

Many stakeholders highlighted the importance of building electronic tools to support sharing of information captured in client management systems—as well as extending system capabilities to allow accommodation vacancy listing and electronic referrals.

Stakeholders highlighted a range threshold issues, success factors and barriers that they believed were critical to deliver streamlined access. These include:

- Dealing with the time and workloads constraints that limit the capacity of SHS to facilitate streamlined access—including the burden of unhelpful ‘paperwork’ and ‘red tape’
- Developing the IT systems and infrastructure to support streamlined access
- Ensuring the consistency and reliability of information collected and shared
- Establishing protocols and client consent procedures to facilitate the sharing of client information
- Ensuring new access arrangements don’t result in service providers ‘losing touch’ with individual client needs or compartmentalising clients into homogenous categories
- Ensuring any centralised triage or assessment arrangements do not lead to incorrect referrals, frustration for clients and increased workloads for services.

3.3 Better planning and resource allocation

Stakeholders acknowledged shortfalls in current planning and resource allocation processes that have arisen because of historical funding arrangements and fragmented planning—and support an evidence-based approach that better matches client needs for all forms of homelessness service responses with the availability of such services at a regional and local area.

From the perspectives of stakeholders, the most important elements in achieving better planning and resource allocation arrangements are:

- Recognition of the diversity of need—both across geographical regions and for different target groups and service streams
 - Ensuring needs-based planning considers both relative regional need and relative need for different target groups including young people, women, families, Aboriginal, singles
 - Using the full range of available evidence to quantify need—ensuring that the methodology used for analysis is sound and transparent
- Devolved decision-making—to avoid ‘top-down’ resource allocation decisions that do not reflect the regional and local need and service context
 - Recognising the importance of ‘local knowledge’ in identifying and planning responses to local need
 - Recognising that state-wide data provides an important starting points for needs-based planning—but that this data needs to be ‘reality tested’ at the regional and local level
 - Ensuring planning and resource allocation occurs through consultation and collaboration with the sector in order to take into account different service streams, population groups and locational differences between regions
- Joined-up planning—that recognises the links between SHS and the broader homelessness service system
 - Planning to be undertaken into conjunction with other service systems and service providers e.g. Health, Disability, Centrelink
 - Combining the SHS and HNSW Temporary Accommodation to avoid fragmented planning and resource allocation
 - Ensuring planning and resource allocation decisions align and support other government priorities including domestic and family violence and child protection
- Support the full range of cost-effective local service solutions—recognising that certain delivery contexts require a greater level of investment to offset high costs e.g. SHS in rural and remote areas, Aboriginal SHS, smaller organisations meeting specific local needs.

Stakeholders highlighted a range threshold issues, success factors and barriers that they believed were critical to achieving better planning and resource allocation decisions. These include:

- Ensuring resourcing levels were adequate to realistically meet government expectations of improved client outcomes—including expanding prevention and post-crisis support activities
- Ensuring the data used for needs-based planning is sufficiently robust to reflect the 'true' regional and local need—with concerns that
 - State-wide data collections are unlikely to have sufficient granularity to predict local needs
 - Service mapping exercises needs to reliable—with some stakeholders highlighting the underrepresentation of youth SHS in the recent service mapping
- Avoiding funding models that have a detrimental impact on smaller organisations—with concerns that:
 - the process of reviewing current resource allocation will lead to the tendering of contracts to large NGO's at the expense of smaller services that have demonstrated expertise is responding to specialist needs such as youth homelessness and women escaping domestic violence
 - smaller organisations that deliver cost-effective local service solutions not being funded because they are unable to generate the same economies of scale as larger organisations
- Concern that new funding arrangements may not address systemic issues in the broader homelessness service system where SHS are often "picking up the slack" for mainstream services e.g. OOH, ADHC, Mental Health.

At the same time, stakeholders highlighted a range of example of current good practice that can be built-on to improve planning and resource allocation arrangements—in particular:

- Building on the planning role of Regional Homelessness Committees and local homelessness forums
- Building on the existing interagency networks
- Ensuring effective consumer engagement and participation in planning processes

3.4 Industry and workforce development

There was broad stakeholder support for investment in industry and workforce development activities to underpin the reforms—with key priorities including:

- Using the innovation fund to support SHS organisations to reconfigure their existing service delivery models and arrangements, up and re skilling their workforces and effectively managing the culture of change that takes place over the next 3 -5 years. A number of stakeholders highlighted existing industry and workforce development strategies in the broader community services sector that can be built-on to leverage the resources in the innovation fund
- More funding for training and professional development to build the skills and capacity of staff in SHS
 - Building sector-wide competencies that are needed by all SHS—such as cultural competence training; working with children;
 - Expanding opportunities to participant in training—through the appropriate use of technology (including online training) and additional resources to allow staff in rural and remote SHS to attend training

- Identifying appropriate skills/qualifications/competency needed for working in SHS including promoting university qualifications
- Facilitation of new partnership and alliance arrangements that achieve the right balance between local community responsiveness and operational efficiencies
 - Exploring opportunities for shared back-office functions; mergers; alliances
 - Exploring differing contracting arrangements such as contracting with consortia of independent organisations, lead agencies- sub contractors and joint venture entities
 - Supporting collaborative rather than competitive procurement models
 - Increasing assistance to help make partnership arrangements and practices work well—including capacity building for participating organisations. Several stakeholders indicated that peak SHS organisations are the preferred auspice of such assistance
 - Supporting smaller organisations to be more financially viable through alliances with other organisations; supporting larger organisations to be more connected to community need through alliances with smaller local organisations
- Improving opportunities for networking, mentoring and external professional supervision
 - Promotion of broader industry networks
 - Mentorship programs for SHS staff
 - Mentoring programs between services on best practice, governance, policy and staff support
- Ensuring peak body arrangements are responsive to the diversity needs of the sector
 - Increasing Aboriginal representation in the SHS sector—either through the existing peak bodies or an Aboriginal SHS representative body
 - Increasing the impact of peak body activities in regional areas

At the same time, stakeholders highlighted a number of key issues and risks in relation to industry and workforce development activities –namely the:

- Adequacy of wages and employment condition for people working in the SHS—particularly compared to other parts of the human services industry
- Government response to funding the flow-on wage increases that community services staff should receive from December 2012 following the Pay Equity case
- Time limited funding provided to the SHS—which impacts on staff retention
- Risk that industry and workforce development strategies will focus on larger, multi-site SHS providers

3.5 Quality improvement and innovation

From the perspectives of stakeholders, the most important elements in relation to quality improvement and innovation are:

- Building on the current national work on a quality framework for homelessness services—so client have greater certainty of receiving the same quality of service from all SHS
 - Exploring options for an Industry Accreditation Scheme of SHS providers—potentially linked to a national quality framework
 - Ensuring accreditation is realistic for smaller organisations
 - National process for SHS accreditation which should link to the National Quality Framework – leads to consistent service, quality assurance

- Adopting a homelessness charter to inform how homelessness services operate covering
 - better complaint handling
 - requirements for SHS providers to meet agreed standards
- Reducing red tape and avoid duplication of existing quality and regulatory schemes (e.g. Community Housing Registration)
 - Synchronising the various quality and regulatory frameworks
 - Minimising duplication of reporting requirements
 - Aligning different quality and regulatory arrangements (e.g. Community Housing Regulatory System)
 - Failing to recognise the additional challenges and cost impost of quality initiatives on smaller organisations
- Improving performance monitoring
 - Focussing on client outcomes rather than processes and activities
 - Needing to ensure monitoring activities are streamlined and deliver information that can be used to improve services—rather than simply ‘bean-counting’
- Using the innovation fund to support structural adjustments associated with the reforms
 - Funding facilitators to develop partnerships and alliances in Regions where they are lacking
 - Supporting smaller providers to achieved accreditation against homelessness standards
 - Running cultural competence training to ensure all SHS are responsive to the needs of Aboriginal clients
- Increasing the focus on continuous improvement processes
 - Developing effective mechanisms to get feedback from consumers and to use this information to drive service improvements
 - Sharing and disseminating evidence of effective practice (e.g. clearinghouse with information on evidenced based models, evaluations & reviews)

4 Cross-cutting themes

There were a number of cross-cutting themes raised by stakeholders that have implications across the five building blocks. In each case, stakeholders highlighted specific issues related to service streams or locational issues that will need to be considered in the detailed development and implementation of the reforms.

4.1 Improving responses to Aboriginal clients

A number of Aboriginal SHS and other stakeholders highlighted the importance of improving responses to Aboriginal homelessness. Key points included:

- Ensuring planning and resource allocation framework appropriately reflects the over-representation of Aboriginal clients in the homelessness at at-risk population, and the specific government commitments to reduce Aboriginal homelessness
- Providing cultural competence training to improve service responses to Aboriginal clients from all SHS organisations
- Improving the representation of Aboriginal SHS and the Aboriginal consumers through peak bodies and consumer input arrangements
- Expanding opportunities to employ Aboriginal staff to provide a culturally approach to working with Aboriginal people.

4.2 Recognising the challenges for regional and remote SHS

A wide range of stakeholders highlighted the additional challenges faced by SHS organisations working in regional and remote locations. Key points included:

- The different cost pressure faced by regional and remote SHS providers
- The challenges of operating an individualised approach when appropriate support services may not be available in local or nearby communities
- The danger that regional and remote communities will receive less funding under a 'data driven' resource allocation model—as some needs-based planning models are not sufficiently robust to reflect the 'true' regional and remote need
- Improving the representation of rural and remote SHS on peak bodies and improving access to the advisory services delivered by peak bodies

4.3 Recognising distinct service responses for young people

A number of stakeholders highlighted the importance of distinct services responses for young people. Key points included:

- The overwhelming evidence-base that highlights the appropriateness of distinct service responses for young people—based on both the different needs of young people and the different outcomes that services need to achieve with young people
- The importance of building on current effective service models for working with young people. This means that options and supports provided for young people need to be developmentally appropriate as well as close to the socially accepted norms as possible. Most people would not consider it appropriate for a 16 year old to be living on their own without supervision, support and education/skills development and mentoring.
- The importance of interpreting the pattern of service usage and outcomes for young people in the correct context—for example, where 'repeat service usage' have be an important positive step towards establishing independence.

- Early intervention for young people means more than simply the maintenance of at risk tenancies and/or rapidly housing homeless people—it requires developmentally appropriate and socially accepted interventions which are different from those of adults and includes maintaining young people in the family home where safe and appropriate, maintaining community and educational engagement and the provision of a range of supported accommodation option.

4.4 Recognising distinct service responses for women and children escaping domestic violence

A number of stakeholders highlighted the importance of distinct services responses for women and children escaping violence. Key points included:

- That many organisations funded as SHS also deliver a broad range of other human services. Importantly, many women's refuges are involved in delivering services that support the NSW government's priority to reduce domestic, family and sexual violence
- A 'One Size Fits All' funding model to deliver individualised responses will not adequately meet the needs of women and children, and would not build on the existing expertise of knowledge of Domestic violence SHS
- The capacity and responsiveness of SHS in responding to individual client needs must be supported by integration service systems and structures, including service system responses for interrelated services systems, including domestic and family violence, child protection.
- Many women's refuges have built partnerships with a diverse range of agencies, including Police and health services, and developed a range of programs to make their services and support accessible to women and children throughout their communities.
- The limitations of the GHSH reforms in addressing the fundamental issues of the lack of access to safe and affordable housing and appropriate mainstream support for women and children escaping domestic and family violence

Attachment 1: List of written submissions

ACON

Albury Supported Accommodation Service

Blue Mountains Youth Accommodation and Support Service

Blue Mountains Youth Accommodation and Support Service

Bonnie Women's Refuge

Broken Hill YASS Inc

Cabramatta Community Centre and Western Sydney Community Forum

Caretakers Cottage

CatholicCare Social Services Hunter-Manning

Centacare New England North West

Council of Social Service of NSW (NCOSS)

Eastern Suburbs Community Youth Association Ltd (ESCYA)

Elsie Women's Refuge

Hastings Women and Children's Refuge

Homeless Persons' Legal Service

Homelessness NSW

Illawarra youth housing

Illawarra Shoalhaven Joint SHS Services

IWSC Job Futures

Jetty Bunker Youth Service Inc

Jewish House

Launchpad Youth Community

Louisa Women's Refuge

Macarthur Disability Services Ltd

Mackillop Family Services

Maitland & Dungog Community Youth Development Project

Manly Warringah Women's Resource Centre

Marist Youth Care

Mission Australia

Mountains Youth Services Team Inc

Nepean Blacktown Regional Taskforce on Homelessness

Newtown Neighbourhood Centre

NSW Federation of Housing Associations

NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors

NSW Women's Refuge Movement

Parramatta Region Homelessness Interagency

Phoenix House

Phoenix House

Refugee Council of Australia

Regional Development Australia

Regional Development Australia – Murray

Shelter NSW

Shoalhaven Youth Accommodation Company

South East Women and Children's Services

South Eastern Sydney Local Health District

Southern Youth and Family Services

SRYSS Inc
St. George Community Housing
St Vincent de Paul Society – Surry Hills
St Vincent de Paul Society - Sydney
Sydney Women's Homeless Alliance
Taldumande Youth Services
Tenants' Union of NSW
The Bridge Youth Service Inc
The Bridge Youth Service Inc
The Northern Rivers Housing Forum Steering Group
The Salvation Army
Tumut Regional Family Services
Turning Point Youth Accommodation Services
UnitingCare Children, Young People and Families
University of Technology, Sydney
Wagga Wagga Women & Children's Refuge
Warilla Women's Refuge
Wentworth Community Housing
Wollongong Emergency Family Housing
Wollongong Emergency Housing
Wollongong Women's Refuge
Women's Community Shelters
YES Youth and Family Services
Yfoundations
Youth Accommodation Interagency Nepean
Youth Action and Policy Association
Youth Connections North Coast
Youth Housing Support Mid North Coast
YP SPACE MNC