

The committee commenced at 12:52 pm.

Madam CHAIR: On behalf of the committee I welcome everyone to the public briefing on the Room to Breathe program.

I welcome to the table Mr Jamie Chalker, Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Housing and Community Development; Mr Jim Bamber, Deputy Chief Executive, Department of Housing and Community Development; Ms Karen Elligett, Executive Director of Corporate Services, Department of Housing and Community Development; Mr Michael Leonard, Chief Procurement Officer, Department of Housing and Community Development; Mr Ken Tinkham, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Community Development; Mr Dwayne McInnes, Senior Executive Officer of Remote Program Delivery Office, Department of Housing and Community Development and Ms Danielle Cross, Senior Director Department Liaison, Remote Program Delivery Office, Department of Housing and Community Development. Thank you for coming before the Committee. We appreciate you taking the time to speak to us today.

This is a formal proceeding of the committee and the protection of parliamentary privilege and the obligation to not mislead the committee does apply.

This is a public session and is being webcast throughout the Assembly's website. A transcript will be made for use by the committee and may be put on the committee's website.

If at any time during the briefing you are concerned that what you will say should not be made public, you may ask that the committee go into a closed session and then we can take your evidence in private.

I am not going to ask you to state your names and the capacity you are appearing because I have already said that. Mr Chalker, would you like to make an opening statement.

Mr CHALKER: Thank you Chair. So, obviously the Room to Breathe program is part of the NT government's commitment of \$1.1 billion for remote housing. It forms \$200 million of that contribution over the ten year period. So, in essence is an allocation of \$20 million per annum.

Its intent is to ultimately try to increase living spaces, so alleviate the pressures of overcrowding in existing homes, as we ultimately deliver new plans, broader programs for new housing, upgrades to housing. But also allows local decision making in our engagement in community, right down to the tenant level in respects to what improvements can be made for their homes to make life easier for them, their family dynamic, and to improve the living conditions for those relevant homes. Not just for now, but into the future.

So, on that basis we are happy to take any questions.

Madam CHAIR: Okay, I may go straight to my right. Member for Nelson has got some questions.

Mr WOOD: What is the target for the end of the financial year, in number of rooms?

Mr CHALKER: So, the process that we are looking at, in respect to rooms, is more living rooms. We are not exclusively dealing in bedrooms. The key part of the local decision making is working, as I indicated, right to the tenant level. So, what has transpired already is, even in respects to the application of disability ramps for certain tenancies, is improved living spaces, where for example, an outdoor toilet has been enclosed to provide internal access to the house, so not leaving it as an exposed, external walkway, exposed to view from others. And it has also realised secured storerooms, or changing of internal design rooms.

Madam CHAIR: Sorry, can we qualify that question. How many homes do you think will be modified if that is the case?

Mr CHALKER: So, I will have Dwayne speak to that.

Mr McINNES: Dwayne McInnes, Senior Executive Officer. In terms of your question around the number of rooms, what we can say is, when you look at the living spaces and additional bedrooms, we are looking at 153 in total. So that is for the Early Works Packages for 16/17, which is rolled over into this year. In terms of the 17/18 program, the program is significantly under way. We cannot identify the number of additional living spaces at this time, until full scoping has been undertaken. But certainly for 16/17 we are looking at 153.

Mr WOOD: Do you have an average price of what that is costing? Should I divide 153 into \$20 million dollars, and that would give me a rough idea of what it is costing?

Mr McINNES: No. We can take that question on notice. It will not give you an indicative average price because of the different works that are undertaken in each dwelling. As Jamie mentioned, there is significant engagement at the local level, with tenants to determine what they want with each of their dwellings. So, it could be two additional bedrooms, it could be an enclosed veranda, it could be an extra toilet facility, so the prices do vary per dwelling. So, it is a bit difficult and masking if you try to do it like that.

Mr WOOD: Not much good taking that on notice then, because it is not a real average then.

Mr Innes: No, correct.

Mr CHALKER: Probably, to give some further clarity to that. This is truly an innovative program that allows us to go into an individual tenancy and work with the tenancy to not only work with the design that is existing within the infrastructure, but then also work with identifying what work will alleviate certain pressures or improve the quality of life for them in that house.

We do not go in necessarily with a set budget per home, because we are trying to move more towards social outcomes as opposed to one equals \$100 000 to tick a KPI. It really is about the ability to try and improve life for people who live in remote housing.

What we also ensure that we do is to understand that, if it is an investment, that investment will provide some level of a return as opposed to, whether it is in greater need for a full upgrade or actually for demolition. Each house is scoped individually to ensure that any works done will extend the existing lifespan of the current asset.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: Following on from that, can I ask if you go into a tenancy in mind, with a cap on what they are allowed to—with a financial cap on what they are allowed to ask for? For example, you said some people might want just a new bathroom or an enclosed veranda. If other people want three more bedrooms et cetera, is there a point where you go, ‘that is too much for you’?

Mr McINNES: That is a good question. We do have a budget per community based on needs and what we consider to be an overcrowding level for a particular house. But the reality is, when we go on site, or we are on ground, that changes.

We do not cap the dwellings, that assessment is made later. What we do take into consideration is the condition of the existing asset and whether the investment is worth it.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: Because some might be ready to be demolished, is that right?

Mr McINNES: Correct.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: So then you are building a whole new house, which is obviously a lot more expensive than a veranda.

Mr McINNES: Absolutely. If I can give you a recent example for the 2017–18 program, we have done significant scoping works in Weemol. In Weemol, the prices vary from around \$9000 up to \$300,000, if I use the \$300,000 as an example we have about—because of the particular dynamics of the family and the existing structure—the scoping works that have been undertaken on that said that the structure is fine but to reduce the overcrowding level on those houses we have introduced three or four more new bedrooms.

It is a much more efficient way to approach overcrowding in such instances because rather than spending \$600,000 on a house, new servicing and all that, if the structure is okay we have added to it and solved the overcrowding problem on that house and addressed the cultural issues as well.

Madam CHAIR: That leads to a question that I have, how many communities are you targeting and how are you prioritising those communities? How are you choosing which community you want to go to next and how is that selected?

Mr McINNES: For the 2016–17 program we did a needs-based analysis, we had to get that out early as part of the stimulus package. We are touching 22 communities in 2016–17.

Madam CHAIR: Out of how many?

Mr McINNES: Seventy three in total, although six we have excluded because we still have leasing arrangements to resolve in those communities.

Madam CHAIR: You are going to do a needs-based analysis on the 73?

Mr McINNES: Yes. Also, it was looking at the broader program. We looked where there were other workers because we were undertaking such as—so for the HomeBuild program, the new construction program under the \$1.1bn—we have identified 67 lots that were ready to go, we have progressed works there. Instead of doubling up with programs in a community we have spread that so it is needs-based to consider what existing works are actually being undertaken or planned for that community and also the capacity of individual organisations that are able to undertake those works.

If there were Aboriginal business enterprises that have the capacity to deliver then we have looked to engage with those ABEs to build their capacity and create local employment. In terms of 2017–18 ...

Madam CHAIR: Can I clarify that before we move on. If the 67 lots are happening with the \$1.1bn you might prioritise some of those communities because you already have works planned, or you might have building crews in those areas and rather them leave and come back. You are looking for some efficiencies.

Mr McINNES: We obviously have an existing national partnership agreement with the Commonwealth government that is in its last current financial year. We actually have works well under way in respects of that. Not only in respects of new homes but also upgrades as part of that.

Madam CHAIR: Is that part of the \$1.1bn?

Mr McINNES: No, that is the national partnership agreement.

Madam CHAIR: \$1.1bn is ...

Mr McINNES: ... is the Northern Territory Government commitment that commenced as at 1 July this year. We brought forward \$10m for the early works of the Room to Breathe so that touched into the 2016–17 financial year. The current financial year is now the works for the \$1.1bn proper, so this is actually the first year. Given that we are now in November we are in essence five months into that.

All the planning has occurred. We are looking through our capital works program for this year with the mix of the national partnership works as well as the new builds for Northern Territory Government, plus the upgrades and the Room to Breathe program, to touch 67 out of the 73 communities as Dwayne touched on the six communities that are not listed currently in the capital works program are the six no lease communities.

Mr WOOD: In relation to contracts the list here, they are all select tenders, is that correct?

Mr McINNES: .That will be in respects to the early works Room to Breathe programs that you have before you.

Mr WOOD: Will that continue, having select tenders?

Mr McINNES: .There will be a combination of select tender process plus an open tender process. Depending on the capacity of Aboriginal business enterprise in those communities, whether there is one or is not one. Where there is not then we go down the open tender process with a focus on local Aboriginal employment.

If there is an existing Aboriginal business enterprise we undertake an analysis to see if they have the capacity or capability to undertake the works. In terms of some of the communities where the Room to Breathe program is currently under way, what we are trying to do is do a package of works on a longer term basis so we can get longer term employment outcomes in those communities.

Mr WOOD: I was going to ask about that a little later. In relation to the tenders you get a rough idea of what a tender should cost—and do you weigh up whether even if the select tender was a bit higher than you might say if it was a competitive tender—do you weigh up the social benefits as against a slightly higher cost?

Mr McINNES: Absolutely, that is the case, yes.

Mr WOOD: The issue of Aboriginal employment, this was an issue that was with the SIHIP program there was a lot of figures given out, when in actual fact many times there were not many Aboriginal people employed

for a period of time. Do you have people working at the moment who are working all the time, not just that we have 50 people and a few of them work one week and some work the next. Do we have a line of sight showing that there is good employment here?

Mr CHALKER: I will have Dwayne speak about the employment outcomes so far, but the important context is looking back to history to inform how we are going about this future 10-year program. The great advantage we have with this 10-year program is we can truly start planning for what the next decade will look like.

The timing of the national partnership agreement with the Commonwealth government we have at the moment concludes on 30 June next year. We are waiting on advice from the Commonwealth via MYEFO as to what the funding contribution will be to the Northern Territory government to continue the remote housing program.

Notably, a review has occurred into remote housing across Australia and that report was publicly released a number of weeks ago. The clear message in that report was that it identified that overcrowding still remains significant and that the Northern Territory has more than half that need across Australia and is the jurisdiction with the lowest capacity to deliver.

We are working on a 10-year plan. The advantage of the \$1.1bn program, with the mix of the new builds, the increased R&M, the local government employee housing and the Room to Breathe is the innovation that it provides for us to do things that are not necessarily restricted by types of materials and other KPIs that are currently linked in the national partnership agreement. Through our negotiations we are trying to alleviate some of those so we can ultimately work towards a more fit-for-purpose program and try to defeat, arguably, the sins of the past where the contracts were feast or famine, so a community may have been exposed to works for four to five months, workers would be mobilised within communities for that period of time and that community was then not touched for some two to three-plus years following that period.

So, because of the mix of the Room to Breathe, in particular, and the upgrades allowing continuity of work that arguably can be protected somewhat from the adverse weather events that we face across the whole of the Territory – and if we can get the funding envelope from the Commonwealth bedded down in sufficient time to launch into the next financial year – we will be able to stabilise the continuity of employment available across all those communities, as well as, hopefully, realise formal lease arrangements in place for all.

Madam CHAIR: Is that a new question or a further question?

Mr WOOD: It is one that was mentioned in there, but I will hold it off.

Madam CHAIR: Can we just park it for a minute?

Mr WOOD: It was about ...

Madam CHAIR: Just to give other people a bit of a chance.

Mr WOOD: No, I am happy, you just tell me when to butt out.

Madam CHAIR: You can stop now. Member for Brennan.

Mr WOOD: How is that?

Mr SIEVERS: When you talk about innovation, are we also talking about length of time some of these repairs or upgrades can last? We know on communities there are fairly harsh conditions and some of the materials you would use here do not last so long out there. We are going back chasing our tails in fixing things again. Any new thought process on that? What are we doing in that area?

Mr CHALKER: There has been. The key linkage is once we understand what the Commonwealth funding contribution will be, if we can build that into a total package, that will assist us in respect to how we do business. For example, at the moment, an upgrade in a remote community is capped at \$80 000 under the national partnership agreement. We do not have such a cap in place for our Room to Breathe program so we are looking more at that social outcome and balancing the NT dollar across that.

The point with upgrades is if you have gone to the trouble of scoping a place to upgrade and you have all the relevant contractors in place with the relevant skill and expertise, it would be folly to de-scope just to meet the \$80 000 when, for an additional \$10 000 to \$20 000 you could have brought that house up to a fully completed refurbished home that, for all intents and purposes, is brand new.

We are very confident the practicalities and experiences that everyone has walked over the last nine years in the remote housing space in the Northern Territory will help positively to inform those future arrangements. The Room to Breathe is a clear indication of how that innovation allows local decision making - right down to the relevant tenancy level - to improve and change the lives of those people in need the most – the people who live in those homes.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: On an unrelated question ...

Madam CHAIR: Hang on, I was going next to the Member for Port Darwin. I will come back to you then.

Mr KIRBY: Mine perhaps ties in with that one. Some queries about materials used and whether – as Tony said – it is just concrete that was used in this day and age, a better understanding of flat pack steel and things like that. What is our ability to expand into those areas so that locals can do more of the work and still have the houses last longer.

Mr CHALKER: That is work we are certainly looking at and particularly under the \$1.1bn program, because we do not have the limitations that the National Partnership obliges on us. Part of that work is what we are moving towards, it is hosting an industry day next year. That is likely going to align with a housing forum by Aboriginal Housing NT that we are working with them on, to allow industry to come before not only government—so, also our partners, the Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics, but also representatives from community to actually see the types of home and material designs and the like that are potentially available and to start that engagement in respect of future home design, specifically as it relates to our improving knowledge through the local decision-making pathway we have undertaken over the last few months.

Mr KIRBY: So will that be at some stage next year?

Mr CHALKER: March next year is when it is aimed to be.

Mr KIRBY: I will get some details of that, because I have had people approach me about having some good products that can assist.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: I just wanted to ask whether it was a Northern Territory guideline or a Department of Housing guideline on how you assess overcrowding so that you know what the need is, or were you working with the families and they guide you? For example, they are happy to have two children in a bedroom, but for adults it is one per person.

How do you make that assessment to determine that overcrowding is resolved as a result of your upgrades?

Mr CHALKER: The answer is both. We use the CNOS standards, which gives you some parameters on how to calculate overcrowding. I do not have all the technical details with me, but it is quite an intricate way of calculating overcrowding.

Jointly with that, when we engage with the tenants or community members, they tell us about the cultural issues, about how their sleeping arrangements ...

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: How they want that too—yes okay.

Mr CHALKER: That is all taken into account when we—so that part is when we engage with the tenants. When we determine where we go, we use the data in our tenancy management system, combined with our needs analysis, which we base on the CNOS approach.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: Thank you.

Mr CHALKER: Just building on that, out of that expert panel review that I have made reference to, that the Commonwealth initiated, they found that there is going to be a need for an additional 5500 homes across Australia for remote housing to address overcrowding. As I indicated, they identified that we had more than half that need alone.

The reality is, we have well in excess of 2750 additional homes they identified that we need.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: Some of that will go down as a result of Room to Breathe in expanding on existing dwellings. You would imagine that the new dwelling number should drop a bit.

Mr CHALKER: It will certainly alleviate pressure, short term. I think as we become more mature through the program and build the synergies to link all elements of the house program more broadly, I think we will see those vastly improved social outcomes that we are all so desperate to see.

Madam CHAIR: I am going to go back to the Member for Nelson.

Mr WOOD: Very kind, Madam Chair.

There have been a few things go past me since then. The materials we used in Housing under SIHIP program, one of the key factors was that basically the house had to last 40 years. We used to regard it, when we inspected houses as the steel picket test.

You still would be considering that any rooms you put onto buildings, or any new programs that you are going to bring in, in relation to new houses will have some sort of standard you would need to apply, that that house has a period of time which you would hope it will last?

Mr CHALKER: Indeed. We certainly want to stay focused on value for the Territory, but I think you can combine that with also realising those improved social outcomes that, arguably some of the programs of the past may not have been truly realised. Particularly as it relates to the opportunity for local jobs and the sustainability of jobs in community.

There have been advancements as we understand it, in materials, and as I say, the industry day will certainly provide some further information for the audience in respects of that, to understand, but we certainly need to make sure there is a significant period of lifespan and true life expectancy for those products.

I think it also opens the door for a conversation around how we support tenants better to be able to ensure that not only are we impacting the longevity of the house, but how we continue to try and make health improvements so that we eliminate scabies, rheumatic heart disease and the like that unfortunately still pervade remote regions of the Northern Territory.

Mr WOOD: I know we are drifting a little here, but there was—I have had a concern that we have government spending millions on building houses and so someone builds up the design and then some contractor comes in and puts that design up. But anyone that has been to Daly River would have known that many of the houses there were built by Aboriginal people from the ground-up. They actually made the bricks and built the houses. Those houses are still there today, they are 40 years old.

Is there any move to try and get the ability for Aboriginal people to build out of materials they find in their own community—build houses to reduce costs, but also give them a much better ownership of those houses, not just imported houses?

Mr CHALKER: Indeed. Again, I think that speaks to, once we ultimately know the totality of the funding envelope that we are going to be able to apply across all 73 communities. Because the Commonwealth is very much a key player in this space for us, and once we know what that full quantum will be, it will certainly assist with our ability to work with communities and plan out potentially five-year plans for that community as to the type of works they may be able to access there.

That can only help creates sustainable economic viability for those communities and the relevant small enterprise that might arise from it.

Mr WOOD: I do remember the mud-brick houses somewhere out in Arnhem Land, they were making houses that way.

Madam CHAIR: Inaudible.

Mr WOOD: Yes. I better get back to the Room to Breathe section.

I was going to ask, since you have put an extra room on a house, has there been a problem with more people coming to the house, therefore overcrowding has not been alleviated?

Mr McINNES: To be honest, we have not had any feedback on additional people coming to the houses since the additional room has been on. Not to say that there has not been, but at this point in time we have not had any negative feedback about it.

Mr CHALKER: The feedback we have had is that more communities are more interested in accessing Room to Breathe sooner rather than later.

Mr WOOD: Any issues with it regarding leases and also being to put the—one of the rumours that I was told was that sometimes the room is put too close to the local septic tank and that was the only place to put it. Have there been issues of practicality in relation to where that room could go?

Mr McINNES: No, not necessarily. It is the first I have heard about the septic tank issue, but hopefully we take those things we would take into account when we go out. We definitely take those things into consideration.

In terms of leasing, the leasing is over the entire lot, or the township lease. So there are no issues in terms of that.

Mr CHALKER: And we are at pains to engage, as I said, with the tenants. So the process is not simply that we just walk in and talk to them and then come back and do the works. There is quite a staged community engagement process that occurs, not only with the broader community, as we are starting to enter the community, but also with the relevant tenants.

Mr WOOD: The communities used to have a housing reference group, do they still exist?

Mr CHALKER: Yes.

Mr WOOD: So you use those people to help decide which house will get the extra?

Mr CHALKER: We use them, but not only them, because from the point of view of local decision-making, we are ensuring that we are engaging with pretty much whoever wants to be involved in that local decision-making pathway and of course, housing is something that is very close to many people's heart.

Mr WOOD: You have to be careful of favouritism.

Mr CHALKER: Hence the reason we make sure that we are very much broadened in our scope of who we are engaging with and promoting that engagement well in advance.

Mr WOOD: The one thing I like that you said, you said you had about 80—I was involved in the SIHIP program for quite a while, that you only had 80 000 under the SIHIP program, to do up a house. I remember the front page of the *NT News*, a house we went to in Maningrida, I think it was, which was covered in graffiti. The inside was painted, the outside was still, 'shithouse'. And it left a bad message and taste in people's—people lived in that house and couldn't understand why the house wasn't painted outside. It was fixed up inside.

This flexibility you have got now, allows that to be overcome.

Mr CHALKER: I think it is that shift to social outcomes. We can be caught up in KPIs as a strict number, and one that equals \$80 000 for the Commonwealth to track is probably not unreasonable but I think we are at a place where the issue of remote housing and overcrowding is one that does pervade the national conversation at the moment, Closing the Gap is still very much a clear issue for us and overcrowding is linked to that.

I think the time is right for us to have those broader conversations around how we truly measure more effective outcomes. And it is my hope that will move into the social element as well.

Mr WOOD: One last question. This is part of a \$1.1bn program by the government. Is it Territory money only?

Mr CHALKER: Correct.

Mr WOOD: I was listening late the other night. They were talking about the value of \$10 now and \$10 in 10 years. In theory you will be able to build fewer homes in 10 years because the value of the dollar will have dropped. Would that be a fair explanation?

Mr CHALKER: Interestingly, that mindset is what we are focused on as well. Clearly, when you are talking about remote communities—and across the Northern Territory many are some distance away from major centres. If we can get that sustainability of employment in a community that is longer lasting than a four-month peak and then nothing for a number of years—if we can expand that over a number of years, arguable some of the money that goes towards travel allowance and travel costs for contractors—if that can create sustainable employment in community for people, those costs can realise that the social dollar percentage is vastly more increased in what is expended in bricks and mortar and/or whatever new, innovative products we are able to put in place.

On the journey, we can improve cost efficiency in the delivery. Equally, by knowing what our full funding envelope will be, our planning should allow some significant investment in understanding and allowing industry, for example—what type of product can they purchase? We may realise some efficient outcomes in that as well so that they are buying knowing there are potentially 2750 homes that need to be built over the next decade, as opposed to waiting for packages that are drip-fed out.

Madam CHAIR: We will draw to a close now, unless anyone has any other burning questions.

As a committee, we are looking for some assurances around the budget and delivery of projects. That is why we wanted to have you in early and see where you are at. Can you give us some assurance that you are on track, on time and on budget under the Room to Breathe program?

Mr McINNES: We are on track in terms of the budget. The planning for the 2017–18 program is well progressed. What we will have is pretty much all of the program committed but not yet fully spent by the end of the financial year, which is not unusual for capital programs. There is a significant planning phase and the procurement phase as well, where we will open tenders.

What we are trying to do in mitigating that, moving forward, is moving to these five-year packages. We engage with the community the first time around and then send the architects out to do the designs. We set that up over a three to five-year period. We have packaged lots for every year, and they could be released a lot earlier in the calendar year as opposed to a financial year, which gives us more flexibility using the dry—we are trying to mitigate a lot of that to make sure we are delivering and that there is a seamless transition of works from year to year.

Madam CHAIR: I guess without the quantity known around NPRH (inaudible). At the moment you can give us some assurances—on time and on budget.

Mr CHALKER: Our engagement is tracking well. We acknowledge that from time to time, being respectful of communities, there are times we have to delay our engagement at their request, and we respect that.

The other point that Dwayne just touched on was the fact we are moving to a panel of architects, which will be local people from across the Northern Territory and architect firms. They are focused specifically on Room to Breathe because we really want to try to promote that innovation and allow it to be applied across all those Room to Breathe sites. We are gaining far better knowledge in respects of what we ultimately design and deliver, and being able to reinform ourselves on that journey.

Madam CHAIR: As every project requires an architect for each one, you do not have a standard—if you need a ramp you have a standard and an extra room. Is each one having to be done architecturally?

Mr McINNES: It will be because it is not a one-size-fits-all program. It is down to local decision-making by the tenant. One household may have a disabled occupant, so we look at the house and do some designs around that house. It is not specific; all ramps have their own technical specs regarding angles and ratios. There are those standards, but it the scopes need to be done in conjunction with the tenant. The tenant signs off on those and then we do the specs and the technical drawings based on that.

Madam CHAIR: Quite a number of those houses are rolled out the same. If there is a requirement to put an extra room on each, I presume you would use some efficiencies around not having a separate architect for each house.

Mr McINNES: That is a good question. That is where this program is a lot different. I have a couple of examples to show how it is different and why the architects are necessary in certain cases. We are happy to leave those with you so you can look at them. Then you can see that each house is different and we approach each one differently.

Some of the older houses, like the ones in Bulman and Weemol that are stone-built, are different designs. Those houses do need some technical expertise in the way we address them.

Madam CHAIR: They are still standing. I have lived in one of those.

Mr KIRBY: Talking about a panel of architects, is there currently a panel of contractors also that you pick from? A pool that do the work?

Mr CHALKER: Not for Room to Breathe. The ones we have done by select tender have gone to a relevant community where Aboriginal business enterprises are in place that have the capability and capacity but also match the overcrowding assessment we have made. The Room to Breathe packages will still be put out to tender, and the relevant entities can apply.

Part of what we are trying to do is create sustainability of local employment. If a select tender meets the relevant procurement guidelines which we comply with, then we make that assessment on a case-by case basis.

Mr WOOD: What is a good place to visit to see variation of the work that has been done?

Mr CHALKER: Ramingining would be a good starting point, but there are a number we can pull up to provide that advice to you.

Mr WOOD: Are there any by road? Ramingining in the Wet might be a bit hard.

Mr CHALKER: Storms are starting to brew out there, so the access by road to some in the north will be challenging. Even some of the desert communities have been impacted by wet weather as well.

Madam CHAIR: Thank you all for coming along. We really appreciate the information. We might reserve the right to check in with you as it goes forward to get and update every now and again and see how it tracking.

Mr CHALKER: Happy to do so.

The committee concluded.
