

Disability Done Different: Episode 31

John Walsh on...More than Independent Assessments

Podcast transcript

Audio Length: 36:05

Hosts: Roland Naufal & Evie Naufal

Guest: John Walsh

Start of Audio

Roland Naufal

Welcome to Disability Done Different Candid Conversations. Welcome Evie.

Evie Naufal

Hey.

Roland Naufal

And we're really excited. We've got John Walsh here today.

Evie Naufal

Yeah, it's a big deal. Welcome John.

John Walsh

Hi guys.

Roland Naufal

So John, we're going to do a longer than usual introduction for you as we think your background gives a lot of credibility to a lot of the current issues that are very hot in the NDIS and around disability at the moment. So forgive me if I do this longer intro and then we'll get you to get going. But John's known disability firsthand since as a 20-year-old university rugby player with plans for a career in astrophysics, he sustained an injury that led to high level quadriplegia. For me John Walsh can be seen as the quiet achiever behind the NDIS. Many names that are much more public, but few have had such a profound influence on the development of the scheme. John was one of the driving forces behind the establishment of the NDIS. He was part of what most people don't even know of, which was called the Disability Investment Group, the DIG, that was way, way predecessor to anything that

happened. He was, or is an actuary and a partner at PWC, but the role a lot of people who do know him known for was as Associate Commissioner to the Productivity Commission in 2011, the very significant contributor to many of the NDIS foundational ideals.

We often talk about the Productivity Commission 2011 report as being the Bible. I think we dropped that language about a year ago when they started moving away from a lot of the Productivity Commission stuff and misquoting a lot of the Productivity Commission stuff. We'll come back to it. In the early days of John's disability he undertook an international study tour to investigate disability systems and statistics. He got into data early and John understands better than most the promise of a data driven insurance scheme to change the nature of disability support in Australia and perhaps the world, if we got it right, this is a ground-breaking scheme. So John understands the often forgotten 'I' in 'NDIS', the insurance part. John resigned from the NDIA board in August, 2020 after having been there since the beginning. Whooosh, so that's not one of those introductions that John wrote and I read and everybody thinks, oh, he wrote that. I wrote the intro. I'm a big fan of John's work. And it's a real pleasure to have you here, John and to talk about some of the big picture, red hot, NDIS issues at the moment, which you know better than most. Welcome John.

John Walsh

Thanks very much Roland and thank you for that flattering introduction. It is an important time to talk about these issues and I think it is appropriate and relevant to go back to some of the foundational thinking that went into the original Productivity Commission report, so I'm excited to talk to you guys.

Roland Naufal

And it's great to have you fresh off the board, in a sense that you're a bit more unshackled about the sorts of things you need to consider before you talk to us. So a great time to be talking and even more important we're now going through the transition to a new minister from Minister Robert to Minister Reynolds, and we're hoping that the new minister will bring a significant change of emphasis to the way the scheme is pursued and progressed. And as someone that was there since the beginning as a real founder of the scheme, what advice would you give Minister Reynolds right now about the key things she needs to be looking at?

John Walsh

I would advise the minister to take time to understand what the scheme is meant to do as opposed to how it was implemented.

Roland Naufal

And we might keep that theme as we go John, about advice for the scheme going forward. I think that's probably the most important contribution you could make, which is a very important contribution. So you're an actuary by trade and my understanding is an actuary is an accountant that really likes numbers. And so you understand numbers, you did numbers right back at the very beginning of your career in disability. And from what I've seen you talking about recently, you're trying to advise the Government that their current approach is the wrong approach to sustainability because it's actually financially unviable the way they're going. Can we spend some time unpacking why the scheme's going out now and what you think the numbers are telling you?

John Walsh

Well, I think the number was unsustainable from the start. If you think about what happened between the delivery of the Productivity Commission report in 2011 and the launch of the scheme in 2013. In my mind that was a black hole of two years where the foundational ideas of the Productivity Commission went into the Canberra and COAG black hole and was massaged into something that

came out totally different. And it came out as a welfare and paternalistic model rather than an opportunistic and investment model, and that's how it was launched, that's how it was trialled.

Evie Naufal

One of the reasons I'm so excited that we're speaking to John today is because independent assessments are such a hot topic in the sector at the moment and I have read 100% negative press coverage about it, and our own analysis has been very largely negative about it. And the only people I've seen in favour of independent assessments have been the NDIA until I read John Walsh's submission to the joint standing committee into independent assessments. It's a 10 page submission that we're going to link in the show notes that I would consider essential reading and it's a really, really interesting case in support of independent assessments. And so we're going to dig into that today with John, but John frames independent assessments as one of three essential pillars to the success of NDIS. So we have the independent assessments, we have full funds flexibility, and we have reasonable and necessary decisions made at the whole plan level as opposed to individual supports. So don't worry if you're not following yet, we're going to get into all of those one by one.

Roland Naufal

Could we start with the success of the scheme John, what are your concerns about the future of the schemes sustainability?

John Walsh

My concern is that we're seeing year on year, escalation of cost of the scheme, both in terms of what people are spending, money out the door, and also in terms of the number of new people that are coming into the scheme, and also the lack of people transferring from the scheme into community support. So those three things pointing one direction only, and that is increasing costs at a rate that sooner or later Government will switch off. What I mean by switch off is do something like make it an ACAT assessment, similar to aged care and wrap it into social security something like that.

Roland Naufal

So John, your central concern is the same as the Government's central concern. How are we going to keep paying for this thing?

Evie Naufal

Or how do we make sure that we design an NDIS that can stand for generations?

John Walsh

That's not my central concern. My central concern is I believe that the way that the scheme was coined by the Productivity Commission will give people with disabilities the greatest opportunity to fulfil their potential. The fact that the cost is escalating is the major obstacle that the Government will use to turn that opportunity off.

Roland Naufal

So the scheme is much bigger than individual packages?

John Walsh

Tier two in the scheme was meant to be an investment in capacity building and linkages to community and mainstream supports. And that investment has never been made properly.

Evie Naufal

And tier two is, so people might also have heard tier two referred to as information linkages and capacity building or the ILC program.

Roland Naufal

Plus a couple of other programs yep.

John Walsh

And the ILC program became an exercise between the States and the Commonwealth and the NDIA was constrained in its implementation by using the Department of Social Services grants platform, which basically prevented any investment in capacity building.

Roland Naufal

And then it seems to have been quietly euthanized by being put over in the Department of Social Services?

John Walsh

It was absolutely, it was killed off almost like on the night of the long nights, and made me want to leave the board.

Roland Naufal

So John, I just want to repeat what you're saying, because it's so important that one of the fundamental underpinnings of this wonderful scheme was meant to be a more inclusive society, where we did capacity building, where not everybody needed an individual package, and that part of the scheme has been ditched?

Evie Naufal

Bruce Bonyhady sometimes describes where we've ended up as the NDIS, that individualised funding thing, an Oasis in the desert.

John Walsh

Yeah, well that's right, but it wasn't meant to be like that of course.

Roland Naufal

I had a friend once who was a ministerial advisor and she said every incoming minister that she ever worked with asked her two questions. And one of those two questions is what discretionary money do I have? And could we be giving advice to the incoming minister, Minister Reynolds to ask what happened to the ILC, to ask what happened to that very big discretionary bucket, and she could use that for massive impact in creating a more inclusive society?

John Walsh

Well, and also in building capacity of people, to be able to make the decision about how they can get supports they need and part of that will include getting an individual package under the NDIS, but for a lot of people it won't mean that. For some people they don't want to be in the NDIS. We had a massive conflict before the scheme with the sector of psychosocial disability mental illness. A lot of people with mental illness didn't want to be labelled as having a disability. For some people it's far preferable to be seen to be using mainstream supports and community supports, and I think the ILC can make that more available to people.

Evie Naufal

And the reason we're starting with this particular context John, I'm guessing is that in the conversation we're going to have next about what individualised funding should look like, this is really key context. Because what we've done in creating this desert where individualised packages are an Oasis is create a situation where people feel that it's NDIS or nothing so that we end up having a bit of bracket

creep with that access criteria. And also that once you're in NDIS, you need to maximise the individualised, your individual package, because if it's not NDIS, then what is it? And so any conversation about planning or access has to put that particular set of conditions that people with disability very reasonably feel in its broader context.

Roland Naufal

Created the situation if this is your one opportunity, make the most of it?

Evie Naufal

Yeah.

John Walsh

That's it. Well said. I wish I'd said all that like that.

Evie Naufal

So that is the broader context. We've created an NDIS now where people with disability will really, you know, understandably fight to become eligible for an individualised package and once eligible will, you know, again, really understandably work to maximize their individualized package. And that creates some issues for scheme sustainability as you said, because we're getting higher numbers of people than expected entering and fewer exiting and the plan packages are growing with time. And so with that pressure on scheme sustainability, what you're asking us to do is to look back to the schemes initial design, and those three pillars you mentioned were about scheme sustainability. And the things that have been forgotten in the implementation of the design, those three things again were, full funding flexibility for participants, reasonable and necessary supports determined at a package level rather than individual supports and independent assessments. So you will be one of very few people that our listeners have heard speak out in favour of independent assessments. Tell us why?

John Walsh

Yeah. Okay. All right. So in that context that you very well described Evie where people want to get into the scheme and once you're into the scheme, once you get a maximum package there clearly needs to be some way of saying what the gateway is. And we know from vast experience in Australia's injury schemes that that gateway can't be self-determined, it just doesn't work to allow people or their representatives to say, yes, we are eligible to the scheme. It's just a matter of fact that that doesn't work, it's subject to what we call insurance bracket creep, and it gradually builds up and it can build up very quickly. Once it starts, it can really escalate in a scary way. So what's the solution? Well, the solution that was proposed by the Productivity Commission was independent experts engaged by the NDIA to make those decisions of eligibility and assessment. I'm not sure if the productivity actually did specifically say independent assessment would be needed for eligibility, but it was sort of inferred by the way the gateway was described, but it definitely did for package size. And that was intended to happen between 2011 and 2014. The government brought it forward to 2013 because it was an election year and in the meantime, in 2011 and 2013, didn't do the work required to develop independent assessment instruments, so we've never done the work.

Roland Naufal

But it makes a lot of sense that self-assessment doesn't work John, that people that there'd be too many diversity of responses and too much self-interest involved, but why can't we go with the system that we've currently got. Where people are using people that they know and trust, the medical and therapeutic and other professionals around them to support their assessments? Why is that not working?

John Walsh

Well again, it's an advocacy type model. People who know and trust them, will be talking on their behalf as if they were the person, there still would be bracket creep in there injury models. You have a context of a plaintiff doctor and defendant doctor, and they're likely to say two very different things. So the idea of a known clinician or advocate or therapist speaking on the person's behalf is likely to lead to the same level of bracket creep as if the person was doing it themselves, or at least that's the history and the evidence from injury schemes.

Evie Naufal

John can you define bracket creep for us?

John Walsh

Bracket creep is probably best defined when you think about levels of disability. So think about a hundred as mostly a disability and zero has no disability. If there's money attached to having a level of disability of say higher than 10, we find that over time the number of people getting over 10 increases pretty drastically without some sort of entry point to get there.

Evie Naufal

So one of the things that really surprised me in reading your submission John, was how predictable a lot of these things are. I have to admit I was a bit embarrassed about how ignorant I was about the other injury schemes and compensation schemes in Australia and New Zealand and the role that independent assessments plays in those schemes. I hadn't known, so that was really interesting and I would really recommend to our listeners to read through some of that history. John I want to ask specifically about the question that a lot of people with disability have about independent assessments, which is around the experience of being assessed by a stranger. And that that can be quite very traumatising for people, and knowing that we have this long history of independent assessments in other schemes, is that the experience of independent assessments?

John Walsh

It's sort of expected, it's just the way it is and I think part of the problem we've got with the NDIS is because it was not implemented from the start there's a different expectation now. And so people have been traumatized by going through a planning process where they have to justify every part of their life and existence, they don't want to do it again, and I can fully understand that. It's a great tragedy that we didn't do this from the start.

Roland Naufal

So John, the point we're making here is that to design an independent assessment on a person's functional limitations, which is what we're doing involves identifying their functional limitations and that's quite an unpleasant experience, but is what we're saying is there's no way around that, that's in the scheme design?

John Walsh

I don't think there's any way around acknowledging that having a disability means there are limits to your function, that's part of the international classification of functioning disability and health. Now where we need to go with that is do the thing cleverly so that having got that sort of base indicator, we can then massage that, one to optimise individual circumstances around, if you like an average, the independent assessments will only ever give an average of people like that if you like. And the scheme needs to be clever enough to give more support to people who need more support around that base level and less to those who can do more for themselves. So I have a certain level of disability, I'm a C5 quadriplegic, but I have a very strong family network, I earn an income, I support myself in lots of ways and so I probably need, I would need less from the NDIS than someone who

didn't have more fortunate opportunities I guess. I mean that's sounding like a means test and I don't mean it. I don't want to be seen to be just thinking about financial sustainability, because this is all about how to get the best outcomes for people. A lot of people say, well you're an actuary, all you worry about is money. That's not true.

Evie Naufal

Of course not.

John Walsh

I'm trying to find the way that is most sustainable before government pull the plug basically.

Roland Naufal

I think that people that know you know that John. I suspect you might be the most knowledgeable person in Australia about the details and the numbers and the drivers of this scheme. You have lived with disability yourself now for quite a number of decades. Is it possible, are there tools out there that can really do what we're saying, that can do an independent assessment, that's vaguely fair because I don't know if we'll ever get past vaguely.

Evie Naufal

And can I add to that which is to just come back to what you've just said John, an assessment tool that can understand the person's functional capacity, but also understand what that looks like in the person's context and how that would then lead to an assessment of what funded supports are required?

Roland Naufal

So can it be done, John?

John Walsh

Can it be done? Well, there is no one tool, so it can't be done using one tool to assess someone with intellectual disabilities, psychosocial disability, cerebral palsy, spinal cord injury, multiple sclerosis, etcetera, etcetera. There is no one tool that does all that. So maybe if I tell you what we did way back 2006-7, when we were preparing for this before even the DIG report for New South Wales, we did a whole bunch of consultations with people of different disability cohorts. So Down Syndrome Association, Council of Intellectual Disability and the spinal cord injury guys, the brain injury guys, across the board, Cerebral Palsy and went through the assessment tools they used internally and said, okay, tell us the different levels of disability within those tools that you guys use yourself and say, what would be a reasonable level of funding that went to that level? So the one I know best is spinal cord injury, C5 spinal cord injury might be \$250,000 to provide, or it wasn't in money, it was you'd need six hours a day that sort of thing, that came to \$250,000. So we did that for all disabilities and all levels of severity and age was also a factor. And this is how the Productivity Commission did its costing. We basically built a model of the overall disability type, age and severity of Australia's population and came up with a dollar number, and that's how the \$22 billion was estimated in the first place.

So what we need to do is ask people about their personal circumstances so we can put them somewhere in that cube at an average level. So someone, the average person with C5 quadriplegia is \$250,000. Now each individual will be different. So it might be somewhere from 200 to 300, but the starting point, and then the assessment around that starting point gives a funding package, which most people will be able to take away and build a good life. That's fundamentally the NDIS.

Roland Naufal

But that's not where we've landed as you're pointing out John, and it's the segue and I've heard some characterise you and I'm sure you'll deny it, as give people an independent assessment and do the sorts of things you're doing to give them a reasonable package and then just give them a lot of flexibility about how they spend it. And is that a reasonable characterisation, and can you take us there?

John Walsh

That's it. So that's what, so two things have stopped that till now. So if we're past the first plank, let's move onto the second, which is what do you then do with that money? So go back to our quadriplegic, \$250,000. What we've done up to date is said, we've forgotten about that, so we haven't got that money. We've said, all right, tell me about your life and we've gone through every stage, every deficit in the person's life and tagged something to it. So it's \$10 for a knob on your wheelchair. It's \$50 for rails on your bed. And we've gone through that and said, no, no, no, you can't have a knob on your wheelchair because you can spend that out of your disability support pension. And that's the way the packages have been built up so far.

We've absolutely killed off any notion of a package of opportunity for a person and we've replaced it with a set of individual items out of a support catalogue. And so people are now represented as a, you know, your item 374 and 376 and 421 and that's how the package is built up at the moment. Get rid of all that, just give the person the \$250,000 and give them the capacity building support and sector development, innovation in the market to be able to go about their life. That's the package level and flexibility, that's the two other flanks of the system.

Roland Naufal

So I just want to pause, Evie and I are fighting about who gets to ask the next question, but I want to ask it because.

Evie Naufal

I'm the boss.

Roland Naufal

But so I just want to repeat what I'm hearing you say, John, and where we're at in the podcast. In a sense you're saying that the scheme is under significant threat for financial sustainability and that.

Evie Naufal

And not reaching its outcomes.

Roland Naufal

And not reaching its outcomes, thank you Evie, and that if the government really wants to address this, yes, independent assessments, but next very significant flexibility in the way that funding is spent.

Evie Naufal

So that's the three pillars, and this is what I found so interesting about reading your submission John, is that when I've heard NDIA say, oh, well, you know, if you accept independent assessments, then you can have funding flexibility. Then I thought nonsense, just give us both what's this, you know, one has to have the other, and now I get it. I hear what you're saying is that they are linked, that if we have independent assessments that determine a funding allocation at a package level, based on a reasonable and necessary determination, that's linked to an independent assessment that then full funding flexibility would not only, you know, be in favour of scheme sustainability or kind of safer for scheme sustainability, but certainly, oh well very much hopefully would lead to better outcomes.

Roland Naufal

But remember what John said, if the only way as a person with a disability I can get support is to go for an individual package we still have major problems. So it's not just these three pillars, it's also the fundamental notion of how we support people with disability in Australia more broadly.

Evie Naufal

Have we butchered it John?

John Walsh

No, that's right, that's absolutely right because if we just do the three pillars, the independence package and flexibility, then the only people that are going to get them are the people who qualify for tier three.

Roland Naufal

Yeah the ones that rushed through that stupid door.

John Walsh

That's right and everyone who doesn't get through the gate are still going to be left, you know, sleeping roughly in Kings Cross. So all Governments, States and Commonwealth, need to live up to their national disability strategy, which we haven't talked about, but which was absolutely abandoned when Governments jumped onto the NDIS bandwagon. So the mainstream supports need to be developed and people need to be given the capacity to prepare for a conversation like we're having.

Roland Naufal

The national disability strategy was meant to be a 10 year plan for States and Territories and the Federal Government to come together to create an overarching framework for an inclusive society, and that just got forgot. It's like the NDIS came along, that's the answer to all our problems and the NDIS got forgotten is that reasonable?

John Walsh

What Governments did was rather than improve and invest in their mainstream services, transport, housing, education, health, justice, they tried to offload those under the NDIS through in-kind services and also through cost shifting. So we had, effectively we had a negative national disability strategy for the last 10 years.

Evie Naufal

I think our friends in the mental health sector will particularly point to how the introduction of NDIS has been a massive disadvantage to a lot of people who live with mental illness.

Roland Naufal

John, I want to go back to some of the detail of flexibility of funding packages, because I honestly don't understand because you talk about reasonable and necessary at the package level. What does that mean?

John Walsh

It's sort of the way I describe that big cube of entitlement. So it's trying to understand where the person fits in the overall spectrum of Australians with functional support needs and giving that level of funding in a fair way to each person, and then customising that package to that person's individual circumstances. So rather than building it up as a set of individual functional incapacities, so need to get in and out of bed, need to help go to the shops, need to help with transport. Rather than building

all that up, whereabouts does the person fit in the overall spectrum, start with that and then vary that up and down for the person's individual circumstances to get a single number, not a number built up of individual components. That's what I mean.

Evie Naufal

And part of the problem with building up from independent components is that reasonable and necessary is so open to interpretation that people with better advocacy skills will naturally be able to make the case for a large number of supports, which leads to that bracket creep is that right?

John Walsh

That's it, yep.

Roland Naufal

And the other bit I wanted to jump in too, because I must be hearing a screaming frustration I think with you John, that 10 years of this sort of data, of the sort of data that you're talking about, about reasonable and necessary at the package level. And you get to really know your population, but as the actuary that was a founder of the scheme, you might be frustrated as buggery that we're not getting that data because the scheme's not being implemented that way?

John Walsh

Look, my wife has been telling me for years, you just got to let go of this because it's been really bad for me seeing how poorly this has been done. It's, you know, when you think about it, it's a pretty straightforward model. We've got a bunch of people that need support and all we got to do is give them the money and let them go for it, and we've institutionalised it in an awful bureaucracy of welfare controlled by Governments and restrictions on what people can do to live their life.

Roland Naufal

And I'm not going to put words in your mouth, I'm going to put them in mine, Minister Robert has made that situation so much worse over the last couple of years, but I want to quickly segue to David Bowen. I saw him at a conference, he was the original CEO as you well know of the NDIA and after a few years into it, he said, what we didn't realise was then when faced with complexity we should have replied with simplicity. We need to come back to the scheme, and instead of getting more complex policies and procedures and flow charts and all ways of dealing with it, come back simple. He never achieved that outcome. It's just become more and more complex, but you're doing another carrion call for simplicity aren't you?

John Walsh

Yeah I am.

Evie Naufal

So just to wrap up this section then about the three planks about funding flexibility, reasonable and necessary supports at a package level and independent assessments, John. What would you say to our listeners who say to you, well, why can't we just have funds flexibility without the other two? Why do you consider them to be linked?

John Walsh

I think because if you look in the data that is available in the quarterly report, the amount of money that's been committed, particularly for people not in supported independent living is much higher than what is actually utilised. So the way costs are being controlled at the moment is people are being restricted in what they can spend their committed support on. And also the market hasn't developed

to an extent that gives people the opportunities to use their full support. So putting it very bluntly, we can't afford for people to have full flexibility until we have fair and reasonable levels of packages.

Evie Naufal

Great.

Roland Naufal

John, can you tell us about the role of SIL in the current NDIS and how it's rolling out?

John Walsh

In a nutshell SIL was a product to allow the transfer from states to the NDIS of their block funded group home model. What SIL is, is a support organisation that has a bunch of people with disabilities in a group home, effectively puts in a quotation to the NDIS for an annual level of funding to cover those people in a group home, and the average amount is more than \$300,000 per year. The people who actually live in that group home in a lot of cases have very little control or choice of the supports that they receive. The sort of anecdotal evidence is that the support providers are doing very well financially out of the group home model, and using that to effectively prop up how they might be struggling in the other parts of their business. What I don't like about the SIL model is that it totally disenfranchises the people that are living there and has done absolutely nothing since before the scheme started. It was a convenient way for states to offload their group homes to the NDIS.

Roland Naufal

That's perfect John. That's great, thank you. I really appreciate the way you've explained this to me. And I guess what annoys me a little is that I've been involved in the scheme since the beginning, I've been involved in disability for 30 years, and you're explaining stuff to me in ways that I didn't understand. And I suppose the annoyance is with myself not with you. John our final question we're going to do jointly, from Evie and I, but I know that you believe that quality of life for everyone and we couldn't agree with you more is strongly supported by people's ability to contribute and that everybody can contribute to our society.

Evie Naufal

And one of my favourite quotes from the submission you've written is that to date the NDIS has been implemented with a culture of welfare and paternalism. So in your view, John, what would need to change to make that not be true, to reverse that culture of welfare and paternalism?

Roland Naufal

And enable people to contribute as they should?

John Walsh

Well, one thing that we haven't talked about that I think we should is that the model that's been introduced has not encouraged sector development and innovation. The money that's flowing is still largely a block-funded model and we don't have disability service organisations working towards innovation and sector development. So I think what I mean by welfare and paternalism is that the system is still controlled by definitions that are limiting rather than opportunistic and welfare in the context that the Government still has control, the Government still runs the sector. And what we had hoped would happen is that people with disability would be running the sector effectively, and you can only do that when you've got full control over your funding.

Evie Naufal

Hmm.

Roland Naufal

That's a perfect place to end. Thank you so much, John. I do want to ask your wife to back off and leave you making this contribution, it's such an important contribution you've made. It's a voice we're not hearing at the moment, isn't it Evie?

Evie Naufal

Yes. And if any of our listeners are still puzzling over any of the concepts that we've talked about today, as I mentioned, we will link John's submission in the show notes, and it really is worth reading.

Roland Naufal

It took me two reads.

Evie Naufal

Yeah, and it's a novel perspective. Like I said, it's not a common perspective to hear somebody, about a person with a disability as well, making the case in favour of independent assessments, I mean, amongst many other qualifications that you bring to that opinion.

Roland Naufal

I just want to, I just genuinely want to thank you. This is not in any way buttering you up, but this is really important material at a really important time, and we're really grateful for it.

Evie Naufal

Yeah. Thanks for making the time.

John Walsh

Good luck guys. Thanks for the contribution you're making. It's fantastic.

Evie Naufal

Likewise. Thanks John.

John Walsh

Bye.

Roland Naufal

So that was a pearler Evie, but it leaves me a little bit nervous at the end of it. How about you?

Evie Naufal

I'm a little bit nervous too.

Roland Naufal

What's going on?

Evie Naufal

I'm a little bit worried that we might be loading the Government's gun a bit.

Roland Naufal

That's exactly my worry.

Evie Naufal

Yeah by publishing anything even vaguely in favour of independent assessments.

Roland Naufal

And the last minister was such a bastard for selectively quoting stuff that he wanted quoted. We've just got to hope that the new minister takes a different approach that she really wants to consult with the sector to co-design to bring back bipartisanship and create a scheme that we've always really wanted.

Evie Naufal

Yes, seeing things in their broader context, which I think John illustrated so beautifully.

Roland Naufal

Yeah. So

Evie Naufal

You've been listening to Disability Done Different Candid Conversations, a podcast by DSC that's produced by Maia Thomas. If you want to subscribe, please do. That's great. You can do that @teamdsc.com.au/podcast or wherever you get podcasts. Next up and other podcasts, it's going to be a business case investigation.

Roland Naufal

Is that right?

Evie Naufal

I think so.

Roland Naufal

Cool.

Evie Naufal

Or not.

Roland Naufal

Yeah. And if any of you are still pissed off at the end of this episode, can we suggest you write to the new Minister for Industry is it?

Evie Naufal

Workplace Small Business something, something.

Roland Naufal

And let the vitriol be felt where it really needs to be felt.