

*What framework and assessment criteria should be used to review the NDA? Is there anything missing from the proposed framework and criteria (figure 2)? What other frameworks could be used?*

The framework and criteria to review the NDA appear logical; clarity, effectiveness and accountability are all appropriate means of assessment. However, I feel that relevance needs to be included as an assessment lens. Given the pace and magnitude of change in the disability sector over the past five years, review of the NDA and other policies needs to consider relevance; what aspects of the agreement will be relevant moving forward; is the interface of the NDA with other policies still relevant etc. The concept of relevance should be extended to reviewing the outcomes and associated KPI's now that NDIS is in effect.

*In light of developments in the disability policy landscape and intergovernmental funding arrangements, is an NDA still required?*

The NDA is definitely required. There needs to be an overarching agreement between the federal and state governments concerning service delivery in the disability sector. People cannot fall through the cracks, whether eligible for NDIS or not. There needs to be an NDA which addresses monitoring and accountability of the NDIA; there must be oversight of the service model being introduced. The NDA should detail what the plan is to meaningfully improve the lives of people with disability in Australia, and how progress is going to be measured and communicated.

The NDA should cover all people with a disability, and should cover all services used by people with a disability, whether specialist or mainstream.

*Are the objectives, outcomes and outputs of the NDA relevant in the context of contemporary policy settings? Are they clear and consistent?*

I do not think that the outcomes of the NDA are relevant in the context of contemporary policy settings. Economic participation and social inclusion are fine ideals, as are choice and wellbeing of people with disability, and the support of carers. With the introduction of the NDIS, it's time to view these as minimum expected standards, not aspirational outcomes. I think the outcomes need to be expanded, and they need to be 'aggressive'. I would like to see outcomes related to employment such as income levels, not just outcomes related to participation in the labour force. The indicators in the National Disability Strategy seem more comprehensive and rigorous, and some of those may be more appropriate for the NDA.

*How have roles and responsibilities of Governments changed since the NDA was updated in 2012? Are roles and responsibilities clear?*

Roles and responsibilities across the disability sector generally, and the NDA, NDIA, and NDIS are not clear unless one has a comprehensive understanding of the disability sector. At the present moment, roles and responsibilities don't appear all that clear even to people within the sector. The NDA should state who is responsible for what in specific terms.

*Should the agreement set out responsibility for reforms to broader regulation that affect people with disability (such as building standards)?*

The NDA should set out the responsibility for reforms to broader regulation affecting people with disability. If the NDA is not the overarching agreement touching on all policy areas relevant to people with disability, then who or what is going to ensure that outcomes are achieved across the full range of stakeholders and policy areas?

*Does public reporting against the indicators serve to ensure that governments are held accountable for their policies and actions relating to disability? If not, why not, and how could this be improved?*

Frequent, well publicised reporting against indicators seems beneficial during this period of change.

*Are the criteria for good performance indicators listed in box 2 suitable? If not, what should be added/changed? How do the existing indicators perform against those criteria?*

The criteria for evaluating the indicators seems logical. There might be some consideration as the relevance or durability of an indicator; depending on the frequency with which the indicators are reviewed, is an indicator worth measuring in five years' time?

*Are there other measures relating to people with disability and/or their carers that should be added as indicators in the NDA?*

There needs to be better measures regarding employment. There needs to be better measures regarding positive discrimination for people with disability in the public and private sector. As mentioned previously, the indicators in the NDS seem a bit more robust than those in the NDA. There also might be better measures of quality of life that could be used with the rollout of NDIS; there is some interesting work being done in other jurisdictions in this area (e.g., Canada).

*What level of disaggregation should the indicators provide? For example, should they be articulated at the national or jurisdictional level? Should they be disaggregated by type of support, nature of disability?*

Indicators should be articulated at the jurisdictional level (state/territory). Service provision is different from state to state. Each state needs performance data reported; a rollup to the national level would not be as informative. Disaggregation by other variables like type of support and nature of disability should provide valuable information as to which groups are seeing better or worse outcomes.

*To what extent has a coherent national performance reporting system been achieved?*

I don't feel that a coherent national reporting system has been achieved, as a member of the public, reporting appears to be a little haphazard. The data available on the COAG dashboard is limited, and the ABS SDAC needs to be completed more frequently. The performance reporting provided on the NDIS by state is useful. There should be a predetermined schedule for evaluation of the NDIS and relevant policies.

*General comments:*

The NDA can still be highly relevant by articulating reform and policy directions with the NDIS in place.

Australia should aim to be a fully inclusive society, where people with disability can actually fulfil their potential without continuously fighting against a wide range of barriers (personal, social, economic, political). We need to see mainstream services actually understand what it is to be disabled, and provide services on the terms of those with disability, not on the terms of the service. People with disability need real employment opportunities where they are valued, not tokenistic employment where they are accommodated. There is enormous value in the understanding people

with disability have about living with a disability; lived experience cannot be taught. People with disability also offer enormous value in their ability to adapt, and to be resilient. These are skills needed in the workforce, and not just in the disability sector. We need people with disability not to simply sit on advisory groups, or attend consultations, or make submissions to reviews such as this one. We need, and should have, people with disability in jobs where they are providing value and making a difference; we need to orient towards concepts like independence and proper jobs.

Another aspect of the PC review should be looking at data. There needs to be a better understanding and agreement on who is collecting what data and for what purpose, and how it is being shared with the sector and the Australian public. Evidence based policy needs good data, and most importantly, for that data to be shared and discussed more widely.