



Closing the Gap Dashboard and Annual Data Compilation Report

Public webinar transcript

Commissioner Selwyn Button: Morning everyone. Thanks to many of you who have taken the time out to jump online today, to join our public forum in relation to the latest Close the Gap Information repository.

My name is Selwyn Button. I'm a Gungarri man from western Queensland, based in Brisbane in Meanjin and I'll be one of the presenters today joined by three of my colleagues (who are on the screen) who will also be presenting. I've got Nat Siegel-Brown, my fellow Commissioner, Andrew McDonald and Amanda Meric, who will be going through some of the data for us in the repository.

Before we kick off, I'll start by acknowledging country that we're all located on, I'm in Brisbane, Meanjin on the lands of the Jagera and Turrbal people and I acknowledge their ancestry and connection to this Country for thousands of years. And we acknowledge the Country everyone else is located on and hope everyone's having a nice day, particularly the guys in Perth that have dialed in for an early start as well. Thank you.

To outline today's presentation, we'll start with an overview of the Commission's role in the Closing the Gap National Agreement, developments that have occurred in relation to the latest Annual Data Compilation Report and the dashboard, and the key messages that are coming out [in the data], and relevance to the Closing the Gap Review that was completed and published in February earlier this year. It's a quick snapshot of how all of these things are connected.

Public accountability underpins our role in undertaking the three yearly reviews of performance against Closing the Gap National Agreement, and we also prepare the Annual Data Compilation Reports, which is what we'll talk about today.

In addition to that we have the responsibility of maintaining the dashboard, to make sure that when we're doing the reviews, the data is still relevant, and that people can access, track, and see performance: what that looks like against the 19 indicators; what we're doing to ensure that the dashboard is up to date; provides relevant information that people can use; and outlines work underway, including some pieces that we are yet to start.

As you'll see on the screen, there is an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led review, which is yet to commence, that will be a complimentary piece for the Productivity Commission's review. This ensures the views of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are part of the process - the government review as well as the community-controlled review.

Some developments that you'll see in the 2024 ADCR include



- the addition of some historical and ongoing contextual information, which recognise the contributions and resilience of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.
- the report is now written and developed with a thematic approach to reporting the outcomes, showing the interconnectedness between the outcomes.
- we've provided a clearer picture of data and availability and gaps, noting that there are still some pieces of the puzzle that are missing around gaps.

There's some work that's happening at Joint Council, and certainly in the conversations that have been going on through the Partnership Working Group, to focus on those data gaps. Reporting currently presents a partial picture, noting that there's still some pieces that are missing throughout the process which are being progressed between the Coalition of Peaks, NIAA and other parties to the Agreement.

We will outline some of the developments in the July dashboard update as well. So if we look at where we're at and what you'll see online - the live updates include a bit of a deep dive into some of these (that Amanda and Andrew will walk us through a little bit later).

The dashboard contains additional context for eight socio-economic targets: life expectancy, healthy babies, early childhood education, adult incarceration, youth justice, child protection. This provides contextualised information on the dashboard, showing how those issues contribute more broadly and the interconnectedness between the two [socio-economic outcomes and contextual information]. The report and dashboard take a more holistic view, leaning on the work of Pat Dudgeon and others, looking at what is holistic wellbeing for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. We'll explore the themes on, to show the interconnectedness.

We've also got some new artwork that you'll see on the report and in the background of the presenters today. The artist that was engaged by the Productivity Commission is Lani Balzan and the work that she produced for the Commission is showing some of the pathways to progress. There are three pieces that we'll adopt over the next three years to show progress. You can learn a little bit more about Lani's artwork on the website - the Commission will be using that for consistency of messaging and branding for the report over the next three years.

Now, there's been some progress and setbacks. Of the 15 socio-economic targets that have data available to assess those areas, we're seeing five targets that are showing good improvement and are on track. There are five targets that are showing small improvement but are not on track. One target shows no change from the baseline. Four targets are worsening, and four targets that still cannot be assessed because we still haven't landed on data definitions and agreed consistency around collecting [data].

Nat will do a bit of a deep dive into some of those targets so you get an idea of what that looks like.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown: Thanks Sel and hello everybody. I too am coming from the lands of the Jagera and Turrbal people, and I'd like to honour connection to Country, and land, and



community, and identity, on the Country that I'm on and to all of the countries that you're coming from today.

A number of you have asked [in the Q&A] whether the presentation will be available after this session.

Yes, the slides and a recorded version of the webinar will be available online that can be accessed at any time.

The next two slides capture the major outcome areas under which we've themed the data.

Five of the targets show good improvement and are on track. They are healthy birth weight, preschool enrolment, land subject to Indigenous rights and interests, Sea area subject to Indigenous rights and interests, and employment.

Five targets show improvement since the first year we measured them, but are not on track to reach the aspired goal by 2031. They are life expectancy, attainment of year 12, tertiary education, youth employment, and appropriate housing (overcrowding).

One target shows no change since the baseline year. On this point, two targets have improved since last year, but another has changed to being as bad as it was at the baseline when governments agreed to improve it, which is children and young people overrepresented in youth detention. We can talk a bit more about that later.

Four of the targets are worsening, they are: the rate of suicide, children developmentally on track, children who've been removed from their family in child protection systems, and adults who are imprisoned. I'll speak to these issues a little bit more.

There are four that cannot be assessed and they are: the prevalence and incidence of family violence, people receiving basic essential services, the number of Aboriginal languages spoken, and digital inclusion. That's because there is no data available to show progress or we haven't received any of the data since the first time they were measured.

There is some improvement across all of the socio-economic areas of disadvantage, but people will rightly ask whether it's enough. I'm going to jump into the detail of each of these now.

The first one is very positive news, the target for babies of a healthy birth weight is on track to be met by 2031. However, the life expectancy gap between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and non-Indigenous people is not on track to close by 2031. Life expectancy is one of the targets that we can only update every five years. So there will be one more update prior to reaching the end of the target period. Tragically, the rate of suicide among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people has increased since the baseline year, and the most recent data is showing that suicide is still the leading cause of death for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 15 to 39. That statistic is from 2022, which is the most recent data set. I want to pause on that



statistic because what that means is that in 2022, 212 Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander people across NSW, Queensland, WA, SA and the NT, which are the only jurisdictions which we acquired data, took their own lives. The rate of suicide is hard enough to hear, let alone that it's increased from 174 people to 212 people. There are human beings behind each of those numbers.

The next section, families and kids, shows the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people in the child protection system, as well as the issues relating to family violence. This is where we continue to see persistent overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in the child protection system. People may already be making a link between the statistics and the lack of progress around government interventions, or lack of interventions in some of these areas and how that impacts some of the other statistics around taking of one's life, and family safety.

Education and training is one area where we are continuing to see more positive signs across the board. The only target updated in the Annual Data Compilation Report is target 3: Enrolment before full time schooling and early childhood education. There's definitely been an increase in this since we last reported the data. The report notes that enrolment cannot be interpreted as an indicator of engagement or attendance. Attendance is something we are looking at reporting soon. The enrolment statistic is over 100% because the administrative data we receive on enrolments, and the estimated population of Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander children don't quite match, which is likely because the count for the Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander population of children and young people is an undercount, which is going to be rectified by the ABS in our next report.

Of the remaining themes, there's two areas I want to draw your attention to, which are the justice theme which captures adult incarceration, and youth justice - targets 10 and 11. Progress is worsening almost consistently across the board, noting we're only reporting targets at a national level because that's what the agreement requires. Progress can be different at the jurisdictional level, which sometimes means that one jurisdiction is compensating for a lack of progress, or a regression in another. Both of these targets are consistently worse in almost every jurisdiction. The number of adults in prison is continuing to grow rather than decline, which is an increase from both the previous year, and the baseline year, which shows how far we're regressing from the target which seeks a reduction of 15% by 2031. We're also reporting an increase in the proportion of Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander young people in detention. The latest data means the target is no longer on track and there has been no change in overrepresentation since the baseline year of 2018-19. There was an improvement [in youth detention rates] last year, but the rates have now gone backwards. Finally, we are seeing positive outcomes in relation to targets 15A and 15B, which is the relationship of Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander people around interest and rights to land and waters. For the first time, sea country is subject to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rights and interests is on track to be met as well as the land subject to Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander rights and interests.

As mentioned earlier, the targets are reported at a national level under the agreement, but it's important that we explore the jurisdictional level, noting that jurisdictional statistics can still mask



what's going on at the regional, and community level. Our assessments of state and territory progress is limited to [a status of] improved, worsened, or remained unchanged. We are continuing to have conversations about how we can start to disaggregate this data to the lowest aggregate level, as committed to by governments in the national agreement.

Jurisdictional progress is included as an appendix to the report. There are improvements in outcomes for most targets in the majority of states, except for the NT, which shows improvement for about half. However, the justice and the child protection targets show the most worsening across the board.

Note, the tyranny of the aggregate often hides some of the really important detail, and these aggregate headline results are only part of the story. Progress [against the agreement] is always reported nationally, and overlooks the different experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in regions and local communities. The local experience can look diametrically different to the national and even state or territory level experience. The report includes disaggregated data to provide more insights into some of the outcomes for different population groups, highlighting areas of progress (and where greater effort is needed), however does not include a regional or community breakdown.

Also included in the report are supporting indicators. Supporting indicators provide a more informed picture of the elements that contribute to the progress against the targets. There are 10 new indicators in the current Annual Data Compilation Report. Supporting indicators measure the factors that significantly impact progress against the target and provide important contextual information about the experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. For some, data is available more frequently than for the headline targets, which contributes to our understanding of progress.

Reporting is yet to achieve a full picture of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander lives and experiences. We currently only report on 31 out of the 164 supporting indicators included in the national agreement, which is only a portion of those outlined in the agreement itself. We are working with the parties to the agreement to develop the supporting indicators to expand the range of indicators that are reported on each year. This requires a lot of effort on both sides, including jurisdictions making that data available. Additional work is also underway between government and the community to progress another 150 data development items that are outlined in the Closing the Gap data development plan.

Unfortunately, it's still not possible to assess progress for every target, due to data not being available or at the frequency needed. The targets that are reported every five years include: life expectancy, education, youth engagement and housing.

In addition to frequency, there are also issues with the quality and the availability of data, and gaps in what type of data is provided. Since the Annual Data Compilation Report was published the first



time (in 2021), progress has not been assessed for four of the 19 targets, and additional to that, an update on progress for seven of the targets has only occurred once.

Of the four targets for which we do not have the data to assess progress against, such as family violence, issues preventing reporting include: a lack of an appropriate data source, regularity of survey intervals, or a lack of information about whether the data will be available again. Importantly, we are still waiting for data sources to be developed to report on the Priority Reforms, which was a focus area in our three-yearly review.

As many will know, the four Priority Reforms are considered to be the levers that, once implemented, should support a big change in the targets. More information is included in the PC three yearly review. It's pleasing to see that Joint Council, which includes all jurisdictions, recently announced that they've accepted 15 out of the 16 recommendations we made in that review. Of these, two relate to the wording of the Priority Reforms, specifically, sharing power and updating Priority Reform 1 to be related to self-determination and, adapting Priority Reform 4 to capture Indigenous data sovereignty and Indigenous data governance. Also recommended are actions that support implementation to move action from of a "static business as usual" process that was apparent in the review. We understand there is some work progressing the Priority Reform data development and that a draft measurement framework and recommended indicators have been submitted to NIAA. The three yearly review also recommends the Independent Mechanism, originally designed to assess progress and hold governments accountable for Priority Reform 3, should be used to hold governments accountable against all four of the Priority Reforms. This will be a critical source of data and information and qualitative input into how governments are performing against each of those four Priority Reforms, and we were very pleased to see governments accepting the comments we made as to the scope and 'punch' that mechanism would need to have.

Andrew will now take us through how to access the data, use and interpret it.

Andrew McDonald: Thanks. Before I start, Natalie, we'll respond to a couple of the questions that have come through.

Commissioner Selwyn Button: Thanks for the questions that are coming through. We will try to answer the majority of the questions through the data presentation and check at the end to make sure we cover them off. Thanks Andrew.

Andrew McDonald: Thanks Selwyn, and good morning, everyone. I'd like to acknowledge that I am on Bunurong/Boon Wurrung Country and beautiful lands to the south of Melbourne and I'd like to acknowledge the custodians, the land and the leaders past, present and emerging.

I'll outline the dashboard: the landing page, the assessment pages for the Priority Reforms and the target or socio-economic outcome areas. There is also the Annual Data Compilation Report, which



is a fabulous report that really helps to explain some of the logic within the agreement, how the data fits together, and provides some of that written context.

[Before I start] There was a question about some of the shorthand included in some of the slides:

Question: "What do we mean by SEO 1?"

A: SEO 1 is the socio-economic outcome area 1, long and healthy lives. The other question was about SEO 11 which is youth justice. My apologies for using shorthand in the slides.

Another question was about the suicide data, and when the data for Victoria should be available.

A: The ABS has worked with the jurisdictions to determine which data sets have sufficient data quality checks to ensure it's suitable for use in the national data sets. Up until now, they've not used the Victorian data, but we understand that there are discussions underway between the ABS and Victorian Government. We're hopeful that soon the Victorian data will be included, but we'll wait for that to come through from the ABS and Victorian Government.

Amanda will now talk about socio-economic outcome area 2.

Amanda Meric: Thanks, Andrew. I just wanted to say that I'm a Trawlwoolway woman and I am grateful and privileged to work on the lands of the Wurundjeri people of the Kulin Nation.

Now we'll head into the dashboard. Socio-economic outcome area 2 is Aboriginal and Torres Islander children are born healthy and strong. The target to achieve that outcome is to increase the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Islander babies with a healthy birth weight to 91% by 2031. We measure the baseline for this target using 2017 data and update the progress annually. The latest year for our assessment of progress is 2021, and of the 18,539 Aboriginal and Torres Islander children born that year, 89.6% were of a healthy birth weight. This is up from 88.8 in 2017, which is the baseline year, and is on track to be met. In addition to the target information, there are also supporting indicators that provide context to the drivers of the outcomes, which are: smoking during pregnancy, and the use of antenatal care. Also available are historical and ongoing contexts, which help improve cultural safety and provide a comprehensive understanding of the data itself. The contexts are strength based, they prioritise literature and research by Aboriginal and Torres Islander authors, and centre Aboriginal and Torres Islander perspectives. We believe that the context provides a valuable addition to the dashboard, and the ADCR. Thanks Andrew.

Andrew McDonald: Thank you, Amanda. To answer one of the queries about whether we have state and territory assessments on the dashboard, yes we do.

On the target pages, we show the national results and provide a brief summary of the national results. There's also an assessment for the states and territories below the figure, and the main target pages can be adjusted to show an individual jurisdiction. The assessment for states and territories, is whether this orange line, which is the trend from the baseline year, is improving, flat



(no change) or worsening. It will depend on the target whether an increase is an improvement or a worsening.

Outcome 11 - Aboriginal young people, not overrepresented in the criminal justice system, includes a target to reduce the rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people in detention by at least 30%. Progress since the baseline year (2018-19), shows an initial decrease, which is an improvement in the rate, followed by more recent increases. Overall, the trend line is flat which means there's been no change from the baseline. It's also important to look at what's driving these changes, and for this, we have supporting indicators:

Children 10 to 13 years, first coming into contact with the justice system, including four measures, age child first enters youth detention, age child first entered youth supervision, which includes community supervision as well as youth detention, proportion of children aged 10 to 13 that first appear in criminal courts, and their first interactions with the police and police proceedings.

Young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' interaction with police includes: when first proceeded against by police, how many times proceeded against by the police (once, twice, or three or more times), and whether or not proceedings lead to a court or a non-court action. Importantly, for each of the targets reported, the disaggregations might include by sex or by age group. You can see the results by Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander, non-Indigenous for each of the particular states.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown: Thanks Andrew, we have many great questions in the chat, thank you.

Question about out-of-home care stats and whether placement with a relative is considered out of home care. The answer is yes, kin-care if formally registered, is considered a form of out of home care. The three types of care that we refer to are: kin care, foster care and residential care. Sadly, residential care is also vastly overrepresented.

Question about whether the birth weight stats were compared with the non-Indigenous population? Not all targets are compared with non-Indigenous people. Some are about the outcomes and aspirations of Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander people for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The healthy birth weight statistic of 91 percent represents the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. There are some areas on the dashboard that include a separate tab for non-Indigenous people to see the rates for non-Indigenous people as well.

I also can see that people are really interested in the disaggregation of data by geographic location. As agreement between the parties comes together on the most appropriate reporting for geographic disaggregations of data (how it will be done) which is part of the data development agreement or plan, we will absolutely be reporting on that data. I will ask Andrew to show later why there's no youth justice data for Victoria. There are some jurisdictions which don't have any data, which we are working with the parties to rectify. It's an ongoing issue.



Question about what is the theory of change or logic behind how we are going to change these outcomes? What is the road map for change? This really dives straight into the heart of our three yearly review, because what we found that a lot of implementation plans by jurisdictions include up to 70% of existing actions. There is no theory of change that outlines exactly how governments have thought deeply about where they are today in relation to the four Priority Reforms, that represent huge change processes in and of themselves and are vital to changing the outcomes. Our review found that where the four Priority Reforms were in action, where government behaviour against the four Priority Reforms were in place (in isolated pockets), we saw targets being exceeded and often exceeded in a way that outperformed outcomes for non-Indigenous communities. Interestingly, one that I personally observed to be the most fundamental to change is shared decision making, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-led scoping of the issue, defining of the problem, right through to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander led solution and Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander designed indicators for success.

Our report was based around the things that governments need to do to move away from a business as usual approach, and start modelling that road map for change. We were rapt that 15 out of the 16 actions from our four major recommendations have been accepted and we are looking forward to seeing how quickly and how thoroughly they are implemented.

Question about whether PWG should be responsible for theory of change.

A joint government approach to theory of change is important, however jurisdictions need to arrive at theories of change across their government, including each agency of that jurisdiction.

Thank you for engaging so deeply. If you have any questions that have been missed, we can engage directly or we can also come and speak to your organisation or group, or answer specific questions. Of the remaining questions, there are about 30 or 40 questions oriented around themes. So I'll try and link into the themes of those questions rather than addressing individual questions per se. Please feel free to email us anything specifically. We're more than keen to help and keep the conversation going.

Question about actions underway by the states and territories to address the data gaps and the role of the Productivity Commission in engaging with states and territories to address those data gaps?

A: We are working hard with our counterparts (the parties to the agreement) to continue to increase the number of supporting indicators that are reported against. While a number of intragovernmental decisions are made about reporting of data, the reporting of that data is an obligation under the agreement. The PC are pushing for improvements, noting the challenges of presenting a skewed approach if only some jurisdictions are reporting and not others.

Question about the link between government action and improvement in the targets



A: In volume one of our 3 yearly review, released in February, we delve really deeply into this because we consistently heard from many over the 18 months of our three yearly review that those Priority Reforms are considered to be the leavers for change. We are seeing awesome changes and outcome for communities in the pockets where the Priority Reforms are in action. Gaps are closing, and they're closing fast in those places.

Question about where to find a disaggregation of data by states and territories.

A: The PC website CtG dashboard area should provide some of that disaggregation.

Question about the connection between some of the SEO's, such as children in out-of-home care, family violence, incarceration rates.

A: Undoubtedly huge, huge links with those. What we've tried to do within the report is talk about what those links look like, and as best we can, centre Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives on what those linkages are. We hope that some of these linkages and data will also help you make the case where you are for things that need to change. We have been frank in our recent review about the fact that a number of states and territories have actively contravened commitments around reducing over incarceration, for example in youth detention by enacting policies and legislative changes which only serve to increase those numbers, when we know a lot of the issues also lie within the child protection system, [such as] the lack of application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, you'll find a lot of this, both within the context section of our ADCR as well as in the report itself.

This connects to some of the questions about whether we feel as a Commission, the Priority Reforms will lead to change. We are hopeful that some of the measurement items will come forward soon for those Priority Reforms. The Priority Reforms aren't something that can be solely measured by quantitative data and we need to reflect the experience on the ground. One of the points in our report about the independent mechanism is that it should have a function that takes complaints in real time from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people about government behaviour, or a hearings function, to be able to inquire into these things, because all of that provides context around the experience of where the Priority Reforms are in action, and often that will have a very distinct deliverable or impact on the socio-economic outcome areas.

Question about specific links between health risk factor data and smoking during pregnancy, and another question about whether there are offence trends for the increasing incarceration rates?

Andrew McDonald: The birth weight data does come from the publication the AIHW prepare - the national perinatal data collection. Included with every page we report is a target data specification or the indicator data specifications, which provide a link to the original data source.

For the offence classifications question, we don't have that data on the dashboard. I'm sure they're available in the ABS data if you wanted to search there.



Question about regional information

A: While we don't always have all of the detail on the dashboard for the regional information that we'd like to have, there are links to the AIHW regional information for Indigenous communities. They present a number of the Close the Gap targets to regional areas. The ABS data by region is something similar. Where we can't provide everything on the dashboard, further information is available through the links we provide.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown: Andrew, there's another question here about whether there's any data for cultural health indicators. Is that on the plan for supporting indicators or data development?

Andrew McDonald: We're very much guided or directed by what's in the National Agreement, set out by the Coalition of Peaks and the governments to determine what they want to have reported on the dashboard. I don't believe that is specifically planned for the dashboard in the short term, but it's something that we can keep in mind and further discussions with the parties.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown: Great, I'm going to try and answer a couple of more questions quickly, but if you want to shoot through any further questions to us, the email address is ctg.data@pc.gov.au

Question about whether we are considering hospitalisation data to support the family violence indicators.

A: Yes, refer to the dashboard or the ADCR for hospitalisation data. However, it's really important to remember that hospitalisation data is not a measurement of family violence, and that's important for a couple of reasons. As we know, family violence extends well beyond physical violence, it doesn't cover emotional abuse, financial abuse, spiritual abuse, all the other known factors. Even reporting data can be very vexed, police reporting data because we know that an increase in police reports can either mean that there is an increased trust level in reporting, or it could mean increased prevalence. Self-reported data has often been taken as the most reliable of prevalence and incidence of family violence, and that's certainly been the case with things like the ABS's Personal Safety Survey etc. However, unfortunately, there's been some real issues with the data collection for Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander people in terms of using culturally safe methods, and that requires a lot of trust as well. So we wouldn't suggest that the hospitalisation data should be taken as indicative of prevalence and incidence. But it is there if you are looking for it.

Question about whether we'll be comparing not just data by jurisdiction, but against regional versus urban, hinterland versus other areas.

A: At the moment we provide some disaggregation between remote and not remote, but we haven't been able to acquire sufficient data to break it down by much more than that. This is a commitment within the agreement, parties have signed up to disaggregating the data a lot more



than just at the jurisdictional level, which is something that is still very much a work in progress for us with the parties.

Andrew McDonald: There was a question about whether or when we might be measuring the Priority Reforms. We understand that the governments and the Coalition of Peaks are doing work to progress that, so we are hopeful that we may get some guidance over the next 12 months and we may see some reporting on that soon.

Commissioner Selwyn Button:

Question in relation to the Priority Reforms and are the Priority Reforms still the underlying basis for the implementation of the Closing the Gap National Agreement.

A: Yes, where we have seen success and where we're seeing significant improvement in some of the outcomes that we've talked about has been as a result of the implementation of Priority Reforms; where there is there is codesign, and funding that's attached. Governments are handing over power for decisions to be made by Community Controlled Organisations and data is being shared; where all of those elements are happening and are occurring, we can see pockets of success and significant improvements. That's why it's still important to focus back on where the Priority Reforms and how we measure those and as Andrew alluded to, there's conversations happening at PWG and other places about how best to measure the Priority Reform implementation over time as well.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown Question about whether the Closing the Gap Commonwealth Partnership stock take conducted by the NIAA feeds into this data.

Andrew McDonald:

A: We'll refer back to an earlier slide presented on the infrastructure around the reporting where we provide some of the baseline data and the three yearly review of the Closing the Gap. Jurisdictions are responding to that and doing their own annual data compilation or their own annual reports and their implementation plans, which I think the partnership stock-take leads into that side of it. Note, it's not a direct link between the partnership stock-take and the data that we're reporting, but it's part of the infrastructure so it does feedback in through that.

Commissioner Natalie Siegel-Brown Thanks, Andrew. Thank you everybody for your attention on a Monday morning. We really appreciate it and thank you to colleagues in WA who started a bit early to jump in online as well. Please stay engaged, we're really happy to keep talking to anyone. The email that address is ctg.data@pc.gov.au. Feel free to ask us to come and have a chat with you. We look forward to engaging with you further through our continued work in this area.

Commissioner Selwyn Button: Thanks guys.