



# **COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND SERVICES COMMITTEE**

**Members present:**

Ms CP McMillan MP—Chair  
Mr SA Bennett MP  
Mr MC Berkman MP  
Ms CL Lui MP  
Dr MA Robinson MP  
Mr RCJ Skelton MP (virtual)

**Staff present:**

Ms L Pretty—Committee Secretary  
Ms R Mills—Assistant Committee Secretary

## **PUBLIC BRIEFING—CONSIDERATION OF AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT NO. 1 OF 2022-23 TITLED *DELIVERING SOCIAL HOUSING SERVICES***

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**MONDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2022**

**Brisbane**

## MONDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2022

---

### **The committee met at 10.02 am.**

**CHAIR:** Good morning, everybody. I declare open the public hearing for the committee’s consideration of Auditor-General’s report No. 1 of 2022-23 titled *Delivering social housing services*. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet this morning and pay our respects to elders past and present. I also acknowledge that we are very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, whose lands, winds and waters we all share. I acknowledge my colleague Cynthia Lui, the member for Cook, as the first Torres Strait Islander elected to the Queensland parliament.

On 12 July 2022, Auditor-General’s report No. 1 of 2022-23 titled *Delivering social housing services* was tabled in the Legislative Assembly. The report was subsequently referred to the Community Support and Services Committee on 18 August 2022. The purpose of today’s hearing is to assist the committee with its examination of this report.

My name is Corrine McMillan. I am the member for Mansfield and chair of the committee. With me here today are: Mr Stephen Bennett, the member for Burnett and deputy chair; Mr Michael Berkman, the member for Maiwar; Ms Cynthia Lui, the member for Cook, whom I have mentioned; and Dr Mark Robinson, the member for Oodgeroo. Mr Robert Skelton, the member for Nicklin, is on the line.

The committee’s proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of this parliament. The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament’s website. Media may be present and will be subject to my direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present today should note that it is possible you might be filmed or photographed during the proceedings by media and that images may also appear on the parliament website or social media pages. I ask everyone present to turn mobile phones off or to silent mode. Only the committee and invited officers may participate in the proceedings. As parliamentary proceedings under the standing orders, any person may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the chair or by order of the committee. I also ask that any responses to questions taken on notice today are provided to the committee by close of business on Friday, 21 October 2022.

I now welcome representatives from the Queensland Audit Office who have been invited to brief the committee.

**FLEMMING, Mr Patrick, Assistant Auditor-General, Queensland Audit Office**

**NATH, Mrs Mayus, Director, Queensland Audit Office**

**WORRALL, Mr Brendan, Auditor-General, Queensland Audit Office**

**CHAIR:** Good morning, Auditor-General, and thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to be with us. I invite you to make a brief opening statement, after which I am sure our committee members will have many questions for you.

**Mr Worrall:** Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to brief the committee on the report *Delivering social housing services*. Social and economic factors are driving an increased demand for social housing. The number of approved applicants on the housing register has grown by 78 per cent over the past four years to 31 March 2022. We examined whether the Department of Communities, Housing and Digital Economy is effectively managing social housing to meet the needs of vulnerable Queenslanders.

We found the department’s current processes to manage the housing register are not effective and, therefore, it needs to take a multifaceted approach to improve its systems and processes. The department’s process for assessing housing needs focuses on individual circumstances. Since 2019, the department has classified all new applicants as ‘very high need’. The department has not effectively communicated this approach to the public. Many applicants—and by that I mean the 11,897 applicants on the register—were in the lower need groups and were deemed to be uncontactable by the department or had inactive applications. These applicants are unlikely to be

allocated social housing. Also, around one in five applications that we examined did not correctly record an applicant’s needs and half were missing a record of an internal check before an approval and allocation.

The department does not forecast future housing needs in Queensland or forecast what the register will look like in the coming years. It does not model how changes in the cost of living and rising rents might impact the demand for social housing. This is necessary to better inform its response to housing pressures.

The department does not consistently apply its processes to allocate social housing. Around one in five allocations that we examined did not record a preallocation check. This check is an important requisite step to confirm if an applicant’s needs have changed since they were first approved for social housing.

Some applicants on the register have circumstances that require urgent social housing. Each of the 17 housing service centres prioritise these applicants for allocations using separate local lists. There is no central process to monitor applicants for priority allocation and the department does not have visibility of those lists. This creates a risk that applicants may be treated inconsistently across the 17 housing centres.

According to the department’s records, around 8,430 social housing dwellings have two or more spare bedrooms. The department does not require tenants to relocate to smaller housing that better aligns with their needs. It advised that it works with tenants to encourage them to move where appropriate. The department does not have structured processes to proactively identify tenants who could transition out of social housing with the right support. This could free housing for applicants on the register.

The department has planned new social housing builds in the areas of current high need. The 6,365 builds planned to commence by 2025 will help increase the supply but will not be enough to meet demand.

The committee may benefit from hearing from the department, including on its progress in implementing our recommendations. We welcome questions from the committee.

**Mr BENNETT:** Mr Worrall, in your opening you mentioned that since 2019 all client assessments were deemed ‘very high need’. Can you elaborate on what the changes were from 2019 in making all applicants ‘very high need’? It was 11,000-odd, I think I heard you say. The number is not that important.

**Mr Worrall:** There were 11,897 in the lower need groups. They are not ‘very high need’. They are in the ones in the lower needs groups who cannot be contacted. I think that is what I said.

**Mr BENNETT:** To clarify my question, since 2019 the Social Housing Register changed and they started making everyone ‘very high need’. Do you know what those changes were?

**Mr Worrall:** I will get Mayus to talk about those. The register did not change, per se. The register is still the register and I think the register as it was at the point of those changes has not changed. I think what did change was only adding people to the register after that date who met the criteria of ‘very high need’. Prior to that, there were other people on the register who did not have very high needs. They were in lower needs groups but they were on the register. The change that happened from 2019 is that only people with very high needs went on to the register, if that makes sense.

**Mr BENNETT:** Yes, thank you.

**Mr Worrall:** I will get Mayus to talk about the change in the criteria that happened in 2019.

**Mrs Nath:** In speaking with the department, they have mentioned to us that they have not changed the criteria; they have only changed the way they are working. Instead of having people in low, moderate and high need categories, they are now just using one category, which is ‘very high need’. At the time of our audit they were in the process of contacting people who are not in the ‘very high need’ category and they were reviewing their applications and they were making their assessments and they were assessing them against the post-2019 criteria that they have published.

In the post-2019 criteria, the department’s explanation is that they have explained the non-financial and complex wellbeing criteria in more detail so that it is easier for social housing officers to map people’s needs to the more detailed criteria, which was a little bit high level in the pre-2019 days. On that basis, they have mentioned that they have not changed the criteria; however, they have changed the way that they are now recording people on the register, so all people who are approved to have social housing will be in a ‘very high need’ category.

**Mr BENNETT:** Thanks for clarifying.

**CHAIR:** Mr Worrall, you make some critique of the department of housing in their work around managing public housing in Queensland. We know that many of the factors that contribute to the impact on social housing are unforeseen. In many cases, many of us cannot predict the global economic climate that emerges, things such as COVID-19 or many of the other moving criteria or aspects of those requiring social housing. Could you help me understand how the department of housing could have better predicted some of the global forces that are not within our control?

**Mr Worrall:** Even putting aside those events of the last 2½ years, the department did not seek to forecast housing needs. I would have thought, if you were managing a register of housing needs and trying to, as best as possible, meet needs, given the state is large and diverse, you would try to predict what future needs might be—given the range of reliable social indicators at a point of time, leaving the pandemic aside. They were not doing that. They have not sought to predict growth or demand through changes such as changes in interest rates, changes in employment rates—those sorts of normal, economic type indicators. Because that was not in place, things like the pandemic and rising interest rates have just compounded the social housing issues.

**CHAIR:** Not to disconsider the issue of migration to Queensland, there were a number of external factors that contributed to the context.

**Dr ROBINSON:** On the issue of stakeholders and feedback, the report states—

... key stakeholders have advised that they do not understand the department's needs categories.

Were these stakeholders interviewed as part of the audit, or was this conclusion made based on feedback from the department itself?

**Mr Worrall:** We would have interviewed stakeholders as part of the audit. That is pretty typical in our approach. We will go and talk to a range of stakeholders. That is where that feedback has come from.

**Dr ROBINSON:** Can you give us some insights into the kinds of stakeholders that provided that feedback?

**Mrs Nath:** We spoke with community housing service providers, Indigenous housing service providers and other industry service providers as well.

**Dr ROBINSON:** Were there any more specific patterns from those individual stakeholders? Without necessarily identifying anything particularly private, were there particular patterns of information or was it a little bit more specific to what each of those stakeholders provided? Maybe you could give us some examples.

**Mrs Nath:** Our questions were very much geared to the scope of our audit. We only talked about the Social Housing Register—the way it is managed, the way social applicants are referred to community housing service providers and how the interaction works with the department. The main pattern that we found in that space was around the department's explanation about the need categories, prioritisation and how the department makes the decision about referring clients to service providers. It was mostly centred around what we have put in the report.

**Ms LUI:** Mr Worrall, you mentioned in your opening address the high cost of living, focusing on individual circumstances in processing applications and so on. Did the audit look at geographical regions—urban centres compared to regional and remote communities? I think that needs to be taken into consideration because of the demand on housing in those centres with a lack of housing options.

**Mr Worrall:** We did in a couple of ways. Figure 6E talks about the location of planned new builds compared to the register demand. That goes from Cape York and Central Queensland all the way through to Wide Bay-Burnett. That is looking at the planned builds and the demands in those regions. In terms of the other perspective, which I think is in the appendices, we actually had some data on the waitlists across the regions. That is appendix D. That is actually quite interesting, the average time spent on the housing register. The Gold Coast has more than a three-year wait. The two shortest waits seem to be Mackay and Rockhampton-Gladstone-Emerald at almost a year and a quarter. There are different communities in between. Remote Indigenous community services have the second-longest wait of about 2.75 years, the average time someone would have spent on the register. Yes, we did put sort of a regional lens on it from both a supply and demand point of view and wait time.

**Mr BERKMAN:** With the secretariat's assistance, could I pass up a copy of this graph to the QAO representatives here?

**CHAIR:** The member for Maiwar, as a member of the committee, does not need to seek leave to table a document.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I am sure it is reasonably familiar to the QAO representatives here. That is essentially just the parliamentary library having plotted out the number of successful applicants added to the Social Housing Register over a period of around four years, from the 2018-19 financial year until the previous financial year. Most relevantly, it shows that end to any additional successful applicants in other than the 'very high needs' category. At the very end of that graph—you can see the numbers in March 2022—there is a very sharp decline which immediately follows the release of the QAO report in March 2022. Can you give the committee any indication of what has driven that decline in successful applicants to the housing register, acknowledging that it is after your report was published? Do you have any insights?

**Mr Worrall:** The last dataset we looked at for the report would have been up to 31 March 2022, as you indicated. We have not done any audit activity with datasets after that date. I think that is a question you could direct to the department in terms of what has happened after that. In our report, figure 6A tries to bring together public housing, community housing and the growth in the applications on the register since 2017-18 up until March 2022. You can see a growth in applications on the register, not really much movement in public housing and a bit of growth in community housing. That is pretty stable as well. Based on that, the historical demand is growing at a faster rate than the supply.

There was another graph in here where, given that the department does not try to predict what the growth will be, we tried to plot what we think the growth could be. We used very conservative figures—this is graph 4D—where we tried to project the growth in the housing register based on the historical increase from 2017-18. That historical increase would not really have necessarily factored in everything that has probably happened in the last little while. Of course, we see that growth projection continuing and continuing to sort of climb at a rate that would appear to be faster than what supply is going to be.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I am now looking at figure 4D. Your work suggests that there was nothing you could see that suggested there would be any decline in the number of people applying for social housing. Within that, we have no real explanation as to why the number of successful applicants would have declined so sharply since March?

**Mr Worrall:** No, I cannot comment about that at all. You would need to ask the director-general about what has happened there.

**CHAIR:** The response from the director-general stated that since 2020-21 the department had contacted 98 per cent of the households on the housing register to review their applications. Was this factored into the audit?

**Mr Worrall:** Yes, it would have been.

**Mrs Nath:** According to our records and at the time of our audit, the department was able to contact 69 per cent of the applicants. It is recorded in figure 4C in terms of how many applicants they were able to contact and those they were not able to contact.

**CHAIR:** I am just interested in the mismatch in those figures. Are you suggesting that 98 per cent of households were attempted to be contacted but that 69 per cent were successfully contacted?

**Mrs Nath:** That is our record as at that date. If there is a timing difference between when the department has provided the information then that could be—

**CHAIR:** It is really a point-in-time issue that led to the discrepancy?

**Mrs Nath:** It could be, yes.

**Mr BENNETT:** The report notes that the department is working with tenants to encourage them to move to smaller properties where appropriate. I think Mr Worrall alluded to that in his opening statement. In the report it says that this is a voluntary and ad hoc process. Are you able to tell the committee: is it happening on a broad scale or only in a small number of those housing service centres?

**Mrs Nath:** It was not a process that was followed consistently and methodically by all of the housing centres; it was a process where they would sometimes review a case and a candidate and they could speak to them about moving to different or more appropriate housing. This is why we have made that recommendation that this be a consistent and methodical process.

**Ms LUI:** Noting that the department has accepted all recommendations, are you satisfied with the time lines proposed by the department for the implementation of those recommendations?

**Mr Worrall:** Yes, we are supportive of those time lines. Chair, can I come back to your question about the two different percentages—what our report says and what the director-general says. Figure 4C in the report tries to break down the applicants on the register. Sixty-one per cent of those Brisbane

applicants are likely to be considered for a housing allocation, are very high need and are contactable. There is another eight per cent that are in lower need categories and contactable. I think that is where our 69 would come from. If you keep moving up that chart, there is 30 per cent who are very high need and uncontactable. Then there is eight per cent who have lower need categories and are uncontactable. Then there is another 10 per cent who are inactive. That in a way I think explains where our 69 per cent has come from: there is very high needs and contactable, lower need categories and contactable, and the rest are basically either inactive or uncontactable. You could clarify that with the director-general, but I think what the director-general is possibly saying there is that they have sought to contact 98 per cent of people on the register.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Mr Worrall.

**Ms LUI:** Do you consider that your recommendations can be implemented by the department within current staffing levels?

**Mr Worrall:** That is something you would probably need to ask the department. I am not privy to their exact staffing levels.

**Dr ROBINSON:** In terms of recommendations 7 and 8 of the report, which make reference to transitioning of suitable tenants away from social housing and into the private rental market, as part of the audit were any housing service centres undertaking these transition plans and conversations? Sorry if you have picked that up a little already.

**Mr Worrall:** I will get Mayus to talk a little bit more about that. The recommendation there is actually saying that, as a starting point, they need to review their tenancy arrangements. My understanding is that at the moment there is no requirement for you to be transitioned to something more suitable as your needs change over many years. There is actually no requirement to do that. We are saying that they need to go back and have a look at that, because the issue is: if there are 5,200 vacant bedrooms and demand is not feeding supply on the register, some of that space could be freed up for people on the register. What we are really saying is that they need to go back and reconsider whether that is an appropriate thing. Mayus can talk more about what she has experienced in terms of any activity encouraging people, under the existing framework, to move to smaller places.

**Mrs Nath:** The scope of our audit only touched that aspect of tenancy management very lightly because we were only looking at the Social Housing Register, the applications and the allocations process, but we did conduct some interviews. From that we have determined that the department, like Brendan just said, does not require people to move out or even have it in their tenancy agreement or have conversations in this time where they are having the conversations up-front to determine their needs to continue to have that throughout the tenancy. That is where our recommendation came from.

**Dr ROBINSON:** Excuse me if you have mentioned this figure and I have missed it, but did the audit identify how many of the tenants might be able to be supported to transition to either private rental or some sort of home ownership?

**Mr Worrall:** I think we identified the number of spare bedrooms, which may not equate to the number of tenants. It was 5,200, I think from memory, spare bedrooms. I think I might have mentioned that in my opening statement, actually. It is 8,430 social housing dwellings that have two or more spare bedrooms. That would not equate to 8,000 tenancies; it would be something less than that. Some might have one spare bedroom.

**Dr ROBINSON:** You do not have a figure on what that would be in terms of individuals?

**Mr Worrall:** No. The department probably would, but we do not have that figure.

**Ms LUI:** Mr Worrall, that is a really good point about the vacant bedrooms in homes. I will take you back to the point I made earlier about regional and remote communities, where I feel there is a huge gap in those communities because most of the houses are built for large families and so that cohort of a single parent with a small child is often overlooked in this space. What is your perspective on that for regional and remote communities? I just feel that with the low number of stocks that we currently have that specific cohort is always going to be overlooked.

**Mr Worrall:** My perspective is probably going through firsthand experience. Out of the Indigenous communities, I think I have visited all but three. It is probably easier to talk about the ones I have not been to, which are Doomadgee—and I am going there the end of this month—Pormpuraaw and Kowanyama. I have been to every other Indigenous community. Speaking to elected members in those communities, people in council and also community people, I think some of their housing situation is that some of those houses are actually overcrowded. They have two or three generations living in the one house. They might have 11 people living in a three-bedroom house and things like that.

I think what you are getting at—and you are probably quite right—is that a lot of the housing is the same sort of style, the same sort of size and not necessarily catering for the small families, like you have indicated. What I have picked up is that, if anything, there is overcrowding in some of those communities where there is, as I said, two or three generations living in the one house—it could be 11 people living in a three-bedroom house—but there is probably not a lot of different types of social housing. That is my impression when I have looked around these communities and seen the sorts of housing there. It all seems to be three- and four-bedroom type housing largely.

I did recently go to Mapoon, and I know that they have built some different style of housing there. I am not sure whether this was community housing, but they actually have short-term-needs housing that has been constructed in Mapoon very recently. I think it has probably only been finished this year, but I am not 100 per cent whether that is full social housing or whether that is something that the community has done off their own bat. Again, that is not for long-term needs; that is for short-term needs, from what I understand.

**Ms LUI:** Going off your point about people on the waiting register, I feel that their individual needs and circumstances often work against them in that if those types of dwellings are not available in the community it pushes them down the list of priority.

**Mr Worrall:** That is probably a question for the director-general, because some of that could explain the average time spent on a register. Earlier I indicated that the register for remote Indigenous community services is the second longest in length of time behind the Gold Coast. It is just under three years, I think, looking at that chart. That could actually play into that because, in that circumstance, if there is no suitable setting for those people, they are probably still on the register. You would need to ask the director-general more about that.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I wanted to return to the social housing eligibility criteria, if I could. Can I confirm very quickly that the social housing eligibility criteria is a single discrete document that exists at any point in time?

**Mr Worrall:** You will find that on the website.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Yes, that’s right. In your earlier answer, Mrs Nath, you referred to the post-2019 criteria. Is it also the case that that document, the social housing eligibility criteria, has changed since 2018 to reflect what is referred to in the report as the strengthened needs assessment?

**Mrs Nath:** That is correct.

**Mr BERKMAN:** That graph that I tabled before showing the drop to zero of any other than ‘very high needs’ applicants being added to the register is a direct consequence of that change to the document that is the strengthened needs assessment.

**Mrs Nath:** I would just like to clarify that point a little bit. The department now only uses the category called ‘very high need’. Anyone who gets approved for social housing will be recorded as ‘very high need’.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Just so I am clear, the social housing eligibility criteria are the criteria against which a person’s eligibility to go on the register is ascertained?

**Mrs Nath:** That is correct.

**Mr BERKMAN:** It is a change to that document, the social housing eligibility criteria, or related to that change is this shift to only adding ‘very high needs’ applicants to the register.

**Mr Worrall:** The change happened in 2019. You are quite right. From 2019 you were only put on that register if you had very high needs.

**Mrs Nath:** I will give just a little bit of clarification around that. I think if we can consider the eligibility criteria as one aspect, the other aspect is how you are recorded on the social housing register. Previous to 2019 the department was recording different levels of needs that people had: low, moderate, high, very high. Now the department does not have any other need categories at all. If you are eligible for social housing based on being assessed with this criteria, you will be recorded on the social housing register and the need category is going to be ‘very high need’. It is almost regardless, whether there is a need category or not.

**Mr BERKMAN:** In effect, what we have seen is a change to both the document—that is, the social housing eligibility criteria—and the way the department is recording successful applicants on the register?

**Mrs Nath:** That is correct. I will give just a point of clarification about the criteria. Prior to 2018 there was a criteria called ‘appropriateness’ criteria. From 2019 to date, that same criteria is now more detailed and is headed as ‘wellbeing’ criteria.

**Mr BERKMAN:** The report notes that the department has not been doing work to forecast the likely growth in the register and social housing needs in the community. Has there been any amount of work done to assess how much housing would be required? The question almost answers itself. In the absence of that forecasting, has there been any work done to forecast how much housing would be required to meet the need?

**Mr Worrall:** I think that is borne out in figure 6A. Figure 6A shows the applications on the register, it shows the number of public housing and the number of community housing—actually, it is probably not 6A; it is probably in that projected growth one that shows the shortfall. That 40 that you are referring to shows what we think is going to be the shortfall based on our projection, which was a conservative projection. It was not really factoring in things that have happened in the last 12 to 18 months in terms of affordability, interest rates, rising rents and those sorts of things.

**Mr BERKMAN:** To be clear, by most of those measures, be that interest rates, vacancy rates for rentals, rent increases or the scale of the housing affordability crisis, it has only increased over that period that you have not factored in?

**CHAIR:** I think that is speculative. I think we need to ask Mr Worrall a definitive question rather than a question that may speculate.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I am asking a question about discrete measures—I have named them: specifically, interest rates, rental vacancy rates, rents themselves. Those measures have all worsened over time and exacerbated the housing affordability crisis in that 12 to 18 months that you have said has not been factored into your projections; is that correct?

**Mr Worrall:** Sorry, I was reading something. Can you repeat the question, please?

**Mr BERKMAN:** Absolutely. The measures that I mentioned just a moment ago all increased or further exacerbated the extent of the housing affordability crisis over that 12 to 18 months that you have not factored into your projections.

**Mr Worrall:** Yes, the projections we put in the report were just based on historical trends from 2017-18. If things were happening in more recent years they are probably not really fully factored in in those projections.

**CHAIR:** Mr Worrall, does everybody who makes application to the register regardless of need join the register? Secondly, does your report reflect on and consider the transient nature of Queenslanders?

**Mr Worrall:** I will try to answer the second part of the question and I will get Mayus to answer the first part. In terms of the transient nature, probably not specifically, but I think if you are getting at migration to the state, some of those would have been reflected in those historical trends. Some of that would have played into growing needs. I think net migration has ramped up in the last one or two years, but I think that would have played into that. Perhaps in some of the appendices where I am showing the wait times across various parts of the state, there might be some play into that from people wanting to live in places like the Gold Coast as opposed to south-west Queensland, for example. I am not casting any aspersions on south-west Queensland, but a lot of people want to live near the beach and that sort of thing. That could be some of it.

**CHAIR:** I was interested to see the Gold Coast as the second highest number requiring. I wondered about, one, the transient nature, and two, the preferred location, but more so the fact that it is the closest community to the border around movement.

**Mr Worrall:** The department might have some figures where they could talk about the population growth rates in those regions. That would be another way to see how those numbers might be impacted.

**CHAIR:** The first aspect was: does everyone who makes application join the register?

**Mrs Nath:** No. Only if you are approved for social housing will you be on the register. Sometimes when people's applications are not complete, the department may put them on the register and ask for more information. We have made a recommendation that those people not be recorded as approved for social housing and published online so that you can see a correct picture of how many people have been approved for social housing to be on the register.

**CHAIR:** The low-need applicants will still join the register?

**Mrs Nath:** No, only if they are approved for social housing and they are waiting for a few documents to be provided or some evidence to be processed. Then they will be on the register as waiting for information.



**Mr BENNETT:** For me, one of the big issues out of the report was that the planned builds and redevelopments are not going to keep up with demand. It is something that we have been talking about now for a number of years. There are two things. I notice there is not a recommendation in the report about that issue. Secondly, were any stakeholders forthcoming with alternative deliveries or options about how we could perhaps increase the supply of housing to meet the crisis?

**Mr Worrall:** We would not have made a recommendation about increasing supply per se because I think that would be going to government policy. We did suggest that the department go back and review its tenancy framework, given that there are those 8,000-odd spare bedrooms. That would be one way to at least satisfy some demand. Obviously there is social housing and there is community housing that feed into this. We do talk about other ways the department might be able to provide assistance or release some of the pressure on the social housing register. There might be some people on the register at the moment who may be able to transition to private dwellings with some other rental assistance but not actually occupy social housing. There is probably no consistent approach across those 17 service centres in fostering those sorts of discussions. We thought that would be one way they could actually have more proactive conversations with people on the register who might have other needs.

**Mr BENNETT:** I know this is not part of the scope and I think we are running out of time, but were stakeholders forthcoming, during the process, in offering their views on how they could increase supply perhaps?

**Mrs Nath:** As I mentioned before, our questions to the stakeholders were very much to the scope of our audit and that was not one that we canvassed this time around.

**CHAIR:** I do not believe there were any questions taken on notice today. I thank you immensely, Mr Worrall and staff, for your attendance today.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Point of order, Chair. I am sorry. This is just on me. While we acknowledge that I did not need leave to table that graph, I do not think I asked that it be tabled.

**CHAIR:** I took it that we would table that graph, so consider the graph tabled, member.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Thank you, Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you immensely to the Queensland Audit Office staff and to you as leader, Mr Worrall, for taking the time to come and talk with us about your interim report. That concludes our briefing this morning. On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you all for your assistance today. Thank you to our Hansard reporters, as always. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's parliamentary webpage in due course. I now declare this public briefing closed.

**The committee adjourned at 10.51 am.**