



**nsw Federation of  
Housing Associations Inc**

**ABN 86 488 945 663**

# **Minutes**

## **Board of Directors Teleconference**

Held 29<sup>th</sup> August 2008

### **Discussion of preliminary Federation position on CAS**

**Present:** Greg Budworth, Bobbie Townsend, Nick Sabel, Patrick Yeung

**Apologies:** Bev Wiggins, Nazha Saad, Mohamed Ibrahim, Coral Garratt

**In attendance:** Adam Farrar

#### **1. Broad views**

It was agreed that the introduction of CAS is inevitable, and that it will benefit tenants.

It was also agreed that the way the development to date has been conducted has been very thoughtful and genuinely inclusive. It was noted that there has been a huge body of work.

It was also agreed that the will comprise a huge change to the social housing system and the business of individual providers. Its implementation will be equally large and complex.

#### **2. Key issues**

##### *Endorsement*

- General support for the idea. Committed to a one stop shop

##### *Governance*

- **The ability to develop and change the system must not be driven by the Department. It is critical that both parts of the system are equal players. Requires a solid partnership approach**
- As a result the governance model must ensure that the CAS is not just another Housing NSW structure.

Signed in accordance with s(28) of the Associations Incorporation Act

President:

Date:

### *Operation issues*

- The main issue will be the 10% of complex clients
- Ensure that it is still arm's length from Housing NSW
- Crucial to share control over implementation
- IT will be a crucial issue – noting that the sector is behind in this area

It was proposed that the board support the following outcomes:

- Independence
- Control over operations
- allocations remains with providers
- The ability to be flexible (not constrained by rigid system)

### **Drop dead issues**

A number of areas of issues were identified as 'drop dead' issues:

*Governance* – It was agreed that Option A is not acceptable. However, the meeting did not reach a final view on which of the other two options. It was noted that some options are linked to a model of stand alone access services.

**ACTION: e-mail board members and seek another teleconference before the next Steering Committee meeting on September 29.**

*Charitable status* – any risk to charitable status arising from not being sufficiently arms length from government. It was suggested that legal opinion be sought.

*Resources* – potential problems include cost shifting, need to ensure transparency of resource allocations; cost neutrality between sectors; clear budgets for new services shared across the system.

*IT* – potential risks include lack of clarity about customer of hosting service (Businesslink), communication costs, who is the customer for the CAS IT; who makes IT business decisions, cost of use decisions.

Nature of the data collected – must retain flexibility and control by providers

*Agreed prioritisation (3 bands)* – while urgency and 'wait turn' flags seem appropriate, the proposal to agree on criteria for a 'priority' band undermines the whole principle of local business decisions on allocation ranking.

*Choice of role* – Ability to choose to participate in all part of the system

*Prime responsibility for applicants*

**ACTION – Further discussion to be placed on the next board agenda**

Signed in accordance with s(28) of the Associations Incorporation Act

President:

Date: