

# Kāinga Ora Review

## Strategy 2030



New Zealand Council Of  
Christian Social Services

Contact Name:	Nikki Hurst Rachel Mackay
Organisation Name:	New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS)
Ko wai au   Who we are:	<p>The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Kāinga Ora's Strategy 2030.</p> <p>NZCCSS has six foundation members; the Anglican Care Network, Baptist Churches of New Zealand, Catholic Social Services, Presbyterian Support and the Methodist and Salvation Army Churches.</p> <p>Through this membership, NZCCSS represents over 250 organisations providing a range of social support services across Aotearoa. We believe in working to achieve a just and compassionate society for all, through our commitment to our faith and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Further details on NZCCSS can be found on our website <a href="http://www.nzccss.org.nz">www.nzccss.org.nz</a>.</p>

### Tirohanga Whānui | Overview

We broadly support the initiative to establish a long term strategy plan for Kāinga Ora that incorporates and prioritises client wellbeing and social cohesion. We note that much of this strategy is inward facing, resulting in success parameters that are not embedded in community outcomes. We acknowledge the aspirational qualities of the organisational characteristics, but do not see these reflected in the accompanying strategy plan documents.

Our main points are:

**Item One – We tautoko acknowledgement that housing is about more than houses, and that communities and wellbeing are critical elements of service delivery in this sector.**

We applaud this direction and the systems-based approach to improving housing.

**Item Two – Success parameters must be embedded in community outcomes, not internal practices**

Ensure the focus of both delivery and success is on how well the clients are served.

**Item Three – Proliferate the ambition of the organisational characteristics throughout the strategy**

Ensure that the whole strategy is striving for ambitious outcomes, not business as usual.

## Taunakitanga | Recommendations

We raise the following points and recommendations for consideration:

### **Item One – We tautoko acknowledgement that housing is about more than houses, and that communities and wellbeing are critical elements of service delivery in this sector.**

Housing tāngata and whānau is about more than simply providing them with a house. It is the community in which they are placed and enveloped by, the support systems that surround them, and the opportunities that are presented as a result of their location and access.

We tautoko this key strategy acknowledgement that in order for housing to be a success, communities must thrive and that the wellbeing of clients should be a key indicator of success in housing programmes. We view the six noted outcomes of this Strategy to be ambitious, clearly defined, and appropriately embody the vision of a community-focused provider.

**Recommendation 1:** We tautoko centralising community and individual wellbeing in this strategy and encourage their prioritisation alongside other fundamental elements of housing provision.

### **Item Two – Success parameters must be embedded in community outcomes, not internal practices**

The majority of outcomes listed against the Strategic Priorities do not appear to reflect the ambitious outcomes mentioned above. The success indicators are chiefly internally reflected, based in Kāinga Ora's internal processes and metrics.

We would rather see the success of Strategic Priorities being purely focused on the overall Outcomes, turning many of these inward-facing metrics into outward observational metrics. The effect of strategy on individuals and community should be the greatest success indicators.

For example, the success factor listed of "Our new customer facing roles are established and filled and we are able to have meaningful interactions with our customers" can readily be reframed as "Clients who engage with our service have immediate access to well-trained and approachable kaimahi, who enable them to navigate the system successfully with dignity in a timely manner".

Making the success indicator focused on clients reframes the organisation's focus externally and reminds those involved both in planning and execution where the priority lies.

**Recommendation 2:** We suggest ensuring the focus of both delivery and success is on how well the clients are served, and reframing success indicators to be client and community focused.

### **Item Three – Proliferate the ambition of the organisational characteristics throughout the strategy**

We note and appreciate the ambition in the organisational characteristics of this strategy. We do not note, however, the same ambition in the accompanying documents. Lines including "We will deliver what we are funded to do to as well as possible" (from the Supporting Housing Strategy) have none of the ambitious and future-focused phrasing of the organisational characteristics. The delivery strategies must maintain the same integrity of direction or these characteristics are meaningless.

**Recommendation 3:** We suggest maintaining quality of ambition throughout the strategy plans.

# Kāinga Ora Review

## Supported Housing Strategy



New Zealand Council Of  
Christian Social Services

Contact Name:	Nikki Hurst Rachel Mackay
Organisation Name:	New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS)
Ko wai au   Who we are:	<p>The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Kāinga Ora's Supported Housing Strategy.</p> <p>NZCCSS has six foundation members; the Anglican Care Network, Baptist Churches of New Zealand, Catholic Social Services, Presbyterian Support and the Methodist and Salvation Army Churches.</p> <p>Through this membership, NZCCSS represents over 250 organisations providing a range of social support services across Aotearoa. We believe in working to achieve a just and compassionate society for all, through our commitment to our faith and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Further details on NZCCSS can be found on our website <a href="http://www.nzccss.org.nz">www.nzccss.org.nz</a>.</p>

### Tirohanga Whānui | Overview

Overall, we support the kaupapa to create a clear and future-focused strategy for the provision of Supported Housing in our communities. However, we find this document to be lacking in sufficient detail to provide us with insight into how the draft plan will function. Particularly how it will improve the quality of service provision in this sector as it relates to the provision of Supported Housing through community partnership. We note specific gaps in this provision model and seek clarity and ambition in the goals and outcome evaluation factors.

Our main points are:

**Item One – Supported Housing clients deserve ambitious goals and clear outcome evaluation.**

The lack of detail in this document and the imprecise language used does not provide confidence in the improvement of services in this area.

**Item Two – We note gaps in service provision for sectors who need further support and protection.**

Supports and accommodations for older persons, disabled persons, and specific cultural groups – specifically Pacific fanau – are not clearly outlined in this draft plan.

**Item Three – The importance and integration of CHP into this model is poorly defined.**

While the importance of collaborative partnerships is mentioned the framework doesn't reflect this.

## Taunakitanga | Recommendations

We raise the following points and recommendations for consideration:

### **Item One – Supported Housing clients deserve ambitious goals and clear outcome evaluation.**

This plan lacks clarity and ambition. Statements such as, *'We will deliver what we're funded to do as well as possible'* give no indication of the standard of delivery expected, nor does it inspire optimism in the quality of delivery.

In addition, there are no metrics defining when the department or the community will know if the deliverables have been achieved and to what capacity or quality. Without clearly defined goals and robust metrics for determining if and when success has been achieved, this strategic plan can be easily replaced with a document stating "business as usual".

We specifically wish to see commitments regarding provision of housing stock (with accessibility and size ratios, and within specific timeframes), CHP partnership commitments, and client-based success metrics for support evaluation.

**Recommendation 1:** We suggest ambitious and clear goals for this sector, with transparent outcome evaluations.

### **Item Two – We note gaps in service provision for sectors who need further support and protection.**

We applaud the commitment this draft shows to Te Rautaki Māori Vision but note a number of other relevant groups are not mentioned or provided for in this plan, which gives us significant concern.

Nothing in this draft document mentions the specific housing needs of Pacific Fanau, older people, or those with disabilities. The draft stipulates upgrading the existing portfolio is a key deliverable, but there are no quotas or insurances that this will result in fit-for-purpose housing for those who require accessible or larger properties to meet their needs. While housing accessibility is listed as a key outcome in the Strategy 2030 document, this accessibility does not mention the standards of physical accessibility nor larger properties.

We understand that this draft plan focuses on transitional and group housing, but when the average wait time to house applicants from on the housing register is 246 days, we know that hard-to-house applicants could be in these transitional placements for a year or longer.

Regardless of the duration of their stay in Supported Housing, the appropriateness and accessibility of properties for these demographics is critical to supporting them out of housing insecurity.

**Recommendation 2:** We suggest a commitment to a minimum number or proportion of accessible and larger properties to meet the needs of all members of a community who may engage with Supported Housing.

### **Item Three – The importance and integration of CHP into this model is poorly defined.**

Among the inexactitudes of this draft is the positioning of CHP within the future frameworks of Supported Living. CHP already provide a great deal of Supported Housing throughout the country in both Transitional and Group Housing formats.

While this plan, and the poorly fleshed out accompanying Partnership strategy, notes that partnership and collaboration is a key guiding principle, it does not define the extent of integration with community partners. Nor the boundaries of collaboration, or success indicators for these partnerships.

While referred to as partnerships, it is asserted that '*Kāinga Ora is the landlord, asset service provider and relationship manager*' - where then do the infrastructure, support systems and valuable community integration of CHP fit into this model at all?

This language is not one of partnership but has clear hierarchical qualities that degrade the historical and contemporary value of CHP withing the Social and Supported Housing sector.

With the removal of redirects last year, expanding CHP portfolios can only increase through their own asset growth. As a result, Kāinga Ora will be none of the three previous assertions in many Supported Housing whare around the motū - neither landlord, asset service provider nor relationship manager. Where then does this model of support integrate with the existing support systems of CHP? How is Kāinga Ora committed to true partnership within what is intimated to be a strongly hierarchical relationship?

We also note that a number of the points in the “Opportunities to do things differently” section of this draft are already key commitments for CHPs. We applaud the focus on innovation but implore Kāinga Ora to look to existing models and successful organisations instead of attempting to independently reinvent the Supported Housing wheel.

**Recommendation 3:** We suggest committing to and engaging with CHP in true partnership, in both service delivery and innovation.

# Kāinga Ora Review

## Asset Management Strategy



New Zealand Council Of  
Christian Social Services

Contact Name:	Nikki Hurst & Rachel Mackay
Organisation Name:	New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS)
Ko wai au   Who we are:	<p>The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Kāinga Ora’s Asset Management Strategy.</p> <p>NZCCSS has six foundation members; the Anglican Care Network, Baptist Churches of New Zealand, Catholic Social Services, Presbyterian Support and the Methodist and Salvation Army Churches.</p> <p>Through this membership, NZCCSS represents over 250 organisations providing a range of social support services across Aotearoa. We believe in working to achieve a just and compassionate society for all, through our commitment to our faith and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Further details on NZCCSS can be found on our website <a href="http://www.nzccss.org.nz">www.nzccss.org.nz</a>.</p>

### Tirohanga Whānui | Overview

We strongly tautoko an asset management delivery policy that focuses on the long-term housing needs of Aotearoa New Zealand and prioritises the principles of a social wellbeing approach.

We agree that a place-based approach to investment is prudent, provided it aligns with observable need (such as the Housing Register) and not simply the non-housing characteristics of such areas.

We do not agree that Kāinga Ora should take care of main centres while others are partnered with for regional areas – all organisations in the Social Housing sector have distinct communities to support and the role and value of CHPs (even in main centres) must be recognised and respected.

Our main points are:

#### **Item One – Place-based prioritisation is prudent, as far as it aligns with metrics of need**

The non-housing characteristics of areas should not be used to overprovide in some areas and underprovide in others.

#### **Item Two – We disagree that Kāinga Ora has a mandate to main centres while partners are responsible for regions**

The regional nature of CHP necessitates collaboration even in main centres where Kāinga Ora would rather lead uninterrupted.

#### **Item Three – Our members require more information regarding the impacts of Asset Policy on their functioning**

This document makes minimal reference to CHP or partnerships, and we require more information on how these new policies will impact functioning and funding.

## Taunakitanga | Recommendations

We raise the following points and recommendations for consideration:

### **Item One – Place-based prioritisation is prudent, as far as it aligns with metrics of need**

Across the motū, our largest cities are also our largest areas of deprivation and need. Despite proximity to more resources, poverty and housing insecurity are rife in each of our main growth centre. Tamaki Makaurau is a pressing example of this, with 32.4% of the Housing Register as of March 2022 living within this region. This strongly supports Auckland being a region of heavy investment.

However, Rotorua is classified as a Regional Hub, with reduced asset investment prioritisation, despite having the fourth largest Housing Register in the nation. While there is near-universal recognition of Rotorua as a unique case with our housing crisis, it stands as a stark reminder as why we cannot use non-housing indicators such as hospital classifications and other infrastructure to inform our housing strategy.

**Recommendation 1:** Ensure that place-based prioritisation aligns with metrics of need, such as Housing Register information.

### **Item Two – We disagree that Kāinga Ora has a mandate to main centres while partners are responsible for regions**

Current funding models for CHP restrict grown capacity where Kāinga Ora already feels they are or have met certain obligations to a community. We are hearing this from main regions across the country, where CHP have excessive wait lists for housing but cannot accommodate new whānau because of dual restrictions on their growth from redirect elimination and regional funding caps.

We strongly oppose the implication that Kāinga Ora can hold alone the responsibility of managing the housing and homelessness crisis in main centres where CHP have been on the forefront for decades. CHP are effective community collaborators and networkers and are currently being both underutilised and actively impeded by Kāinga Ora policy. The assertion that Kāinga Ora should focus its attention on the main centres and creating partnership in the regions further strengthens this hierarchical approach to housing support when we in a crisis in need of collaboration.

While CHP can function effectively in both main centres and the regions, they are clustered around the increased need of the main centres. Denying effective practitioners access to funding based on their location does not fit with the proposed partnership models in other parts of Strategy 2030 and will work in opposition to many of the Outcomes.

**Recommendation 2:** Ensure that CHPs are integrated into service deliver models with authentic partnership, not relegated to the regions as secondary contributors and secondary recipients of support.

### **Item Three – Our members require more information regarding the impacts of Asset Policy on their functioning**

As sector standards increase through the development of this new asset plan, our members who function as CHPs require further information about how this will affect their performance indicators for funding and support.

Page 20 of this document outlines a range of policies under the heading of Asset Management. Only one of these is coded as Existing document, and while the others have a variety of coding designations (including some colours not in the legend for the infographic so of uncertain designation) each will presumably have implications for CHP who wish to partner with Kāinga Ora and receive HUD funding.

Clarification around these further policies and the implications of these for CHP is critical information for our members, and we seek this urgently.

**Recommendation 3:** Inform partnership organisations and CHP urgently on how the updates to the Asset Management plan will alter requirements.



# Kāinga Ora Review

## Partnership Strategy



New Zealand Council Of  
Christian Social Services

Contact Name:	Nikki Hurst Rachel Mackay
Organisation Name:	New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS)
Ko wai au   Who we are:	<p>The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on Kāinga Ora's Partnership Strategy.</p> <p>NZCCSS has six foundation members; the Anglican Care Network, Baptist Churches of New Zealand, Catholic Social Services, Presbyterian Support and the Methodist and Salvation Army Churches.</p> <p>Through this membership, NZCCSS represents over 250 organisations providing a range of social support services across Aotearoa. We believe in working to achieve a just and compassionate society for all, through our commitment to our faith and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Further details on NZCCSS can be found on our website <a href="http://www.nzccss.org.nz">www.nzccss.org.nz</a>.</p>

### Tirohanga Whānui | Overview

We support the proposal to create a Partnership Plan that centre clients and communities and is based in mutual understanding and reciprocity with partners. We express concern about the wording of other strategy draft documents that indicates a continuation of the currently perceived hierarchy - of Kāinga Ora being the primary provider of Social Housing, and CHP fulfilling a secondary and supplementary role. We understand that this is the beginning of a journey towards effective partnership models within the organisation, but without any indication as the intended framework we cannot make comment on the likelihood of success of any such approach.

Our main points are:

**Kāinga Ora must approach partnership in a non-hierarchical way, treating and valuing CHP and other community providers as equitable allies in the fight against housing insecurity.**

**Development of partnership frameworks must be collaborative and iterative, ensuring that they can work in diverse regions and communities with the organisations already working there.**

**Client and community outcomes must be the key success indicators for the success of a partnership, not the economic value of the partnership for either organisation.**