

Monday, 1 December 2014

Mr George Christensen MP
Committee Chair
Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs Committee
Parliamentary Inquiry into the Child Support Program
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Christensen MP

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Standing Committee on Social Policy and Legal Affairs' Inquiry into the Child Support Program on Friday 29th August 2014 in Canberra.

At that session you asked our organisation to consider whether Family Relationship Centres (Centres) and Family Dispute Resolution (FDR) services could be a first port of call for child support matters, perhaps assisting parents to mediate agreements that are binding with parameters guided by a formula but not adhering to that formula if parents are able to agree. You also flagged a potential role for the Department of Human Services' Child Support (the Agency) that limited its assistance to only the complex cases (ie family violence). You asked whether we could consider implementing a trial of this approach and to report back to the Committee.

In preparing this response we have consulted further with our member organisations. As outlined in our earlier submission, the majority (66%) of FDR survey respondents indicated their clients would benefit from dealing with child support matters during FDR but less than half (40%) felt confident about providing this service without additional training. There are also two 'schools of thought' and while the majority of respondents consider that there are benefits to assisting parents in this way, there is a small group that believes that discussing finances during the mediation process detracts parents from being able to maintain a 'child-focussed' approach.

The family law, child support and family assistance service systems are complex. The 2006 amendments to the *Family Law Act 1975* saw the introduction of the requirement (with exceptions) of parties to attend FDR before filing family court proceedings for a parenting order. The Attorney-General's Department currently administers a FDR accreditation process and maintains a FDR Register. Only accredited FDR practitioners can issue s60I certificate under the Family Law Act verifying that a genuine effort has been made by the parties to mediate prior to filing a parenting matter with the court.¹ An accredited FDR practitioner may be a private practitioner or publicly funded in a community-based setting (such as our member organisations in Centres and FDR services), community legal centres or legal aid commissions. Our comments are limited to community-based FDR practitioners working in member organisations.

With the limited time and resources available, it has not been possible to trial alternative approaches to resolving child support matters within a community-based FDR setting. There are also legislative and supporting operational frameworks in place that authorise administrative decision making powers (on the Agency's Registrar and by delegation to Agency staff) and ensure procedural fairness, natural justice and avenues of appeal are available to child support clients. These processes limit what can be trialled within the current environment. However, we offer the following observations on the range of practices that are currently in place and flag changes that may be possible within the current environment but require additional resourcing.

Role of Centres and how they currently manage child support matters within FDR

Commonwealth-funded Centres are required to comply with the parameters of service as defined in the *Operational Framework for Family Relationship Centres June 2011*. The Framework states that Centres should assist Agency customers to achieve workable and appropriate arrangements for the children, through information, advice and referral to services. The Centres also have a particular role in helping parents consider child support payment issues and encouraging them to reach agreement on child support payments. Centre staff are not expected to be experts in child support or income support – instead they are able to telephone Agency staff to discuss child support implications of arrangements they are considering. Clients may also be able to talk to Agency staff directly in private using Centre telephones. Similarly they are able to talk to Centrelink about Family Tax Benefit implications (noting that the 2010 changes align the two systems and the Agency's Registrar is able to make the percentage of care determination for both systems based on pattern of care). With the consent of both parents, a parenting plan developed at the Centre and/or other relevant information can be provided to the Agency so that the parents do not have to provide that information again to Agency.ⁱⁱ At the time of establishing the Centres, a dedicated direct telephone line was established to facilitate communication between Centres and the Agency. Unfortunately this line is no longer operational although a similar line appears to have been set up for solicitors.ⁱⁱⁱ We consider this resource to be an important tool that should be utilised by Centres and FDR services, along with further training.

The Framework recommends that legal advice be sought where the client requires advice on complex child support issues (which have not been addressed after a primary referral to the Child Support Agency including by three-way conversation between the client, Centre Staff and the Child Support Agency). Complex child support issues may include variations, change of assessments, departure applications, drafting court applications etc.^{iv} We agree with the requirement outlined in the Operational Framework about when Centre staff should recommend that parties obtain legal advice.

When child support changes were implemented in 2008, Centres received some additional funding to assist with managing change of assessment clients. Guidelines were drafted to facilitate referrals from the Agency to Centres (Attachment 1).

The Operational Framework supports but does not mandate the delivery of information sessions at Centres. Consequently the conduct and content of information sessions, prior to

commencing FDR, are variable across the Centre network. Some Centres provide information on the Agency, while others mention that all matters involving child support should be referred to the Agency. Of the member organisations that responded to our survey, no information sessions involve Agency representatives.

Parenting Plans

One of the objectives when Centres were established was to assist separated parents to resolve disputes and reach agreement on parenting arrangements outside the court system where appropriate, through child-focused information, advice and family dispute resolution, as well as referral to other services. Centres have focussed on resolving parenting issues and very few currently mediate property matters (including child support) as this requires a different service model.

Parenting plans set out parenting arrangements for children. The plan may cover the day to day responsibilities of each parent, the practical considerations of a child's daily life, as well as how parents will agree and consult on important, long-term issues, such as which schools children will attend.

Parenting plans are not legally binding. Parties can elect to make them binding by applying to the court for consent orders. The court will only make a consent order if it is satisfied that the terms of the plan are in the best interests of the child. Once made, consent orders are legally binding. Parties to a parenting plan may have the plan 'registered' with the court. A registered parenting plan also has the same legal effect as a court order. A parenting plan may be varied or revoked by agreement in writing between the parties to the agreement. A parenting plan may also be entered into altering previous court orders as long as this is not prohibited by the parenting order.

Centres and FDR services will recommend that parties obtain legal advice if they wish to make key parts of their parenting plan reflected in a legally enforceable court order through the filing of consent orders. Legal advice will also be recommended where the signing of a parenting plan varies existing parenting orders.^v

If parents proceed to court at any time, the court will be required to consider the terms of the most recent parenting plan when making a parenting order in relation to the child, if it is in best interest of the child to do so (as defined under the *Family Law Act 1975*). In order to be recognised by the court, a parenting plan must be in writing, dated and signed by both parents. It must be made free from any threat, duress or coercion. In addition, when considering the best interests of the child, the court will also consider the extent to which both parents have complied with their obligations in relation to the child, which may include the terms of a parenting plan.^{vi}

Parenting plans may or may not include child support provisions but these have no effect and are not enforceable unless the Agency agrees that the outcome arrived at through the parenting plan aligns with their processes. Although limited child support agreements do not require legal advice, they will not be accepted by the Registrar unless there is a child support administrative assessment in place and the agreement is for at least the annual rate of child

support that would otherwise be payable under the administrative assessment. For binding child support agreements, independent legal advice is required but there is no requirement for an administrative assessment to be in place prior to the making or acceptance of a binding child support agreement. If there is no existing administrative assessment, the Registrar must be satisfied that the parties to the agreement are parents or eligible non-parent carers before a binding agreement can be accepted. A document that forms a property division order, parenting plan, maintenance agreement or financial agreement under the Family Law Act can also be a binding child support agreement for child support purposes if it complies with the necessary requirements.^{vii}

The working relationship with the Agency is variable across the country. In some areas, member organisations interact with the Agency through stakeholder meetings and Family Law Pathways Networks. In other areas, contact with the Agency is limited.

In general terms, Centres define at the outset what will be covered in the FDR process. Currently, most Centres do not get involved with the child support formula or lump sum payment negotiations. However, Centres and FDR services can see the value in mediating child support matters through the FDR process so long as services are resourced appropriately to do so. This would enable practitioners to take on a more integrated role when making arrangements that are in the best interest of the child while assisting parties to better understand the child support system such as the range, scope and application of the formula; what kinds of expenses are covered and what might constitute reasonable grounds for an appeal.

Clients are currently advised to seek legal advice (community legal centres, legal aid or private family lawyers) if they wish to discuss child support and are provided with information on the Agency and advised to seek its assistance when determining child support assessments. However, FDR negotiations may include discussion on financial support for extra expenses relating to child/ren that are directly related to costs (eg school fees, sporting costs, specialist costs, school camps, music lessons and special occasions such as birthday gifts or holidays). Care arrangements or time spent with each parent is also negotiated during FDR.

Parenting plan templates are used to record the number of hours/days with the child/ren, details around parenting arrangements and any financial arrangements agreed to over and above what would be covered by a child support assessment. Examples of parenting plan checklists and information brochures are accessible at Relationships Australia Victoria's [website](#). It is made clear that the parenting plan is not a legally binding agreement and if clients want to negotiate child support (in terms of regular financial payments and lump sums) they are referred to legal aid, community legal centres, the Agency or to family lawyers for advice and assistance.

It appears that there may be some scope for Centres and the Agency to improve: information sharing about the Agency to Centre clients, the transitioning of clients from one system to the other (without having to re-tell information) and the streamlining of child support assessment processes by making better use/ capitalising on agreements reached in FDR, particularly with respect to limited child support agreements where legal advice is not required. Strategies could include information on the child support assessment process to the commencement of FDR (as limited child support agreements require an assessment to be in place), training and resourcing

of Centre and FDR service staff in child support matters, better use of child support resources and a review of parenting plan templates.

We note and agree with the recommendation made by National Legal Aid that there may be a need for increased education as to how court orders could be best drafted so that they provide for maximum appropriate support of children and do not lead to obligations that are weaker than the minimum requirement of the Child Support System^{viii}. A similar approach could be adopted with regard to the drafting of parenting plans while retaining language that has meaning to the parents and is child-focussed.

A few member organisations have been funded to provide dispute resolution in property and financial matters and others have been trialling this work at their own expense. Examples and feedback from these organisations are outlined below.

Family Relationship Advice Line (FRAL), Telephone Dispute Resolution Service (TDRS) and Online Family Dispute Resolution services

The Attorney-General's Department currently funds the FRAL, a phone line that provides information and advice on family separation issues, guidance on developing workable parenting arrangements after family separation and referral to Centres and other dispute resolution services. Through the FRAL, telephone dispute resolution or online family dispute resolution sessions are organised for people unable to attend a family dispute resolution service. These sessions focus on achieving workable parenting arrangements, property and financial arrangements including child support.

Referral Guidelines for Centres and the FRAL state the importance of developing and maintaining referral relationships between FRAL, Centres and key national services such as the Agency.^{ix}

FMC Mediation and Counselling Victoria

FMC has a long history of providing family dispute resolution in parenting, property and financial matters. FMC's Chief Executive Officer (Kim O'Neill) has provided the following information on mediating child support arrangements. FMC practitioners currently mediate child support arrangements if parents identify it as a need. It generally arises in the following circumstances:

- exploring options of private agreements, if in line with the Agency's assessment
- time child/ren spend with each parent and the impact of this on child support
- what the Child Support should cover – assisting parents with developing a budget, particularly in shared care arrangements, and
- paying for additional expenses such as medical, extra-curricular activities and private school fees.

The actual cost of children is one of the tools used to ground both parents and this is done through developing a budget that identifies actual cost of school fees, excursions, books, uniforms, curricula/extra curricula activities, clothes, shoes, gifts, birthday parties, Christmas and

entertainment. This approach often highlights what parents are not aware of and the possible blockers for moving forward. Reality checking involves asking parents how important it is for them and their children to continue with the status quo and, if so, how much they are each able to contribute. Following the mediation of child support matters, FMC's practice is always to refer clients to receive independent legal advice and/or child support or Centrelink advice on the impact of the agreements they have made.

FMC considers that mediating child support arrangements is a positive step, as it is in the best interests of the child/ren that all areas of parental conflict be addressed. The proposed mediation model is property based using a hybrid child/child support approach with a child-focussed approach particularly when mediating parenting plans and care arrangements. This enables the practitioner to determine issues that lie outside the child support arrangement as well as using the child support assessment formula to support parents in decision making.

FMC considers that the perceived difficulties of mediating child support arrangements from a client's perspective include:

- what is covered by child support
- the child support assessment does not reflect the paying parents true income
- perceived injustice (I'm being ripped off)
- linking contact to child support
- confusion over Centrelink and Child Support, and
- how and if private negotiations impact on Centrelink payments

FMC considers that from a practitioner's perspective, possible difficulties with mediating child support arrangements within a family dispute resolution setting include:

- disclosure of income and its evidence and collection issues where family dispute resolution relies on parties' honesty
- increased length of the family dispute resolution process
- training of FDR practitioners in child support and the impact of increasing conflict regarding nights spent versus time spent
- the existence of a clear formula for calculating child support liability which leaves little room for negotiation.

FMC considers that the perceived benefits of mediating child support in family dispute resolution outweigh the associated difficulties.

Family Relationship Centre legal assistance partnerships program

The Attorney-General's Department currently funds the delivery of legal assistance to Centre clients. Protocols for the provision of legal assistance at Centres are available on the Department's website.^x An evaluation, conducted by the Australian Institute of Family Studies in March 2011, found very positive conclusions with most partnerships functioning well or very well with high or very high levels of collaboration. Providing legal services was generally rated by legal and family relationship practitioners and clients who had participated in the program as being effective in assisting clients to progress their case. The types of services offered and the effectiveness of each legal service varied, but two that were rated as core services were:

individual advice sessions (including advice on family violence concerns) and group information sessions. While there was near consensus among professionals and clients about the value and importance of individual legal advice, views on providing general legal information in a group setting were more mixed. Some partnerships reported that this was an important service with strong uptake, while others had had less successful experiences and a few had stopped offering this service altogether.

Legally assisted FDR at Centres and FDR services

At the time of the evaluation of the legal assistance partnerships program, there was considerable variation in attitudes and approaches to lawyer assisted FDR, with the service not offered to a great extent. Lawyer assisted FDR is a multi-disciplinary approach (lawyers and FDR practitioner) to dispute resolution that requires, amongst other things, a shared understanding of each profession's roles, responsibilities and ways of working; trust in the other profession's intake, screening and referral practices particularly in cases involving family violence; and the extension of professional courtesies.

While most professionals indicated a strong belief in the potential of this service, a range of reasons were given for not offering this service, including the resource-intensive nature of the service, conflict of interest issues and the need to develop an agreed practice model. Some philosophical concerns were expressed by a small number of family relationship practitioners about losing the child focus if lawyers became actively engaged in FDR.^{xi}

Recent feedback from our members indicates that lawyer assisted mediation has considerable potential if well-targeted and supported by clear protocols. We consider that legally assisted FDR, with each party having independent legal advice, is the preferred practice model for parties who wish to resolve complex property and financial matters (including child support) through FDR and to formalise their arrangements through a binding child support agreement. We consider that the FDR and legally assisted FDR can both operate and be effective in this service system.

Flash points in the system

We consider that there are flash points in the child support system that are likely to give rise to complaints as outlined in other submissions.^{xii} Issues include breaches (payments calculated based on the agreement and continuing up to 14 weeks after the date of breach and difficulty obtaining assistance from Centres, FDR services and courts within this timeframe); collection of arrears and management of overpayments (greater transparency, need for legal advice), court enforcement of child support arrears being pursued for matters involving property and not alienated income, change of assessment and enforcement. The child support system is complex and case load is high. Any changes to a system this size require considerable trialling and resourcing that reflects the scale of change.

The child support system has been in place since 1988 and has been the subject of extensive review. The *Child Support Act 1988* and the *Child Support (Assessment) Act 1989* established the child support scheme and provided for the registration, collection and enforcement of court

orders and court-registered agreements for child support and spousal maintenance; as well as the implementation of an administrative assessment of child support in accordance with a formula. Through this legislative framework the Child Support Registrar has extensive administrative decision making powers and is able to amend, vary, change or revoke child support assessments. For the most part, in order for arrangements to be accepted by the Agency they must be reviewed by the Registrar (to enable comparisons against the formula) and/or certified by independent lawyers. Only in specified circumstances is a deviation from the application of the administrative formula available (ie 1 or more of 10 circumstances for change of assessment). The Agency also has investigative powers including access to Centrelink records, recovering overdue amounts and applying penalties. Avenues of appeal are also available to clients and include a review of the merits (through the SSAT) or on a question of law (though the courts with relevant federal jurisdiction).

We believe that all powers that currently vest with the Agency should remain unchanged.

Reasonable action

There are stages within the child support system where the Registrar requires reasonable action to be taken by the parties before proceeding with a particular application. For instance, where care is not in accordance with a written agreement, parenting plan or court order, the Registrar may make an interim care determination but will only do so where at least one of the parties has taken reasonable action to formalise a new arrangement about the care of a child. Reasonable action includes making an appointment or attending family dispute resolution.

In disputed care arrangements, where a care arrangement is in place and there is a departure from the terms of the arrangement by one of the parties, the individual must take reasonable action to ensure compliance with the care arrangement. Reasonable action includes making an appointment or attending family dispute resolution (as flagged previously this is often difficult to do within the 14 week period).

There may be other stages within the child support system where 'reasonable action' may be an appropriate requirement. However, any changes in this regard would require an equitable shift in resourcing to enable the service system to meet any increase in demand. Streamlining and simplifying processes, with information asked once but used, often is also critical. The sharing of information held by the Agency and Centrelink (that furthers the objects of the legislation) to other agents should also be considered.

We recommend that resourcing be made available to:

- establish a working group comprising representatives from key government agencies, courts and sector groups to identify system flash points and possible system changes (along with appropriate resourcing) to streamline processes, improve information sharing and increase early dispute resolution. For instance, the requirement of parties to take reasonable action may encourage a more timely use of family dispute resolution, legally assisted family dispute resolution and legal services and avoid entrenched conflict
- continue funding of the Family Relationship Centre legal assistance partnerships program post 30 June 2015, expand the program to other Commonwealth-funded FDR services and review the protocols for the provision of legal assistance in Family Relationship Centre (Attorney-General's Department)
- increase the trialling and evaluation of legally assisted FDR services to resolve the more complex cases (Attorney-General's Department)
- support other practitioners such as FDR practitioners and lawyers when working with this client group. This could involve re-instating the Agency phone line for Centre and FDR services, conducting training sessions for practitioners, developing on-line resources and templates (for practitioners) and out-posting Agency staff to provide assistance and advice (in Centres, FDR services and legal assistance services). Centrelink should also establish an advice line for Centre and FDR services (DHS Child Support), and
- increase legal assistance and advice in child support matters (Attorney-General's Department, DHS Child Support).

We also recommend that:

- the Agency increase its transparency around its decision making processes particularly with regard to change of assessment determinations and applying the balance of probabilities (DHS Child Support)
- the Agency continue to develop and implement tools that enable it to identify high/risk complex cases early and assign a case manager (DHS Child Support)
- a competency module on child support should be developed and form part of the core requirements for accreditation of FDR practitioners. (In recognition that the child support system is complex and difficult to navigate and this necessitates a specialised skills set) (Attorney-General's Department), and

- consideration should be given to a joint venture between major Government agencies to refer clients to information sessions. These sessions would identify and demystify (recommended by FMC):
 - Centrelink and the Agency
 - the impact of separation and conflict on their children
 - what they need to do as parents to meet their children's financial support

Please note that Ms Reima Pryor (Director of Research and Evaluation, drummond street/Stepfamilies Australia) who also appeared before the Committee, is currently working on a DHS Child Support policy discussion paper (under funding from the Department of Social Services' Child Support Policy Community Strategy). The current paper is exploring the viability of incorporating Child Support discussions into existing Family Dispute Resolution (FDR) Practice. The paper is due at the end of January 2015, and is being undertaken in partnership with Relationships Australia Victoria (RAV) and Family Mediation and Counselling (FMC).

The research involves surveying FDR Practitioners in relation to their practice, undertaking FDR case audits in relation to Child Support discussions, and interviewing key stakeholders from DHS Child Support and from the Family Law sector. The basis of the paper is the feedback received from 844 Child Support community members (over 11 prior policy discussion papers, 2010-2014) which indicated that a more friendly and informative introduction to the Child Support system, and an opportunity to discuss child support issues with the other parent towards shared understandings and agreement, might enable more flexibility and satisfaction with Child Support arrangements and possibly enhanced integration and sustainability of both Child Support and FDR agreements. The paper will put forward a practice model for a trial that will enable the comparison of FDR and Child Support outcomes across existing and new practice models. Following feedback from DSS, the paper will be available on drummond street's website, and upon request.

I trust this responds to the outstanding matters relating to FRSA's appearance before the Committee. Please do not hesitate to call if you wish to discuss further (0417 220 779).

Yours sincerely



Jackie Brady
Executive Director

GUIDELINES RELATING TO REFERRALS FROM THE CHILD SUPPORT AGENCY

Child Support Agency (CSA) customers may consider that they, the children or the other parent have special circumstances that aren't reflected in their child support assessment and can apply to CSA for a Change of Assessment. Where the reason for applying for a Change of Assessment relates to an issue about parenting, the CSA can refer the parents to Family Relationship Advice Line (Advice Line), a Family Relationship Centre (Centre), family dispute resolution or counselling service to assist them in resolving the issues themselves and formulating their own agreement.

1. It is expected that the majority of calls from CSA will come via the Advice Line, but CSA may directly refer in some situations.
2. Incoming calls from the Child Support Agency (either directly or via the Advice Line) received during the Centre's opening hours must be answered within 20 seconds. This can be achieved by:
 - the creation of a special priority telephone number made available only to the Advice Line and CSA
 - setting up specialised telephony systems that can recognise and give priority to calls from the Advice Line and CSA designated numbers, or
 - applying this standard for all incoming calls regardless of source. (Note: a 20 second response standard is a reasonable expectation for all clients.)
3. Calls received from the Advice Line outside usual opening hours must be directed to a voice mail system enabling the Centre to call the client back.
4. Voice mail should only be used during usual opening hours when a Centre is unable to:
 - answer a call from the CSA or Advice Line within 20 seconds due to temporary and unusual circumstances (ie up to one day). The call must be diverted to voice mail after 20 seconds. This will enable the Advice Line to provide client details and call ID, as with calls outside usual opening hours. Centres must keep a record of the number of calls from the Advice Line or CSA diverted to voice mail on this basis, and report this information in their status reporting.
 - meet the 20 second standard for calls from the Advice Line or CSA for a prolonged period (ie more than one day). It must advise FaHCSIA that it is unable to meet the standard.
5. Opening hours: Centres must register these on Family Relationships Online.
6. Referrals from CSA (direct or via the Advice Line) will be recorded by Centres in the FRSP Online database in the 'Referral' data entity (two different relevant options, namely 'Child Support Agency - general referral' and 'Child Support Agency - change of assessment'.)

Contacting the Child Support Agency

Priority contact from a Centre to CSA may be made via a dedicated phone number that will be provided to Centre staff. This number is to be used by Centre staff only from all phones within the Centre. This number is NOT to be provided to the general public or clients. Specific client information may not be discussed unless the client is also present. The phone number available to the general public is 131 272.

ⁱ S60I(8) of the Family Law Act 1975 lists the five different types of certificates that may be issued by a family dispute resolution practitioner.

ⁱⁱ Operational Framework for Family Relationship Centres, Revised June 2011, p. 6,
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipcentreresources.aspx>

ⁱⁱⁱ National Legal Aid Submission no. 57, p.7,
http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Social_Policy_and_Legal_Affairs/Child_Support_Program/Submissions

^{iv} Operational Framework for Family Relationship Centres, Revised June 2011, p. 48,
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipcentreresources.aspx>

^v Operational Framework for Family Relationship Centres, September 2011, p. 48,
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipcentreresources.aspx>

^{vi} Family Counsellors in the Family Law System,
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipserviceproviders.aspx>,

^{vii} As per sections 80C, 82, 83 and 84 (section 84(5)). What is a child support agreement, para 2.7.1., <http://guides.dss.gov.au/child-support-guide/2/7/1#limitedchildsupportagreements>

^{viii} National Legal Aid, Submission no. 57, p.8
http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Social_Policy_and_Legal_Affairs/Child_Support_Program/Submissions

^{ix} Linking to other services: Referral Guidelines for Family Relationship Centres and the Family Relationship Advice Line,
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipcentreresources.aspx>

^x Protocols for the provision of legal assistance in Family Relationship Centres
<http://www.ag.gov.au/FamiliesAndMarriage/Families/FamilyRelationshipServices/Pages/Familyrelationshipcentreresources.aspx>

^{xi} Moloney, L., Kaspiew, R., De Maio, J., Deblaquiere, J., Hand, K., and Horsfall, B.,
[http://www.ag.gov.au/PublicatiEvaluation of the Family Relationship Centre Legal Assistance Partnerships Program, Final Report, March 2011, p E1,
\[http://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Documents/ArchivedFamilyLawPublications/Evaluation%20of%20the%20Family%20Relationship%20Centre%20and%20Legal%20Assistance%20Services%20Partnerships%20-%20Accessible%20\\(2\\).pdf\]\(http://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Documents/ArchivedFamilyLawPublications/Evaluation%20of%20the%20Family%20Relationship%20Centre%20and%20Legal%20Assistance%20Services%20Partnerships%20-%20Accessible%20\(2\).pdf\)](http://www.ag.gov.au/PublicatiEvaluation%20of%20the%20Family%20Relationship%20Centre%20and%20Legal%20Assistance%20Services%20Partnerships%20-%20Accessible%20(2).pdf)

^{xii} As outlined in the Attorney-General's Department submission number 95 and National Legal Aid submission number 57,
http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Social_Policy_and_Legal_Affairs/Child_Support_Program/Submissions