



Natalie Wilde

Deputy Director-General,
Department of State Development, Infrastructure,
Local Government and Planning

1. *On the whole how would you rate Queensland local governments' handling of the pandemic?*

They got better with time as we all did. Much of Queensland was not impacted until last 6 months. South-East Queensland (SEQ) felt it most but there was anxiety outside SEQ.

Border councils should be commended and many councils dealt simultaneously with natural disasters, too.

There were supply chain challenges for outside SEQ. Indigenous communities had to handle unique challenges.

2. *Generally what aspects did Queensland local governments' handle best?*

With extensive disaster management experience, they were very good at understanding community needs and advocating back to the State.

The disaster management framework worked well, however, we all understood that things needed to be done differently from what usually happens in more routine natural disasters.

SEQ was first to move with relief from fees and charges for the business community. Some rural and regional councils saw opportunity e.g. captive domestic tourism, but there were infrastructure limitations.

3. *Generally what aspects did Queensland local governments' handle worst?*

Generally, local governments wanted clear (perhaps prescriptive) direction. Health Directives were an eye-opener and a lot grappled with lack of prescription but at the same time, wanted to do their own thing too.

Some councils wanted restitution/reimbursement for their efforts in the very early days e.g. QR Codes, EHO regulation of food premises etc. There was some reluctance and some had an expectation of funding. I think in hindsight their advocacy may have been premature. They needed to understand it was being sorted as we go with a collective effort.

Importantly, everyone was trying to do the best. The joint survey (with LGAQ) very early yielded hard to quantify impacts. There was difficulty identifying 'critical workers'. Some councils didn't adapt to the circumstances and the need flexibility and contemporary work practices e.g. work from home.

4. To what extent was the local government sector reliant on State Government guidance/direction?

As mentioned before some had prescription expectations and some had funding expectations which could not be met. With such wide local government and community diversity across state, it was not practical to be prescriptive. Directions regarding management of public facilities e.g. Showgrounds, could not be prescribed in detail.

5. How would you rate the local government sector's performance during the pandemic in the following (1 = worst performance, 10 = best performance)?

Aspect	Rating	Comment
Timing of first response?	ranged 5 average	
Structure and strategy in the response?	ranged 5 average	
Community engagement?	8	
Service delivery?	8	
Integration with other governments and their agencies?	6	
Enforcement of Health Directives?	6	
Compliance with Health Directives?	6	
Community support?	8	
Business support?	8	
Economic stimuli?	4	
Protection of their communities?	8	
Advocacy to State and Commonwealth governments?	effort 8 effectiveness 6	
Vaccination encouragement/facilitation?	most 9	There were a few exceptions
Border control?	effort 9 effectiveness 6	Some unnecessary work some asked and cost reimbursement

6. If you were to guide Councils in a future epidemic what three things would you define as paramount?

1. Be willing to work together and don't seek funding unless evidence based and timely.
2. Be adaptable and work with change.
3. Act as a sector and don't leave anyone behind (i.e. don't be territorial).

7. Do you have any other comments you would like to make?

I would like to think that sector is stronger for it e.g. State changed legislation for virtual meetings.