SPRC
UNSW
Social Policy Research Centre

Making submissions to government inquiries: DPMP reflections

Laura McLauchlan
with the DPMP submission team for the "ACT Legislative Assembly, Inquiry into the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Use) Amendment Bill 2021"

Drug Policy Modelling Program, UNSW

Summary

Making submissions to governmental and parliamentary inquiries is an important avenue through which to have one's voice heard and to influence policy, whether as a researcher or a member of the public. However, there is little academic reflection on the process or impact of making submissions. In this bulletin, we share insights and experiences from DPMP team members involved in making a submission to the ACT Legislative Assembly, Inquiry into the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Use) Amendment Bill 2021. With an aim to both assist others considering making submissions as well as to reflect on our own submission-writing practices as researchers, we consider key elements of the process of writing submissions, including the importance of team culture; discerning what to focus on; working with team members and other organisations; strategies for building confidence; and how to sustain the submission-writing process. Alongside these insights, we also note the necessity for more research into the submissions process. Thus, we end with recommendations for further research and reflection on both the impact of submissions at a policy level, as well as on the experiential benefits of being involved in the process of submission-writing.

Introduction

Making submissions to governmental and parliamentary inquiries is an important way for individuals and organisations to have their voices heard and to potentially influence emerging policy (Evans 1993; Benton and Russell 2013). Despite its potential importance, however, the process of submission writing has been the subject of little reflection or academic discussion (Hendriks and Kay 2017; Geddes 2021).

Making submissions as a transdisciplinary team is a matter of core business for the Drug Policy Modelling Program (DPMP): over the last 15 years, DPMP has made more than 40 submissions to government and parliamentary enquiries on drug-related policy matters (some of which are 2-5 pages, others up to 50 pages). As an anthropologist with DPMP I had the opportunity to witness a small part of the drafting process for the ACT Legislative Assembly, Inquiry into the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Use) Amendment Bill 2021   as well as to have short (30-45 minute) conversations with five team members on their experiences. Acknowledging that there are many ways in which to carry out a submissions process, we offer the following as reflections on one possible way of writing a group submission. In this Bulletin, we reflect upon this experience of submission writing with the aim of both reflecting on and further developing our own processes, as well as sharing our learnings with other groups interested in making submissions, particularly as an interdisciplinary team.

1. Why make submissions?

(a) An opportunity to influence policy

There are a variety of governmental/parliamentary committees, inquiries, task forces, independent reviews and other deliberative processes which call for public submissions. While each of these has its own procedural and decision-making authority, in the main these various processes offer recommendations to government. In the example used here, it was a select committee at a state level that held the inquiry. While select committees influence rather than make governmental policy decisions (Geddes 2021, 45), a British study has estimated that more than 40% of select committee recommendations may get included in policy (Benton and Russell 2013).

While there is no guarantee that a submission will influence a committee's policy recommendations to parliament, making a submission offers the *possibility* to influence the relevant committee and have an impact on policy. It is thus an activity that we see as part of our core business at DPMP and are willing to put considerable time and research effort into. While the DPMP team making this submission reported their major motivation for making the submission was the opportunity to have their views and research considered by the relevant parliamentary committee (and potentially influencing policy), making a submission to a parliamentary inquiry also had value in terms of sharing knowledge and developing both as a team and as individuals.

(b) Sharing knowledge

Submissions to government and parliamentary inquiries are kept on the public record, typically published to the government body which hosted the inquiry's website. Thus, making a submission is a way to get one's views "on the record". It is also a way to reach new audiences, as these submissions are not just read by people in academia. As one member of the submission team noted, knowing that your work is going to be read by new audiences can be highly motivating:

> *You know, you put hours and hours into a paper and getting cited and you see your altmetrics… But even then, if people are reading it, it's like, this just because people are doing something adjacent to this. With submissions there's a chance it will be read either by people who don't know a lot on the issue or would disagree—someone will read this and it will make them think.*

Relatedly, members of the team also valued the chance to give members of the public access to information that they may not usually have access to—particularly to peer reviewed articles that may otherwise be behind paywalls.

(c) Learning and growth

All members of the submission team also felt that co-creating policy submissions offered valuable learning opportunities. These learnings included developing a greater sense of agency, developing new content expertise, as well as in developing skills in teamwork and getting to know each other's professional skills in new ways.

(i) Moving out of critique
Some members of the team noted that working on the submission drafting helped them experience a new way of contributing to drug policy issues. Members noted a feeling of both relevance and responsibility arising from their awareness that their recommendations might be taken up in policy. While members noted a sense of pressure from this, it was also seen as motivating:

> *It feels like more pressure when you're giving a recommendation rather than just critiquing… but it's good, that feeling that you're actually contributing to something that actually goes out there and does matter.*

(ii) Developing/building on expertise
As all team members noted, making submissions offered a chance to really "deep dive" into an issue. People felt that the approach used in the submission drafting process being examined here—in which people were encouraged to work on what was of most interest to them (see Section 2b), as well as the research-motivating impetus of making real-world recommendations—particularly encouraged such learning. For some members, this has led to new on-going research interests. Team members also noted that the process led them to reconsider their previous stances on topics they had thought about and/or heard colleagues discuss, but which they had not thoroughly investigated themselves.

(iii) Team building
Drafting submissions also allowed for team building, particularly in terms of getting to know the knowledge and skills that are in the group. As noted in the process section below, submission writing was seen as a truly interdisciplinary act in which different people were able to—and needed to—shine in their own areas of expertise. This was experienced as being a great way to get to know colleagues better and to get a sense of the talents and potential future contributions of others, as well as one's own. Members of the team also pointed out that writing a submission was not inherently a team-building activity. Instead, particular processes and cultures of valuing people and their contributions were seen as an important part of ensuring that team building was part of this process (see Section 3(a)).

2. The process

(a) Getting started

(i) Finding out about submissions
In this instance, DPMP found out that submissions were being accepted through an email from an advocacy organisation to one team member asking DPMP to consider making a submission. In other instances, DPMP has found out that submissions were being accepted because a team member had heard that a matter had been referred to an Inquiry and then checked the parliamentary committee pages (often signing up to email updates about progress, submission timelines etc).[1] In other instances, DPMP has heard through word of mouth or via direct contact from politicians inviting submissions to an inquiry.

(ii) What do they want? What do we want to contribute?
One of the first things the team did was to (a) work out what the Inquiry was focusing on and (b) discussing what the team would like to submit on. As one team member noted, the submissions process is about getting a range of views from the community on the record. Thus, while it is important to address the terms of reference (and not submit something totally off topic), team members emphasised that you don't need to submit on everything—it is okay to just speak to your expertise. Although group members noted that it can be hard to say, "I don't know" or, "that's not really in my expertise", they spoke of this as an ethical strategy of not speaking outside of expertise (or, out of the expertise one is committed to developing during the process of writing the submission). People also noted that saying "I don't know" about certain issues was a way in which to make space for other voices.

In this instance, the Committee's Inquiry (see the [Terms of Reference (TOR)](#)) was broad, and included the opportunity to comment on the [proposed Bill](#) as well as to comment on other aspects of drug policy in the ACT. In this case, the team decided to focus the DPMP submission on the Bill, and not on the other Terms of Reference. The reasons for this included time, wanting to focus the submission on areas in which DPMP had a strong research history, and knowing that another organisation had already made a strong submission covering the Inquiry's TORs in detail but which had not focused on the Bill itself (See Section 2 (b(ii)) for more on coordinating submissions).

(b) Finding your place in the submission

One does not have to submit as an academic team to make an effective submission. Individual and/or experience-based submissions are an important form of evidence used by committees (Geddes 2021, 46). As the DPMP team's evidence, however, was research-based, working together was seen as a particularly good way of making a submission, both because of the amount of research involved as well as the benefits that derive from the different expertise and interests in the group.

---

1 For more about the Federal submissions process, see the Australian Parliament's information page 'Making a submission to a committee inquiry' https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Making_a_submission

The division of labour in the group emerged through letting people find their own space/niche from which to contribute. In this, roles weren't allocated, instead, team members were encouraged to read the bill and then find their own interest and "pick the bits you want to do." Some team members were surprised at this approach, and that it worked without having jobs be allocated:

> It surprised me how collaborative it was and how we came together—I thought it would be like "you're doing this", I was really surprised when Alison said "just go at it" and I thought it would be really messy, and we would just all end up doing the same thing. With things like group assignments, you would never be like "go at it", you'd allocate jobs.

(see Section 3 (a(i)) for further discussion of organised anarchic aspects of this approach)

For some team members, this approach of following what was most interesting or important meant building on expertise they already had. For others, it was a matter of developing a new area of expertise that emerged out of being puzzled about a certain part of the proposed Bill.

In this, and in the processes noted below, information was shared between members both in-person (particularly between the three team members who shared an office space at the time) and via zoom meetings. Finer points were then teased out through the use of a shared Word document using track-changes.

(i) Working with other organisations

Recognition of the expertise held by other organisations also factored into which aspects of the Inquiry's Terms of Reference were taken on for analysis. One team member, for example, recognised that submitting adequately on another one of the Terms of Reference was not part of her expertise and was going to take a lot of research. As the area was important and warranted comment, she emailed another academic with expertise in that field, asking her to consider making a submission on this matter. Another team member noted that building community with other organisations operating in the same area can be useful, allowing groups to coordinate submissions (each submitting on different aspects), to work together on a shared submission or to check each other's drafts. As the intellectual property of the submissions is owned by the select committee and submissions are typically immediately made public, it is also possible to wait and read other submissions before posting one's own.

(c) Understanding the policy

Having a sense of how a policy proposal might operate in practice is vital for making a useful submission on the proposed policy. Understanding the implications of this particular draft legislation was a substantial challenge and took contribution from all team members. There were two main aspects to this challenge: understanding what the policy might look like 'on the ground' and how the policy would articulate with other legislation. As noted below, this required teamwork, making the most of real-world experience of team members, as well as utilising their research labour.

(i) Generating evidence

An initial sense of how the Bill might function in practice (including identifying aspects of the proposed legislation that could be problematic) came from team members' own previous experiences. This was then backed up/investigated with further research. For example, one member's experience of drug checking points/services allowed her to recognise the problematic nature of the Bill's "Proposed personal possession limits", in which there was no discussion of the difference between active ingredient amount and pill weight. Working from this insight, another team member found data on average pill weight which fed into the teams' final recommendations on personal possession limits. A similar combination of personal experience backed-up with research evidence was used to make recommendations on police discretion.

For aspects of the draft legislation that team members did not have insight into through personal experience, they searched for similar legislation in other jurisdictions, gaining a deeper understanding of the functioning of such legislation through studying academic analyses of its impacts in different countries.

(ii) The articulation of policies
As one member of our team noted, "the Bill doesn't give you a map of how it is going to fit in with other pieces of legislation." In Australia, the question of what is under the legislative jurisdiction of the states and territories and what is in the federal government's jurisdiction is one source of complexity. Other complexities arise from questions of how amendments interact with pre-existing legislation, including whether they replace or are additional to older legislation.

One such instance of articulation complexity related to whether the bill's listed "personal possession" quantities would replace existing thresholds for trafficking. After tracing all the related legislation, one team member noted that she was able to get a sense of how the new bill would articulate with the old. However, having never looked at such legislation before, some doubt lingered. As she recalled, "I thought, 'no, maybe I'm reading this wrong'—so I went back to previous DPMP work and that confirmed it." For this team member, and for others, secondary literature—in this case, academic publications charting the articulation of policies—was helpful to confirm interpretations.

(d) Researching as a team

In holding this complexity, working as a team was framed by all team members as being useful for both sharing knowledge and for keeping up motivation. As one member noted, individual labour of envisioning potential issues and gaining understandings fed back to the team: "people could go away and do that kind of imagining work and then bring it back to the group". Seeing that others had gone away and done that deep thought process helped to get people interested in doing "the work of teasing out the points."

3. Reflections on culture

In holding this process of teamwork together, participants noted a range of useful individual and group strategies. These included both a well-established team culture suited to the challenges (and advantages) of interdisciplinary work as well as inner work needed to feel

able to share their understandings even in the presence of some self-doubt.

(a) Team culture

Team members came from a range of disciplinary backgrounds including sociology, psychology, and policy studies. In reflecting on what enabled interdisciplinary cooperation, members noted a culture of seeing knowledge as situated, valuing both 'failure' and learning, and welcoming disagreements.

(i) Valuing contributions/diversity

One factor that all members felt was vital to the drafting process was a sense of valuing all contributions regardless of how long the contributor had been working with DPMP. One group member expressed this as a sense of "I trust whatever you do". This echoed the initial interest-based task allocation strategy for the submission (Section 2(a)i). For this member, it wasn't a surprise that such approaches worked. As she noted, in line with anarcho-syndicalist approaches to community, within groups in which everyone is an expert and everyone has equal responsibility, there is a sense of order and motivation. She noted that this also rested on pre-existing workplace culture:

> *No one had an ego, and everyone built each other up, we have a workplace that is really supportive. Everyone can do it without having to fight for recognition. It makes for a really collaborative workplace.*

This approach also leaned on a sense of valuing people's different areas of expertise. A sense of valuing a diversity of contributions was present, even when contributions ended up being red herrings. As one member noted, even if nothing emerged from such suggestions, "it's good, now we have explored this little alley way".

(ii) Comfort with disagreement

While the drafting process for this particular submission was not heated, several members noted that submissions processes can involve disagreement. In approaching questions of disagreement, team members saw two aspects of the drafting process as being useful. Firstly, as mentioned above, this involved both valuing contributions from a range of positionalities and seeing sharing from those different positions as a learning process, rather than one in which people need to be 'right' in order to be making a valued contribution. This seemed to lead to a culture of not only not being threatened by disagreement but, at times, even welcoming it:

> *It's a culture of working in transdisciplinary teams. We all work on different things—I had this modelled for me, it's not a disagreement, it's about talking out of your own position. I also think that when someone disagrees with you it's really useful because it helps you cement your thinking or gets you to go and do some research.*

Secondly, team members noted that a sense of productive disagreement—including on how to prioritise various points (as indicated by whether they would be included in the submission's main text or the appendix)—was supported through a combination of collective discussion of such points as well as there being a lead author with whom the final decision rested. Although authorship of the submission was shared, it was agreed at the outset that one person would be responsible for making the final call. While, in this case, the lead author was DPMP's director, all members saw that the process could also work with different

people taking this responsibility. What was seen as important was that there was one person "with whom the buck stops". People saw this as enabling them to focus on their particular research areas. Knowing that someone else would pull it all together and work out the priorities allowed people to "really go for it" in their own areas. In this, though, alongside a sense of responsibility for one's own part, members also noted valuing the critique of others and wanting to put effort into looking for potential problems in other people's areas. As one team member noted, "we all had responsibility to get it right."

(b) Strategies for building self-trust

Group members noted that, as a genre, legislation could be intimidating. Alongside the use of secondary research to gain confidence in one's interpretations and a sense of team culture being vital in feeling able to contribute, people used several strategies to help themselves to "trust yourself and share what you've found" with the group. One of the key elements that helped members to feel able to contribute to the team was around recognising that the complexity of policy means that many different contributions are needed.

> *I was lacking in confidence at the start—the people who write submissions are experts and I don't feel like an expert. But the mindset of an expert isn't about knowing everything about everything. Then [politicians] would just go and ask "the expert" what they should do. But there are so many readings of these things that any idea, or reflections are valid and important to consider and some of them in the end might not be considered or go in there, but it is important that any policy gets seen in those different views.*

Relatedly, one team member noted that while the complexity of the law was daunting, that she had been encouraged by knowing that law is open to interpretation and, indeed, that legal argumentation takes advantage of the fact that there are *multiple* possible valid meanings of legislation. Remembering this encouraged her when she identified puzzling or unclear aspects of the Bill: rather than her divergent readings being a misunderstanding on her part, the fact that she had identified that a different interpretation was possible meant there was something to consider:

> *Because there's so much creativity in law, you can kind of build a case for anything, in some sense… there's like certain rules, so you flexibly apply them. … If I can possibly interpret that in this way, then there's something to be addressed there.*

(c) Sustaining submission writing

As there is no guarantee that one's submission will have the desired impact, several of our team have also noted that a sense of effectiveness and efficiency is an important aspect of keeping submission drafting feeling sustainable. While all members felt that the present submission had felt worthwhile and wasn't taxing, experienced members noted the possibility of dreading making submissions and coming to feel that submission-making was "just another thing you just do", without necessarily being impactful. Strategies to avoid feelings of pointlessness included maximising the value of aspects of the process of submission drafting not related to policy-outcomes, attempting to increase the impact of submissions, and not unnecessarily labouring over submissions.

(i) Finding value in the process

One element of sustainability involved enjoying aspects of the process—rather than focusing solely on the policy impacts—of making submissions. In discussing whether they would be interested in being involved in future submissions, members noted the value of getting to know their colleagues and developing their expertise and sense of agency (see Section 1(c) for further discussion).

(ii) Having impact

At the same time, all team members also noted a desire to be as effective as possible. Members noted that much of this was not in the members' own hands but was, instead, related to the extent to which policy processes were genuinely consultative, or whether they were "already stitched up". In this particular process, the team gained information that the particular jurisdiction to which the submission was being made (ACT) tended to take information from submissions on board. This was cited by all members as being highly motivating.

Members with experience of writing submissions and/or analysing the submissions of others also noted the importance of being strategic in drafting. This included both having compelling evidence, embracing the academic expertise of one's team and approaching policy writing as a particular genre. Strategies for good submission writing style—and, thus, potentially increasing the influence of the submission—included:

- Being concise—covering the vital evidence but not unnecessarily padding out reports: "no waffle, don't muck around".
- Writing an engaging/clear introduction.
- Looking at the style that the organisation uses (such as through looking at what has previously been written by the organisation, and then attempting to match the tone).
- Embracing the group's particular expertise. In this case, writing as part of a research group who has a voice. As one team member noted, "it's nice that feeling that you're actually contributing to something that actually goes out there and does matter, and the DPMP name is on it."
- Tweeting submissions.

(iii) Uncertainty in effectiveness

There were some differences of opinion as to which forms of evidence were most effective in submissions. Noting that submissions are read by politicians, industry bodies and individuals rather than academics, some team members noted the importance of compelling stories and case studies. In this case, stories with purchase were valued for their potential to become examples that could make their way through the parliamentary process to affect policy. Other team members preferred a strategy of embracing the power of having an academic voice through emphasising peer-reviewed evidence in the submission. However, all members expressed an openness to using the strongest form of argumentation possible while also acknowledging the difficulty of knowing just how to package data for greatest effect (see 4(a): Future Directions). On this final point, team members noted several ways in which one can get a sense of the impact of one's submission. These included:

- Looking at reports released by inquiries after submissions and evidence has been given. Through looking at such reports, one can sometimes get a sense of how things have been weighed up.

- Being called in to a meeting, or to give further briefing, or give oral evidence, which is a sign they want to know more.
- Assuming impact if the decisions made are in accord with what has been recommended.
- Insider confirmation of impact.

(iv) Time

In the example of submission writing being explored here, the team initially had three weeks in which to get the submission completed, a duration considered relatively standard by team members (who have participated in Inquiries with windows of submission from 3 to 6 weeks). In this instance, the submission date was then extended by one week.

All members valued not spending more time than necessary on the process. However, some members noted that, through getting invested in the process, they ended up spending more time than they had initially thought. Estimates for the four members' time spent on the submission ranged from one day's work to five, spread over several weeks.

4. Future directions/research

As team members noted, while the process had felt very rewarding, and members looked forward to seeing where their contributions might be included in emerging policy, the lack of research on submission impact means it is difficult to know where the team's approach could have been maximised for influence. Some emerging evidence suggests that systematic reviews, statistics, and narrative case studies may be useful forms of evidence for politicians in select committees, and that building personal connections with policy makers may increase the policy impact of one's work (Dommett et. al. 2016, 3). At least one select committee (on sustainable development) was found to have privileged evidence deemed 'scientific' (Turnpenny et. al. 2012). A further study has suggested that the social status of witnesses may influence how their evidence is regarded by select committees (Geddes 2021). There is need for more research in this area and there remain many curiosities, including the impact of 'form' submissions (many people making identical submissions), possible context-specific aspects of the effectiveness of particular kinds of evidence (i.e. how might different forms of deliberation affect the impact and/or perceived credibility of different types of evidence?) and the difficulties of measuring the impact of evidence on decision-makers (i.e., might moving personal anecdotes have influence on decision-makers, even when they are not cited in parliamentary discussions?). While acknowledging that many of these questions provide significant research challenges, in looking to continue to improve the impact of submissions to inquiries, commissions and committees, we suggest that points for further consideration/investigation include:

- The impact of giving testimony within the submissions policy process

- How to measure effectiveness of different kinds of evidence in submissions (and the variation in effectiveness depending on the nature of the area of inquiry)

- Differences in jurisdiction's or differing committee's approaches to considering evidence

As noted throughout this reflection, however, the value of writing submissions resides not

just in the possibility of direct policy impact, but in the value-added team opportunities, capacity development, and new learnings that accrue to those participating in the process. Thus, maximising the possible benefits of making submissions might be best achieved by taking a more holistic view, reflecting not only on the impact of final submissions, but also on the submissions process as a whole.

References

Benton, M., & Russell, M. (2013). Assessing the impact of parliamentary oversight committees: The select committees in the British House of Commons. Parliamentary Affairs, 66(4), 772–797.

Dommett, K., Geddes, M., & Prosser, B. (2016). A recipe for parliamentary impact? An academic guide to effective engagement. University of Sheffield. https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.658541!/file/RecipeForImpact.pdf

Evans, H. (1993), 'Parliamentary Committees and the Public Interest', Legislative Studies, 8(1), 15–19.

Geddes, M. (2021). The webs of belief around 'evidence' in legislatures: The case of select committees in the UK House of Commons. Public Administration, 99(1), 40-54. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12687

Hendriks, C., & Kay, A. (2017). From 'Opening Up' to Democratic Renewal: Deepening Public Engagement in Legislative Committees. Government and Opposition. https://crawford.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/uploads/crawford01_cap_anu_edu_au/2017-01/go_hendrikskay_accepted.pdf

Turnpenny, J., Russel, D., & Rayner, T. (2012). The complexity of evidence for sustainable development policy: Analysing the boundary work of the UK Parliamentary Environmental Audit Committee. Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 38(4), 586–598.

Appendix: Examples of past DPMP submissions

2009
Inquiry into the adequacy and appropriateness of prevention and treatment services for alcohol and illicit drug problems in WA. Submission to the Education and Health Standing Committee Legislative Assembly (2009, July)

2010
Submission to the Department of Health and Ageing: the National Drug Strategy 2010 – 2015 consultation process (2010, December)

Australia's National Drug Strategy - Submission to the National Drug Strategy Consultation by panel of experts roundtable led by the Drug Policy Modelling Program. (February 2010). Sydney: Drug Policy Modelling Program. Available at www.dpmp.unsw.edu.au.

Submission to the Department of Health and Ageing: Australia's National Drug Strategy. (2010, February) Available at: www.dpmp.unsw.edu.au.

Submission to the Department of Health and Ageing - Medicare Locals: Discussion paper on governance and functions.(2010, November)

Submission to NSW Health: Promoting the generation and effective use of population health research in NSW (2010, November)

2011
NHMRC ethics guideline submission, 'Public consultation on ethical issues in research into alcohol and other drugs: an issues paper exploring the need for a guidance framework'. (2011, December)

Public consultation on the Public Health Association of Australia (PHAA) report on the implementation of a Needle and Syringe Program at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC). (2011, September)

Submission for Community consultation on the Whole of Government Victorian Alcohol and Drug Strategy. (2011, September)

Submission to the Health System Capacity Development Fund (2011, September)

Submission to the Commonwealth consultation on implementation of model drug schedules for Commonwealth serious drug offences. (2011, March)

Submission to the Substance Misuse Prevention and Service Improvement Grants (SMPSIG) Fund guidelines. (2011, September)

2012
Senate Committee Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010 submission (2012, February)

Submission to the Australian National Preventative Health Agency. Real or Perceived Impediments to Minimum Pricing of Alcohol in Australia: Public Opinion, the Industry and the Law. (2012, November)

Expert advice into the Australian Illicit Data Centre, National Drug Precursor Risk Assessment of methamphetamine (2012, January)

Feedback on Draft Strategic Framework for the Management of Blood Borne Viruses in the Alexander Maconochie Centre 2012 – 2014. Submitted to ACT Government Health Directorate. (2012, October)

2013
Submission to NSW Legislative Council: Inquiry into drug treatment and alcohol treatment. (2013, March)

Submission to AFP Senate inquiry: Value of a justice reinvestment approach to criminal justice in Australia (2013, March)

Submission to the NSW Legislative Council: Inquiry into drug and alcohol treatment. General Purpose Standing Committee No. 2 (2013)

2014
Evidence into the Inquiry into the supply and use of methamphetamines, particularly 'ice'. *Victorian Parliamentary Law Reform, Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee*, (May 2014)

Submission to the US White House 2015 National Drug Control Strategy (2014, September)

2015
Submission to the Legislative Assembly Committee on Law and Safety Inquiry into Measures to Reduce Alcohol and Drug-Related Violence (2015)

Submission to House of Representatives Standing Committee on Health - Inquiry into Hepatitis C in Australia (2015)

Submission to Australia's National Drug Strategy: Beyond 2009 - Consultation Process (March 2015)

Submission to Australian Federal Parliament Senate Inquiry: Value of a justice reinvestment approach to criminal justice in Australia (2015)

Submission to Inquiry into the Regulator of Medicinal Cannabis Bill: Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee (2015)

Submission to Victorian Crime Statistics (Fees and Charges) Regulation (April, 2015)
Submission to the National Ice Taskforce (May, 2015)

Submission to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement inquiry into crystal methamphetamine (June, 2015)

2016

Submission to the Independent review of the impact of liquor law reforms (April, 2016)

Submission to Parliamentary Joint Committee on Law Enforcement – Inquiry into crystal methamphetamine (November, 2016)

Response to National Alcohol Strategy 2016-2021 Consultation (2016)

Submission to ACT Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2016

2017
Submission into the Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Drug Law Reform (March, 2017)

Submission to Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into Steroids: Why Australia should stop ramping up their steroid laws and help users instead (2017)

Submission to the Inquiry into the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Welfare Reform) Bill 2017 (August 2017)

2018
Submission to the Inquiry into the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Drugs Testing Trial) Bill 2018 (April 2018)

2019
Submission to the NSW Special Commission of Inquiry into the Drug 'Ice' (May 2019)

Submission to the Inquiry into the Social Services Legislation Amendment (Drugs Testing Trial) Bill 2019 (September, 2019)

2021
Submission to ACT Legislative Assembly, Inquiry into the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Use) Amendment Bill 2021 (June 2021)