

Thank you for enabling CDU to comment on the proposals contained within the discussion paper. Charles Darwin University and Flinders University contribute to the Northern Territory Medical Program (NTMP), although we are separately contributing to this discussion paper. We notice that the NT is absent from all of your tables, despite (one could argue) the greatest need being evident. We appreciate the funding supporting the NTMP is not all CSP.

We are pleased with the initiative to redistribute the pool of medical places to regional, rural and remote communities. We support the general principle of redistribution to better meet workforce need and, therefore are supportive of the intent of the paper.

This will, or should be, of great benefit for the NT and rural and remote regions more broadly. We are all, painfully, aware of the shortage of medical practitioners across the Territory and, as such, we feel that an increase in medical places located here would go some way to ameliorating this issue. There is potential to grow both the size of this program and CDU's involvement in the education of medical students. We are also aware of the necessary support, infrastructure and associated policy directions that would need to be in place to ensure maximum benefit of this approach.

In terms of the specific proposals highlight in the paper, we would like to contribute:

1. We appreciate the necessity of defining what a *genuine* end-to-end rural medical program looks like.
2. We would argue that the NT has a unique and compelling case for a significant number of the redistributed places. Indeed, it would argue that a doubling of the current numbers of students being admitted to the NTMP would be a minimum increase required.
3. We wonder whether the arrangements for determining the redistribution pool is overly simplistic and perhaps needs to consider outcomes as well as inputs.
4. We agree that the construction of the redistribution pool should include factors related to success (or failure) in currently serving the needs of rural and regional communities.
5. Option 1 appears the most equitable of approaches, although it is appreciated that if the number of places bid for exceeds those available then a clear and transparent method of allocation needs to be enacted. Whilst the redistribution being based on the "strongest bid" would appear potentially burdensome and opaque. Consequently, the combination of Option 1, with some elements of Option 2 should be enacted in the case of the bids exceeding the numbers available.
6. We acknowledge the policy parameters and consider them appropriate and sensible.

Kind regards,

Dominic

Professor Dominic Upton
Dean