

NATIONAL HOUSING DELIVERY INFRASTRUCTURE PLATFORM

A Delivery Architecture for Converting Housing Inputs into Housing Outcomes

Supporting Attachment to the Productivity Commission Inquiry into Housing Supply Regulation

Prepared by

Enzo Guarino
Founder & CEO
LYV Group

11 June 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Australia's housing challenge is commonly framed as a shortage of housing supply.

As a result, public policy has focused on increasing housing inputs through planning reform, land release, infrastructure investment, housing finance initiatives and construction productivity improvements.

These interventions remain important.

However, increasing housing inputs does not automatically increase housing outcomes.

Housing outcomes emerge through the interaction of multiple systems operating across multiple institutions.

Capital must align with land.

Land must align with planning.

Planning must align with infrastructure.

Infrastructure must align with delivery.

Delivery must align with occupancy.

Where these systems operate effectively together, housing throughput increases.

Where they operate independently, housing throughput declines.

This paper proposes a National Housing Delivery Infrastructure Platform as a framework for improving the coordination, governance and performance of Australia's housing delivery system.

The platform is not a builder.

It is not a developer.

It is not a housing programme.

It is not a funding mechanism.

It is a delivery architecture.

Its purpose is to improve the conversion of housing inputs into housing outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

The preceding papers in this submission have advanced two propositions.

First, Australia's housing challenge is fundamentally a delivery system challenge.

Second, housing should increasingly be viewed through the lens of infrastructure delivery.

This paper explores the practical implications of those propositions.

If housing is a delivery challenge, and if housing should be viewed as infrastructure, then the next question becomes:

What type of delivery architecture is required to improve housing outcomes?

The purpose of this paper is to answer that question.

THE CURRENT DELIVERY MODEL

Australia's housing system currently operates through a distributed network of institutions.

Participants include:

- Commonwealth Government
- State Governments
- Local Government
- Planning Authorities
- Infrastructure Providers

- Utilities
- Institutional Capital
- Housing Agencies
- Developers
- Builders
- Manufacturers
- Community Housing Providers

Each participant performs an important role.

Each operates according to its own objectives, governance arrangements and performance measures.

The challenge is that housing outcomes emerge from the interaction of all participants rather than the performance of any individual participant.

The current model can therefore be represented as:

Capital

↓

Planning

↓

Infrastructure

↓

Procurement

↓

Construction

↓

Occupation

Responsibility exists throughout the system.

Coordination accountability does not.

This creates fragmentation.

The result is reduced housing throughput.

THE MISSING LAYER

Australia's housing system contains multiple operational layers.

Policy Layer

Responsible for housing policy, funding programs and regulatory frameworks.

Capital Layer

Responsible for financing housing outcomes.

Infrastructure Layer

Responsible for enabling development.

Production Layer

Responsible for delivering housing products.

Occupancy Layer

Responsible for housing outcomes.

What is largely absent is a dedicated coordination layer connecting these systems.

The absence of this layer creates the Housing Coordination Gap.

The challenge is not that the individual layers do not exist.

The challenge is that they are not consistently connected through a common delivery architecture.

THE NATIONAL HOUSING DELIVERY INFRASTRUCTURE PLATFORM

The proposed platform acts as the coordinating layer between housing inputs and housing outcomes.

Housing Inputs

- Capital
- Land
- Planning
- Infrastructure
- Utilities
- Workforce
- Manufacturing
- Construction

↓

National Housing Delivery Infrastructure Platform

↓

Housing Outcomes

- Completed Homes
- Occupied Homes
- Housing Throughput
- Programme Performance

The platform does not replace existing institutions.

It improves coordination between them.

CORE FUNCTIONS

Function One

Programme Governance

Establish clear accountability for housing delivery outcomes.

Responsibilities include:

- programme oversight
- performance reporting
- risk management
- stakeholder coordination
- delivery assurance

Function Two

Capital-to-Housing Conversion

Improve the efficiency with which housing funding becomes completed housing.

Focus areas include:

- programme structuring
- delivery sequencing
- investment alignment
- risk allocation
- delivery monitoring

Function Three

Infrastructure Coordination

Align housing delivery with:

- roads
- water
- sewerage
- electricity
- telecommunications
- social infrastructure

The objective is improved sequencing between infrastructure and housing delivery.

Function Four

Delivery Integration

Coordinate:

- planning
- approvals
- procurement
- manufacturing
- construction
- logistics
- deployment

The objective is improved system performance rather than component performance.

Function Five

Delivery Intelligence

Provide visibility across the full housing lifecycle.

This includes:

- project status
- approvals performance
- infrastructure readiness
- delivery bottlenecks
- programme risks
- housing throughput

Without visibility, effective coordination becomes difficult.

THE NATIONAL HOUSING DELIVERY INDEX

A core capability of the platform would be performance measurement.

Current reporting frameworks frequently focus on:

- housing targets
- funding allocations
- approvals
- commencements

These metrics remain important.

However, they provide limited visibility across the full delivery chain.

The proposed National Housing Delivery Index would track:

Policy Allocation

↓

Funding Commitment

↓

Project Approval

↓

Infrastructure Readiness

↓

Procurement

↓

Construction Commencement

↓

Completion

↓

Occupation

This framework creates visibility across the entire housing delivery lifecycle.

Most importantly, it identifies where housing is delayed, constrained or lost.

POTENTIAL GOVERNANCE MODELS

The purpose of this paper is not to prescribe a specific institutional arrangement.

Several governance models may be capable of performing the coordination function.

Model One

National Housing Delivery Authority

A dedicated national institution responsible for housing delivery performance.

Model Two

Housing Australia Delivery Framework

Expansion of existing institutional capabilities to include delivery coordination functions.

Model Three

National Cabinet Housing Coordination Framework

A Commonwealth-State coordination mechanism focused on housing throughput.

Model Four

State-Based Delivery Authorities

State delivery authorities operating under nationally aligned performance frameworks.

The key principle is not institutional form.

The key principle is accountability for delivery outcomes.

FEDERAL-STATE INTEGRATION

Housing delivery requires coordination across all levels of government.

A future delivery architecture should complement existing responsibilities rather than replace them.

Commonwealth Government

National policy.

Funding frameworks.

Performance reporting.

↓

State Governments

Planning systems.

Infrastructure delivery.

Programme implementation.

↓

Local Government

Development assessment.

Local planning.

Community integration.

The objective is not centralisation.

The objective is alignment.

WHY THIS MATTERS

Australia's housing challenge is often described as a shortage of homes.

A more accurate description may be a shortage of housing delivery capability.

The nation possesses many of the inputs required to increase housing supply.

The challenge is combining those inputs effectively.

Without a delivery architecture, housing programmes remain vulnerable to fragmentation.

With a delivery architecture, housing outcomes become more measurable, accountable and scalable.

The objective is not simply to build more homes.

The objective is to build a system capable of consistently delivering more homes.

CONCLUSION

Australia's housing challenge should increasingly be understood as a delivery challenge.

Housing outcomes emerge when capital, land, infrastructure, approvals, manufacturing capability and construction capacity operate as a coordinated whole.

The National Housing Delivery Infrastructure Platform represents a framework for strengthening that coordination capability.

It is not a proposal for a new housing programme.

It is a proposal for improving the system responsible for delivering housing programmes.

The long-term opportunity extends beyond housing itself.

The capability being developed is coordination.

Housing is the first application.

Coordination is the capability.

Delivery is the objective.

Outcomes are the measure.

Australia does not primarily lack housing inputs.

Australia lacks a housing delivery operating system.