

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(301) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Crossin asked:

Are you aware of any “best practice” arrangements that may have developed for coordinating the interface with Indigenous communities through the operations of the ICCs?

*Answer:*

OIPC has several internal mechanisms to facilitate networking and sharing best practice experience between ICC Managers and other staff in ICCs. In addition, OIPC and other agencies are working together at all levels to continuously improve the way the Australian Government works with Indigenous communities. These include coordinated field trips to communities; and the electronic submission process where communities apply for their ongoing funding through one submission that is coordinated through the ICC.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(302) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Investing in the Indigenous art industry across the Northern Territory to maintain and enhance production and quality of Indigenous art.

This did not have a funding level attached to it in the election policy. How much money is involved?

*Answer:*

Any decision about the amount of funding to be committed from the Aboriginals Benefit Account for an investment in the Indigenous art industry, or another purpose, is a matter for the Minister on advice from the ABA Advisory Committee.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(303) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Up to \$2 million to support Indigenous involvement in the aquaculture industry in the Darwin region.

Is the funding level \$2 million or is it less?

*Answer:*

As indicated in response to Question on Notice 283, no funds have been allocated for this purpose at this stage. The decision about funding is a matter for the Minister on advice from the Aboriginals Benefit Account Advisory Committee.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(304) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

In Groote Eylandt, funding of up to \$2 million to support Indigenous involvement, again, in the aquaculture industry.

Is the funding level \$2 million or is it less?

*Answer:*

No funds have been allocated for this purpose at this stage. The decision about funding is a matter for the Minister on advice from the Aboriginals Benefit Account Advisory Committee.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(305) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

In Alice Springs, funding of up to \$2 million to further support the development of Indigenous horticulture projects in association with the CLC.

Is the funding level \$2 million or is it less?

*Answer:*

No funds have been allocated for this purpose at this stage. The decision about funding is a matter for the Minister on advice from the Aboriginals Benefit Account Advisory Committee.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(306) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

In relation to all projects funded from ABA in 2003-04 and 2004-05, when was each project approved for funding? When did it commence, or when is it expected to commence?

*Answer:*

A list of approved projects for 2003-04 and 2004-05 including dates when projects were considered by the ABA Advisory Committee has been provided in response to Question on Notice 287. There is an acquittal procedure and funds for each project are administered in accordance with that procedure.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(307) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Are there any threats to the long term viability of the ABA that the Department is aware of? Please provide details.

*Answer:*

The ABA's revenue is derived from mining royalties paid by companies which operate mines on Aboriginal land in the Northern Territory. Therefore, the ABA's long term viability is dependent on those mines continuing to operate, on new mines being established and on enough mining royalties being paid to enable the ABA to meet its commitments to its beneficiaries. In the past 2 years, royalties paid for mines on Aboriginal land have been high and the Department expects that this will continue for the 2005-06 financial year at least. However, mining royalties are very volatile and it is impossible to predict what will happen over the longer term.

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(308) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Employees:

1. Please provide an update on commencements and separations of Indigenous staff within the Indigenous affairs areas of DIMIA since July 2004.
2. In response to QON 165 from February 2005, the Department indicated that five of its Indigenous staff were on extended leave as of 3 March 2005. Please provide an update and indicate what types of extended leave staff are on.

*Answer:*

1. For the period 1 July 2004 to late May 2005, 20 ongoing Indigenous employees were engaged by OIPC.

In the same period, out of an Indigenous workforce of around 194, there have been 34 separations of ongoing Indigenous staff. This figure includes 10 transfers or promotions to other agencies.

2. OIPC currently has six staff on extended leave (ie for a cumulative period of more than 12 months). One staff member has taken up a statutory position in the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission; three are on miscellaneous leave without pay for fixed terms, engaged in outside employment considered to be in the interest of the Australian Public Service; one is on extended sick leave; and the final one is on leave without pay for family reasons.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(309) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

(1) Is the Government planning to respond to Mr Calma's *Social Justice Report 2004* in any formal way? If so, when are we likely to see a response from the Government? If not, is there any mechanism within the Department to consider this report and recommend appropriate action to the Executive or the Government? Is this done formally, and monitored in some way, or is a more informal, ad hoc approach taken?

(2) Does the same approach apply to the Commissioner's *Native Title Report* – which may be primarily the Attorney-General's Department, but also has some implications for DIMIA, particularly as regards Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs)?

(3) Mr Calma quotes information provided by OIPC in relation to its communication strategy on page 98 of his report. This information talks about a series of one-day workshops that were held between July and September last year. Were these workshops Evaluated? If so, what was the outcome of the evaluation? Have any further such workshops been held for ICC staff?

(4) The OIPC information also quoted in the report also states that a weekly bulletin is produced to provide a common source of information for all ICC staff. Have such bulletins been going out on a weekly basis?

(5) Will OIPC conduct a comprehensive information campaign as recommended by the SJC?

If so:

- what plans have been made to date for this campaign?
- what funding is available?
- How are language and literacy issues being addressed?

If not, why not? What is OIPC doing instead?

(6) In response question on notice number 190 in February this year, OIPC advised that three consultants had been engaged to undertake pilot projects in different regions focusing on communications methods and materials for communicating with Indigenous communities about the new arrangements in Indigenous affairs. Have these pilot projects been completed? Have they been evaluated? If so, please provide a copy of the evaluations?

(7) Have these consultancies resulted in any examples of what you would describe as "best practice" in communication between the Government (particularly ICCs) and Indigenous communities?

(8) In verbal evidence, the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) stated that it is about to approach the market for further assistance with communication and is currently finalising a tender specification. Is OIPC aware of this? Has OIPC provided any advice to DOTARS in relation to this proposed tender?

(9) DOTARS advised that OIPC has established a panel of communications consultants that they may choose to access instead of putting out their own tender. Is it correct that OIPC has established such a panel? If so, when did this occur?

(10) Who made the decision that it would be appropriate to establish the panel?

(11) Please provide details of the consultants who are on the panel. What kinds of services are available from these consultants?

(12) How were these consultants selected? Is there any opportunity for further consultants to seek to join the panel?

(13) Are any of the consultants being paid any kind of retainer to ensure that their services will be available to the Commonwealth when they are required?

(14) Which agencies, if any, have used the panel process to select consultants? How many consultancies have resulted?

(15) The SJC's Recommendation 4 is to reintroduce as mandatory in selection criteria for APS jobs relating to the new arrangements (in particular in the OIPC) the two identified criteria – a demonstrated knowledge and understanding of Indigenous cultures; and an ability to communicate effectively with Indigenous people. Why were these criteria dropped in the first place? Please explain how that decision was made.

(16) Has the SJC's recommendation now been accepted and implemented by OIPC in relation to its own recruitment?

(17) Is OIPC aware of whether other departments are including the criteria for positions working in Indigenous programs?

(18) Clearly some staff have been recruited without having to meet these criteria. What cross cultural training has been provided for OIPC staff who don't have a background in Indigenous affairs?

(19) What is the total training budget for OIPC and how is that expected to be allocated across the various areas of training (for example, cross-cultural, leadership, IT, etc)?

Recommendation 5 asks for the Commonwealth Grants Commission to enquire into the new arrangements with particular focus on: the role of ICCs in targeting regional

need and implementing WoG approach; processes for establishing regional need; integration of local and regional need through Regional Partnership Agreements and SRA processes; and the role of regional Indigenous representative structures in these processes.

(20) Have you provided any advice to the Minister in regard to how the Government could respond to this recommendation? Has the Government made any decisions in this regard?

The Commissioner has identified a range of follow-up actions which he is proposing to take over this year. One of these (number 2) is to seek to establish whether any Indigenous communities or organisations have experienced any ongoing financial difficulties or disadvantage as a result of the transition of grant management processes from ATSI to mainstream departments. The Commissioner states that he will draw any such issues to the Government's attention so that they can be rectified.

(21) Is OIPC aware of any such issues that have been raised by the Commissioner to date?

(22) Is OIPC aware of any organisations that have themselves raised concerns about the continuity of their funding under the new arrangements?

Another action (no. 9) will be to assess whether there has been a reduction in the flexibility in interpreting program guidelines since the transfer of programs from ATSI to mainstream departments.

In response to a question on notice to OIPC in February this year about funding for Kimberley Interpreting Services (no. 189), OIPC advised that this was now the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department. However, AG's has advised that it only funds interpreting services in the Northern Territory.

(23) Which department would actually fund interpreting services outside the NT? Or would each case be coordinated through the local ICC to find an appropriate source of funding depending on the project or reason for needing interpreters?

*Answer:*

(1) The Government has a practice of not responding formally to Social Justice Reports/recommendations.

(2) The current and previous Governments have not provided a response to these reports since 1994.

The Attorney-General, the Hon Phillip Ruddock MP, and the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, Senator the Hon Amanda Vanstone, issued a joint media release on 8 April 2005 in response to the Commissioner's Native Title Report 2004.

In the media release, the Government acknowledged the importance of the Social Justice Commissioner's efforts in drawing attention to the issues outlined in the Native Title Report, and welcomed the focus of the report on the economic and social outcomes that may be generated through the native title system, which includes Native Title Representative Bodies.

The Government also stated in the media release that it was pleased by the Social Justice Commissioner's proposal to consult further with Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments on native title related issues.

(3) OIPC conducted the one-day induction workshops to provide staff with information on the new arrangements. Feedback was received from participants and this was used in developing further training on operating whole-of-government arrangements. This training is currently being rolled out to all ICCs through the Australia Public Service Commission.

(4) The ICC Newsletter was distributed weekly from 31 July 2004 to 24 December 2004. It was used to provide information as the ICC network commenced on administrative issues relating to the operation of the ICCs to ICC staff and staff in Australian Government agencies. OIPC web sites now contain key information for ICC staff.

(5) Please see answers provided to Question on Notice Number 293.

(6) The pilot projects referred to in the response to QoN 190 were not long-term field projects but short-term scoping trials designed to test proposals from three different consultants and scope issues for further work. After assessment of the consultants' proposals it was decided to engage two of the consultants to undertake further work to assist OIPC develop effective and culturally appropriate methods of communicating with Indigenous communities.

(7) The consultancies resulted in the cross-cultural communications strategy referred to in the response to QoN 293, which OIPC regards as providing the basis for good practice communications with Indigenous communities.

(8) Yes. OIPC was invited by DoTARS to assist in assessing tender proposals.

(9)-(14) No, OIPC has not established a panel of communication consultants. However, OIPC has recently established four other panels which are described in answer to QoN 313.

(15)-(19) This has been answered in QoN 293, part (2).

(20) It is not appropriate to comment on the advice provided to Government on policy matters. Announcement of Government decisions is a matter for the Minister.

(21) The Commissioner has not referred any such issues to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination to date.

(22) As part of the new arrangements, contracted funding for programs previously

administered by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services was transferred to mainstream agencies. The Indigenous Coordination Centre network coordinates the application, assessment and contracting process across the agencies for the majority of these programs.

As has occurred in the past, some concerns were raised relating to specific program funding decisions taken by individual funding agencies against relevant program guidelines. Funding decisions take account of the performance and capacity of the funded organisation and seek to ensure value for money, accountability and the delivery of quality services on the ground.

(23) Correct.

As example of funding for such a service outside of the Northern Territory is the following, funded by the Department of Transport and Regional Services:  
Mirima Council Aboriginal Corporation - Kimberley Interpreter Service (\$29,480) and (\$127,000).

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(310) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

#### Regional representative arrangements

1. How many areas or regions of Australia will have regional structures of some type in place once the Regional Councils cease to exist on 30 June? Could you provide a list of these regions?
2. How many regional councils or other organisations have approached OIPC or Senator Vanstone seeking to discuss the establishment of new regional structures in their areas?
3. How many of these groups has Senator Vanstone met with? Please provide details.
4. If Senator Vanstone has not met with the Many Rivers Regional Council, why not?
5. Has OIPC provided the Government or the Secretaries Group with any advice on the options for funding the development and operation of new regional structures since the ATSIC legislation was passed?
6. Page 99 of the DIMIA PBS indicates that there is a target of 5 RPAs to be developed in 2005-06. Who are these RPAs expected to be signed by in the absence of Regional Councils or alternative representative structures?

*Answer:*

1. This is ultimately a matter for Indigenous people themselves. As at end-June 2005, proposals on Indigenous regional representative arrangements were well developed in ten regions, based on community consultations. These regions are: Murdi Paaki (western NSW); Many Rivers (central and northern coast NSW); the Gulf & West Queensland; Central Queensland; Wunan (east Kimberley WA); Kullarri (west Kimberley WA); Yamatji (central west WA); Ngaanyatjarra, (Warburton region WA); Nulla Wimila Kutja, (north east SA) and Cairns. Other areas may continue to utilise existing representative arrangements such as community councils, working parties, or committees, often based on specific issues such as land and native title, health or housing.

2. All 35 Regional Councils, or their Chairs, have held discussions with the relevant ICC manager and/or with OIPC staff based in Canberra on the processes for consulting with communities on new engagement methods with governments and the options for establishing new representative bodies.
3. The Minister met with the Regional Council Chairs on 12 April 2005. The primary topic of discussion was new regional representative arrangements.
4. The Minister was unable to meet with the Many Rivers Regional Council due to competing priorities. However, there were discussions between OIPC and the Regional Council and the Minister has written to the Council Chairperson about regional representation models.
5. We do not comment on the advice provided within Government.
6. Regional Partnership Agreements may be signed by existing Indigenous bodies, such as the Ngaanyatjarra Council and by newly emerging Indigenous bodies.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(311) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

1. In response to questions on notice about the trials of removing Remote Area Exemptions in February 2005, the Department said that the trials are being managed by a Deputy Secretaries Group comprising representatives from OIPC, DEWR, FACS and Centrelink. Does OIPC chair this committee? Please provide a list of meeting dates and attendees and apologies at each meeting.
2. Please provide further details about the practical effects of the trial? What opportunities are being made available to people who give up their access to remote area exemption in terms of accessing work experience or training, or to find 'real' jobs?
3. How much is each of these trials costing?
4. In terms of evaluating the impact of these trials, has an evaluation plan been developed? Is there going to be a consistent approach to evaluation across the sites or will each site be evaluated separately?

*Answer:*

1. Yes. OIPC has chaired this group although this role has now been taken on by DEWR. Meeting dates have been as follows:

#### Meeting 8 June 2005

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (OIPC)

Bob Correll (DEWR)

Margaret Brown (Centrelink)

Stephen Hunter (FaCS)

Kate Gumley (OIPC)

Jody Hamilton (DEWR)

Barbara Causon (Centrelink)

Anna Wheeler (OIPC)

Geoff Richardson (FaCS)

Meeting 11 May 2005

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (OIPC)  
Bob Correll (DEWR)  
Margaret Brown (Centrelink)  
Dianne Hawgood (OIPC)  
Barbara Causon (Centrelink)  
Kate Gumley (OIPC)  
Anna Wheeler (OIPC)  
James McDonald (OIPC)  
Geoff Richardson (FaCS)

Apologies:

Stephen Hunter (FaCS)  
Carolyn Hogg (Centrelink)  
Jody Hamilton (DEWR)

Meeting 20 August 2004

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (OIPC)  
Pat Turner (Centrelink)  
Glenys Beauchamps (FaCS)  
Graham Carters (DEWR)  
Janine Gertz (Centrelink)  
Bradley Knight (DEWR)  
Evan Mann (FaCS)  
Kate Gumley (OIPC)  
Jim Ramsay (OIPC)  
Pauline McDonough (OIPC)

Apologies:

Bob Correll (DEWR)  
Stephen Hunter (FACS)

Meeting 23 July 2004

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (OIPC)  
Pat Turner (Centrelink)  
Stephen Hunter (FaCS)  
Barbara Causon (Centrelink)  
Janine Gertz (Centrelink)  
Alison Durban (DEWR)  
Malcolm Cook (DEWR)  
Evan Mann (FaCS)  
Jim Ramsay (OIPC)  
Gwen Davis-Goff (OIPC)

#### Meeting 25 June 2004

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (ATSIS)  
Pat Turner (Centrelink)  
Stephen Hunter (FaCS)  
Bob Correll (DEWR)  
Barbara Causon (Centrelink)  
Malcolm Cook (DEWR)  
Evan Mann (FaCS)  
Barry Sandison (FaCS)  
Tom Calma (ATSIS)  
Jim Ramsay (ATSIS)

#### Meeting 21 May 2004

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (ATSIS)  
Pat Turner (Centrelink)  
Stephen Hunter (FaCS)  
Bob Correll (DEWR)  
Barbara Causon (Centrelink)  
Carolyn McNally (DEWR)  
Evan Mann (FaCS)  
Barry Sandison (FaCS)  
Tom Calma (ATSIS)  
Jim Ramsay (ATSIS)

#### Meeting 7 May 2004

Attendees:

Bernie Yates (ATSIS)  
Pat Turner (Centrelink)  
Stephen Hunter (FaCS)  
Bob Correll (DEWR)  
Barbara Causon (Centrelink)  
Carolyn McNally (DEWR)  
Evan Mann (FaCS)  
Barry Sandison (FaCS)  
Tom Calma (ATSIS)  
Jim Ramsay (ATSIS)

2. The Government's Mutual Obligation policy applies generally across Australia and people in receipt of certain income support payments are required to undertake activities as a condition of receiving such support. Mutual Obligation policy has been applied differently in some areas where there were insufficient funded community work activities or labour market opportunities for income support recipients to participate in. As a result many working age adults in remote Australia are exempt from activity testing, usually through a Remote Area Exemption (RAE) administered by Centrelink.

The Government's policy is that this exemption will be removed. This is being done in a phased approach.

The Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination, the Departments of Family and Community Services and Employment and Workplace Relations, and Centrelink are arranging better access opportunities. This will mean income support recipients can improve their own skills at the same time as they contribute to their community. They will be better placed to take advantage of local job and business opportunities and be able to gain support for employment and training support through Job Network.

3. The funds committed to the former Community Participation Agreement sites in 2004-05 are as follows: Bidyganga \$180,900; Gunbalanya \$100,275; Canteen Creek \$94,000; Ali Carung \$141,000.

With regard to the Yirrkala and Tiwi Island sites, the servicing of remote Indigenous communities is part of the existing Fee for Service arrangements established under Job Network. As such, no additional costs have been incurred outside of the normal Job Network arrangements for the area except for some minor travel and Departmental support costs. So as not to prejudice future contracting processes, DEWR does not release information on payments made to employment services providers for specific areas.

4. There will be a post implementation review, along with regular performance monitoring of contracted providers, of the Phase One sites that will inform the arrangements put in place for subsequent phases.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(312) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

1. Please provide details of the tender process for the consultancy which produced the report *Key Social and Economic Indicators for Indigenous Australia: A Comparative Analysis*.
2. What was the primary purpose of this consultancy?
3. What was the initial budget for this project?
4. What was the final cost?

*Answer:*

1. The consultant for this project was contracted by a select tender process.
2. The primary purpose of the consultancy was to inform policy development in Indigenous affairs by detailed analysis of key social and economic indicators from 1996 and 2001 census data.
3. The Office of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs originally estimated that the total cost of the contract would not exceed \$25 000.
4. The final amount paid to the consultant was \$20 000 (GST exclusive).

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

### BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005

#### IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

#### **(313) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

1. Please provide details of the tender mentioned by Ms Hawgood on page L&C35 from 27 May 2005.
2. Will separate tenders be conducted for different regions?
3. Is the intention to develop a panel of consultants, similar to that established in relation to communication issues?

*Answer:*

1. A request for tender was released nationally in February 2005. The tender sought to establish four panels of experts to provide communities with access to a pool of skills and expertise in financial management, SRA implementation, risk management, governance and community engagement and development.

The tender closed on 24 March 2005 and 114 responses were received. Contract negotiations are underway with 73 firms/organisations selected to join the panel. Fifty organisations were successful for more than one panel.

They represent a mix of private sector consultants and NGOs, including Indigenous organisations. The work of the panels will be funded from the SRA Implementation Assistance Program.

2. Not at this time. Separate tenders were not conducted for different regions. Tenderers were required to deliver their services in regional and remote areas.
3. Yes, a panel of consultants has been established.

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(314) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

1. Mr Gibbons stated in verbal evidence (L&C 35) that OIPC has established a new approach to communication with communities in northern South Australia, which has been jointly agreed with the South Australian Government. Is this approach being used within or outside the COAG trial region?
2. What has been the role of the Department of Health and Ageing in establishing the forum described by Mr Gibbons? What is its role in terms of participating in the forum, if any?

*Answer:*

1. The approach to government engagement with communities in South Australia, mentioned at page 35, is being applied within the COAG trial site.
2. The Department of Health and Ageing has supported and assisted the establishment of the forum. They have a continuing role as a member of the forum.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(315) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

1. Do ICCs have a uniform complaint handling mechanism?
2. Is there any formal mechanism for ICCs to report complaints from stakeholders about the new arrangements, or funding problems due to the new arrangements, to senior managers in OIPC?
3. How many such complaints have been received?

*Answer:*

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

As part of the new arrangements, contracted funding for a number of programs previously administered by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services was transferred to mainstream agencies. The ICC network coordinates the application, assessment and contracting process across the agencies for the majority of these programs.

Where a complaint relates to a specific program or funding decision, it is managed by the responsible funding agency, in line with that agency's complaints management procedures. Where a complaint relates to the overall process or programs administered by OIPC or the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs, it is managed at the ICC level in accordance with OIPC/DIMIA client feedback guidelines.

3. OIPC is aware that some concerns have been received, relating to specific program funding decisions taken by individual funding agencies. Funding decisions take account of the performance and capacity of the funded organisation that services are aligned to meet community needs and seek to ensure value for money, accountability and the delivery of quality services on the ground.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(316) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C Written) asked:

#### Grant Management System upgrade

1. In response to a question on notice from February regarding what would happen to ATSI's software, DIMIA indicated that all software would be retained by OIPC except the loans management and CDEP Manager software. Is that answer still correct?
2. Does the software retained by DIMIA include the Grant Management System? Is this now the primary software used by ICCs in managing grant applications which are relevant to a range of departments?
3. Have any updates/upgrades to the Grant Management System been required to manage the change of the range of grant programs from ATSI to mainstream agencies?
4. How much did this enhancement or upgrade cost?
5. What is the nature of the changes, enhancements or upgrades made to the system? Please provide details.
6. Does the upgrade include the introduction of a requirement for people entering information about grant proposals to include information about which electorate the proposal will affect? If so, who made the decision to include this information? How was that decision made? Why does the Government believe it necessary to collect electorate information related to indigenous organisations that apply for grant funding?

*Answer:*

1. Yes.
2. Yes. The current GMS is retained and managed by DIMIA. It is the primary software used to manage grant applications for a range of other agency (ex-ATSI) programs.
3. Yes.
4. The precise costs are difficult to estimate as ongoing upgrades and

enhancements are required each year as part of a continuous improvement process for GMS, which are not directly related to multiple agency arrangements.

To implement the specific system changes necessary to provide for multiple agencies access and reporting is estimated to have cost approximately \$20,000.

5. The main changes relating to multiple agency usage were as follows:

- Provide links between programs in GMS and specific agencies;
- Change reporting options to enable Agency specific reports; and
- Change GMS access arrangements to suit individual Agency arrangements.

6. The inclusion of a provision to input electorate data into GMS was not related to the upgrades and enhancements to facilitate the new agency arrangements.

The decision to include provision for recording electorate information was taken by the GMS System Administrators as a consequence of the number of ad hoc requests during 2004 to supply information on individual electorates by members of Parliament.

The process of mapping a funded organisation to an electorate has not yet been completed and no such information was provided to staff as part of the decision making process. The facility has been provided to enable reports to be produced once funding decisions have been taken.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(317) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Advice provided to TSRA

One purpose of the ICCs is to ensure that communities have a single point of contact where they can receive advice about the funding available through a range of Government programs. Is any such service available to the TSRA to assist it in identifying sources of funding – for example, for the infrastructure projects it has identified as important? Could TSRA seek advice from an ICC? If so, which ICC would it approach?

*Answer:*

The TSRA is able to gain advice from the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination in Canberra on the range of program funding. On the example of infrastructure, OIPC would coordinate with the Department of Family and Community Services and other departments as necessary in order to provide advice to the TSRA.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(318) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C Written) asked:

- (1) What is meant by 'holistic' SRAs (p. 99 of DIMIA PBS)?
- (2) On page 99 of the DIMIA PBS, one of the performance measures identified is "Level of stakeholder satisfaction with SRA development and implementation". Who are the stakeholders whose satisfaction will be measured? How will this be done?
- (3) Is it the case that performance bonuses are being paid to ICC Managers and senior officials within OIPC on the basis of the number of SRAs negotiated? Please explain how performance pay for senior officers is and will be related to the number of SRAs that are negotiated.

Answer:

- (1) We are using the term 'holistic' SRA to describe the more intensive work that we are doing, or will be doing, with Indigenous communities that goes beyond addressing single issues.

In some cases this work will progress by building on the single issue SRAs that are now in place in communities. In other cases, where communities are willing and ready, it can mean working intensively with those communities to identify longer term goals as an early step, and develop in partnership with them a range of responses and shared commitments for meeting those goals.

This work would be likely to encompass some of the following elements:

- supporting the community to develop its long term strategic approach to achieving identified goals, wherever possible building on the planning and thinking that many Indigenous communities have done over many years;
  - eg if one of the goals of a community is, within the next 20 years, to have all of their kids achieving a Year 12 education – then the government and community partners start to plan and agree from now: what the community role and commitments will need to be during that time; what the government responsibilities, commitments and interventions will need to be; and what assistance may be needed from others – eg NGOs (eg, for community development support), corporate sector (eg for future job opportunities) etc;

- a family/community development component (eg capacity building) – including empowering community people to be able negotiate strategically with government where this is not already the case;
- some mapping of the assets of a community – people, infrastructure, other physical assets – so that these can be drawn into the community's overall effort to support the community's development aspirations;
- governments identifying how they will 'bundle' funding strategically throughout the process, to enable a longer term coordinated social investment that supports the community in achieving its goals.

Part of this holistic approach would involve bringing together a number of initiatives to form a more comprehensive SRA that can grow – and change – over time as actions are either completed or added that are consistent with advancing the community's goals.

It might also be linked to the development of a Regional Partnership Agreement across several communities, or groups, which could provide an overarching framework for progress in a region.

This approach would be relevant in remote and regional communities and in urban areas where 'communities of interest' (eg family groups, people and organisations with common interests) want to work together and with governments to achieve particular goals (eg early childhood development).

(2) Stakeholders are all parties nominated in the SRA.

The satisfaction of stakeholders will be gauged through qualitative reviews of individual SRAs commencing in 2005-06. The reviews will identify lessons learnt and capture stakeholder perceptions of the process, how it worked for them and how it could be improved. The reviews will be conducted by independent consultants engaged by OIPC.

More generally in 2005-06, OIPC plans an implementation review of the 2004-05 SRA processes and this review should also inform OIPC's understanding of stakeholder satisfaction.

(3) ICC Managers and senior officials within OIPC are not paid performance bonuses on the basis of the number of SRAs negotiated.

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(319) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

Proposed Cunnamulla Shared Responsibility Agreement

Please note that questions on this SRA have also been asked of the Department of Family and Community Services, as the agency which is making the most significant offers in relation to the SRA. However, it is understood that the ICC Manager from Roma is leading the negotiations. These questions are based on a document called "SRA with Cunnamulla", Version 1 (06/04/2005).

1. What action had been taken by the South West Queensland Aboriginal Cooperative Community Advancement Society Ltd (SWACCAS) and the Cunnamulla community to improve the payment/collection of rent and management of properties by SWACCAS before the local ICC became involved?
2. What proportion of tenants are currently paying rent through a direct debit scheme? What proportion of tenants overall are now paying their rent consistently?
3. Who suggested that it would be appropriate to force all tenants to attend budgeting/financial management courses provided by FACS before they can have air-conditioners installed?
4. What evidence is there that it is necessary for those people who are already paying their rent consistently to attend a budgeting/financial management course?
5. Who will assess whether tenants' yards and houses are being kept "in good order"? What will happen to tenants who are deemed not to be complying with this requirement? Will they be provided with support to address other issues that may be contributing, such as drug and alcohol abuse?
6. Is alcohol abuse a significant problem in the area? Is it assessed as a contributing factor to the low proportion of people paying rent in previous years? If so, why does the SRA contain no measures to address this as a cause of the current housing problems?
7. Are the 10-16 people from the community who would participate in the project to upgrade two houses the same as the 10 CDEP workers who would be undertaking house and yard maintenance? What qualifications are expected to be achieved by this group or groups? Why is no commitment made in the draft SRA to work towards AQF qualifications for these people?

*Answer:*

1.-7. A possible Shared Responsibility Agreement (SRA) is being discussed with the Cunnamulla community and negotiations around benefits and commitments are continuing. The Department of Family and Community Services is best placed to answer some of the factual questions raised.

Negotiations with stakeholders are still proceeding and an SRA is yet to be finalised with community groups. Once that occurs, it will be possible to account for the focus, priorities and outcomes agreed with the community.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(320) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

On 15 March 2002, the Ministerial Council for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs (MCATSIA) announced a national audit of Indigenous family violence programs. In his submission to the Senate Select Committee on the Administration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, the Social Justice Commissioner, Mr Tom Calma, stated that the outcomes of this national review had not yet been presented to the Council of Australian Governments or made public.

1. Has this audit now been completed?
2. If it has been completed:

Will it be made public? If so, when?

One aim of the exercise was to gain information about what is working and what isn't.

Can you briefly outline what has been learnt from the audit?

What action is the Commonwealth or the Ministerial Council planning to take in response to the audit?

3. If it has not been completed:

Is it still on MCATSIA's work program?

What progress has been made and when is the audit expected to be completed?

What lessons have been learnt from the work undertaken to date, if any?

4. According to Minister Ruddock's media release, the audit proposal was developed by the National Indigenous Working Group on Violence, which was an ATSIIC initiative. Are you aware of whether this working group still exists? If it does, what is its structure and purpose? Which agency or program supports its operation?

*Answer:*

1. The audit has not been completed.
2. Not applicable.
3. The audit is no longer on MCATSIA's work program. The need for an audit of services being provided to address the issue of family violence was a response to the increasing level of family violence in Indigenous communities.

After the audit was proposed, this issue was taken up by various leaders and government representatives, and in 2003, after a national round table, the Prime Minister commissioned a working group comprising Indigenous leaders and senior officials to develop a national strategy to address Indigenous family violence.

This strategy has been incorporated into the Australian Government's new whole-of-government approach to delivering services to Indigenous Australians, announced in 2004. The second of the Australian Government's three priorities for this approach is that of safer communities with an emphasis on law and order, which includes family violence.

#### 4. The National Indigenous Working Group on Violence

The National Indigenous Working Group on Violence (NIWGV) was established as a result of a series of roundtable meetings on family violence convened by ATSIC during 2001-02. It comprised delegates from each State and Territory and was created to lobby for the coordination of programs and the resourcing of community-driven approaches to violence based on Indigenous self-determination. NIWGV operated from February to December 2002 and played an integral role in informing the development of the ATSIC Family Violence policy.

As part of the new Australian Government approach to Indigenous Affairs, the Department of Family and Community Services is now responsible for national programs addressing family violence and child abuse in Indigenous families and communities. These programs include the Responding Early Assisting Children (REACH) Program, the Family Violence Program and the Family Violence Regional Activities Program.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(321) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

- (1) Please provide details of the impact of changes to the Australian Government procurement guidelines on NTRB funding arrangements.
- (2) Has the Department undertaken any work on the pros and cons of tendering out NTRB services?
- (3) Has OIPC recently removed, or proposed removing, a clause from NTRB funding agreements which requires NTRBs to ensure that Indigenous people and organisations had an opportunity to compete for the provision of services to the NTRB? If so, what was the reason for removing that clause?
- (4) Please provide an update on the government's consideration of the proposals put forward in August 2003 by the Northern Territory Government, Land Councils and the mining industry in relation to amendments to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976.
- (5) Has the Government made any decisions on other amendments to the Land Rights Act?
- (6) Did DIMIA receive representations from the North Queensland Land Council expressing a number of concerns about the contract with DIMIA for their funding? Have the issues raised by NQLC been resolved? Please provide details of any changes made to the funding agreement as a result of NQLC's concerns and any issues that remain outstanding.

*Answer:*

- (1) Procurement guidelines for funded Indigenous organisations for the acquisition of goods and services have been, and are still, intended to achieve value for money by obtaining quotations or the calling of tenders. Threshold dollar limits determine whether quotations or tenders are to be sought for particular goods or services.

Procurement guidelines have been in place for funded Indigenous organisations for a number of years and have not changed as a result of the new Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines.

- (2) OIPC monitors the effectiveness of the current legislation as part of its

ongoing work. However, OIPC cannot comment on any particular policy proposals it may have been undertaking for the Government's consideration.

(3) Yes. The procurement requirements in the *2004-2005 General Terms and Conditions Relating To Native Title Program Funding Agreements* (the PFA) included specific clauses that provided for opportunities for Indigenous organisations to participate in the tendering/quoting for contracts and for the provision of employment and training opportunities for Indigenous peoples. These specific clauses had no legal effect and have been omitted from the PFA for 2005-06. The redrafted PFA does not in any way discourage or prevent NTRBs from seeking quotations or tenders from Indigenous suppliers or service providers.

(4) See answer to question no. 272.

(5) See answer to question no. 272.

(6) Yes. North Queensland Land Council, along with other Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs), provided comments on the 2004-05 funding agreement. In all some 84 comments were received from the NTRBs. Each comment was considered individually and as a result some 28 changes were made to the 2005-06 funding agreement. In considering the comments from NTRBs regard was had for the need for the 2005-06 funding agreement to promote the effective and efficient use of Commonwealth funds to achieve Native Title outcomes for claimants and stakeholders.

OIPC is not aware of any outstanding issues.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(322) Output 3.2: Services for Indigenous Australians**

Senator Crossin (L&C 45) asked:

In relation to the training managed by the Office of the Registrar of Aboriginal Corporations, what is the amount allocated against the training? How much specifically is the training? Further to that, my understanding is that there are 2,500 corporations, so even though it is 220 days of training all up, it does not seem to be an awful lot when you are talking about 2,500 corporations in this country.

*Answer:*

The amount allocated for the Office of Registrar of Aboriginal Corporations' (ORAC's) training program is \$1.46 million per annum. The target of 220 training days is made up of:

70 non-accredited training days; and  
150 accredited training days.

This target represents targets of approximately 43 one day 'trouble shooting' information sessions, 9 three day Introductory Corporate Governance workshops, and 8 accredited Certificate IV in Business (Governance) courses delivered in four blocks of five days totalling 125 hours.

A suite of training is offered to targeted localities and groups around Australia, in line with ORAC's information and training framework and based on numbers of corporations, availability of suitable mainstream courses, and location. ORAC's training is tailored to suit the groups being trained. The programs are also being tailored to suit corporations in the most remote areas since 60% of ORAC's corporations are located there. All of ORAC's training complements rather than duplicates mainstream programs. The Certificate IV in Business (Governance) was not being delivered by the VET sector when ORAC began its training program, but it is now being run through some TAFE and private registered training organizations.

Given the available resources and the number of corporations registered under its legislation ORAC targets its training, builds local capacity to deliver similar programs, assists other registered training organisations to improve their delivery, and will share the results of the planned assessment and evaluation.

To date, 20 three day introductory corporate governance workshops (500 participants, 460 receiving full attendance statements) have been conducted throughout Australia. In most cases the three day introductory workshop is a pre-requisite for entry into the Certificate IV in Business (Governance). To date, 246 people have participated in the three day workshop in Queensland and 85 of these (34%) have then enrolled in the Certificate IV course. Of these 85 enrolments, 81 participants (95%) have graduated from the 10 Certificate IV courses completed

demonstrating an above average retention and graduation rate. An impact assessment of the program in Queensland is underway and the results will be considered prior to rolling the program out substantially in the Northern Territory and Western Australia.

ORAC has also been piloting two highly tailored remote programs, in Maningrida and Central Australia.

ORAC targets boards, members and key staff of Indigenous corporations. Women and youth are also encouraged to apply. Participation is voluntary. While 'troubleshooting' information sessions target ORAC incorporated bodies only, participation in the training program is open to target groups from corporations that are incorporated with ORAC, and other State/Territory and Commonwealth legislation, since participants from one legislative regime often end up being Board members or key staff for corporations registered with ORAC. An evaluation of the overall training program will be conducted this calendar year.

A useful report from a forum on good practice in corporate governance training co-hosted by ORAC and Reconciliation Australia, held in June 2004 is available on the ORAC website - [www.orac.gov.au](http://www.orac.gov.au).

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(323) Output 4.1: Policy and Advocacy**

Senator Carr asked:

Can you provide an update on the situation with regard to the disposal of ATSIC assets?

Has any final decision been taken on disposal of ATSIC's artworks, including those taken from ATSIC's head office and regional offices or ICCs? If not, what processes are underway to resolve the issue and when is a final decision expected?

How much ATSIC funds were left unspent at the final abolition and what has happened to these funds – on a program by program basis?

4. I understand that Yarrteen Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Corporation had submitted a request to ATSIC for release of ATSIC's mortgage and caveat. Is that correct? If so, what stage did that request get to before ATSIC was abolished? Is it now a matter for the ILC or IBA?

*Answer:*

1. The ATSIC Amendment Act 2005 provided for the distribution of ATSIC's assets. Certain prescribed assets were distributed to either IBA or the ILC following a determination by the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs. Ownership of the remainder of the assets has transferred to the Commonwealth.

2. No decision has been taken at this stage concerning the future of the ATSIC artworks. A decision is expected to be taken shortly.

3. Funds remaining in ATSIC at the time of its abolition included \$46.783m for the Home ownership and Business Development Programmes (these funds were transferred to Indigenous Business Australia); \$7.839m for the Regional Land Fund (these funds were transferred to the Indigenous Land Corporation) and \$24.753m of residual funds (these funds are being used to fund ATSIC creditors with the balance returned to the Commonwealth's Official Public Account to offset Budget Measures agreed to in the 2004-05 Budget).

4. Yes. The matter was close to finalisation when ATSIC was abolished. The matter was then transferred to IBA and we understand that IBA has now completed action on it.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(324) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

A letter and petition sent to Senator Vanstone on 1 February 2005 sought her assistance in making a representation to Senator Patterson to release NAHS funding for repair and upgrade of homes in the La Perouse Aboriginal community.

1. Did Senator Vanstone write to Senator Patterson or was this matter discussed between the relevant Departments?
2. Is it the case that NAHS funding was set aside a number of years ago, when the program was managed by ATSIC, for the repair and upgrade of homes in La Perouse? If so, when was the funding allocated and why was this project not undertaken?

*Answer:*

1. The Minister received the letter and petition on 11 February 2005. The Minister referred the issue to Senator Patterson on 16 February 2005.
2. With the abolition of ATSIC at the end of June 2004, responsibility for the National Aboriginal Health Strategy (NAHS) was transferred to the Department of Family and Community Services. Given this transfer of responsibility, the response to Senator Carr's question, which was also directed to the Department of Family and Community Services, is being provided by that portfolio.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(325) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr asked:

In response to QON 192, the Department advised that where there was a conflict of interest and ATSI was therefore unable to provide legal advice to ATSI, ATSI was able to obtain its own legal advice. The answer stated that payment for that advice was the responsibility of ATSI. Please provide details of the program or funding allocation which ATSI could have legitimately used to pay for legal advice.

*Answer:*

Funds for legal advice were paid from ATSI's administrative Budget. This budget was approved by the Minister for 2004-05 to cover the general operating costs of ATSI. The Budget covered remuneration for Commissioners, operating costs of Regional Councils and other general administrative costs.