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Executive Summary

The Housing and Environment Branch of ATSIS (now the Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Branch – IHIB – of the Department of Family and Community Services) initiated a review of the ATSIC National Homelands Policy (NHP). The scope of work for the review identified six components:

- Analysis of planning and funding frameworks impacting on homelands with emphasis on state/territory and local government frameworks;
- Overview and assessment of the relationship between homelands and larger communities;
- Assessment of effectiveness of Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans;
- Overview and analysis of relationships between homelands and Resource Agencies;
- Preliminary comment/opinion on long term viability/sustainability of homelands drawing upon desktop case studies of 12 homeland communities.
- Recommendations and/or proposals for the revision and implementation of homelands policy, planning and funding frameworks;

Within the short timeframe available, this review concentrated on obtaining a rapid appraisal of readily available information. This included the compilation of a series of 12 snapshot studies of homelands settlements in various jurisdiction and environments. The review also references seven factors that contribute to settlement viability, drawn from application of the sustainable livelihoods framework.

Planning and funding frameworks
There are two key elements to the overall picture of planning and funding frameworks impacting on homelands. The first element is complexity. A complex web of agreements, plans and laws at local, regional, state/territory and Commonwealth level are in operation, and determining the operative processes for any particular location is a difficult task. The bilateral agreement-making process appears to be bringing some order to the picture, in particular in those states where essential services are also being included in these agreements. The second element is that despite the plethora of agreements, plans and programs, the needs of homelands settlements are still routinely overlooked. Due to their small size they simply fall through the net. There are some notable exceptions, such as the explicit inclusion of homelands by IHANT in the NT, and the detailed planning for energy services on homelands that has occurred as part of the Bushlight program. It also appears that ATSIC Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIPs) place the needs of homelands settlements alongside those of larger settlements, although further investigation is required as to how the RHIPs interact with allocation processes at higher levels.

Larger communities
Homelands and larger settlements form a regional network of facilities and services around which Indigenous people move regularly in order to meet their material, social, economic and spiritual needs. Some people choose to reside almost permanently at outstations, whereas others move regularly between several residences.
Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans (RCHPPs)
At this early stage in the implementation of the RCHPPs, evidence for their impact on the ground is limited. More significantly, it appears that the RCHPP process has not been successful in establishing a transparent and defensible process for the allocation of funding to support homelands development. The review uncovered no evidence of improvement in coordination between agencies at the regional level, although this is certainly happening at higher levels through the bilaterals and the COAG trials. From the wider perspective of community viability and sustainability, there are significant shortcomings in the RCHPP process. In particular, the process offers little support to homelands communities to develop the governance capacity required to establish and manage small, remote settlements and the relationships with larger service communities that it requires to survive. Also, RCHPPs do not recognise the tension that exists between externally defined standards for infrastructure and services, as against the standards that can be afforded and maintained by small communities. The RCHPP process also offers little practical support in the direction of economic development.

Resource Agencies
The review team encountered several examples of well-managed resource agencies making major contributions to the livelihoods of homelands settlements through a range of services, as envisaged in the NHP and RCHPPs. These agencies typically have inclusive governance systems that engage homelands residents in planning and resource allocation processes, and have transparent mechanisms to manage allocation of resources between individual homelands, and to establish cost-sharing arrangements. The best of these agencies are engaged with the homelands communities on a broad agenda including cultural maintenance, land management and enterprise development as well as essential services and administrative support. They adopt a facilitation role whereby they endeavour to support directions that are set by the community. Good staff are central to resource agency operations, and yet staff mobility is part of the operating environment.

A variety of successful organisational models exist, however it appears that homelands resourcing functions need to be established separately to the service delivery functions for larger parent communities, so that the needs of the homelands are not routinely submerged by the larger, more proximate needs of the larger community.

Resource agencies experience difficulty in meeting the recurrent costs of homeland operation, and express frustration with the limitations, and ad hoc nature of existing funding programs. This funding situation contributes to a culture of reactive, crisis management, and of high stress for senior staff. Many also experience difficulty in extracting user contributions to operating costs.

It appears that some of the best resource agencies are those that have existed for many years. A question arises as to whether their size and scope, and the scope of the homelands settlements they service, are a legacy of past, less restricted funding regimes, and conversely whether it is feasible for newer organisations to attain similar capacity.
Viability and sustainability
A strong sense of aspiration, functional models of family-based governance, and the wide range of livelihood activities that are available and practised on homelands suggest that many homelands have the potential to be viable and sustainable in the long term. Developing this potential will require addressing complex issues concerning standards of facilities, developing homeland economies that ensure a positive net flow of resources and ensuring that services are made available in ways that provide homeland residents with access and choice. Appropriate external support for homelands groups can encourage people to make realistic plans and informed choices, and can encourage the development of effective governance beyond the level of the family. Support will also be required to protect embryonic homelands enterprises from the burden of regulation and compliance that can otherwise smother them.

Suggested directions for policy development
This review suggests a number of directions for policy development in response to the various issues identified in the project scope. These can be summarised under three main headings:
• A recognition of homelands as one element in regional patterns of Indigenous settlement;
• A shift in the mode of support provided to homelands settlements from delivery of services to facilitation of access; and
• A focus on sustainable livelihoods rather than improved health and well-being as the desired outcome of policy interventions.

Suggested scope of work for Stage 2
A further stage to this review is warranted to address specific knowledge gaps identified in Stage 1, and to take the suggested policy directions forward through more detailed ground truthing, followed by a more comprehensive and rigorous policy development process. In addition, before any steps are taken towards implementation, substantial consultation on the content of the proposals and the rationale behind them is required with key stakeholders who were excluded from the Stage 1 process.
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHIC</td>
<td>Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Council (WA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHID</td>
<td>Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Directorate (implements policies and programs of the AHIU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHIU</td>
<td>Aboriginal Housing and Infrastructure Unit (within Western Australia’s Department of Housing and Works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHURI</td>
<td>Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIHW</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Health and Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHP</td>
<td>Aboriginal Rental Housing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIC</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATSIS</td>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBF</td>
<td>Building a Better Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Centre for Appropriate Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDEP</td>
<td>Community Development Employment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPM</td>
<td>Community Energy Plan Modelling (Bushlight)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINS</td>
<td>Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP</td>
<td>Community Housing and Infrastructure Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAG</td>
<td>Coalition of Australian Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHA</td>
<td>Commonwealth-State Housing Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKCRC</td>
<td>Desert Knowledge Cooperative Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOGIT</td>
<td>Deed of Grant in Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO</td>
<td>Essential Services Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaCS</td>
<td>Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMAC</td>
<td>Housing Ministers’ Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREOC</td>
<td>Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTs</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHANT</td>
<td>Indigenous Housing Authority of the Northern Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHIB</td>
<td>Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Branch (of FaCS - formerly HEB).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILUA</td>
<td>Indigenous Land Use Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPG</td>
<td>Joint Planning Group (QLD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;SMC</td>
<td>Land and Sea Management Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAHS</td>
<td>National Aboriginal Health Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>National Competition Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHP</td>
<td>National Homeland Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Resource Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAESP</td>
<td>Remote Area Essential Services Program (WA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPS</td>
<td>Remote Area Power Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCHPP</td>
<td>Regional Council Homeland Policy and Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REP</td>
<td>Regional Energy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHIP</td>
<td>Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTO</td>
<td>Registered Training Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAHA</td>
<td>South Australian Aboriginal Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMP</td>
<td>Strategic Asset Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIH</td>
<td>Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>Technical and Further Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1: Introduction

The Housing and Environment Branch of ATSIS (now the Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Branch – IHIB – of the department of Family and Community Services) has initiated a review of the ATSIC National Homelands Policy. The scope of work for the review identified six components:

- Analysis of planning and funding frameworks impacting on homelands with emphasis on state/territory and local government frameworks;
- Overview and assessment of the relationship between homelands and larger communities;
- Assessment of effectiveness of Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans;
- Overview and analysis of relationships between homelands and Resource Agencies;
- Preliminary comment/opinion on long term viability/sustainability of homelands drawing upon desktop case studies of 12 homeland communities.
- Recommendations and/or proposals for the revision and implementation of homelands policy, planning and funding frameworks;

The complete project scope is included at Appendix 1.

Findings under these headings are presented in Sections 5 to 10 of this report. These findings are preceded by a brief review of the history of the homelands movement and policy responses to it (Section 2), a summary of the methodology employed for the review (Section 3), and a discussion of relevant definitions (Section 4).
Section 2: Indigenous Settlement and Homelands

Indigenous settlement in Australia
The homelands movement is one strand in the history of Indigenous settlement in Australia. Before focusing in more detail on the history of the homelands movement, it is worth noting some general features of Indigenous settlement. The particulars of this history vary enormously across different locations, regions, States and Territories, however it is possible to identify common features that have relevance to the consideration of policy responses to the homelands movement.

Any consideration of Indigenous settlement begins by recognising the central importance of land, and attachment to land, in Indigenous culture. This is expressed, for example, in the following quotation.

Our land is our life. We look at it in a different way to non-Aboriginal people. For us, land isn’t simply a resource to be exploited. It provides us with food and materials for life, but it also provides our identity and it must be looked after, both physically and spiritually. If we abuse our land, or allow someone else to abuse it, we too suffer.

(Central and Northern Land Councils, 1999)

Much of the history of Indigenous settlement since colonisation consists of expropriation of land from its traditional owners, and the relocation of Indigenous people to new settlements. The majority of today's larger settlements or 'communities' were initially established as ration stations or missions, under policy regimes firstly of protection and later of assimilation.

These settlements can be described as 'artificial' in the sense that they were established by outside authorities, and not driven by the economic factors that usually underpin settlement establishment, such as proximity to resources, employment or markets. Nevertheless, many of these settlements did supply a pool of workers for the pastoral and other local industry and did facilitate some ongoing connection to country.

This history has given rise to a pattern of Indigenous settlement in the remote areas of Australia that is quite different from the prevailing pattern of settlement in the rest of the country. Aboriginal people live in small settlements, far removed from the major networks of trade, employment and service provision. This pattern has major impacts on the social and economic environment of Indigenous communities, and has major implications for how services can be delivered. Homelands form the outer fringe of this pattern of settlement. They are smaller, even more remote and pose even greater challenges for policy makers. The current distribution of homelands settlements is described in the following two tables prepared by IHIB from the 2001 CHINS data.
Table 1: Distribution and population of discrete Indigenous communities with populations of less than 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Number of communities with population &lt; 50</th>
<th>Total Population of communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>7715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of Discrete Indigenous Communities with populations of less than 20, and with populations between 20 and 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>No. of communities with less than 20 pop.</th>
<th>No. of communities with pop. of 20-49 (inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Homelands Movement and Homelands Policy

The homelands movement began in the 1960s, and gained momentum in the 1970s. In a broad sense, the homelands movement has always been about Indigenous people resettling their traditional country and was made possible by shifts in Government policy that recognised traditional land rights and the broader rights of Indigenous people to determine their own future. Remote resettlements have followed closely return to country opportunities enabled through changes to land tenure. Support for the early homeland movement involved pushing tracks out to places where people wanted to establish settlements, and providing people with 4WD vehicles.

This early history included the establishment of outstation resource centres: new organisations, typically Aboriginal-controlled, tasked with providing physical services such as housing, water supply, sanitation and power supply. The first 20 years of the homelands movement are described in the Blanchard Return to Country Report (Commonwealth of Australia, 1987).

The late 1980s also saw the rise of the environmental health agenda as a key driver of policy making in Indigenous affairs. The premise of the environmental health approach is that good physical facilities in the human living environment enable people to live healthy lives. This approach was encapsulated in the ‘Housing for Health’ model, which identifies minimum infrastructure and services required to perform nine essential ‘healthy living practices’ (Pholeros et al 1993). In a policy sense, the environmental health agenda is reflected in a focus on capital works and the adoption of standards and guidelines to improve housing and infrastructure.

By the beginning of the 1990s, concern was mounting about the rising costs of providing essential services to increasing numbers of homelands settlements, about the sustainability of such settlements, and about the need to achieve balance between investment in homelands, and investment in existing larger settlements. This concern
led in 1994 to a decision by the Ministerial Council for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs that ATSIC should develop a national policy on homelands, and a decision in 1996 by the ATSIC Board of Commissioners to impose a moratorium on funding new homelands until the national policy was in place. ATSIC also commissioned a major review of the operation of outstation resource agencies (Altman et al, 1998).

This review stimulated a policy development process that resulted in 1999 in the adoption by the ATSIC Board of the National Homelands Policy. This policy was later incorporated into the Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP) Policy, where it remains in force (ATSIC, 2002). In essence, the National Homelands Policy sets out threshold conditions that must be met in order for a new homeland to attract Government funding. These conditions are:

- Security of land tenure;
- Principal place of residence;
- Availability of potable water; and
- Ongoing support by resource agencies.

The policy also establishes a planning and administrative framework for the resourcing of homelands. This framework is illustrated in Figure 1.

Planning at the regional council, resource agency and individual homeland level is a central thrust of the National Homelands Policy. More recently, most State and Territory Governments have negotiated agreements with the Commonwealth Government covering provision of housing, and in some cases essential services, to Indigenous communities. These agreements, known as the 'bilaterals', insert an additional level of planning into the model in Figure 1. The bilaterals require ATSIC Regional Councils to develop Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIPs).
setting out needs and priorities including both outstations and larger communities. The National Homelands Policy thus sits very clearly within a paradigm of meeting needs. Through a nested framework of planning tools, it seeks to manage the supply of services (in this case housing and infrastructure) to meet identified and prioritised need.

Meanwhile, more recent thinking questions the efficacy of this approach to service delivery. This was expressed, for example, in Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission's 2001 *Review of the Water Report*, which drew extensively on international experience in the supply of water and sanitation services to impoverished communities. It observed that:

The provision of services is no longer seen as a construction job to be hired out to the most cost efficient contractor, but as a contribution to the economic, social and human development of people, including their skill, knowledge and organisational capacity. The success of these processes - not the technical perfection of systems - ultimately decides whether services are used, are sustainable, and have an impact on health and quality of life (Quoting Black, 1998, p70).

The key conceptual shift to have taken place is the substitution of the notion of beneficiaries of services with that of consumers of services. Where services are consumer driven, demand has to have reached a point where there is significant public appreciation of the value of services - for convenience, health and quality of life reasons - an understanding by consumers of what they can and cannot afford, how the services they select work, and how their providers and managers are performing.

The overwhelming challenge in the provision of water and sanitation services is how to create demand and match service provision to it in a transparent and accountable fashion, without losing sight of the basic human right to share in a resource conferred by nature. (HREOC 2001, p17)

This shift is reflected in more recent policy focus on reciprocity, partnership and community economic development. The difficulty here is that remote Indigenous communities participate only marginally in the mainstream economy, and have very little access to markets for services. This also was highlighted in the *Review of the Water Report*:

Remote Indigenous communities are only partially integrated into national mainstream markets. The proportion of community members in formal full-time employment has been relatively low, and welfare transfers account for a significant proportion of household income.

[...]

Such lack of integration, when viewed as a corollary of welfare dependency, has been seen as negative. It has recently been argued that: “To achieve better outcomes, indigenous people need to develop ways of operating in modern society. Such development ultimately has to come from an internal process of cultural and institutional adaptation. It cannot be given from
outside. It may, by very careful policy, be assisted; but not more than that.”  
(Warby, 1999, p50) The same author considered that “protection”, 
“assimilation” and “self-determination” failed as policies, and concerning the 
latter: “What is known as “self-determination”, but is more aptly labelled 
“welfarism”, has not worked because it has failed to provide structures and 
incentives helpful for successful adaptation to modern society.” (op. cit., p55)

It was argued that the policy goal should be to facilitate full Indigenous 
participation in the benefits of Australian society, the key principles being anti-
discrimination, acknowledgment of distinctive culture, participation, and 
empowerment (op. cit., p56) For adaptation to be substantively different from 
asimilation, remote Indigenous communities would need to be viable on the 
margins of the mainstream economy, and for economic opportunity to be 
available without trading off key aspects of Indigenous social and cultural life.

In this context, it is pertinent to note recent comments by Noel Pearson:

"In the future in Cape York there is no reason why our people cannot live within 
and move successfully between two real economies and societies. We can 
maintain our traditional society and economy and we can engage in the 
outside market economy and society and our children can move with great 
facility between the two, provided that we ensure that the resources that the 
State provides us, and indeed the resources we generate ourselves, and which 
we distribute within our own communities, is no longer in the form of negative 
welfare.” (Pearson, 1999)

In another pertinent observation:

"The great tragedy of 1967 was that it brought us citizenship and the 
recognition of our land rights and human rights but it also dumped us into 
welfare. It took us out of the real economy and dumped us into welfare, 
instead of giving us a non-discriminatory place in the real economy, 
maintaining us in the real economy without discrimination.” (Pearson, 1999)

Noel Pearson also talked of an enabling approach for the State, and of the 
need to involve the private sector. He has argued: “Only by incorporating 
aboriginal people in the real economy will we achieve our goal of taking our 
share of the country.”

This perspective suggests finding an alternative to negative welfare without 
ignoring the need for government resources. 
(HREOC, 2001, p11-12)

This sets the challenge for the next phase of homelands policy. Government has 
announced its intention to improve service delivery through better coordination of 
agencies, yet experience shows that service delivery does not on its own lead to viable 
and sustainable communities where people lead happy and fulfilled lives. What type of 
policy is required so that services are available in a way that enhances rather than 
reduces community engagement? Or, expressed the other way, what type of policy will 
enable Government to augment and facilitate what communities decide to do for 
themselves?
A useful framework for this discussion is the sustainable livelihoods framework (Fisher, 2001). The sustainable livelihoods framework provides a holistic model of how a group of people in a particular location interact with their physical, social and political environment, in order to achieve their aspirations. The sustainable livelihoods framework identifies seven factors that play a role in community viability. These seven factors are: effective governance, expressed aspirations, reliable infrastructure, livelihood activity, positive resource flows, access to services and low vulnerability. They are discussed in more detail in Appendix 2.

Interestingly, Balkanu Cape York Development Corporation have proposed a comparable list of characteristics of successful outstations (Balkanu, 2002, p13):

- The outstation people are in control of the place;
- The outstation group has their own plan for how the place will work and develop;
- There is enough infrastructure to be comfortable and safe, but not so much that it becomes a burden; the outstation group is largely self-sufficient for most essential services; there is a network of support from both agencies and other sources and there are alternatives should one fail;
- The relationship with support agencies is well understood and is not based on dependency;
- The outstation group has access to CDEP;
- There is enough worthwhile activity to keep a range of people occupied, healthy and happy; and
- The operating costs of the outstation are within the capacity of the group to meet comfortably.

A demand-responsive model of homeland viability looks at the local expression of these factors, and at the networks and relationships that support them. Such a model is illustrated in Figure 2.

---

Figure 2: A systems model of homeland viability
This review examines the effectiveness of the current National Homelands Policy in creating homelands that are viable and sustainable. It does this by examining the formal relationship between homelands, their larger service communities and resource agencies, regional structures and State and Territory planning, regulatory and funding frameworks, as set out in the Project Scope. It also analyses these relationships with reference to the systems model of homeland viability presented above.
Section 3: Review Methodology

This review is constrained to a desktop study and telephone enquiry coupled with past experience of the review team. The methodology adopted can best be described as 'snap shotting'. Within the short time frame available, the review team concentrated on obtaining a rapid appraisal of information available to inform discussion of each of the terms of the project scope. This focused on the following sources of information:

- **Policy review.** The review examined current policy and regulatory frameworks, predominantly through reviewing public access documents, informed by some discussion with relevant Government officers. This included review of all State-Commonwealth bilateral agreements on housing for Indigenous communities.

- **Literature review.** Relevant recent academic and general literature on homelands issues was reviewed. Two particularly useful documents were the *Gulf and Western Queensland Regional Homeland Plan Stage II Main Report* (Moran and Burgen, 2000) and the *Draft Cape York Outstation Report* (Balkanu, 2002). These two documents present the findings of consultancy studies commissioned to assist Regional Councils in these two regions to prepare Regional Council Homelands Policy and Plans. As such, they contain detailed and recent information on the status of the homelands movements in these two regions. No similar documents were identified for other regions.

- **Review of Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans (RCHPPs).** Thirteen of the approved RCHPPs were reviewed.

- **Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIPs).** A number of these plans were supplied to the Review team by IHIB.

- **Homeland Snapshots.** A series of mini-case studies, or snapshots, were conducted through interviews with key informants with recent field knowledge of 12 different homelands, situated in different jurisdictions and environments.

- **The review team also drew on CAT’s existing body of knowledge regarding homeland issues, and the experiences of particular homelands and agencies.**

Analysis and discussion of each component was guided by consideration of the seven factors in community viability discussed above.

Under the terms and timelines of the contract the review team did not hold discussions with homeland communities, staff in regional ATSIC (now ICC) offices, nor with major regional Indigenous organisations such as land councils and community councils. These are key stakeholders in homelands policy, who have not as yet had the opportunity to participate in this review. Suggested directions for policy development identified in this review are thus only a starting point for discussion between IHIB and other stakeholders. All require ground truthing and further consultation.
Section 4: Defining homelands

Those who work with Aboriginal communities have been grappling with the issue of how to define 'outstations' and 'homelands' since the outstation movement began.

The Blanchard Report defined homelands as "small decentralised communities of close kin established by the movement of Aboriginal people to land of social, cultural and economic significance to them" (Commonwealth of Australia, 1987, p7).

The National Review of Outstation Resource Agencies considered the Blanchard definition, and others put forward in the literature between 1987 and 1998 and concluded that "for every definition of outstations many exceptions to the general rule are readily found" (Altman et al., 1998, p30). It recommended that "Rather than attempting to arrive at a national definition of outstations it is more realistic, for policy purposes, to accept outstations and ORAs [outstation resource agencies] in their various regional manifestations, as a permanent and evolving element of social and physical planning in any region where there are significant indigenous populations" (op. cit., p33).

This is in effect the approach taken in the National Homelands Policy which, rather than putting forward a definition of homelands, instead talks about the characteristics of the homelands movement (ATSIC, 2002, p57). The NHP also abbreviates the multiple terminology of "homelands, outstations and new and emerging communities to the single term 'homelands'. The characteristics of homelands discussed in the NHP are consistent with those presented elsewhere and include the following aspects:

- Homelands are small and remote;
- Homelands provide people with the ability to access and care for country;
- Homelands offer an escape from pressure and dysfunction in larger communities;
- There is a degree of mobility associated with homeland living.

Although the NHP itself does not define homelands, a de facto definition appears to have been adopted by ATSIC whereby homelands are equated to discrete settlements having populations of less than fifty, as reported in CHINS data. The origin of this definition is not clear, but it appears to have some utility in identifying those settlements likely to have the characteristics listed above.

Although it refers to one possible purpose of homelands as being to "cement traditional ownership", The NHP does not stipulate that homelands must be established by traditional owners. This issue is discussed in more detail in a 1996 discussion paper released as part of the process of developing the NHP. It states that "ATSIC believes that where homelands are established on land that is not the traditional country of the resident group, and where consent has been given by the traditional owners (if they still exist), they should be viewed in the context of indigenous rights and be treated no differently to other homelands as regards eligibility for community infrastructure" (ATSIC 1996, p16). Presumably this represented the position of the Board of Commissioners at that time. Since no specific position in respect to traditional ownership is made in the final policy, it can only be assumed that the Board did not intend that support for homelands be limited only to settlements established by traditional owners on their traditional country.
Other authors (eg Moran and Burgen, 2000, p3) point out that homelands generally retain a "close association" with a larger "parent" settlement. This association is historical, in that homelands are often established through the movement of people out of the parent settlement into the surrounding country, as the country becomes available for settlement. There are examples in central Australia where outstation members have come from more than one larger settlement. The association is also social and economic in the sense that people continue to move frequently between the outstation and the larger settlement.

The variety in the nature of homelands is also reflected in the definitions that have been adopted by Regional Councils in their Regional Council Homeland Policies and Plans (RCHPPs). Many of the RCHPPs attempt to break homeland settlements down into various classifications, based on criteria such as frequency of occupancy, time established, population size and existing services and facilities. These classifications are intended to assist in determining an appropriate program response to the needs of different types of settlements. The Yapakurlangu Regional Council Homelands/Outstation Policy and Guide, for example, classifies "homeland/outstations" as occasional, seasonal/semi-permanent or permanent, and also defines "new, emerging and existing communities" and "major communities", based on population size, facilities and services.

Some of the RCHPPs also draw a distinction between homelands established by traditional owners on their own traditional country, and homeland-type settlements established by people other than traditional owners (usually described as people with an historical connection). The Gulf and Western Queensland Regional Council Homelands Policy, for example, requires people who are not traditional owners to have the consent of the traditional owners to their being on the land, and states that "traditional ownership has precedence where there is any competing interest". Other RCHPPs draw a distinction between homelands and outstations.

In fact, homelands are different things to different people and any definition is inherently contextual. To many older Aboriginal people, homelands are a continuation of an ancient tradition of occupying and caring for country. For others, they are an escape from the problems of larger settlements. For some younger Indigenous people, homelands can be where you get sent as punishment: a place you struggle to escape from, in order to get back to a more comfortable and entertaining lifestyle in town.

For agencies and service providers, homelands are a resource and service delivery problem to be solved. That is the context out of which most of the definitions discussed above have arisen. Although the NHP does not contain a definition of homelands as such, the whole approach of the Policy sits within this context of service delivery. The NHP forms part of the Community Housing and Infrastructure Program, and is primarily concerned with establishing a basis for the funding, operation and maintenance of physical infrastructure on homelands.

A task of this review is to begin exploring the issues of sustainability and viability as they apply to homelands. A question arises as to what is an appropriate definition of homelands to use in this context. Drawing on the characteristics of homelands discussed above, and with reference to the factors influencing community viability presented in Section 2, the following elements emerge:
Homelands are small and remote. It is therefore not possible for them to be self-reliant for many services. It is intrinsic to their nature that they will need to access many services including retail stores, health, education, Government, technical and financial services, at other larger centres. The converse of perceived dependence of homelands on larger communities is that they potentially contribute greater cultural depth to the larger communities.

Homelands communities consist of small groups of closely related individuals. This will usually have a strong influence on how decisions get made. There is generally an absence of non-indigenous people.

The small, remote nature of homelands also influences the types of enterprises that can be established.

This review contends that homelands are best seen as one level in a hierarchy of settlements of different sizes in which people reside. Homelands can not be considered viable or sustainable on their own: they are necessarily dependent on larger settlements for many essential services. An appropriate definition must reflect this reality. A definition that begins to capture remoteness from services and dependence on larger settlements as the defining characteristic of homelands is given in the Draft Cape York Outstation Report. It defines an outstation as "any place where Aboriginal people live too far from a town to be able to access normal town services" (Balkanu, 2002). This review contends that in fact people do and must access town services, but they do it in different ways to people living in larger settlements. It is through understanding the way people in small, remote communities can meet their needs through accessing services at various locations and in various ways that we can begin to develop policy directions that will enhance the viability and sustainability of settlements.

In keeping with the above discussion, this review uses the terminology ‘homelands settlements’ to refer to small, remote settlements of the type covered by the provisions of the NHP.

Suggested directions for policy development

In the context of managing the delivery of Government services, homelands settlements are best considered as one level in a hierarchy of settlements of different sizes. Homelands settlements are the smallest settlements that occupy the bottom level of this hierarchy. Service delivery needs to consider the needs of homelands in the context of their relationships with other settlements.

Whilst not yet evident at this point in the report, a future definition of homelands would carry greater weight on the concept of the homeland as one node in a settlement pattern: one point at which a particular group of individuals can sustain livelihood opportunities.

In keeping with the recommendations of the 1998 Review we see little point in adopting a national definition of homelands settlements for policy purposes. Nevertheless, for statistical analysis purposes we see no difficulty in continuing to utilise the current criterion of population less than 50 to identify a category of very small settlements with particular service needs.

The current policy of not limiting support to settlements of traditional owners on their traditional country should be continued.
Section 5: Analysis of planning and funding frameworks impacting on homelands with emphasis on state/territory and local government frameworks

This section discusses planning and funding frameworks impacting on the provision of housing and selected services (power, water and transport) to homelands settlements. It is recognised that the service requirements of homelands settlements go beyond these four areas and include infrastructure services such as telecommunications and waste disposal, as well as non-infrastructure services such as health care, education, financial services, public transport and others. The focus on power, water and transport reflects the origin of this review in IHIB, the focus of the Project Scope and the limited resources available to the review. In addition to the material presented here, some preliminary comments on delivery of education and training services to homelands and presented in Appendix 4, and some preliminary comments on health and indicators of well-being are presented in Appendix 5.

Indigenous Housing

Bilateral agreements for Indigenous housing and infrastructure between ATSIC, State or Territory Governments and the Commonwealth Government exist in the NT, WA, SA, QLD, NSW, Vic and more recently Tasmania. Most jurisdictions have now signed a second term agreement securing funding against agreed outputs and directions (as encapsulated in Strategic and Operational plans) for a period of up to 5 years. Pooled funding arrangements also exist in four jurisdictions whilst ‘notionally’ pooled planning processes occur in others (eg QLD). The bilateral agreements outline roles and responsibilities of the parties and their overall objectives are to improve housing and related health outcomes through the development of strategic and operational plans that:

a) increase participation and involvement of Indigenous people in decision making;
b) increase effectiveness and efficiencies of service delivery;
c) coordinate related and linked funding programs;
d) identify and measure need;
e) develop programs to enable effective management of housing and related infrastructure assets; and
f) contribute to social and economic benefits for Indigenous peoples and communities.

Commissioners and Regional Council Chairpersons are represented on the Boards of State/Territory Indigenous Housing Authorities (eg AHIC in WA and IHANT in NT) or on planning committees established under the bilateral agreements, such as the Joint Planning Group (JPG) in Queensland. WA, through AHIC has also signed a bilateral agreement relating to the provision of essential services to Indigenous communities, as has SA. The NT through IHANT is currently negotiating a similar agreement. Responsibility for essential services remains a contested area across all jurisdictions particularly in terms of water and energy services. Some key issues relating to essential services provision are discussed later in this section. Overall, whilst some advancement in terms of commitment and responsibility for Indigenous housing need has been made through the bilateral agreements on housing, the lag in similar coordinated approaches to essential services, particularly in an era of increasing privatisation of such services, reduces their overall effectiveness.

In 2000 Commonwealth and State/Territory Ministers established the Standing Committee on Indigenous Housing (SCIH) which is comprised of representatives from all parties including ATSIC and reports directly to the Housing Ministers.
Advisory Council (HMAC). The SCIH functions include providing advice on Indigenous housing issues, implementing the 2001 Building a Better Future (BBF) vision for Indigenous Housing (see below) and identifying priorities for the Indigenous Housing Research Program of the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI). A number of working groups have been established and these are progressing effort in key priority areas which include addressing homelessness, renegotiating the bilateral agreements, developing the National Skills Development Strategy and the National Reporting Framework and further developing a multi measure approach to measuring Indigenous housing need.

In 2001 Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers, together with the Commonwealth Minister for Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs articulated their commitment and vision for better indigenous housing. This is contained in the document *Building a Better Future: Indigenous Housing to 2010* (BBF) and is subsequently reflected in all strategic plans across jurisdictions. As would be expected, a key premise of the BBF is improved coordination and targeting of resources to areas of greatest need, ‘whole of government’ approaches and improved partnerships with Indigenous peoples through recognition of the role and capacity building needs of the Indigenous community housing sector and its representative organizations, alongside improved cross jurisdiction performance and accountability measures as per the National Reporting Framework approved in December 2003.

**Measures of Need**

Information about the state of Indigenous housing and infrastructure has improved greatly over recent years with the data gathered through the Community Housing and Infrastructure Surveys (CHINS) undertaken in 1999 and 2001 and the health impact and environmental health assessment surveys undertaken annually in some jurisdictions to inform planning at a regional level. Improved information, alongside more focused and regionally representative allocation processes as delineated by the composition of Boards or Councils of State or Territory indigenous housing authorities (eg SAAHA, AHIC, IHANT) has enabled greater targeting of funding to need. The focus on building the capacity of Indigenous housing organizations has also seen the rollout of asset management tools and capacity building programs enabled by the use of ARHP funds for recurrent as opposed to capital purposes. Improvement to data coverage and quality is supporting the development of national data sets on Indigenous housing compiled by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW).

Indigenous housing need is complex, hence the ongoing emphasis on developing and refining multi measure approaches. Such approaches tend to emphasise three dimensions of need:

- the number of people living in houses;
- the number of people living in inappropriate and substandard housing; and
- condition of housing.

These measures inform the distribution of funds to Regional Councils over and above denoted minimal allocations (eg $1.0 million annually in the NT). However, once needs have been measured an estimate of relative need against which the position of each region can be measured and ranked is required. It is unclear to the review team what constitutes the benchmark or common point against which relative need is assessed. For example, is it the condition of housing and infrastructure compared to the Australian average or other communities or regions, or is it the degree of functionality of health hardware and safety fittings against a benchmark of...
full functionality? Ultimately identification of need hinges on the difference between an existing situation and an acceptable one. It also requires an analysis of the varying factors that contribute to the actuality of that need. The number of improvised dwellings in a location, for example a homeland, could relate to a need for more housing stock but could also relate to seasonal mobility patterns, a preference for a less complicated and more harmonious living arrangement or movement from a residence elsewhere due to a death in the family.

Using existing measurements, remote areas of Indigenous Australia present with the highest housing need in terms of overcrowding and homelessness (albeit based on one limited measure) whilst urban areas record the highest need based on affordability. Reducing such need is undoubtedly urgent, however determining the impact of programs and services remains an area needing more attention. Currently the measurement of the impact of housing and infrastructure programs is focused on itemising the outputs achieved with given levels of inputs. Measures of output include the number of new houses built or the number of houses upgraded, the type of municipal services delivered and the number of days of training delivered. Given the complex interrelatedness of the many indicators of well-being – housing, health, education, income – consideration of an outcomes focus to assessing the impact of housing and infrastructure services is perhaps long overdue. In particular, an outcomes focus enables a diversity and flexibility of approaches to suit local circumstances and recognizes that programs and services change over time, several programs can contribute to an outcome and Indigenous peoples themselves need a voice in determining what constitutes beneficial social and economic outcomes.

**Strategic Planning**

Strategic plans developed in each State or Territory, as mandated by the Bilateral Agreements, are comprehensive and detailed and delineate a diversity of objectives and approaches to addressing need and disadvantage as necessitated by differing demographic, geographic and spatial distributions of Indigenous communities and peoples, as well as differing histories and patterns of service delivery models.

In WA, for example, the 2003/04 – 2006/07 Strategic Plan developed by AHIC raises challenges regarding the existing paradigm of service delivery built as it is around welfare or grant dependency and highlights a ‘normalisation’ approach to predicted growth in town reserves and larger communities. A key part of ‘normalisation’ being that of increasing the role of local government in the delivery of municipal services particularly in relation to improving environmental health outcomes. Based on available demographic data, discrete communities in WA are identified as experiencing low growth or stagnation of populations and given their size are considered unlikely to be viable or sustaining in the long term, viability in this instance being defined as the potential for self sufficiency and extent of opportunities for employment and business ventures. Homelands and homelands development are therefore relegated to the background, likely to benefit from improvements to the scale and efficiency of housing management and, in the intermediate period, the continuation of the Remote Area Essential Services Program (RAESP), but in the long term remain a low priority for AHIC. Indeed it is understood by the review team that RAESP will provide capital but not maintenance services to communities with populations of less than 50.

In Queensland, normalisation processes related to the status of community governance are under way with Deed of Grant in Trust Indigenous Communities (DOGIT) now ascribed the same status as local government. Improved housing management processes through developing links to accredited training opportunities.
and providing opportunities for skills development through construction and cyclical repairs operations on communities, provide the key strategies for addressing Indigenous housing need. To the extent that homelands exist within the newly designated local councils, whose capacity to address housing and other needs in their jurisdiction will depend much on the scale and support of the transition, how the needs of homelands can be accommodated is yet to be seen. Whole of government and joint planning approaches for servicing Indigenous communities are currently under way in Queensland and the shift to Aboriginal Community Councils will have some impact on what services are assumed by joint service delivery approaches and what are assumed by local governance structures. With economic development through improved governance structures articulating the key strategy of the Queensland government, what constitutes economic development will have particular relevance for homeland viability.

In all jurisdictions, the strategic focus is also on improving access to safe and affordable housing, building the capacity of the housing sector, better asset management, promoting employment and education opportunities and well as improved service coordination. In the NT, where the largest number of homelands are and where strong land and cultural ties exist alongside marked social and economic disadvantage, focus has also been directed towards piloting and supporting home care programs, trialing models of housing design and construction to support local capacity building and developing land servicing plans for future homeland and community development. IHANT explicitly acknowledges that Homelands Plans are used in determining future land servicing needs. IHANT has also incorporated an itinerants strategy to begin to address the realities of homelessness, urban drift and inadequacy of accommodation and other services for increasing numbers of Indigenous peoples.

In all jurisdictions the overarching definition of a homeland relates almost exclusively to the level of infrastructure existing and/or lacking against a time related judgment regarding level and frequency of occupation and thus status as an emerging or non-emerging community. Against a background of responsibility shifting between various levels of government and in the case of essential services, between governments and private corporations, it is notable that reluctance tends to hinge on assessments of viability and expected returns on investment. This arguably has led to a focus on asset management, Indigenous housing sector viability and a standardisation of levels and types of infrastructure as a means to counteract responsibility shifting. For example, if essential services infrastructure is built to the standard mandated by the relevant Authority (eg Power and Water) there is greater likelihood, if uncertain probability, that such authorities may assume responsibility for maintaining the infrastructure. This ‘Catch 22’ situation inevitably means that limited and stretched funds are spread even more thinly against meeting need. The poverty experienced by most Indigenous peoples also means, whoever in the end assumes responsibility, the affordability of such services is limited. There are numerous stories collected by the Bushlight team of large houses (designed to limit overcrowding) built on outstations, where energy services, whether for cooking, heating or hot water, are not used because of cost.

Regional Planning
At the regional level, it is understood that allocation of housing and infrastructure funding is to be guided by Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIPs), to be developed by Regional Councils. A selection of RHIPs was provided to the review team by IHIB. The RHIPs place the needs of homelands settlements alongside those of larger communities and thus appear to have the effect of integrating homelands settlements into the same allocation process as larger communities.
Further investigation into the operation of the RHIPs and of needs assessment and allocation processes at the state/territory and national levels would be needed to confirm this view. Further comments about the RHIPs are made in Section 7.

Energy services
The provision of energy services to discrete Indigenous communities, like other essential services, differs across jurisdictions and presents as a complex web of cost and responsibility shifting across government and non-government agencies. The impact of privatization of energy services is increasingly felt particularly in terms of the focus on revenue earning capacity. In WA and SA bilateral agreements on the provision of essential services to Indigenous communities are beginning to shift accountability and responsibility structures from ATSIC/S funded resource agencies to energy authorities or corporations, but primarily only for larger communities. For homelands, capital and maintenance responsibilities for energy services remains tied to access to CHIP funds as distributed by resource agencies or indeed whatever access to funds homelands residents can secure.

Most community energy services are supplied by stand alone hybrid power stations, including a combination of wind, solar and diesel, whilst homelands are overwhelmingly reliant on fossil fuel gensets or small renewable energy systems. A study undertaken by the Australian Centre for Renewable Energy and CAT in 2000 highlighted that the majority of renewable systems on small communities were not functioning due to poor maintenance and servicing regimes or equipment breakdown. The Bushlight program funded by ATSIC and the Australian Greenhouse Office is the one innovative program dealing with securing affordable and effective renewable energy supplies to small discrete communities such as homelands. The Bushlight program includes a process of developing Regional Energy Plans (REPs) for each ATSIC region in which it operates. These REPs provide details of existing housing and infrastructure at all small, discrete communities in the region, and identify priorities for improving energy services.

In a number of jurisdictions, QLD, WA and the NT for example, the provision of energy services as part of the Community Service Obligation, resulted in a finite list of Indigenous communities, (eg 30 in QLD, 77 in the NT) for whom state power authorities or their delegates (eg Ergon Energy), assumed responsibility for power station maintenance and upgrades. Despite the expansion in size and number of discrete Indigenous communities these lists are rarely altered and indeed the process of ‘moving over’ remains a process of bun fights over cost estimates and dollar shifting. As a result of the bilateral agreement in WA, Western Power is now assuming responsibility for energy services to communities with populations between 50 and 200 and in line with the ‘normalisation’ focus of AHIC, is beginning the process of upgrading services to meet required standards. None of these agreements cover services to homelands settlements.

The issue of standards looms large in determinations of who will assume responsibility for energy services. Historically, most power services existing on discrete communities have been implemented on the basis of available funds with little regard to regulatory regimes. In some instances NAHS funds have been directed towards upgrading infrastructure (primarily in larger communities) in order to pressure energy authorities to assume responsibility for maintenance and supply. It is arguable that the limited scope of revenue earning capacity, given the entrenched poverty of most residents on communities, militates against the willingness of private corporations to assume responsibility without assurances of additional and ongoing subsidies.
Ultimately the pressures of standardisation which underpin service supply regimes to discrete communities reflect a philosophic position of ‘equity’ defined as bridging the gap or minimising the difference between Indigenous domains and the mainstream. Cost factors alone make this objective difficult to achieve, let alone the apparent ill fit between local aspirations, opportunities and viability considerations and the externally driven and often undefined costs associated with regulation. An alternative approach to that of ‘one size fits all’ standardisation is that encapsulated in the community energy plan modelling (CEPM) developed by the Bushlight program. A summary of the CEPM is presented in Appendix 6.

Water Supply
Access to potable water is one of the preconditions for homelands funding under the NHP. Across the 889 discrete communities with populations of less than 50 recorded by the CHINS, the primary source of water is groundwater (CHINS 2001). Homelands in the NT, SA and WA are largely reliant on bore water, whereas in Queensland communities have a wider range of sources of supplies including wells, rainwater tanks, rivers and bores. In NSW, all but one settlement were connected to reticulated town water supplies (1999 data). In 2001, 21 of these small communities (comprising 90 people) had no organised supply.

In examining existing water regulation and provision across Australia, the main finding is the complexity and diversity of who assumes authority and who ensures compliance. To complicate this situation further, under National Competition Policy reforms, water provision is increasingly being corporatised or privatised.

In Western Australia, the main service provider is the WA Water Corporation. It is the primary service provider in urban areas, on a standardised fee for service basis. In regional and remote areas, it either undertakes service provision as a contractor (eg., paid through ATSIS or WA Indigenous Affairs) or through delegation of some services to local governments. Overall, water services on homelands are viewed as private systems and any external service is on a fee for service basis.

In the 67 remote communities in Western Australia, water, waste and power services are provided under the Remote Area Essential Services Program (RAESP). Local service providers are contracted to provide six-weekly rotating visits to service and maintain the water, waste and power systems. Initial infrastructure provision remains the under the CHIP or NAHS programs. Microbiological water quality testing is provided for communities in the RAESP. The RAESP is provided to larger communities rather than homelands settlements.

In the Northern Territory, the main service provider is the Power and Water Corporation (PowerWater). There is currently no ‘user pays’ policy for water services, but user pay agreements exist on an ad hoc basis across the Territory. PowerWater services some homelands. These are often in proximity to larger communities where PowerWater has authority and can delegate operational responsibility to community councils by funding Essential Services Officer (ESO) positions. Where systems do not meet PowerWater guidelines, ATSIC/ATSIS, now FaCS, assumes responsibility, usually via funds allocations to resource agencies.

Compliance with PowerWater standards and design is necessary before it will assume longer-term responsibility and support. There are some exceptions to this system in communities located within National Parks. For example, water services to Mutitjulu community (near Uluru - population 400) are currently the responsibility of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. A recent NAHS program there funded full
upgrading of the water supply system to bring it in line with PowerWater standards, with a view to PowerWater assuming responsibility.

As in Western Australia, repairs and maintenance at homelands usually become the responsibility of local resource agencies. PowerWater undertakes water testing across the Northern Territory, but rarely in homelands.

The water system in Queensland is dominated by local governments, including DOGIT community councils, as primary service providers. Operational grants are provided to local government and DOGIT communities to maintain and service water supplies. Small communities such as homelands that are unable to connect to a town supply are required to fund their own private supply.

The Water Act 2000 provides a regulatory framework for water provision. It requires local governments, including DOGIT Councils to develop Strategic Asset Management Plans (SAMP) and Customer Service Standards. Service providers are required to be registered and this provides them with certain powers and imposes obligations.

**Transport**

Transport is one of the most pressing infrastructure requirements of remote communities. The responsibility and funding for transport provision and upkeep is ostensibly met by Commonwealth, State and Local Governments in complex and unclear funding arrangements. All have responsibility for maintaining and upgrading certain categories of roads. Funding from ATSIS/ATSIC, now FaCS, is often directed to roads, barge landings and creek crossings and airstrips. Access to homelands via roads, air or across water is a major determinant of occupancy levels.

Responsibility for access roads into homelands is a highly contested area, primarily due to the high cost of maintenance of unsealed roads in the desert or in the tropical north, where wash outs in the wet season are common. The issue is often highlighted when new infrastructure is put in to support homelands (usually funded through ATSIC/ATSIS, now FaCS under the NHP). High mobility between homelands and service centres exacerbates both maintenance needs and costs of remote living.

In remote areas, road maintenance is usually a local council responsibility. Generally these have been very reluctant to assume responsibility for the type of road infrastructure needs that have emerged alongside the homelands movement. Whilst limited Grants Commission funding is provided to many Community Councils for road maintenance, the sheer level of need in town areas means homelands often assume a low priority.

Roads to homelands in the NT and WA have been criticised on the following grounds: “Access roads are not systematically planned; are not designed to meet engineering and environmental requirements; are constructed to low standard when opening up new communities; are not given a very high priority when compared to other community infrastructure; are not developed by any formal process. Access roads tend to involve ad hoc planning over time, and are given minimal funding by ATSIC with no formal funding for maintenance” (WA Main Roads Department, 1992, p35). The situation has not changed significantly since then. Tracks initially established for basic access to country, progressively evolve into homelands access roads.
Conclusions
There are two key elements to the overall picture of planning and funding frameworks impacting on homelands. The first element is complexity. A complex web of agreements, plans and laws at local, regional, state/territory and Commonwealth level are in operation, and determining the operative processes for any particular location is a difficult task. The bilateral agreement-making process appears to be bringing some order to the picture, in particular in those states where essential services are also being included in these agreements. The second element is that despite the plethora of agreements, plans and programs, the needs of homelands settlements are still routinely overlooked. Due to their small size they simply fall through the net. There are some notable exceptions, such as the explicit inclusion of homelands by IHANT in the NT, and the detailed planning for energy services on homelands that has occurred as part of the Bushlight program. It also appears that ATSIC Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIPs) place the needs of homelands settlements alongside those of larger settlements, although further investigation is required as to how the RHIPs interact with allocation processes at higher levels.

Suggested directions for policy development

- The inclusion of homelands in RHIPs is a useful step in acknowledging the part the homelands settlements play in regional settlement networks. However if homelands are to be included in allocation processes such as those that are incorporated in the housing bilaterals it is essential that the different nature of homelands settlements be recognised. Service delivery models and design standards that suit larger settlements do not suit homelands. Needs assessment methodologies based on township-style communities can also produce misleading results when applied to homelands settlements.
- Whether through RHIPs or other mechanisms, it is essential that the needs of homelands for both housing and essential services be incorporated into planning and allocation frameworks. It is also essential the housing interventions always be accompanied by the necessary essential services.
- Roads funding is a particularly difficult issue for homelands settlements. Further comments in this regard are made in Section 9.
Section 6: Overview and assessment of the relationship between homelands and larger communities

The NHP does not provide much information on its perception of the relationship between homelands and larger communities, other than setting an objective that ‘…best practice models…..must balance the needs of larger settlements with those of homelands.’ (ATSIC, 2002, p59).

In contrast, both the homelands literature and the snapshots compiled for this review suggest that in fact homelands and larger communities must be viewed together as mutually dependent components of a broader picture of Indigenous settlement in remote regions of Australia. Rather than balancing the needs of the two, policy should seek to respond to the intertwined needs of both.

The research study that informed the development of the Gulf and Western Queensland Regional Homelands Policy describes this situation as follows. “Given the high level of mobility within and between Indigenous settlements, it is instructive to take a regional perspective to settlement planning. Indigenous people typically live more in an area with two or more residences. To view one Indigenous settlement in isolation may only reveal part of the settlement pattern of a particular community group. This applies in particular to outstation development, where population mobility is pronounced. It is not possible to consider homelands in isolation of the ‘parent’ discrete community to which it is attached.” (Moran and Burgen, 2000, p13, our emphasis).

A large body of literature exists discussing mobility in Indigenous populations, including mobility to and from homelands. This literature was reviewed by Moran and Burgen (2000, Appendix II). The following summary observations emerged.

Various ‘push and pull’ factors can be identified within a region, operating in both urban and rural areas to create a circular flow of movement. Factors which promote movement away from rural into urban centres include escaping social tensions, and the attraction to employment prospects, social services and access to alcohol. Factors which promote the return to rural areas include traditional obligations, need for family, and escaping alcohol-related problems.

[...]

Outstation life is characterised by a constant stream of visitors from town, and regular trips back into town. Given the high level of mobility, it is not possible in any policy sense to separate outstations from the ‘mother’ community to which they are inextricably linked. It may be more instructive to consider outstations as rooms within the one large community house, rather than separate settlements in their own right. (Moran and Burgen, 2000, p21)

This same pattern of mobility was observed in outstations surrounding Coen, in central Cape York Peninsula by Smith (2002):

In 1996 and 1997, Aboriginal dry-season mobility levels between places in the Coen region were generally high, particularly between Coen and its
outstations. Most people using outstations (the majority of the adult population) spent no more than a week or two there at a time and periods of town residence were typically not much longer. In the wet season, when access to outstations was more limited and several were not used, the level of town residency was greater, although those who did visit outstations tended to stay there for longer periods. The differences in residency patterns between the two seasons can be seen in Tables 1 and 2, which compare the mobility and residence patterns of Aboriginal people at Port Stewart, a large coastal outstation complex in the region, during the period of study.

Table 1. Mobility of a ‘focal man’ from Langi outstation (July 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th July</td>
<td>Drives from Coen to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen, then drives to Lilly Vale Cattle Station (to take his older sister’s son for work), then drives back to Coen, then drives to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen, drives to Lockhart River (to pick up wife’s son and another young man), drives back to Coen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th July</td>
<td>Drives to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th July</td>
<td>Drives to Aurukun (to pick up older brother and older brother’s wife).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th July</td>
<td>Drives to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen, drives back to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd July</td>
<td>Drives to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th July</td>
<td>Drives to Coen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th July</td>
<td>Drives to Aurukun (to take back older brother and older brother’s wife), drives back to Coen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th July</td>
<td>Drives to Langi outstation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Dry season mobility patterns, 1996–97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moojeeba</th>
<th>Theethinji</th>
<th>Wenlock River</th>
<th>Langi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the outstation all week</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At outstation some of week, moved (between Coen and outstation) once</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At outstation some of week, moved (between Coen and outstation) twice or more</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Coen all week</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in Coen region, but not to or from own group’s outstation</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Coen region all Week</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that mobility regions may be structured by economic as well as social factors (Taylor 1998). Contemporary mobility regions might be partly shaped by local CDEP schemes, just as distribution of the population in pre-contact Aboriginal society was structured by seasonal availability of resources and constraints on mobility (Altman 1987; Chase and Sutton 1987). In fact, the Coen data suggests that CDEP played a particularly important role in shaping the mobility of the Aboriginal population. Conversely, Aboriginal mobility remained a key concern for the CRAC administrators.

The Draft Cape York Outstation Report makes the following observations about reasons for movement between homelands and larger settlements.

People who have had well-established infrastructure at outstations but who do not live there permanently cite a number of reasons for this:

- Access to school education
- Access to jobs
- Young people want to stay around town
- Transport problems
- Need to come to town often anyway for stores, funerals or meetings, and usually get stuck there, so it is better to be based in town and use the outstation when there is clear time.

Some people think that it is simple - some people like outstation life, some people like town life and some people like a bit of both. (Balkanu, 2002, p54-55).

Under these circumstances it could be argued that enhancing the level of health infrastructure will not guarantee sustainable occupation of a homeland.

Very similar observations were made by informants in the snap shots compiled for this review. Generally, outstation people depend on larger settlements for a whole range of services including retails stores, trade and technical services, health and education services, financial services and Government services including social security. Further observations of this pattern of service access are reported in Taylor (2002).

It is also the case in most regions that CDEP forms the backbone of the outstation economy, and that CDEP offices are located in the larger communities. This provides another reason for routine movement backwards and forwards between outstations and the main community. Outstation resource agencies, whether or not they are also the CDEP organisation, are also almost universally located in the larger communities. In many instances, individuals visit the main community on at least a weekly or fortnightly basis.

One frequent observation was that school-age children and their parents don't spend much time on homelands because the schools are locate in the larger communities. This leads to a pattern where parents and children visit homelands on weekends and school holidays, while older people live there more permanently.

In the case of Cape York, the Draft Outstation Report also reports that "A characteristic of all outstations is that there is a core of 'serious' outstation people - those who are
dedicated to outstation life and who are generally recognised as living permanently at
their outstations. [...] However, there is nearly always a group of people who spend
time at outstations but are not part of the core group - they may move back and forth to
town or to other outstations for various reasons" (Balkanu, 2002, p51). This
observation seems to generally hold for most other regions.

Movement is also not limited to between outstations and the nearby 'main' Indigenous
community. People also visit mainstream towns and cities to access the larger array of
services that can be found there. This is analogous to the situation in the wider
community where people in regional centres visit or move temporarily or more
permanently to larger centres to access a larger range of services and opportunities
such as better health or education services and a wider range of employment options.

The people who have the best picture of population movements at the local level are
resource agency and CDEP coordinators. This picture can be obtained from the
documentation associated with CDEP administration, and by monitoring requests for
transportation, equipment, repairs and maintenance. One RA coordinator claimed that
he knows week by week where people are and where they aren't, just through the daily
flow of people and information through his office. He also pointed out, however, that
this does not allow him to predict where people will be in the future. A particular
outstation may be empty for several weeks or months and then suddenly be occupied
again.

These coordinators are also the people best placed to make observations about
general trends of movement to or away from outstations. No particular comments
about trends were made during the snapshot interviews. The general sense conveyed
was that there is continued strong interest and commitment in all regions to the
homelands movement. In no region was there a sense that the homelands movement
is waning. Some specific comments on this topic are made in the Draft Cape York
Outstation Report. Subject to a number of influences and assumptions, it concluded
that "We expect that there will be a steady increase in the number of new outstation
developments over the next five years." (Balkanu, 2002, p56). However it also
observed that "Although people tend to indicate that they would like their occasional
outstation to become a permanent place for them to live, this appears to be more a
hope than an intention. It would appear that the reality of outstations in the Cape is that
most will be occasional with a few becoming permanent" (Balkanu, 2002, p55).

This distinction between 'permanent' and 'occasional' outstations is important to
examine in the light of the earlier discussion about mobility patterns. A tension exists
between the threshold condition set out in the NHP of an outstation as a 'principal place
of residence', and the observed pattern of residence of Indigenous people, who may
have several regular places of residence and no principal place. In planning documents
and other forums, people have routinely stated their intention to reside permanently at
their outstation simply in order to maximise the support that they receive, even though
the factors outlined above make it almost certain that in fact they will move regularly
between the outstation and other centres. This leads to the accusation that outstations
are really only 'weekenders', and that public funds should not be used to build holiday
homes for people. The Gulf and Western Queensland Regional Homelands Policy, for
example, states that in allocating funds, preference will be given to permanently
occupied settlements rather than 'weekenders'.
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While it may be the case that the standard of facilities required, and the expenditure that can be justified, are different for occasionally occupied settlements than for permanent homes, that is not to say that occasionally occupied settlements do not form a valuable part of the settlement pattern of a region. As observed in Moran and Burgen (2000, p21) "In an extreme case, if an outstation is only occupied for the occasional weekend, this may still serve as a critical point of escape from the pressure associated with town living. Of course, such an outstation would not be deserving of the same level of funding assistance as other outstations that are more permanently occupied. Nonetheless, it can play an extremely important part of a family's life and coping mechanisms."

A final issue to discuss under the heading of mobility relates to abandonment of homelands. It is a requirement of the NHP that "Regional Councils should develop clearly understood and agreed guidelines for reduction or withdrawal of funding". Informants made a variety of observations in relation to abandonment. One RA has established a clear policy on abandonment that is understood and enforced by its management committee, which is made up of outstation representatives. Homelands residents clearly understand that if their occupation of the homeland drops below the agreed threshold then they will no longer be eligible for the agreed level of support from the RA. Most RAs have a general approach of matching support provided to the observed level of commitment to a particular outstation. This approach is expressed more specifically in one of the snapshot communities, where the governing body of the RA agreed to support the development of a set number of outstations to a set, basic standard of facilities, and then make further support dependent on demonstrated commitment over a five year period. In another case the RA coordinator made the observation that particular outstations get 'abandoned' and then reoccupied again routinely, often for cultural reasons. The RA responds to this by trying to be in a position to ensure that essential services can be made functional again quickly if an unoccupied outstation becomes occupied again.

An interesting recent phenomenon relating to abandonment comes from the AP Lands in South Australia where apparently there is a surge of people seeking to have water and power facilities on homelands reinstated as they return to their homelands amidst uncertainty about the outcomes of the post ATSIC service models and attitudes to homelands.

The Draft Cape York Outstation Report makes the following observation about abandonment. "There is a lot of talk about abandonment of outstations. In reality, though, it is difficult to find outstations that have been abandoned. Some have infrastructure that is excessive for the level of occupation at different times, but […] this appears to be a legacy of the funding processes that have been in place rather than the 'fault' of the particular outstation group. There are only a couple of instances where outstations have been only rarely occupied after the initial construction period" (Balkanu, 2002, p55).

**Conclusions**

In summary, understanding the relationship between homelands and other, larger settlements is critical to developing any policy response to the service delivery needs of homelands. Homelands and larger settlements form a regional network of facilities and services around which Indigenous people move regularly in order to meet their material, social, economic and spiritual needs. Some people choose to reside almost
permanently at outstations, whereas others move regularly between several residences. The threshold condition of “principal place of residence” has created tension around this movement pattern, whereby outstation communities have consistently misrepresented their true pattern of residence, and service providers have been criticised for funding ‘weekenders’. A more realistic policy framework could examine how best to meet peoples’ needs through interventions at various levels of this settlement hierarchy.

**Suggested directions for policy development**

The following directions emerge from this discussion:

- Policy must recognise the high level of mobility that is both typical and necessary for Indigenous people to sustain their livelihood.
- Policy should respond to patterns of Indigenous settlement at a regional level, and determine the most effective way to facilitate access to services through this regional hierarchy of settlements of different sizes.
- The notion of "principal place of residence" must be revisited. Settlements that are not a "principal place of residence" may serve a vital role in maintaining livelihoods for people and may be worthy of some support, although the standard of facilities required at an occasional settlement will differ from that required at a permanent settlement.
- The focus on housing as the point of service delivery tends to distort the place or relevance of a homeland as an element in a regional approach to sustaining a livelihood.

The ability to move the existing paradigm of delivery of services leading to healthy living outcomes to a paradigm of facilitating access to services that enhance livelihood opportunities in a region, will be a significant policy challenge.
Section 7: Assessment of effectiveness of Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans

Of the 28 ATSIC regions containing homelands, thirteen have endorsed regional homelands policies and plans (RCHPPs) in place, nine have draft policies yet to be ratified, one region has a policy under development and five regional councils have yet to begin developing RCHPPs. The review team reviewed the 13 approved RCHPPs and gathered raw data from resource agencies to determine how effective the approved RCHPPs have been. The review team examined each of the RCHPPs in relation to community viability factors, and relationships and planning frameworks. A table capturing this analysis is included in Appendix 7. This section addresses the following questions:

- How effective have the RCHPPs been in implementing the National Homelands Policy?
- What has been the effect of the RCHPPs on the ground?
- To what extent do the RCHPPs address the factors of community viability presented in Section 2?

RCHPPs and the National Homelands Policy

As would be expected, those RCHPPs that have been approved by the National Homelands Unit conform very closely to the principles set out in the National Homelands Policy. They incorporate the threshold conditions and the policy and planning principles including staged development, minimum standards for housing, infrastructure and services, and individual homelands plans. They also incorporate the requirement for funding to be directed through resource agencies and include some detail on the roles and operations of resource agencies. Therefore it can be said that the RCHPPs have successfully applied the principles of the NHP to regional level planning and policy making. It remains to examine whether the RCHPPs have effectively achieved the objectives of the NHP.

The first objective of the National Homelands Policy (NHP) is to ‘meet regionally unique needs, as long as nationally determined and defensible standards of planning and accountability are met’.

The degree of variation in the RCHPPs is an indication that the NHP does provide flexibility to meet regionally unique needs. This variation is evident in differing interpretations of the threshold conditions, differing minimum standards and staged development models, differing policy in relation to resource agencies, and in other areas.

However several RCHPPs take pains to point out that funds are very limited and have not been increased to deal with increased demand associated with the lifting of the moratorium on new homelands. This is seen as limiting the ability to respond to need. In most regions, the RCHPP envisages funding housing and infrastructure on homelands from the existing regional CHIP budget. All of the RCHPPs were prepared at a time when funding allocation was the responsibility of Regional Councils. A range of assessment models that differentiate between applicants are presented, ranging from detailed and rigid points-based systems, to less than clear arrangements consisting of a commitment to decision-making according to a set of stated ‘core principles’ and priorities.
Since the 'separation of powers' between ATSIC and ATSIS in 2003, allocation of funding is no longer the responsibility of the Regional Council, but rather is to be guided by a Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plan (RHIP). Several examples of RHIPs were provided to the review team by IHIB. As noted in Section 5, the RHIPs appear to have flowed out of the bilateral agreement process and incorporate homelands settlements into the same planning and allocation process as larger communities. They thus appear to override some aspects of RCHPPs. Minimal evidence was found of cross-referencing between RCHPPs and RHIPs.

Many RCHPPs also say that Regional Councils will contribute to the recurrent costs of resource agencies. This was a point of tension for resource agency coordinators who frequently expressed frustration that funds are generally only available for capital works and municipal services, and that accessing funds for routine maintenance of housing and infrastructure is problematic. This suggests that current CHIP program guidelines make it difficult for resource agencies to fill the role envisaged for them in the RCHPPs.

The second objective of the NHP is to 'provide a foundation for negotiating agreements on the provision of housing, infrastructure and services to homelands'. State and federal policies on homelands are not clearly articulated in the RCHPPs. Most RCHPPs merely provided extensive lists of the government agencies that may provide support to homelands, without specifying any particular services that they are obliged to provide.

The final objective of the NHP states that '...best practice models must balance the needs of larger settlements with those of homelands.' Most RCHPPs recognise the importance of homelands in providing an escape from larger communities, and relief of overcrowding, but do not deal in any detail with the flow of people, services and resources backwards and forwards. One RCHPP puts homelands behind larger communities in the funding queue, while another prioritises homelands for funding if housing becomes stressed in the larger community. As noted above, allocating funds between homelands and larger communities is now a function of Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans and further investigation is required into how this occurs.

An additional question raised in the scope of work for this review relates to whether ATSIC regional offices have established registers of homelands plans for their region, and databases containing key performance information on homelands. The regional homelands databases were supplied to the review team by IHIB, and it is understood that these are the only databases so far established under the RCHPP process. The three databases provide to the review covered Yapakurlangu, Kullari and Gulf and Western Queensland regions. The Gulf and Western Queensland Homeland Database was developed by the consultant engaged to undertake research to inform the development of the RCHPP (Moran and Burgen, 2000). It contains comprehensive planning information on all homelands in the region. No updating of information in the database has occurred since its initial development by the consultant, but steps are currently under way to remedy this. The Yapakurlangu database is reported to be comprehensive and up to date. The currency of information in the Kullari database was not established. It is not known how many regional offices have established registers of homelands plans, although the general experience of CAT staff is that staff in regional ATSIC offices experience difficulty in locating planning documents, suggesting that such registers are not universally in place.
RCHPPs on the ground
A further test of the effectiveness of the RCHPPs is to look for evidence of their impact on the ground. Of the twelve snapshot homelands examined for this review, five are located in regions where approved RCHPPs are in place, while the remaining seven are located in regions where RCHPPs are under development. In looking for evidence of the effect of RCHPPs it is important to note that the RCHPP process is still in its early stages. Although development of the RCHPPs has been going on in some regions for several years, approved RCHPPs have been in place for 3 years in one region, and less than two years in all other regions. It is therefore unreasonable to look for a complete implementation of the provisions of the RCHPP. Instead, the review team looked for some evidence that the RCHPP is having some impact.

There is clear evidence that the RCHPP process has not been effective in implementing the moratorium on establishment of new homelands. One of the snapshot homelands was established in 2001 in a region without an approved RCHPP in place. The review team is aware of many other similar cases that were not featured in this review.

In only one of the snapshots was the RCHPP reported to have played a major role in the policy development and operations of the resource agency responsible for the homeland in question. This region has a long-established and extensive homeland movement, and the resource agency in question is also large and well established. The resource agency has implemented the RCHPP through establishing service agreements with each homeland, implementing cost sharing and cost recovery policies, and applying a firm rule in relation to abandonment of homelands. The resource agency is also involved in supporting economic development, and in securing support for homelands activities from other funding sources.

For the remaining eleven snapshot communities, awareness of the RCHPP at the homeland and resource agency level was limited or nonexistent. This included four snapshots where an approved RCHPP was in fact in place. This is not to say that the RCHPP has had no impact in these cases, as it may well have had an impact on decision-making within ATSIC/ATSIS, whether or not the agency or homeland in question understood this process.

In the case of several of the snapshots located in regions where the RCHPP is under development, there was some awareness of a policy and planning process being underway, but no detailed knowledge of the process or its implications for the homeland in question. Nevertheless, some aspects of the NHP are still being implemented, including some cost recovery by resource agencies from homelands and some policies in relation to abandonment of homelands.

As per the NHP, RCHPPs stipulate that formal agreements must exist between resource agencies and homelands, and between resource agencies and the regional council. Some provide a model form of service agreement between resource agencies and homelands. Of the resource agencies contacted for the snapshots, none reported having MOUs in place with their Regional Council. Their agreement with the Regional Council consisted only of the letter of offer attached to their funding. This was the case for regions both with and without approved RCHPPs in place. In the majority of cases, service agreements between resource agencies and individual homelands have also not been implemented.
All RCHPPs require individual homelands to have development plans and many provide a proforma for this plan. Six of the snapshot homelands had some form of individual homeland plan in place. Four of these six plans were developed independently of the RCHPP process, but nevertheless have influenced resourcing and decision-making. Three of the snapshot homelands definitely have no written plan in place, however none of these are located in regions with approved RCHPPs in place. For three of the snapshot homelands, including two covered by approved RCHPPs, the review team was unable to establish whether individual homeland plans exist, suggesting that they may not.

RCHPPs set minimum standards for infrastructure, and adopt a staged development model, as dictated by the NHP, so that the standard of infrastructure improves commensurate with increased occupancy and commitment. Most RCHPPs recognise that early-stage infrastructure may not meet all mainstream standards; however, they generally state that all funded development must comply with local government and other legal requirements.

The snapshot homelands had a range of infrastructure standards. All had access to water, although the review team has anecdotal evidence of a homeland trucking in water. Some homelands have professionally built houses, while some have owner built sheds. The standard of housing did not seem to correlate to current occupancy levels. Roads and access were commonly given as barriers to permanent occupation of homelands, particularly in wet weather.

**RCHPPs and Community Viability**

This section explores the extent to which the RCHPPs are likely to lead to the establishment of viable homeland communities, by reference to factors influencing community viability.

**Expressed aspirations**

RCHPPs require homelands individually to have documented plans, which is a form of expressed aspiration. However mostly these plans consist of little more than a 'wish list' of housing and infrastructure, and pay little attention to broader aspirations or vision. They do not provide a mechanism for homeland communities to reflect critically on what is a realistic pathway of development that will achieve a long-term vision for their community.

**Effective Governance**

RCHPPs generally require homelands to be incorporated organisations. They are silent about how the organisation or the homeland community will actually make decisions. The RCHPPs imply that corporate governance applies, as per the requirements of the incorporation legislation. There appears to be no consideration of the burden that incorporation may place upon a small group. There is no discussion of traditional decision-making procedures or ways of reflecting these in corporation constitutions. On the other hand, homelands in the snapshots often had a traditional form of governance adopted that reflects an agreed form of joint decision making.

**Livelihood activity**

RCHPPs encourage homeland groups to work towards a high degree of self-sufficiency in areas of infrastructure operations and management, food supply and income generation. RCHPPs recognise the importance of homeland groups accessing training.
in these basic skill areas. RCHPPs recognise that economic development on homelands is desirable and supporting economic development is seen as a role for resource agencies. However there is little mention of what sorts of economic development have proven viable or how feasible different ventures might be, either from a marketing or a production viewpoint. Also missing is any discussion in the plans as to whether self-sufficient homelands are a realistic goal in very remote areas.

While most of the snapshot homelands’ residents are trying to find moneymaking ventures on their country, none of the homelands in the snapshots had made major inroads towards achieving economic self-reliance.

**Reliable infrastructure**
Through setting of minimum standards, the RCHPPs have a clear intention to ensure that reliable infrastructure is available for homelands. The tension that arises is the gap between the minimum standards that are acceptable from a mainstream legal perspective on the one hand, as against the standard of infrastructure that can be satisfactorily maintained by homeland residents and their resource agencies. Put another way, the style of facilities which people can afford to operate and maintain may not meet the normative standards that the RCHPPs are obliged by law to stipulate. This is discussed further in Section 9.

**Access to services**
RCHPPs set minimum requirements for access to health and education services. Some policies preclude funding homelands that are more than 100km from the nearest larger community, on the basis that this makes them too remote from services. This is a somewhat arbitrary condition, given that 100km of reasonable road can be traversed in about an hour, whereas 100km of rough track can take 3 or 4 hours. It also doesn’t allow room for homeland communities to develop their own solutions to servicing issues.

**Positive resource flows**
RCHPPs highlight the importance of resource flows to ensure that assets are maintained, and recognise the high costs of living in homeland situations. They generally put forward a cost-sharing model where homelands residents are expected to make some contribution to O&M costs, and some subsidy comes from the Regional Council via the Resource Agency. Residents can contribute through paying rent, or other less formal arrangements. Some cost recovery from residents is usually a pre-condition for continued support. This cost recovery model is working well in some places and less well in others, and is discussed in more detail in Sections 8 and 9.

**Low vulnerability**
RCHPPs recognise the role that homelands play in providing a safe environment, away from dysfunctional larger communities, where people can be more in control of their situation. Later in the paper the snapshot findings will be discussed in detail. However the findings from the snapshots, as well as the prior experiences of the review team indicate that the foremost reason for homelands’ existence is to reduce the violence and abuse vulnerability levels of the residents. The RCHPPs, while acknowledging vulnerability reduction as a reason for the existence of homelands, did not in any case make specific mention of measures to reduce vulnerability on the homelands themselves.
Conclusions
The National Homelands Policy sets clear guidelines for the development of Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans, and the majority of ATSIC regions containing homelands either already have RCHPPs in place that satisfy the provision of the NHP, or are well on their way.

At this early stage in the implementation of the RCHPPs, evidence for their impact on the ground is limited. As would be expected at this early stage, minimum standards of housing, infrastructure and services set out in RCHPPs have not universally been achieved. Planning and agreement making at the homeland and resource agency level has also not followed the model set out in the RCHPPs.

More significantly, it appears that the RCHPP process has not been successful in establishing a transparent and defensible process for the allocation of funding to support homelands development. Most of those working closely with homelands in regions both with and without RCHPPs in place speak of 'wish list' and 'Father Christmas' funding, and of lurching from crisis to crisis. They also report a mismatch between the conditions attached to the funding they receive and the work they need to do. In particular they report difficulty in obtaining funds for recurrent expenditure.

Further, it appears that the RCHPP process has failed to meet the objective of the NHP of establishing agreements with other agencies to provide support to homelands. No evidence of such an agreement being made at the regional level was found. It seems likely that the RCHPPs, and particularly the detailed investigation that in many cases went into their preparation, had lead to improved decision-making and coordination within ATSIC. The review uncovered no evidence of improvement in coordination between agencies at the regional level, although this is certainly happening at higher levels through the bilaterals and the COAG trials.

Generally, then, the RCHPP process has attempted to establish a clear framework for the allocation of resources to support homelands development. It has made some progress in this regard, but has fallen well short of its objectives.

From the wider perspective of community viability and sustainability, there are significant shortcomings in the RCHPP process. In particular, the process offers little support to homelands communities to develop the governance capacity required to establish and manage a small, remote settlements and the relationships with larger service communities that it requires to survive. Also, RCHPPs do not recognise the tension that exists between externally defined standards for infrastructure and services, as against the standards that can be afforded and maintained by small communities. The RCHPP process also offers little practical support in the direction of economic development.

Suggested directions for policy development
• Some level of regional planning is essential to assist regional and higher-level resource allocation;
• Transport infrastructure is a particular case where increased planning and advocacy effort is required at the regional level;
• There is an urgent need to establish transparent and responsive funding programs for homelands;
• Risk management and affordability considerations warrant greater emphasis in the setting of minimum standards for facilities and services;
• Planning at the individual settlement level should relate to broader aspirations and the development of realistic livelihood opportunities, rather than narrowly on housing and infrastructure aspirations;
• This will require a shift in the skill base and operating methods of resource agencies towards a greater focus on facilitation of processes of community engagement.
Section 8: Overview and analysis of relationships between homelands and Resource Agencies

Resource Agencies and the NHP
Resource agencies (RAs) are a central component of the National Homelands Policy. The availability of ongoing support from a resource agency is a threshold condition for eligibility for ATSIC funding, and funding must be provided only to resource agencies, rather than directly to homelands.

Resource agencies were the subject of a major review in 1998 (Altman et al). The 1998 review was far more detailed and comprehensive than the current review and involved in-depth investigation of the operation of a number of different individual agencies. Within the scope of this current review, it is possible only to make general observations on a number of themes identified in the Project Scope, drawing on information from the sources identified in Section 3. It is notable that many of the recommendations of the 1998 Review do not appear to have been implemented, and yet remain relevant.

In the NHP, a resource agency is described as "a community organisation or ... agency that is able to provide sound planning, management and accounting skills, and centralised service delivery arrangements" (ATSIC 2002, p59). The role envisaged for resource agencies is set out in more detail in most RCHPPs and includes core functions of assisting with planning for individual homelands, receiving and managing funds on behalf of homeland groups and assisting with the development, operation and maintenance of housing and infrastructure on homelands. Many RCHPPs identify a range of other services to be provided by resource agencies including support for homelands groups wanting to establish enterprises, support with land management activities and provision of training.

The NHP stipulates that resource agencies need to "formalise arrangements for service delivery and asset and infrastructure management through the negotiation of agreements with the Regional Council and homeland groups" (ATSIC 2002, p59-60). Most RCHPPs implement this directive in part by stipulating that resource agencies should negotiate service agreements with individual homelands. Many RCHPPs provide model agreements to be used for this purpose. The RCHPPs are less proactive about establishing formal agreements between Regional Councils and resource agencies.

Through the process of compiling the homeland snapshots that form part of this review, the review team spoke to the coordinators of nine resource agencies in three states and the Northern Territory. The following description and analysis of the relationship between resource agencies and homelands is drawn largely from these discussions, with some additional comments drawn from the review team’s general knowledge of the topic, and some comments coming from the literature.

Roles
Generally, the resource agencies featured in the snapshots have a clear sense of their role in providing essential services and support to people living on homelands and in some cases in supporting the establishment of new homelands settlements. The core services they provide include procuring or managing construction services, purchasing major equipment including components for essential services (water supply, power...
supply, sanitation), purchasing minor tools and equipment and providing repair and maintenance services for housing, essential services, vehicles, equipment and tools. Many homelands resource agencies also operate CDEP programs and delivery of homelands services is interwoven with CDEP work programs. This link with CDEP is discussed further below.

The role of resource agencies to receive and manage funds on behalf of homelands groups is less clear. Some agencies operate individual accounts or budget lines for each homeland, thus allowing them to manage funds for individual homelands, however in most cases, resource agencies seek grant funds in their own right, to enable them to deliver the services required by the homelands they serve. The distinction is significant, because it is one source of friction between resource agencies and homelands residents. Often homelands residents are of the view that individually designated funding for each homeland is provided to the resource agency by ATSIC, and they want direct control of 'their money'. When this is not forthcoming, accusations arise that money for one homeland has been spent at another or, in cases where resource agencies are involved in other activities in addition to homelands services, that funds have been diverted elsewhere. This conflict has been avoided or resolved in a number of the snapshot communities through the establishment of transparent decision-making and resource allocation processes at the resource agency level. This is discussed further below.

There was much greater variation amongst the snapshots in the planning aspect of the resource agency role. Some resource agencies see planning as a valuable activity in its own right, regardless of the fact that it is a requirement of RCHPPs. Others see planning at the individual homeland level as little more than a necessary hurdle in order to access funding, and others again do or require no formal planning at this level.

There was also variation in the extent to which resource agencies were taking on other roles such as supporting enterprises, supporting land management activities and providing or brokering training. Examples exist of resource agencies taking on all these roles. Some resource agencies have been successful in taking on a range of roles that meet specific needs of their clients, and attracting funds to support these roles from a variety of sources.

Types of organisations
Within the snapshot sample there was a great deal of variation in the organisational set-up of resource agencies. In particular, in the Northern Territory and South Australia, the resource agencies that feature in the snapshots are all dedicated organisations focusing solely on resourcing homelands, whereas in Queensland and Western Australia, resource agency functions are performed by a number of different types of organisations, which have other functions in addition to their homelands resource function. These other organisations include DOGIT Community Councils (now Shire Councils) in Queensland, CDEP organisations, land management agencies and 'general purpose' corporations that provide a variety of services to towns or larger communities, as well as homelands. This difference is an outcome of the different history of the homelands movement in different jurisdictions.

Some difficulties were reported with this model of having a single corporation providing services to both homelands and a larger settlement, with homelands residents feeling that their needs are consistently given a lower priority than the needs of the larger...
settlement. This applies to gaining access to limited resources such as road plant, but also to general services such as housing repairs and maintenance. There is a sense that homelands are out of sight and expensive and difficult to get to and hence easy to ignore when there is always plenty of work to do closer at hand in town. In general, it appears that it is possible for outstation resource agency services to be provided satisfactorily by different types of organisations, as long as the content of each of the different roles of the organisation are clearly understood and managed.

This tension between the needs of homelands and the needs of larger communities is also sometimes a source of discontent in the relationships between resource agencies and community councils of larger (parent) communities. The issue is the same as noted above, except that it concerns negotiation between two different organisations, rather than between different activities within the one organisation.

In this context of examining different types of resource agencies, it is interesting to note that the Draft Cape York Outstation Report identifies a category of “independent outstations” that “fall outside the existing service arrangements of councils and community corporations” (Balkanu, 2002, p48). “These outstations have […] a relatively high degree of independence in their operations, a characteristic that is universally considered very important. They wish to remain outside more regimented or structured arrangements that prevail on community lands. These outstations, by necessity, rely on a high level of private arrangements to maintain their operations” (op. cit., p77). It is reported that the number of outstations in this category is increasing. This points towards a model of homelands resourcing contrary to that envisaged in the NHP, where residents access the services they need from a variety of different sources, including local and regional Aboriginal organisations, the private sector and ‘mainstream’ (ie not Indigenous-specific) public services. The report also identifies a difficulty with this model in that independent outstations “need to navigate the mainstream service systems to survive. Often this is difficult and requires advocacy and negotiation skills that may be beyond [their] capacity in the early stages of development”.

The 1998 Review of Resource Agencies made a series of recommendations concerning amalgamation of resource agencies, or components of their operations, into larger regional organisations, to achieve economies of scale. The review also recognised the "cultural and political restraints" that make this difficult (Altman et al, 1998, p17). As far as the review team is aware, none of the agencies featured in the snapshots are the result of such an amalgamation process, nor is any proposing to participate in such a process. The Gulf and Western Queensland RCHPP sets out an intention to establish a single regional resource agency, yet this has not happened in reality. Resource agency services are in fact provided by a series of local CDEP organisations, as was the preferred option that arose from consultations reported in the planning study that informed the development of the policy (Moran and Burgen, 2000, p85ff). This study did however recommend that a regional resource agency be established in addition to the local agencies to provide particular services that are identified in the report as being more appropriately provided at this level. Such an organisation would fulfil a role similar to that filled by Balkanu for the Cape York Peninsula region. The Draft Cape York Outstation Report also identifies particular roles for regional resource agencies (Balkanu, 2002, p80ff). The review team is not aware of any other proposals to establish regional resource agencies.
The 1998 Review also recommends that there be greater communication and knowledge sharing between resource agencies through an exchange network and regional forums. Our perception from the snapshot interviews is that these agencies still typically operate largely in isolation, and in fact feel isolated and unsupported. The contact made as part of this review provided staff with an opportunity to express their views and feelings about their situation which it seems they rarely get.

As mentioned above, outstation resourcing operations are commonly interwoven with CDEP operations. CDEP programs have access to tools, equipment and skills that are needed to run homelands, and the CDEP employment model can provide some structure and support to people’s engagement with their homeland. In the case of Cape York, the Draft Outstation Report describes CDEP as "the basis of most outstation economies" but "also the major cause of conflict between outstations and resource agencies" (Balkanu, 2002, p12). The conflict relates especially to the allocation of CDEP on-costs, but also to perceived reluctance by CDEP administrators to recognise work on outstations as valid work, especially if outstations are not permanently occupied. It appears, however, that involvement of resource agencies in CDEP schemes can be a positive as long as the arrangements and accountabilities are clearly understood by all parties.

Agreements and funding
As noted above, the NHP envisages that resource agencies should have a service agreement with each homeland settlement that they serve, setting out the services they agree to provide. In only two of the snapshots are such formal agreements in place. Both are in the Northern Territory, and in both cases the resource agency has been established for more than a decade. The service agreements in these two cases also set out the obligations of homelands residents in terms of contributions to operating costs, and set out conditions under which support for homelands settlements will cease. The resource agency coordinators in these cases see these agreements as an important mechanism for managing their relationships with the homelands. In a number of the other snapshots resource agency coordinators consider that there is a general ‘understanding’ between the resource agency and the homelands residents as to what services will be provided. However, in the majority of the snapshots, there is no clear agreement or understanding between the resource agency and the homelands residents, and this is a major source of discontent. Coordinators report that in the absence of an agreement, homelands residents tend to expect everything and contribute nothing. Homelands residents, on the other hand, refer to a lack of communication and clarity from the resource agency on what services they will actually provide. These feeds into discontent about funds management.

The NHP also envisages that resource agencies should have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in place with the Regional Council setting out the services that they agree to supply (and presumably providing some level of certainty in relation to continuing support from the Regional Council). No example of such an agreement was reported to the review team. However the ATSIC funding process was identified as a major point of frustration for the majority of resource agency coordinators interviewed, indicating that a better form of agreement is required. The frustration was at two levels: firstly frustration with the conditions attached to various funding programs, and secondly frustration with the funding allocation process.
At the level of grant conditions, resource agencies experience difficulty in matching the funds they receive to the services that are demanded of them. Generally, resource agencies receive funding under the CHIP program for capital works (housing and infrastructure construction), and municipal services. They report high demand for recurrent expenditure for repairs and maintenance of housing, essential services, vehicles, tools and equipment which they see as being outside the conditions attached to their grants. Resource agencies that also operate CDEP programs also have access to CDEP on-costs funds, which they say are often used to meet the recurrent expenditure requirements of maintaining homelands housing and infrastructure.

At the level of funding allocation, resource agencies express frustration with what they see as 'Father Christmas' or 'ad hoc' funding. The process they experience is that they prepare and submit a funding application by the due date, then hear nothing for a long time, then hear that they have been granted only a portion of what they asked for, with the majority of the grant earmarked for new capital works and little for recurrent expenditure. Then towards the end of the financial year they are informed that surplus funds are available and encouraged to submit an additional grant application within days. This may yield additional funds, again earmarked for capital works, and with a requirement that the funds must be spent within a very short timeframe.

The effect of this process is to force resource agencies into a reactive management model where they lurch from crisis to crisis. It makes it difficult for agencies to plan both capital works programs and operation and maintenance programs, and hence results in inefficiency, poor planning and costly failures to maintain assets. A further effect of this process is to elevate stress levels of senior agency staff. This then contributes to high staff turnover, a factor that is discussed further below.

As with most aspects of the operation of resource agencies, this funding process is less problematic for the larger, longer-established agencies such as some of those in the Northern Territory. They receive regular allocations of funding from ATSIC that have been more or less stable for several years, they recover some operational costs from homeland residents, and they may also have other sources of funds independent of ATSIC. In the Northern Territory, for example, resource agencies are eligible to receive recurrent funding for housing maintenance from IHANT at an agreed rate per house, contingent on rent being paid by the residents.

Recovering costs from homelands residents is difficult for many resource agencies. Partly this is an outcome of the nature of homelands settlements. They are usually established by traditional owners on their traditional lands, and residents understandably are reluctant to pay a fee to live on their own land. This is especially the case in Queensland where early-stage facilities are often built by the residents themselves using their own resources. However even in cases where contractor-built houses have been provided from public funds, people are reluctant to pay what looks like rent while living on their own land. In this situation, resource agencies are clearly acting as defacto housing organisations in that they are managing the upkeep of housing stock, and yet they are operating in an environment that is completely unlike other community housing situations. Often ownership of housing assets is not clear in a legal sense, and even if it is clear, it is overridden by traditional ownership considerations. For example it would be difficult for a resource agency to evict a senior traditional owner from his outstation home, and if you did, no one else would live there anyway. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, some agencies do manage to set up
systems of cost recovery that make them eligible to receive funds from the community housing sector. As is discussed below, the critical link is that the residents understand what they are paying for and why.

Management systems & governance
As mentioned above, the uncertain funding environment is perceived by most resource agencies to be a major constraint on their ability to plan their operations and manage their resources and assets. Other aspects of the operating environment such as the mobility of homelands populations and the logistical difficulties of operating in remote areas contribute to the complexity and uncertainty of the management task. There was a sense from many agencies they are perpetually too busy reacting to the latest crisis to be able to do much in the way of proactive planning. Nevertheless agencies have various systems in place including accounting systems and asset registers. A number have also prepared routine maintenance schedules, forward-looking capital works plans and strategic plans. It was not possible to investigate these in any detail as part of this review. No example was reported of a resource agency having a strategic plan linked in with a RCHPP or other Regional Plan, and no example was reported of regular performance review of resource agencies by Regional Council.

Generally the resource agency coordinator is a critical component of resource agency management systems. A number of the snapshots involved coordinators who have been around for five years or more, who have a very good understanding of the settlements and people they service. They are able to respond appropriately to complex situations because they have a detailed and integrated appreciation of their operating environment, and functional, long-term relationships with important people in the homelands communities. With reference to population mobility, for example, one coordinator explained that he always knows week by week where people are, just through being part of the daily life of the community. Nevertheless he also knows from experience that occupancy can't be predicted or planned, and so the agency aims for a situation where essential services can be provided to any of the homeland settlements they service should they become occupied again. There are also stories of where a once strong agency has been brought almost to the point of collapse through loosing a key staff member.

Staff turnover, and difficulty in attracting and retaining staff with appropriate skills, is widely perceived to be a major problem for resource agencies. In fact it is an issue for all services in remote areas of Australia and is perhaps best treated as an intrinsic characteristic of the operating environment that needs to be planned for and managed, rather than as a problem to be solved. Evidence from the snapshots suggests a two-pronged approach: firstly, choose staff very carefully and secondly, be aware that all staff will eventually move on, and plan for it.

In terms of choosing staff, agencies should try to find someone who is likely to stay around for a while, who is likely to work with the community in a respectful way, and who has a good skill base to draw on. Someone who already has relationships in the community, or someone who already lives locally, can be a good option. A number of coordinators interviewed expressed the view that the role is best performed by someone who is not a member of the community being served, so that they are not subject to kinship obligations that can prevent them operating fairly towards different groups within the community. As has already been mentioned, anything that can be
done to make the job less stressful and difficult, and better supported, will assist in retaining staff for longer.

Good governance and management systems can lessen the vulnerability of an agency to the shock of staff turnover by ensuring that the vision and direction of the organisation, and key operational information, is captured somewhere outside the head of the agency coordinator: in meeting minutes, in management systems, in plans and in the knowledge base of committee members and other staff.

Governance appears to be another key factor in the success of resource agencies. Governance refers to the way decisions are made about the direction and operations of the agency. Good governance ensures that these decisions are made in a transparent and inclusive manner: that is, the content of decisions is understood by, and able to be influenced by, those who they effect. For example in relation to resource agency budgets, if homelands residents understand the way the agency is funded, the limits to this funding, and the way the funds are allocated, there is less likelihood of misunderstanding arising around allocation of funds. More concretely, an understanding of the funding situation may assist residents to see the importance of making their own contributions to the running costs of their homeland. The situation with IHANT funding for housing maintenance in the NT is an example of this. In one of the snapshot communities, community leaders understand that by paying their rent they enable the resource agency to access additional funds from elsewhere, and that this benefits everybody. These leaders understand and ‘own’ the decision that residents must pay rent, and so they are active in enforcing this decision. The decision is also reflected in the service agreement between the homeland and the agency. It is important to note, though, that just including the decision in an agreement will not ensure compliance. It is the participatory governance process whereby those affected understand the decision that creates compliance.

Various governance arrangements were reported, depending on the nature of the agency. Some CDEP organisations that also operate as resource agencies have an 'outstation committee' separate from their main statutory governing committee, whereas dedicated homelands agencies have just one committee. It is generally seen as very important to have representation from several or all of the individual homelands settlements serviced by an agency on the decision-making committee. This reflects aspects of traditional law whereby people can't speak for other people's country, but also provides inclusiveness and transparency in decision making, which is particularly important around issues of funding allocation.

In one of the snapshot communities, decisions about the operation of the homeland resource agency are made by a council of elders that, while it is broadly representative of different traditional owners groups in the community, is not explicitly representative of all the different homelands settlements. The council of elders has existed for a lot longer than the homelands settlements, and has a firm tradition of inclusive decision-making directed at collective rather than individual interests. An informant who has worked closely with this community has observed that the new business of determining funding allocation for individual settlements has put pressure on this tradition of acting in the common interest. This highlights a tension in the governance of homelands resource agencies: often the homelands movement is an agreed priority or project at a wider community level, and the resource agency should be serving the vision of the homelands movement as a whole. Simultaneously each individual homeland is its own
project with its own vision. Committee members who are also leaders of their own settlements (a typical situation) thus wear two hats: as a representative of the wider community they are seeking to serve the interests of the homelands movement as a whole, whereas as a representative of their own settlement they will naturally seek to maximise benefits for their own settlement. One simple way that this tension is managed in some agencies is that total homelands funding is simply split equally between all the homelands, to be spent as each homeland agrees. A more sophisticated approach that was also observed is to undertake participatory planning at the resource agency level to agree on policies that serve the interests of the whole homelands movement and provide clear guidelines on how support will be allocated to individual settlements.

Conclusions
The review team encountered several examples of well-managed resource agencies making major contributions to the livelihoods of homelands settlements through a range of services, as envisaged in the NHP and RCHPPs. These agencies typically have inclusive governance systems that engage homelands residents in planning and resource allocation processes, and have transparent mechanisms to manage allocation of resources between individual homelands, and to establish cost-sharing arrangements. The best of these agencies are engaged with the homelands communities on a broad agenda including cultural maintenance, land management and enterprise development as well as essential services and administrative support. They adopt a facilitation role whereby they endeavour to support directions that are set by the community. Good staff are central to resource agency operations, and yet staff mobility is part of the operating environment.

A variety of successful organisational models exist, however it appears that homelands resourcing functions need to be established separately to the service delivery functions for larger parent communities, so that the needs of the homelands are not routinely submerged by the larger, more proximate needs of the larger community.

Resource agencies experience difficulty in meeting the recurrent costs of homeland operation, and express frustration with the limitations, and ad hoc nature of existing funding programs. This funding situation contributes to a culture of reactive, crisis management, and of high stress for senior staff. Many also experience difficulty in extracting user contributions to operating costs.

It appears that some of the best resource agencies are those that have existed for many years. A question arises as to whether their size and scope, and the scope of the homelands settlements they service, are a legacy of past, less restricted funding regimes, and conversely whether it is feasible for newer organisations to attain similar capacity.

Suggested directions for policy development
- The role of resource agencies as facilitators can be further developed and reflected in policy;
- The role of resource agencies to support enterprise activities and livelihood opportunities also requires development;
- Greater flexibility in the models of resourcing to homelands is needed, particularly as part of a shift to a more demand-responsive policy framework;
• Recommendations from the 1998 review concerning information exchange and networking opportunities for resource agencies are still relevant, as are recommendations directed at improving quality and longevity of staff.
Section 9: Preliminary comment/opinion on long term viability/sustainability of homelands drawing upon desktop case studies of 12 homeland communities

This section begins to explore the likely long-term viability and sustainability of homelands settlements, through examination of 12 settlement snapshots compiled for this review. We call these studies snapshots rather than case studies, because they are based on a rapid collation of information from readily accessible sources, and do not claim to be in any sense a comprehensive study of the settlements involved. The snapshots covered settlements in Queensland (5), Western Australia (2), Northern Territory (4) and South Australia (1) and included settlements in tropical, coastal and desert regions.

Informants for the snapshots included resource agency staff (particularly coordinators), regional staff from the Bushlight program, CAT staff and other workers in the public and private sectors having long-term working relationships with people at particular settlements. Community members were generally not interviewed for this exercise. This is thought to be the intention of stage 2 of the review. Some of the communities have a long and on-going relationship with the review team, giving access to privileged information. This information is sometimes sensitive, which is why no homeland community has been identified.

Information was collected primarily through telephone interviews, with some informants also providing written submissions. The structure of the interviews and written submissions was based on the settlement viability factors identified in Section 2. The discussion in this section is presented under the headings of these seven factors. Completed pro-forma summaries of information collected for each snapshot are included in Appendix 8.

Expressed Aspirations

A sense of vision or aspiration on the part of those wanting to establish homelands settlements has always been a central part of the homelands movement. One informant to this review commented that in fact it is this opportunity that homelands provide to people to enact their own vision for their future that makes them a potentially powerful avenue for redressing disadvantage. The Draft Cape York Outstation Report identifies this as the "drive … to take back personal power" (Balkanu, 2002, p54).

As well as this general sense of homelands as a place where people can be more in charge of their lives, people also have specific aspirations that they seek to achieve through establishing homelands settlements. The most common of these are:

- Cultural maintenance (living more according to traditional law and custom, looking after country and significant sites, passing on knowledge);
- Escaping the pressures and dysfunction (eg grog and violence) in larger settlements. Homelands are also seen more actively as healing places, where people can come or be sent to recover from alcoholism, violence or crime;
- Some form of economic development: art and craft, tourism, pastoral.

In the past it has often been older community members who have held the vision of the homelands most strongly. This is the case in several of the snapshots. There has been concern in many quarters that the homelands settlements may not survive generational
transition. However there was also evidence in a number of snapshots of younger people taking on leadership roles, and also of younger leaders having a broader vision of homelands settlements, encompassing the cultural maintenance aspects that were central to the elders' vision, but also incorporating a greater awareness of the needs of younger Aboriginal people who desire a greater level of engagement with mainstream society. The best of the younger leaders are adept at operating in both these cultural worlds.

The sustainable livelihood framework suggests that aspirations must not only exist, but they must be expressed in some form of planning process or document, so that a community is engaged in a process of managing its progress towards a desired future. As has been discussed elsewhere in this review, homelands plans developed as part of the RCHPP process typically consist largely of wish lists covering desired housing and infrastructure improvements. They may include statements to do with vision, purpose or objectives, but neither the planning documents, nor the processes used address in any detail the complex task of converting an aspiration into a plan of action with the required cycles of activity and review. Further, the planning process is often biased by consideration of what type of aspiration is likely to attract support. In other words, people will say whatever they think they need to say in order to get funding. In this sense, people's expressed aspirations tend to follow the latest policy trends. This can be seen in the recent rush of homelands settlements wanting to establish various types of rehabilitation centres, and various types of enterprises, reflecting policy shifts away from cultural maintenance towards addressing substance abuse, community justice issues and economic development.

This is not an argument that these issues are not an important and useful component of peoples' visions. Policy after all reflects governments' attempts to respond to the issues of the day. Nevertheless, planning for long-term viability and sustainability demands that communities develop realistic, achievable strategies for survival that are much more complex and integrated than simply catering to the latest grant program. A funding application should be the outcome, rather than the driver, of the planning process.

A wealth of examples of more holistic community development planning exist in the literature, where planning is an on-going process of identifying and carrying out small steps, within a broader framework of an agreed vision. Outside intervention in this process is in the form of on-going facilitation of the process, rather than one-off planning 'event'. This review contends that it is this type of planning, as opposed to capital works checklists, that will contribute to viability and sustainability of homelands settlements.

Effective Governance

Governance refers to the ability of a group of people to make and enact decisions about their common business. A number of the snapshot settlements exhibit effective governance, seemingly based on traditional decision-making processes. Elders or leaders within families make decisions, presumably based on some level of consultation or familiarity with the views and needs of others. Others abide by and enact these decisions. Often the perception from outside is of a single leader or 'champion' driving the management and development of the settlement. This type of governance works effectively at the level of an individual family 'camp', and has facilitated substantial self-directed and even self-funded development at a number of the snapshot settlements.
There is less evidence of effective governance at the next level of organisation, where several individual camps exist on one land holding. Typically in this situation different family groups occupy different camps. Typically also, the land transfer process has required people to form an incorporated body to hold the land title. Usually the formal governance of the corporation, as set out in its constitution, follows a mainstream model with a governing committee, office-bearers, decision by majority, annual general meetings and so on. There are several reasons why homelands groups struggle to achieve effective governance at this level:

- Firstly, corporate governance does little to reflect any aspects of more traditional governance, which may require certain people to speak for certain areas of land, and may require decisions to be made in one case by a single elder, and in another case by broad consensus. In this sense, the imposed governance model is culturally illegitimate.
- Secondly, people have limited understanding of the corporate governance model.
- Thirdly, people often also have limited understanding of traditional governance at this higher level. In particular, in many places, people have lost some of the critical skills of negotiation and collective agreement making that formed part of their traditional governance practice.

Nevertheless, there are examples where effective community governance proceeds following a hybrid model that respects the operative aspects of traditional law and custom, while also operating an incorporated body that is used to engage with the wider society. This form of governance can be supported through the facilitated community development planning process referred to above.

**Livelihood Activity**

Livelihood activity refers to "the range of activities that support improved well-being through work, enterprise and trading" (CAT, 2001). Livelihood activity was present at all the snapshot settlements and included cultural maintenance activity, land management activity, hunting, gathering of food and craft materials and construction and maintenance of housing and infrastructure. Several of the snapshot settlements were also engaged in enterprises including cattle raising, commercial fishing and tourism. One of the snapshot settlements was operating a drug and alcohol rehabilitation centre, which it is understood receives some external funding. In general, there is no shortage of livelihood activity on homelands, and this is a major advantage that they offer.

Recent policy and program focus on enterprise has provided some homelands residents with some worthwhile support opportunities. Although this wasn't a feature of any of the snapshot settlements, the review team is aware of instances where residents have received support for business planning, skills development and development of tourism infrastructure. On the other hand, there is widespread concern that expectations placed on homelands enterprises by agencies and the broader community are unrealistic, given the range of constraints that operate in the homelands context. These constraints include:

- Limited financial resources of communities, and inability to raise capital due to restrictive forms of land tenure;
- Remoteness of settlements from mainstream markets (for inputs and products);
- Complexity of operating enterprises on collectively owned land;
• Limited skill levels, especially in light of the highly complex regulatory environment in Australia.

In some senses, the economic development context of remote Indigenous communities resembles more the situation in poor communities in poorer, less industrialised nations of the world that it does the situation in mainstream Australia: people have little or no capital and little or no skill in business management. In other countries, people in this circumstance usually operate micro-enterprises in the informal economy. They offer goods and services to people in their immediate community, and have no interaction with the regulatory system. This is not an option that is available to people in remote Australia.

A particular instance of unrealistic expectations arises when pastoral properties that had proved to be not viable under the management of an experienced non-Indigenous pastoral manager are expected to be viable under Aboriginal management. There is no disputing the substantial pastoral industry skill base that exists in the Aboriginal community, however these skills are unlikely to be able to turn an unprofitable operation around, especially when the complexities of enforced joint ownership and management are also considered.

The operation of CDEP programs at homelands settlements has been discussed elsewhere in this review. There is scope to improve the linking of CDEP work plans to livelihood activities that will contribute to long-term viability and sustainability of settlements. There are also opportunities, and current examples, of where CDEP programs shoulder some of the regulatory burden of new enterprises. This role of CDEP programs and resource agencies as 'enterprise incubators' warrants further development.

Positive Resource Flows
The sustainable livelihoods approach indicates that for sustainability, the net flow of resources into a settlement must be positive. Although at a theoretical level this applies to all resources (human, social, natural, physical and financial), at a practical level it is the flow of financial resources that is of most relevance. Put simply, are or will homelands settlements be able to source enough financial income to operate and maintain their communities? We look first at the resource flows associated directly with construction and management of housing and infrastructure, and then consider other sources of financial resource flows in homelands.

There are essentially two different models of financial resource flows in homelands settlements that appeared in the snapshots: the self-built and managed model and the externally funded model. A number of the snapshot communities exhibited a mixture of these two models.

In the self-built and managed model, people have built or purchased most of their own facilities including housing, ablation facilities, water supply, power supply, access tracks and telephones. Mostly these facilities are simple, and, in the case of water supply and power supply, at the individual household rather than community scale. People use materials and technologies that they are familiar with and that they can afford. This includes pit toilets, small, fossil-fuel water pumps and generators, and simple timber-frame housing, usually with recycled corrugated iron cladding. As people have
purchased or built things themselves, ownership is generally clear. People take responsibility for managing their own facilities.

In the externally funded model, housing and other facilities are provided by a funding program. Usually a grant is made to the relevant resource agency who contracts out the construction. There is usually some attempt to involve residents in construction work. Ownership of facilities so constructed is not always clear, and may rest with the homeland corporation or the resource agency. In recent times, grant-making organisations have usually required some evidence of appropriate management regimes being put in place to ensure future management of assets. This is usually in the form of a cost-sharing arrangement whereby residents agree to make some contribution to the resource agency, which agrees to take responsibility for management of the asset. It is generally expected that the resource agency will augment the resident-contributed funds from other sources.

As has been mentioned elsewhere, these cost recovery arrangements are achieving mixed results. Although they are working well in some cases, there are more cases where they fail to deliver resource flows adequate for the satisfactory operation and maintenance of facilities, particularly for two reasons: firstly residents fail to make contributions and secondly resource agencies are unable to source sufficient funding for operation and maintenance costs.

One of the snapshot communities has moved over the last five years from the self-built model to the externally funded model, through provision of a large community building and several houses through grant funding. There is a resource agency involved, but no clarity about what services they will deliver, and at what cost. The residents are currently making no contribution to the resource agency, and are not taking responsibility themselves for maintenance of the assets. As a result, the assets are deteriorating.

The review team is aware of other settlements where prior to grant funding being provided self-built facilities were being adequately managed whereas subsequent to grant-funded facilities being provided, no further user contribution to management is made. This is usually attributed to a lack of ‘ownership’ on the part of the residents for the new facilities, and the solution usually proposed is to have more consultation at the design stage, and more participation at the construction stage, so that residents feel a greater sense of ownership of the facilities. This is a worthwhile direction but, as discussed below, inadequate on its own to guarantee sustainable management of assets.

Policy responses to this issue of resource flows usually focus on the supply side: increasing the resource flows by encouraging larger user contributions, or more funds matching. Less attention is paid to the demand side: making management more affordable through appropriate technology choice. This aspect is discussed further under the sub-heading of reliable infrastructure.

One success story in the area of user contributions to operating costs is in the area of communications. The Universal Service Obligation (USO), combined with innovations in technology, has made private telephone services affordable for homelands settlements. Mobile telecommunications are also now becoming available in remote areas. Homelands residents are demonstrating their demand for those services.
through willingness to pay. This is an example of where because of the particular technology involved, homelands settlements can be incorporated into the mainstream market for services. An equivalent set up for, for example, electricity supply, would see homelands residents paying the same tariff as those on the national grid, and see operation and maintenance responsibility vested in the utility, regardless of the technology being used. Clearly that is not a feasible arrangement because of the different technology involved.

A final point of discussion in regard to resource flows relates to the positive contributions that homelands residents make to the national economy. These contributions include land management of remote areas, participation in quarantine, coastguard and defence programs, and the maintenance of Aboriginal cultural identity that is an essential component of Australia's tourism product and export image. For example, mainstream Australia has embraced Aboriginal culture as was evidenced by the opening ceremony of the Sydney Olympics and the colourfully painted Qantas jets. These items impact on the mainstream economy. Some of these contributions are remunerated directly through wages, royalties and other payments. There are, however, additional opportunities to generate resource flows from the mainstream economy into homelands settlements through recognising and further developing and sustaining contributions in these areas.

**Reliable Infrastructure**

Infrastructure contributes to settlement viability by enabling people to meet their basic needs of water, food, shelter and social relationships. A number of the snapshot settlements featured very simple facilities that nevertheless meet these basic needs. These may consist of self-built dwellings, pit toilets, water drawn by bucket or small fossil-fuel pumps from creeks, lighting from kerosene lanterns or small fossil-fuel generators, and cooking on open fires or wood stoves.

In our highly regulated society, infrastructure also contributes to viability by establishing the *bona fide's* of a settlement. In essence, a settlement is eligible for various funding and support programs only if its facilities meet certain minimum standards. These standards usually include compliance with local government planning schemes, the Building Code of Australia and in some cases other standards or regulations covering sanitation, water supply and power supply. This effects, for example, the NAHS program, which can only supply water and power to compliant dwellings, and the Bushlight program, which can only provide renewable energy installations to settlements where are least one structure is an approved dwelling.

This aspect of establishing settlement *bona fide's* is one of several forces that operate to raise the standards of infrastructure on homelands. Another force is the various standards and guidelines that are incorporated in funding programs and regulatory systems such as the NAHS Housing Standards (see ATSIC, 2000, p74), the National Indigenous Housing Guide (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999), the Northern Territory Environmental Health Standards (Northern Territory Government, 2001) and the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines (Commonwealth of Australia, 1996). Many of these have been carried through into minimum infrastructure standards in RCHPPs, although there has usually been some attempt to recognise that early-stage facilities may not met all these requirements. Many of these standards and guidelines derive from the environmental health agenda that has been driving policy in Indigenous affairs since the early 1990s.
Other forces exerting upwards pressure on standards are public opinion in the wider society which does not tolerate people living in third world conditions, and public opinion in the Indigenous community which demands equity in standards with the wider society.

These higher standards begin to endanger viability when they require operation and maintenance resources that the homeland settlement and their support networks can't provide. This can be financial resources, as has already been discussed, but can also relate to skills or physical resources such as spare parts and consumables. One of the snapshot communities has a solar water pump that has been inoperative for almost 12 months because no one knows how to fix it. Maintenance issues were also identified as the main reason for failure of water supplies in the Kimberley region in a survey undertaken by CAT (O'Mullane, 2004).

The solution is obviously not to abandon all standards and guidelines. Rather, careful consideration is required of the range of technologies available as against the skills and resources available for operation and maintenance, and bearing in mind the level of risk associated with failure to meet normative standards on the one hand, versus failure to maintain service at all due to equipment failure on the other. In some cases it may be more prudent to have a reliable system that fails to meet some normative standards but does not seriously endanger public safety, rather than a system that meets all service standards, but is unreliable. Informed choice on the part of residents is key.

A further aspect of infrastructure reliability that emerged from the snapshots relates to poor workmanship by contractors. Despite improvements in regulation, program administration and procurement practice, there are still examples of contractors delivering poor quality results. The factors that contribute to this are well known and include the cost and logistical difficulty of maintaining close supervision of work in remote areas.

The Bushlight program being managed by CAT, and funded jointly by the Australian Greenhouse Office and former ATSIC, is an example of a program that attempts to tackle these complex issues in an integrated way. Bushlight supports homeland residents to make informed choices about energy services infrastructure, applies high standards of quality control on equipment and installation, implements cost sharing arrangements for operation and maintenance, and builds technical capacity for operation and maintenance at the community, resource agency and regional level.

A final aspect of infrastructure relates to transport. Whereas most other aspects of infrastructure (housing, sanitation, energy, communications, water) can be addressed at some level by homelands residents using their own resources, road construction can not. Roads construction and maintenance was identified as a major constraint to homeland viability in almost half the snapshot settlements. Issues raised include the difficulty of procuring grant funds for this purpose, unwillingness of mainstream local governments to spend money on roads servicing homelands even when they hold statutory responsibility, competition for road plant between homelands and larger communities, and the high cost impact on resource agencies and residents of poor road services. Over the years in various homelands studies, roads have typically been put in the too hard, too expensive basket. Various methods of providing transport services to homelands have been trialed including tractors, 4WD bus services, aeroplanes and boats. The focus in this review on viewing homelands settlements as part of a network
of settlements, and the view that homelands settlements depend necessarily on larger settlements for some services, means that the transport issue must be addressed.

**Access to Services**

Similarly to infrastructure, access to services contributes to viability by enabling people to live and function on homelands. Services that people access routinely include education, health care, financial services, retail stores and government services (eg social security). Evidence from the snapshots is that people make choices about where to live partly in order to secure access to the services they want. For example, people with school-age children often live in larger communities so that their children can attend school, and visit homelands on weekends and holidays.

Policy can support people’s access to services by offering a variety of services (eg school of the air), and through recognising that some degree of mobility is inevitable as people in small, remote communities seek to meet their needs.

**Low Vulnerability**

Vulnerability refers to the ability of a settlement to withstand or recover from shocks. It is a complex concept and was not investigated in great detail in the snapshots.

**Conclusions**

A strong sense of aspiration, functional models of family-based governance, and the wide range of livelihood activities that are available and practised on homelands suggest that many homelands have the potential to be viable and sustainable in the long term. Developing this potential will require addressing complex issues concerning standards of facilities, developing homeland economies that ensure a positive net flow of resources and ensuring that services are made available in ways that provide homelands residents with access and choice. Appropriate external support for homelands groups can encourage people to make realistic plans and informed choices, and can encourage the development of effective governance beyond the level of the family. Support will also be required to protect embryonic homelands enterprises from the burden of regulation and compliance that can otherwise smother them.

**Suggested directions for policy development**

- Resource agencies to take on a facilitation role in relation to participatory planning and governance development;
- Resources agencies to take on a business incubator role;
- Standards for facilities on homelands to be revisited taking into account affordability and risk management considerations, and recognising that some settlements may never be permanently occupied.
Section 10: Recommendations and/or proposals for the revision and implementation of homelands policy, planning and funding frameworks

This section begins by examining the various components of the NHP as they appear in the current CHIP Policy Program (ATSIC 2002, p58-81) in the light of the findings of this review, before proceeding to a broader discussion of homelands policy, planning and funding frameworks, informed by understanding of viability considerations incorporating a package of suggestions for future policy directions, and a suggested scope of work for Stage 2 of this Review.

Discussion of key components of the NHP

13.4 Objectives

• Increase the flexibility of Regional Councils to meet regionally unique needs, as long as nationally determined and defensible standards of planning and accountability are met.

The large variation in content of the RCHPPs suggests that the NHP has enabled some level of flexibility at the regional level. However, the delay in many RCHPPs being enacted indicates that while there may be spatial flexibility, there has not been the nimbleness needed to support new homeland development.

• Provide a foundation for the negotiation of agreements (by Regional Councils and ATSIC staff) with relevant State and Territory governments on the provision of housing, infrastructure and services to homelands.

The review team was not able to investigate the extent of any negotiations between ATSIC/ATSIS and other agencies, however it is clear that with a few notable exceptions, state and territory governments are yet to make any significant commitment to provision of housing, infrastructure and services to homelands. The exceptions include IHANT in the NT, who works with ATSIS in a jointly funded arrangement. It appears more likely that these negotiations will flow on from the bilateral agreement-making process. The change from ATSIS to FaCS and ICCs offer an opportunity to restart the negotiation process. Undoubtedly the comprehensive information on current homelands development and future aspirations that is contained in RCHPPs and the studies that informed them will be a valuable resource in negotiating these agreements.

• Develop and implement best practice models for policy formulation and planning by Regional Councils, resource agencies, homeland groups and governments. These models need to be seen by the elected arm, the Aboriginal community, staff and government as legitimate, sensible and equitable, and must balance the needs of larger settlements with those of homelands.

This objective has not yet been met. There is a widespread perception that RC funding is ‘wish-list’ or ‘Father Christmas’ funding. Moreover, the perception is that larger communities are looked after first, and that homelands get the leftovers.

13.5 Threshold Conditions
• **Security of Land Tenure.** The requirement for secure land tenure is not usually contested. However, sometimes land tenure requires people to create and participate in corporate entities. This causes stress when people are not sufficiently skilled. A cycle begins: the corporation is set up; is not maintained to regulatory standard, administrators are brought in, the corporation becomes defunct, a new corporation is established, and so it continues. The only real impact that this has on homeland residents is that it causes stress and distraction.

• **Principle Place of Residence.** Problems associated with this condition have been raised elsewhere in this review.

• **Availability of Potable Water.** This condition is not contentious, but neither is it particularly useful. Water is only one of a range of essential resources and services that must exist for settlements to be viable and sustainable and there seems little benefit in singling it out for special attention.

• **Use of Resource Agencies.** Most individual homelands can not be self-reliant for most services, and so some resource agency-type services required. Nevertheless, there may be instances where a homeland community is sufficiently skilled that it can operate independently. A demand-driven policy response would provide flexibility for homelands settlements to meet their resource needs through a variety of networks and relationships. Evidence has been presented of this occurring in one region. This review also contends that resource agencies must move more into the role of facilitating rather than providing services.

13.6 **Policy and Planning Principles**

Some level of regional planning is essential to support regional allocation processes, and to feed up into planning and allocation processes at higher levels. It appears that to some extent the regional planning functions under the NHP have been superseded by the RHIPs established under the bilaterals. More investigation is required to determine how allocation operates under the bilaterals in the case of homelands settlements.

An aspect of regional planning that does not appear to have received much attention is transport and access. Access is a major factor in homelands community viability, and requires planning at a regional or sub-regional, rather than individual homeland level. It is also an area where contributions from other government agencies are essential.

13.6.1 **Staged Development** Staged development has worked as a process in some areas where community planning has occurred, independently of whether there was an RCHPP in place. However a drawback of the staged development model is that it fosters a growth mentality. People see that the way to get more things funded is to grow. Sometimes the growth has been manufactured insofar as there have not been as many people living at the homeland as has been purported. Sometimes the growth has been disproportionate to the capacity of the homeland residents to be able to maintain. Staged development can work, as part of an agreed community plan for homelands development.

13.6.2 **Minimum Standards.** There is a tension between legal requirements on the one hand, and what can be afforded and maintained on the other hand. Often the most
A sustainable standard of infrastructure is what people can afford to build and maintain with their own resources, and this may not meet even minimal legal requirements. This should emerge from informed decision-making by residents, rather than from external imposition. As a general principle for small communities, risk management appears to be a more appropriate approach than regulation although this requires different institutional support.

13.6.3 Regionally Appropriate Planning Models The RCHPPs differed considerably to one another, indicating the freedom that Regional Councils have had to develop regional plans. Whether RAs have had the opportunity to develop three to five year strategic plans is unclear. The review team suspects that the reactive environment in which most RA coordinators work makes any strategic planning an onerous task. Some individual homelands have made plans, often without an umbrella RCHPP.

13.7 Refusal, Reduction and Withdrawal of Funding A small number of examples were encountered of clearly understood agreements being established between resource agencies and homelands residents.

13.8 Allocation Process for Funding This process appears to be ad hoc and not governed by any planning process, even where an RCHPP has been approved and is in place. The NHP’s focus on housing as the locus of support for homelands has been discussed elsewhere in this review.

13.9 Policies to Promote Financial Viability The issue of cost recovery by RAs is a common theme, and all RAs that the review team spoke to were endeavouring to recover costs at some level. Enterprise development has been discussed elsewhere in this review. None of the homelands snapshots compiled for this review indicated substantial progress towards economic self-reliance, however there is certainly a great deal of interest in enterprise development on the part of residents. The capacity of resource agencies to support enterprise activities needs development.

Summary and discussion of suggested directions for policy development This review has suggested a number of directions for policy development in response to the various issues identified in the project scope. These can be summarised under three main headings:

- A recognition of homelands as one element in regional patterns of Indigenous settlement;
- A shift in the mode of support provided to homelands settlements from delivery of services to facilitation of access; and
- A focus on sustainable livelihoods rather than improved health and well-being as the desired outcome of policy interventions.

This review has presented evidence from the literature, and from the homelands snapshots, establishing that homelands settlements are best seen as one element in regional patterns of Indigenous settlement consisting of networks of settlements of different sizes. People move around this network of settlements to meet their material, social and spiritual needs. In fact the same process operates for all people all over the world, including non-Indigenous Australians, particularly those living in regional or remote centres who travel regularly to larger centres to access specialist goods and services and social contact. Nevertheless this phenomenon is particularly pronounced...
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for Aboriginal people due to aspects of traditional culture and colonial history, but also due to the extremely limited availability of services in remote Indigenous communities, and more especially homelands settlements, which occupy the bottom rung of the settlement hierarchy.

The inevitable dependence of homelands settlements on services from larger settlements demands policy recognition of the validity of different patterns of occupation. This in turn requires flexibility in the imposition of standards for facilities and services, in recognition of the fact that lower levels of occupancy place different demands on such services and involve different levels of risk.

A further policy response is to recognise the complexity of the systems, relationships and networks that people develop in order to meet their needs. In a situation of such complexity, centralised service delivery is prone to failure simply because it is so difficult for outsiders to understand the forces at play. Facilitating access, rather than delivering services, is likely to be a more successful strategy. Facilitating access involves policies that attempt to make an array of service options available to people, from which they can choose. Of course this can be very challenging in remote areas without existing markets for goods and services.

Facilitating access also involves mechanisms that require people to express demand for a service. Demand can be expressed in the form of a user contribution to the cost of services, but can also be expressed in non-monetary terms. Evidence from an international review of water and sanitation projects in poor communities is presented in Section 2 of this review articulating the importance of expressed demand as an indicator of the likely sustainability of infrastructure interventions.

This review has presented evidence from a variety of sources that indicates that addressing health and well-being considerations through safe and healthy housing and infrastructure will not guarantee the viability and sustainability of settlements, and may in fact detract from them when, for example, the health agenda imposes facility standards with operation and maintenance requirement beyond the reach of residents and their support networks. This is not to say that key insights from the environmental health field should be discarded, but rather that the must be considered alongside other aspects of settlement viability. This review has utilised a checklist of seven factors that contribute to settlement viability, derived from application of the sustainable livelihoods approach. Other frameworks exist, and all point to a similar list of requirements for settlement viability: an ability to plan, make decisions, meet essential physical, social and economic needs, sustain assets, do meaningful work and survive shocks and changes.

A policy response to serve broader outcomes of sustainable livelihoods must address this wider agenda, rather than the narrow agenda of housing and infrastructure provision which has dominated the agenda under the current NHP. There are many challenges raised by such a policy agenda, not the least of which is the need to balance recognition of the essential role that user contributions and responsibilities play in sustainable service arrangements against Government responsibilities to ensure some level of equity and rights. Development of a detailed policy agenda to serve a sustainable livelihoods approach is beyond the scope of this Stage 1 review. Nevertheless, a number of suggested policy directions have emerged from this investigation. These are listed here under headings of those that apply to policy
Recommendations

development at the national level, and those that apply more particularly to the operation of resource agencies.

Directions for FaCS/ICCs

• In keeping with the recommendations of the 1998 Review we see little point in adopting a national definition of homelands settlements for policy purposes. Nevertheless, for statistical analysis purposes we see no difficulty in continuing to utilise the current criterion of population less than 50 to identify a category of very small settlements with particular service needs.
• The current policy of not limiting support to settlements of traditional owners on their traditional country should be continued.
• Policy must recognise the high level of mobility that is both typical and necessary for Indigenous people to sustain their livelihood.
• Policy should respond to patterns of Indigenous settlement at a regional level, and determine the most effective way to facilitate access to services through this regional hierarchy of settlements of different sizes.
• The notion of “principal place of residence” must be revisited. Settlements that are not a “principal place of residence” may serve a vital role in maintaining livelihoods for people and may be worthy of some support.
• Standards for facilities on homelands should be revisited taking into account affordability and risk management considerations, and recognising that some settlements may never be permanently occupied.
• Risk management and affordability considerations warrant greater emphasis in the setting of minimum standards for facilities and services;
• The inclusion of homelands in RHIPs is a useful step in acknowledging the part the homelands settlements play in regional settlement networks. However if homelands are to be included in allocation processes such as those that are incorporated in the housing bilaterals it is essential that the different nature of homelands settlements be recognised. Service delivery models and design standards that suit larger settlements do not suit homelands. Needs assessment methodologies based on township-style communities can also produce misleading results when applied to homelands settlements.
• Whether through RHIPs or other mechanisms, it is essential that the needs of homelands for both housing and essential services be incorporated into planning and allocation frameworks. It is also essential the housing interventions always be accompanied by the necessary essential services.
• Policy should recognise that the past focus on housing as the point of service delivery tends to distort the place or relevance of a homeland as an element in a regional approach to sustaining a livelihood.
• Some level of regional planning is essential to assist regional and higher-level resource allocation;
• Transport infrastructure is a particular case where increased planning and advocacy effort is required at the regional level;
• There is an urgent need to establish transparent and responsive funding programs for homelands;
• Greater flexibility in the models of resourcing to homelands is needed, particularly as part of a shift to a more demand-responsive policy framework;

Planning at the individual settlement level should relate to broader aspirations and the development of realistic livelihood opportunities, rather than narrowly on housing and infrastructure aspirations;
Directions for resource agencies

- Resource agencies to take on a facilitation role in relation to participatory planning and governance development;
- Resources agencies to take on a business incubatorenterprise support role;
- This will require a shift in the skill base and operating methods of resource agencies towards a greater focus on facilitation of processes of community engagement.
- Recommendations from the 1998 review concerning information exchange and networking opportunities for resource agencies are still relevant, as are recommendations directed at improving quality and longevity of staff.

Suggested scope of work for Stage 2

The National Homelands Policy Project Scope prepared by IHIB (see Appendix 1) envisaged a two stage approach to reviewing the current NHP, with the first stage focusing on the relationships and planning frameworks issues addressed in Sections 5 to 8 above, and the second stage focusing on evaluation of outcomes and viability and sustainability of homelands settlements. The approach adopted for Stage 1 of the review has differed somewhat from the envisaged in the project scope, mainly through the early introduction of viability considerations as an overarching framework to inform the study. That has allowed us to make some preliminary comments on viability and sustainability, and to propose some suggested directions for policy development. Nevertheless, a Stage 2 is still clearly warranted to address specific knowledge gaps identified in Stage 1, and to take the suggested policy directions forward through more detailed ground truthing, followed by a more comprehensive and rigorous policy development process. In addition, before any steps are taken towards implementation, substantial consultation on the content of the proposals and the rationale behind them is required with key stakeholders who were excluded from the Stage 1 process: in particular homelands residents, local and regional Aboriginal organisations and regional ICC officers.

A suggested outline of a project scope based around these three components is as follows.

Knowledge gaps

Key knowledge gaps identified in Stage 1 include:

- Details of how planning and allocation process under the bilaterals operate at the regional level, and in particular how they incorporate the needs of homelands, whether through RHIPs, RCHPPs or other instruments. Further detail is also required concerning how current needs assessment methods respond to the different context of homelands settlements. This must cover both housing and essential services, across all jurisdictions with significant numbers of homelands settlements.
- Details of funding provision by ATSIC to resource agencies, including division between capital and recurrent funds, and amount of any CDEP on-costs. This information is required to verify claims by resource agencies that they are unable to secure sufficient income to meet recurrent expenditure. In the Project Scope, it was envisaged that this information would be compiled by IHIB as part of Stage 1.
Ground truthing
Field-based investigation is required to confirm the conclusions drawn from the Stage 1 desktop study. This could be based on further development of the existing snapshots, possibly with some substitution to achieve better geographic representation. The methodology for this component could be based on participatory appraisal methods whereby the researchers would facilitate a process of enquiry by homelands residents and resource agencies into the subject matter of the review. This methodology has the advantage of providing immediate benefits to the participants in the form of enhanced understanding of their own circumstances, while at the same time producing data that can be used to test the findings of the Stage 1 review. The central question of a participatory appraisal would be along the lines of "How can we improve the viability and sustainability of our homelands?"

Policy development
Policy directions identified in Stage 1 require elaboration and refinement into comprehensive policy proposals. This process will require additional research and analysis and engagement with experts in public policy formulation.

Consultation
Consultation could begin before the ground truthing exercise, but would ideally continue beyond it. The first step would be to produce one or more summary versions of the review in formats suitable for different audiences.
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Appendix 1: National Homelands Policy Project Scope
1. Introduction

Since the late 1960’s groups of Aboriginal people have been moving from large, densely populated Aboriginal settlements, or from mainstream towns, to form small, decentralised settlements, variously referred to as outstations, homelands or new and emerging communities.

There are many reasons why people move from larger communities to homelands including cultural preservation and social and health benefits. One of the consequences of the homelands movement is the increased cost to governments of service provision both capital and recurrent and the difficulty in funding development in an environment already resource deprived.

ATSIC in an effort to manage the issues around homelands introduced a moratorium on funding new homelands as part of the National Homelands Policy (NHP), as well as the requirement for Regional Councils to provide a homelands policy and plan for approval as part of the management of housing and infrastructure in regions. The National Homelands Policy (NHP) is a component of the Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP).

2. Background Information

a) The “Homelands Movement”

Homelands are characteristically formed for a combination of social, cultural and economic reasons. By returning to country, homeland residents have the opportunity to:

- maintain and renew connection with their traditional land and culture (the prime determinant of homeland aspiration);
- avoid the social problems experienced within some larger communities, and
- aspire to become self sufficient by engaging in various forms of economic activity.

It should be recognised that not all Indigenous groups have the same aspirations. Re-occupation of country for some groups may not be a viable option or may not be desired for a variety of reasons. In some circumstances what may be desired is the ability to visit country on a seasonal basis for cultural and natural resource management purposes.

The best national source of information on homelands is the 2001 Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey (CHINS) recorded over 1000 small remote Indigenous communities (with a population less than 50) located throughout the country.
greatest concentration is found in the northern and central regions of the Northern Territory, South Australia and Western Australia.

Due to their size, geographic location and factors such as seasonal occupation and population mobility, these settlements often have problems with matters such as secure land tenure, funding, planning, housing quality, infrastructure, service delivery and access to water.

ATSIC policy and program development has supported the establishment of homelands as they have been considered to provide:

- Improved living conditions, environmentally, socially, psychologically
- Better access to traditional food sources
- Opportunities for maintenance, renewal and transmission of language and culture
- Fewer social problems/conflicts as compared to larger communities/urban areas
- Protection and preservation of the environment including significant cultural sites

**b) Development of National Homelands Policy**

In 1994 the Ministerial Council for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs (MCATSIA) determined that ATSIC, in consultation with all State/Territory and local governments, should develop a national policy for homelands/outstations that balanced the resource requirements of homelands with those of the larger established communities.

Underlying MCATSIA’s position was recognition by governments of:

- the growing establishment of homelands, and
- a lack of agreed roles and responsibilities in relation to homelands funding and support - apart from ATSIC, government funding and support for housing and associated infrastructure on homelands was almost non-existent.

In 1996, recognising the limited funds for dealing with the ever increasing backlog of Indigenous housing and infrastructure need in existing communities let alone supporting the establishment of new communities, the ATSIC Board imposed a moratorium on the funding of new homelands under the Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP) pending development of a homelands policy.

The National Homelands Policy (NHP) approved by the ATSIC Board in February 1999, establishes threshold conditions, policy and planning principles, minimum standards and allocation processes for Regional Councils to develop their own regional homelands polices and plans as a prerequisite for funding of new homelands.

The homelands policy was adopted as an amendment to CHIP policy and therefore applied to all homelands communities both established and proposed. Under the policy the terms outstations, homelands and new and emerging communities were all abbreviated to ‘homelands’.
The objectives of the homelands policy are to:

- Increase the flexibility of Regional Councils to meet regionally unique needs, as long as nationally determined and defensible standards of planning and accountability are met;
- Provide a foundation for the negotiation of agreements (by Regional Councils and ATSIC staff) with relevant state and territory governments on the provision of housing, infrastructure and services to homelands; and
- Develop and implement best practice models for policy formulation and planning by Regional Councils, resource agencies, homeland groups and governments. These models need to be seen by the elected arm, the Aboriginal community, staff and government as legitimate, sensible and equitable, and must balance the needs of larger settlements with those of homelands.

The homelands policy provides that the moratorium on funding for new homelands could be lifted only once Regional Councils had developed their own homelands policies and plans consistent with the policy. Of the 35 ATSIC Regional Councils, 23 have identified homelands located within their regions. Currently, 13 of those Councils have approved Regional Homelands Policies and Guidelines in place.

It should be noted that indirectly, the moratorium has allowed funding to be concentrated in existing settlements based on identified housing and infrastructure need.

The homelands policy establishes four threshold conditions that must be met before provision of funding to a new homeland can be considered and sets out the principles that should be used to develop regional homelands policies and plans. The four threshold conditions are:

- security of land tenure
- the homeland is a principle place of residence
- availability of adequate supplies of potable water, and
- ongoing support by resource agencies

While the homelands policy requires that all regional homelands policies meet national criteria, each has tended to be unique in its presentation and degree of complexity. While some of the earlier regional polices were relatively simple ‘user friendly’ documents in more recent times they have tended to be much more comprehensive and multi-dimensional. However, all policies focus on:

- improved housing and infrastructure management based on principles that promote consistency and equity in decision making
- setting boundaries on ATSIC/ATSIS responsibilities for funding and providing advice to homelands residents on alternative sources of funds
- advocating with State/Territory agencies in relation to their responsibility for the provision of housing and infrastructure services
- the availability of other essential services such as health and education
• the accessibility of homelands, including roads, transport, communication and supplies
• the development of sustainable livelihoods and
• the importance of self-governance (as distinct from efficiency and efficacy of service delivery).

At the 83rd meeting of the ATSIC Board held in December 2003, the Commission agreed to the need for review and reform of CHIP Policy adopting a staged approach initially focusing on the National Aboriginal Health Strategy and homelands policy (decision 2799). The supporting brief provided to the Board noted:

• Homelands have largely been considered outside the bilateral housing arrangements, and it is important to now consider their implication within this framework, particularly as more Regional Councils seem to looking at homelands as a strategy to address overcrowding and other social issues on larger communities.

• The Housing and Environment Branch (HEB) proposes to assess the effectiveness of the homelands policy including a review of the role of resource agencies and their relationship with other housing organisations; identifying homelands planning processes; and in particular the planning relationships between small and large communities within a region.

The review of the homelands policy provides an opportunity to:

• develop a national profile of the circumstances of all homelands communities
• evaluate the effectiveness of homelands in contributing to the improving the social, economic and cultural life of Indigenous people
• identify and assess options for the sustainable development of homelands
• establish the basis for the Commonwealth, within the context of bilateral housing agreements, to influence State and Territory strategic policy development in relation to the funding of homelands as an integral part of overall planning for housing and infrastructure delivery, and
• recommend appropriate revision of the terms of the homelands policy.

3. Components of the Review

This review will involve several interrelated aspects and details of each of these are set out below. It is proposed that the first component of the review be conducted internally by HEB staff with other components being contracted to CAT.

There are 7 components of the review and it will be conducted in 2 stages with the first stage to be completed by 18 June 2004. Although there will clearly be an overlap in the roles of HEB and CAT, the basic role delineation is as follows:

• A national statistical overview of homelands (HEB)
• Determining the relationship between homelands and larger communities (CAT)
• Allocation of funds and interaction with planning frameworks – Housing Agreements (CAT)
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- Regional Council Homeland Polices and Plans (CAT)
- Relationship with Resource Agencies (CAT)
- Evaluation of outcomes (CAT)
- Viability and sustainability of homelands (CAT)

Stage One

Stage 1 will involve the completion of the first five components. (one by HEB, and the remainder by CAT). This stage should be completed by **18 June 2004**.

It is proposed that the consultant focus their initial research on issues associated with planning frameworks, the roles of Regional Councils and resource agencies including their relationship with Regional Councils and with individual homelands communities. This will involve case studies of a selection of ATSIC Regions that have established homelands communities and resource agencies.

The case studies will provide information on actual outcomes and how these compare to the expected outcomes in the policy and plans developed by Regional Councils. Issues of sustainability and viability are expected to be considered within the case study.

A useful sample for the case studies may be 3 differing regions (e.g. tropical, coastal, and desert) which have approved Regional Council Homelands Policies and Plans. Potential locations include the ATSIC regions: Central Remote, Kullarri, Malarabah, Miwatj, Nulla Wimila Kutju, Peninsula and Yapakurlangu.

Stage Two

This stage will focus on the last two components, “Evaluation of Outcomes” and “Viability and Sustainability of homelands”, and should be completed no later than **31 December 2004**.

**A statistical overview of homelands nationally**

Through the use of administrative and other data sets including CHINS 2001 and the 2001 Census, provide an overview of homelands as follows:

- total number of homelands by Regional Council area
- total population believed to be residing on all homelands
- age demographics of homelands residents
- number of homelands established since 1991
- categorise homelands by the level of facilities, i.e. bore/shelter/portable generator set as opposed to those with more permanent housing and essential service infrastructure
• number of resource agencies by Regional Council area and number and size of homelands communities serviced by each RA
• identify which ATSIC’/S programs are providing significant funding to homelands and for which purposes
• estimate of 2002 – 2006 national ATSIC CHIP and CDEP expenditures or estimates on homelands
• document where RC’s are proposing to support the establishment of new homelands

Issues for consideration include:

• Whether existing data sources are adequate /informative?
• Whether RC RHIP’s are able to provide informative data in relation to homelands?
• Whether a database has been established and maintained on homelands and resource agencies in each region with an approved Regional Homelands Policy and Plan?
• If so, what information is being collected and maintained? Consistency of data items, collection and reporting from region to region.
• Whether the database contains key performance information on each homeland?

Relationship between homelands and larger permanent communities

Given that there are over 1000 homelands throughout the country some case studies could be undertaken in relation to a sample of homelands. Part of each case study should involve an analysis of the relationship with large communities/mainstream towns in the region.

One issue to be considered is whether the existing definition of a ‘homeland’ within homelands policy is adequate or whether it requires clarification: what did the ATSIC Board envisage when developing a policy to enable funding of ‘homelands’? Did the Board intend that funding could be provided to any outstation initiative regardless of connection to country or did it intend that funding would only be available where the resident group has a traditional connection to the country on which their homeland settlement is established?

Other issues include:

• The current relationship between larger permanent communities and homelands?
• What data is required to monitor the above relationship, trends etc?
• Are people moving towards homelands, away from them? Why?
• Are some homelands essentially “weekenders”?
• Are residents spending large tracts of time at a larger community in the vicinity of the homeland?
• Which (major) community located/provided services are being accessed by homeland residents and with what frequency?
• What is rate of abandonment of homelands?
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- What information is available on reasons for abandonment?
- Is abandonment connected to issues in larger communities/towns in region?

Interaction with planning frameworks – Housing Agreements

This will entail consideration of matters such as:

- Relationship of homelands policy to planning frameworks such as bilateral housing agreements, State/Territory Indigenous Housing Authority Strategic and Annual Operational Plans, Regional Council Regional Plans and Regional Housing and Infrastructure Plans (RHIP’s).

- The impact of bilateral housing agreements, particularly where pooled funding arrangements are in place (e.g., SA, WA and NT - copies of those agreements are attached)
  - Impact of needs assessment tools to determine allocation of funding
  - State and Territory policy on funding and support for homelands/smaller communities – incorporation of ATSIC NHP in state/territory policy frameworks under housing agreements.

- Regional energy plans and other regional planning processes

Regional Council Homeland Policies and Plans (RCHPP)

There are 35 ATSIC Regional Councils and 28 of these have homelands in their region. Currently, 23 of the 28 Regional Councils having homelands in their region have identified homelands as a priority. Thirteen of those RC’s have gained exemption from the moratorium as they have developed approved policies and plans. The other ten need to further develop their policy and plan documents (P&P). Five Regional Councils are yet to commence development of a homelands P&P.

A copy of each of the 13 approved policy and plan documents is attached together with a spreadsheet showing the current status (i.e. approved, under development etc) of each Regional Council’s Homeland Policy and Plan.

Issues for consideration are:

- From both an ATSIC and State/Territory perspective, has improved planning and coordination in the development of homelands resulted where RCHPP’s have been established?
- Where RCHPP has been approved, how has the homelands policy been implemented and is it being effectively managed?
- Are there perceived problems or inconsistencies in the implementation of the policy?
- Has the Regional Council established a register of homelands plans?
• In practice, have individual homelands plans assisted RC’s to identify and prioritise need?
• What, if any, is the link between individual homelands plans and RC RHIP and Regional Planning processes?
• Has a database been established and maintained on homelands and resource agencies in the region?
• Does the database contain key performance information on each homeland?

Resource Agencies

Homelands policy stipulates that CHIP funding for homelands must be channelled through a community organisation or resource agency (RA). The review should assess whether RA’s are functioning effectively and whether they are accountable?

The 1998 National Review of Resource Agencies Servicing Indigenous Communities (copy attached) will be a useful resource in the NHP review process. The Review highlighted issues such as a haphazard growth in resources flowing to RA’s and the lack of clarity of core RA objectives. It noted an urgent need to rigorously quantify the global funding of RA’s

An Appendix to the review “Resource Agency funding options, resource management and cost recovery” observes that to function effectively, resource agencies need to be “large enough to accommodate a range of skills in a range of personnel”. This may be difficult for small organisations to achieve and accordingly, there may be benefit in establishing larger organisations – possibly formed by combining a number of existing small agencies.

Another possibility raised by the Review is to combine RA’s with community councils or with community housing organisations. However in developing larger RA type frameworks a number of questions need to be considered, including:

• Identification and assessment of the planning, resource allocation and resource management tools used by RA’s
• An assessment of the extent/adequacy of accounting, planning and logistical support provided by RA’s to homelands communities
• Whether RA’s have developed 3-5 year strategic plans as required under homelands policy and whether those plans are linked into RC Regional Plans?
• Whether service agreements between resource agencies and individual homelands are in place?
• Have RC’s developed MOU’s with RA’s outlining respective roles and responsibilities?
• Have individual homeland plans been developed. Are minimum requirements for these incorporated into RCHPP’s?
• Whether the implementation of homeland plans is monitored?
• Has a process been established for regular performance reviews of organisations that are providing homeland support (resource agencies/community organisations)?

1 appendix 5 at page 192
Review of the National Homelands Policy

- Whether RA’s are operating as defacto housing organisations?
  - Assessment of nature of RA involvement in management of housing on homelands (asset and tenancy management, including whole of life maintenance programs)
  - In respect of their housing management role assessment of RA compliance with CHIP policy relating to Indigenous Housing Organisations.
- Has RC established or considered establishing a regional resource agency or other mechanism to rationalise the number of existing resource agencies in the region?
- Is there evidence of cooperation between RA’s within a region?
- An assessment of the relationships between RA’s and community councils of large (parent) communities
- The involvement of RA’s in CDEP scheme?

Evaluation of outcomes

The homelands policy states that:

“While the benefits [of homelands] are difficult to quantify, it is generally accepted that these developments often provide improved living conditions – environmentally, socially and psychologically. Residents usually have better access to traditional food sources, greater opportunities to share language and customs across generations and fewer social conflicts.”

In addition, academic discussion of homelands often indicates an assertion or acceptance that homelands residents enjoy better primary health outcomes than residents of large communities or mainstream towns. However, the research that is commonly cited to support such assertions tends to be 10 – 20 years old.

In the circumstances, it is suggested that there is a clear need for a contemporary assessment and evaluation of the outcomes of the homelands movement. Such an evaluation may entail a comparative analysis of the performance of a selection of homelands with large permanently established Indigenous communities and mainstream rural/remote towns.

A recent paper concerning development options for Kaanju homelands in central Cape York Peninsula noted potential social and cultural benefits linked to restoration of Kaanju management and decision making as including:

improvements in the health and social well-being of the Kaanju people
• the transmission of cultural knowledge of land to the younger generation and
• the education of the wider community on the interrelationships between Kaanju
people and their homelands.

Potential environmental benefits were identified to include:
• improvement in the health of the environment, including water quality on the
homelands
• the minimisation of further impact on the environment by third parties (weeds,
feral animals etc)
• reduction of illegal fishing in waterways
• reduction in land degradation
• protection of biological diversity
• maintenance of ecological processes and habitat protection

Suggested primary indicators for an evaluation of the outcomes achieved by/through
homelands may include:

a. environmental health – appropriateness and condition of infrastructure
b. primary health
c. social well being/conflict
d. cultural preservation/enhancement
e. education – participation and retention rates
f. employment/enterprise/income levels
g. availability of services

Viability and sustainability of homelands

“There is growing recognition that Indigenous economic futures in northern Australia
must deliver inter alia, sustainable development opportunity on the Indigenous estate
where people reside.”

Demographic projections based upon Census data indicate that the Indigenous
population of much of remote and regional Australia where an expanding Indigenous
estate is located will continue to increase.

The NHP notes that RC’s will be restricted in their ability to establish new homelands
due to limited funds and the high level of existing need. RC’s “will need to think
critically about the ability of homelands to meet their ongoing costs.” The policy refers
to the use of technology that is both appropriate to the social and environmental
circumstances of a homeland and that is also economically sustainable.

---

3 Smith BR & Claudie D “Developing a land and resource management framework for Kaanju homelands,
Central Cape York Peninsula”; 2003 CAEPR Discussion Paper No. 256/2003 at p 16
4 Ibid pp 16-17
5 Altman JC & Whitehead PJ: “Caring for country and sustainable Indigenous development:
6 Homelands Outstations and New and Emerging Communities – ATSIC CHIP Policy 2002-2005 at p.56.
If outcomes sought are improved planning, better relationships with larger communities, improved social and cultural benefits, better quality housing/infrastructure, improved roads/essential services and better health/education outcomes, how are these to be achieved and sustained?

The limited economic development potential for Indigenous people resident on homelands (and Aboriginal land in general) stems in large part from the relative absence of a functioning market or private sector. Engagement with the mainstream market economy is at best small and at worst, non-existent. Incomes are low and reliance on the State as a provider of welfare (income) and services is high.

It is also observed that the absence of, or distance from the market economy may be one of the reasons why an Aboriginal group has decided to return to country. In recent years Altman has promoted the concept of a "hybrid economy" – demonstrating linkages between market, state and customary components of the local economy – as a necessary analytical construct for understanding the position of homelands communities and developing options for their sustainable development.

Altman has suggested that for a true assessment of sustainability “there is a need for a hybrid approach that combines scientific assessment of biological sustainability, social-scientific assessment of commercial and social viability, and indigenous expert assessment of cultural practice” and that “a variety of approaches combining science, social sciences and indigenous expertise is needed to provide holistic and realistic assessments of sustainability and viability”.

There are two broad aspects to the issue of sustainability of homelands communities:

1) Improved and sustained efficiencies in the management of existing resources (including those applied to the planning and delivery of services); and

2) Identifying and supporting options for future development

The consultant’s role will include formulating/developing policy and planning tools to promote sustainable development of homelands and development of sustainability models for homelands communities. This will involve close consideration of the values held by Indigenous people living on homelands, and mechanisms to appropriately tap into any market/economic opportunities.

Efficiencies in the management of existing resources

This will involve consideration of matters such as:

- Planning, resource allocation and resource management tools
- Efficient, coordinated delivery of services
- Maintenance of infrastructure and assets
- Use of appropriate and economically sustainable technologies
- An assessment of the relative costs of housing and infrastructure provision and maintenance in homelands contrasted with permanent large communities.

---

7 Ibid p 8
• Query examining whether NHP could include a requirement for a % contribution by homelands residents to the cost of establishing and maintaining a homeland – need to assess and include “in kind” contributions?
• In relation to cost recovery policy – should there be an assessment of anticipated recurrent costs: R&M and consumption, (resource agency) rent policy?
• NHP states that “ideally RC’s should be able to make a commitment to ongoing support over a 3 to 5 year period”. Should this be an essential criterion? Is the ability to make such a commitment essential for sustainability?
• Is it appropriate to consider the “sustainability” of an individual homeland community in isolation? Is it more appropriate to look at sustainable occupation and use of Aboriginal land that may involve a number of different homeland settlements?

Options for future development

• Should economic development of a homeland be an optional or essential component of a homelands plan?
• Should it be a mandatory requirement for homelands establishment that a land use assessment/survey is undertaken?
• In relation to natural resource management policies – what is the average area of a homeland community; what area do they hold secure tenure over? Is it the case that those areas are generally small, albeit adjoining or being surrounded by larger areas of country of significance to the resident group?

The Commonwealth Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 has as one of its principle objects the application of Indigenous knowledge to the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.

There is a need to explore options for Indigenous community based involvement in natural resource management such as:

• sustainable commercial harvest of plants (including intellectual knowledge of botanical applications)
• sustainable commercial harvest of native animals
• management of feral animals
• biodiversity conservation
• provision of ecosystem services including wildfire management, carbon abatement and sequestration (carbon sinks)
• low impact eco-tourism

Finally comment is sought on Professor Altman’s observation that “Overall reliance on the state, so called ‘welfare dependence’, will not decline, because there are structural and other impediments that will limit the overall growth of the market in the remote regions where Indigenous people live on Aboriginal land.”

8 Ibid p 8
Appendix 2: Viability and the sustainable livelihoods framework

CAT first took a close interest in the sustainable livelihoods framework in 2001, when the Board reviewed its strategic direction at a meeting held at Glen Helen.

The subsequent CAT Plan adopted ‘securing sustainable livelihoods through appropriate technology’ as the purpose of the organisation. The paper ‘A Livelihood Less Ordinary’ (Fisher, 2001) was prepared to provide a description of the framework and how it could work in our context.

A CAT ‘think tank’ was established to research, discuss and develop practical work in this area. The result was a paper entitled ‘The Livelihoods Opportunity’.

Much of CAT’s work is now directed towards livelihoods outcomes, defined as ‘the range of activities that support improved well-being through work, enterprise and trading and that can be maintained into the future’.

Through application of the sustainable livelihoods framework, the following factors have emerged as being important contributors to settlement viability:

**Effective governance**
Governance is the means by which a group of people allocate resources to achieve their aims. To be viable, a community requires a form of organisation that is effective in making decisions on resource use.

**Expressed aspirations**
Viability depends upon some kind of planning taking place, however loosely. Without a plan, it is hard to work out who might be living in the community in the future, what the pressures on facilities might be and how resources could be used to best effect.

**Reliable infrastructure**
Reliable infrastructure is essential to community viability.

**Livelihood activity**
Without livelihood activity, a community cannot be considered viable since people are not engaged in improving or developing their assets. An active CDEP, a functioning local corporation, an arts centre or the rental of land to the tourism trade are examples of livelihood activity.

**Positive resource flows**
If the resources flowing out of a community over time are greater than the inflow, then the assets of that community will deplete. A positive balance sheet for resource flows is therefore fundamental to viability.

**Access to services**
The ability of a group of people to live safely and happily in a remote location relies upon their access to services. These include access to essentials such as food, water and domestic products, as well as health, technical, energy and communications services.
Low vulnerability
Communities often talk about the threat that they feel due to debt, violence, substance abuse or tensions inside or with other communities. A reduction in vulnerability is critical to the ability of the community as a whole to sustain itself.

(Fisher, 2003).
Appendix 3: The Review Team
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Appendix 4: Preliminary comments on education and training provision to homelands

The RCHPPs identify provision of education and training as important to the development of the individual capability of homeland residents and the sustainability of homeland living. Some NT plans prescribe that homelands must have an association with an education service provider, to ensure that children living on homelands can participate in compulsory education, and that adults can access training programs. The aim of the plans is to reduce homelands residents’ reliance on external agencies for basic repairs, maintenance and development. The relationship between homelands and larger communities in relation to education provision is important.

Participation, retention and achievement at all levels of education is significantly lower for Indigenous peoples than non Indigenous peoples (NCVER, 2003). There is also a high correlation between remoteness and poor attendance and achievement. The HREOC 2000 report into rural and remote education identified that at least 1000 young people in WA and the NT, mainly homelands residents, had no access to education.

Whilst education is primarily the responsibility of the States, the Australian Government allocates funds to the States across both public and private sectors. The funds are dependent on enrolment numbers. Indigenous enrolments also attract supplementary funding assistance that is tied to performance indicators under the Indigenous Education Strategy. States have individual policies regarding minimum enrolment levels and the sustainability of such enrolments that determines the establishment of new schools. (see box)

How many students are needed?
Before funding for a school will be considered in the NT, a minimum and sustained enrolment of 12 students is required. The school also needs to have been functioning with an Indigenous assistant teacher for 6 months (unpaid). There have been many incidences where schools have been established on homelands, only to be closed when enrolments drop below 12.

Whilst most larger discrete communities and some homelands in the Northern Territory have a primary school, there is no secondary education (Northern Territory Government, 2004). In the NT, some ‘post primary’ provision is available through Community Education Centres (CECs), although this is based on a correspondence model. Without this option, young people must leave the community to attend boarding schools. Generally the academic results of young people completing primary school are not sufficient for them to undertake secondary studies either at CECs or at boarding schools. This pattern of education provision is largely replicated across the States.

Most schooling provision in discrete communities is arranged along mainstream school education lines – set terms and holidays, curriculum and staffing formulas, with occasional ‘top ups’ for ESL students. The inflexibility of these arrangements impacts on both attendance and achievement. Homeland residents live in geographically and

What happened to bilingual education?
The linguistic and lifestyle differences of Indigenous peoples are seen to be a ‘barrier to be overcome’ to improve educational achievement. Attempts at ‘both ways’ or bilingual education practices have largely ceased. State Indigenous education strategies identify key focus areas for improving Indigenous education outcomes. These include literacy and numeracy, support for Indigenous education staff, the increasing involvement of families and communities in the school, and culturally inclusive curricula.
climatically difficult locations with cultural calendars that may not superimpose onto the mainstream teaching year. National performance indicators, particularly English literacy, numeracy and attendance, have caused a decrease in innovative education responses. (see box)

The backlog of educational underachievement in schools has spawned an increase in the provision of Vocational Educational and Training (VET) to remote communities. 73% of those participating in VET in the NT are from remote communities, with the bulk of enrolments at Certificate 1 and 11 levels in literacy and numeracy or basic technical subjects. Other jurisdictions record lower participation rates, but this may reflect State funding arrangements (NCVER, 2003).

In recent years, the interest in VET in-schools programs has increased, as it is seen to be able to provide hands-on experiential learning which can engage young people at risk of dropping out. VET also provides the bulk of training for those working in CDEP programs, hence the pressure for increasing on site delivery (Northern Territory Government, 2004). VET is a national system involving the delivery of qualifications and competencies developed in conjunction with mainstream industry bodies. There is some tension between the prior skills and knowledge of Indigenous students, especially fluency in English literacy and numeracy against the mainstream competencies and presumed resource access encapsulated in Training Packages (the VET curriculum) (Every & Young, 2002).

VET funding formula

The generic formula for funds distribution is Annual Hours of Curriculum (AHC), which provides a certain level of funding by industry area and nominal hours of competency. For example in the NT, training in the building and construction area attracts a funding level of $14.00 per AHC per student including remote loading. In WA, the equivalent rate is $19.00. RTOs receive funding based on achieving a certain quantity of AHC in nominated industry areas.

Funding for VET is also distributed by the Australian Government to the States, which in turn develop policies and programs for the distribution of these funds to public providers like TAFE and private Registered Training Organisations (RTOs). (see box) As with schools, some supplementary funds from the Australian Government are available for Indigenous enrolments.

In all States, funding levels and training fields are negotiated annually. The NT also provides funds under the Flexible Response and Community Response Programs, which distribute funds for training programs to community nominated RTOs. These tend to be short ‘just in time’ type programs and are based on community request.

How does a competitive market work?
The investment of training providers in developing community infrastructure is a cost saving rarely factored in. The ‘competitive market’ driven VET system operating with little overarching coordination has resulted, in one community of under 150 people, in 3 different RTOs, a youth sport and recreation program and a diversionary program all competing for the same cohort of students.

The move to a national and industry driven VET system alongside increasing concern for developing community capacity has resulted in complexity and an overabundance of private and government bodies providing education and training. (see box)

The increasing use of Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUA), particularly by
mining companies, has led to a range of education training and development activities, sometimes in association with RTOs or schools and sometimes, given the complexity of fitting in to these systems, run independently.

A range of education activities are being sponsored on remote communities by NGOs, for example; Oxfam and World Vision, and by the Australian Government. Most courses are in the areas of land care, heritage and environment, information and communication technologies, sport and recreation. There are also family and community services programs such as the Local Solutions program, Stronger Families Stronger Communities, Reconnect and the FHBH2. No basic home care courses are available under the National VET training system.

Local and State government agencies are also involved in ‘training’, particularly in the areas of governance, as are Indigenous organisations such as Land Councils and ACCHOs (Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisations).

The ICT revolution may solve some of the problems of education service provision to remote communities. (see box) Whilst schools of the air exist and have serviced remote populations (mostly pastoral properties) for many years, this mode of delivery to ESL/ EFL Indigenous students has not been very effective to date.

Where do ICTs fit in?
Some communities are keenly trying new technologies, but issues with content and the need for both educational and technical support on site remains an issue.

Conclusions
Given mobility patterns and cultural obligations, fluctuations in school enrolments are inevitable. Isolated pockets of innovation exist, but overall education provision is increasingly tied to national performance indicators which tend to stifle locally responsive innovation. The issues surrounding mobility and attendance have translated into an overall reluctance by State Governments to establish homelands schools, especially when considering the costs associated with recruitment and deployment of a teacher and associated infrastructure needs.

While there are strategies that express a national commitment to Indigenous students and families, these are premised on mainstream settlement patterns of community and access, and not on homelands. Homelands highlight the evolving settlement patterns of remote Indigenous peoples, an issue yet to be resolved by education policy makers. The rationale and methodology of incorporating ‘culture’ into the curriculum remain contested and difficult areas. Currently the emphasis is on equity of inputs, including distribution of funds to non government education providers, with Indigenous students treated as mainstream students whose needs can be addressed by adjustments to content and parent participation.

In the VET area accountability for the funding is based on AHC achievement and the completion rate of competencies and qualifications by students. Whilst no minimal enrolments are specified, the realities and costs of delivering to remote communities usually mean that RTOs specify minimum initial and ongoing enrolment numbers before they will agree to deliver and maintain a program. Attendance, attrition and the real
costs of delivering remote are also key issues for VET programs (Gelade & Stehlik, 2004).

**How do you be cost effective and small?**

For many homelands and small communities, attracting the ‘cost effective’ cohort of students is not possible, so they miss out on training opportunities - unless they combine with other communities or leave the community to undertake training on campus. Availability of accommodation for trainers, accessible training venues and viable transport networks also impact on the ability to deliver.

Leaving the community to undertake training at a TAFE or other provider brings its own array of costs and issues associated with accommodation, transport and food. For many people on remote communities, the preference is for training on site, partly because they can access the type of skills development, tools and expertise they want, whilst working on repairing or constructing the very infrastructure they need to develop their house or homeland. With on site delivery, training providers usually deploy the tools and materials that people need to use, which are personally unaffordable.

The potential supply is immense, particularly in the area of ‘governance training’, but whether this translates into sustainable capacity development remains to be seen.

Whilst some home care programs are identified as critical to improved health benefits from improved health hardware installation and maintenance, there are only 13 such programs being funded by FaCS nationally, at an average cost of approximately $20,000 per program (Cairnduff & Guthridge, 2002).

Although it would seem very possible for homelands to develop an association with an ‘education’ provider, it is doubtful whether such an association is able to respond to the needs of children, young adults and adults in supporting their livelihoods on homelands. The pressure of the mainstream education system, both schooling and VET, is for settlements to establish a critical and stable mass of people and infrastructure prior to provision. The intention of homelands living is to dilute the pressures of critical mass experienced on larger communities. The dilemma of education service provision is that it tends to enforce structures and living arrangements inimical to the structures and circumstances that are actively chosen by Indigenous peoples.

ICTs present one possible solution, and it is worth exploring their potential at the homelands level. The lack of dysfunction experienced on homelands, and the general sense of endeavour, enterprise and vision articulated by residents, provides an opportunity to evolve intergenerational models of ICT mediated appropriate educational provision.
Appendix 5: Preliminary comments on health and indicators of well-being

The current national Indigenous health strategies address infrastructure issues under the umbrella of environmental health. The focus is on the supply of services and regulatory arrangements for maintaining these services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is poor health fixed by good housing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Review Team’s livelihoods experience leads us to question whether the relationship between poor environmental health practices/facilities and poor health is always directly causal. The assumptions of causality may have led to policy actions with unforeseen and unintended consequences. The social, economic and cultural contexts of environmental health may impact on health improvements, which are as dependent upon behaviour as physical conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The health disadvantage of Indigenous peoples remains high. The main adult health shortcoming has shifted in recent years away from infectious and communicable diseases to chronic health problems, injury and violence. Indigenous children still have a high rate of infectious and communicable diseases. There is a high incidence of chronic diseases that are in part caused by overcrowding and poor nutrition.

The current framework for healthy housing is based upon addressing overcrowding, poor health hardware, safety issues and providing kitchen/cooking facilities to enable good nutrition. Torzillo and Pholeros (2002) outline the type of facilities most needed to support the nine healthy living practices – capacity to wash people, clothes and bedding, remove waste safely, improve nutrition, reduce crowding, separate people from animals, reduce dust, control temperature and reduce trauma. These have subsequently been translated into the National Indigenous Housing Guide.

There is a significant relationship between poor health and poverty, and how this impacts on lack of control, poor self esteem and crumbling social cohesion (Commonwealth of Australia, 2004).

Conclusions

Within the current national Indigenous health strategies there is recognition of significant gaps in supply of even the most basic services such as potable water. These gaps may influence health outcomes, just as overcrowding and nutrition may be causing some chronic diseases. Much more work remains to be done in improving food supplies and affordability in remote communities (Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care, 1999).

This highlights the importance of social determinants of health status as well as physical determinants, the latter being very much a part of a bio-medical model of health. Physical determinants also drive the Housing for Health agenda, in addition to social and community capacity building. In an era of high social dysfunction, particularly on larger communities, infrastructure development as a health solution may assist, but is not sufficient. Other outcomes of social and economic well being may have greater impact and more relevance for homelands.

The key question is whether the provision of facilities, as proposed in the Housing for Health approach, is sufficient. Repeated recommendations for home care and healthy living training indicate that supply is not adequate. Personal development training is
difficult to implement, fund and sustain, particularly with the current emphasis on vocational education.

Aspects of the relationship between poverty, and poor health will be causal, but may vary according to particular historical, cultural, geographic, social and economic circumstances, as well as the nature of the interaction between policy and practice over time. Poverty is a key indicator of poor education, high rates of incarceration and poor health status.

The Review Team considers improved human and social capital as the outcome for Indigenous housing and infrastructure development rather than the singular element of health. To this end, health becomes but one of a matrix of indicators for assessing the livelihood outcomes.

The core to this approach is participation and building well being through enterprise and endeavour. In such an approach, solutions and options are negotiable, viability and innovation are emphasised, and the particular constraints and elements of vulnerability are recognised.
Appendix 6: The Bushlight Community Energy Plan Model

In the CEPM, the provision of a technical service, (in this case energy although the process could be applied to housing, pumps, ICTs etc), is approached not only in terms of technical ‘fit’ but also in terms of how it can function and be used to improve livelihoods and well being rather than diminish them. Thus the CEPM involves initial interactions between Bushlight team members, Regional Councils, ATSIC, resource agencies and community members to identify existing development plans, aspirations and issues. An understanding of the ‘bigger picture’ in terms of support and maintenance networks, enterprise opportunities and financial and other constraints is then brought to the table in detailed discussions with community members about their energy service needs, livelihood aspirations and capabilities. This process feeds into a comprehensive community profile that can be used to inform decision making at the technical system selection stage.

Community members are heavily involved at the system selection stage to ensure their needs are taken into account. This stage involves working through an understanding of energy needs, for cooking, heating, cooling etc as well as an exploration of the type of skills support and training that may be required. In particular, the cost and affordability of any particular energy use choice is explored so that community members can make informed decisions about what they can afford as opposed to wish lists of what they would like. This stage also factors in demand side management considerations including future maintenance and service costs and back up energy fuel types. Once an agreement has been made with the community the agreed most appropriate system is installed. The system will be individually tailored to choices made by community members and may include features such as timer switches. On-site just in time training is also provide at this point. The system is constructed to required industry standards but demand side management approaches ensures that a risk management rather than a mandatory regulatory process governs the ultimate useability and affordability of the system installed.

Unlike most other technical transfer systems the Bushlight CEPM process ensures two further stages occur to maximise community benefit from the system installed. For a period of 12 months the system is maintained and serviced by Bushlight and general support such as ongoing training, networking and knowledge exchange is facilitated. This stage also incorporates an impact and evaluation process to feed back into improving the overall CEPM process. The final sustain stage incorporates a hand over of ownership to the resource agency servicing the community with 6 or 12 monthly visits continuing to be made to the community for a period of four years to ensure sustainability is achieved.

This process aims to ensure that outcomes for the community, as opposed to outputs from the dollars expended, are prioritised. Rather than instigating systems where complexity of technology and compliance regimes mandate the costly ongoing role of external agencies, the Bushlight process attempts to build the understanding, knowledge and skills of the system users to make informed choices and access skills to manage energy needs and systems in combination. If for example, the design and construction of new houses involved a similar process, residents would have the opportunity to make informed decisions not only about design and size, but also about the lifestyle, use and recurrent maintenance activities they wish to pursue, can afford or
are willing to learn. The capacity of associated infrastructure to ‘fit’ with choices made would also be integral to the process. It would mean that the example given to the review team of a small homeland near Alice Springs where large 4 bedroom houses have been built (according to multi measure needs analyses) but are relatively unused because a) the fitted electrical heating and cooking systems are too expensive to use and there is no indoor fireplace and b) the air conditioner placed on the roof is unusable because the water pump does not have the capacity to pump water uphill from the tank to reach it, would occur less frequently.
Appendix 7: Analysis of RCHPPs
# Appendix 8: Homeland settlement snapshots

## Snapshot 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
<th>85km North West of Larger community in desert region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</td>
<td>There are about 5 dwellings at homeland 2 are inhabited and a third is being upgraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time established/history</td>
<td>The homeland was first developed in the 80s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Viability framework

### Aspirations: Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

There are a number of ideas for the future that are either the people at homeland or the RA coordinators. These are mainly enterprise ideas such as building a yard to house camels for tourism and planting a date farm.

### Governance: How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?

The traditional owner is X. He also has a house in the larger community. The main driver in the homeland is Y. Y comes from a southern regional city. Y ran over X’s daughter and killed her, and was then speared in the leg by X. Apparently, although there has been some bad blood in the past, they now tolerate each other. Y is the Vice-Chair of the RA which is the organisation responsible for both the local emerging community, and the homeland.


Y has a relationship with a Melbourne based tourism company. International guests stay at the homeland to participate in traditional culture such as dancing and dreamtime story telling.

### Positive resource flows: Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

ATSIS funds the RA, who last year directed $14,000 towards the homeland. No money comes from Melbourne based tourism company to the governing body, but the RA coordinator thinks that some does go directly to Y and other individuals such as dancers and story tellers.

### Infrastructure: What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, etc.)
sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

There are two main houses and a third house is being upgraded. The power is an renewable energy system, with diesel generator back-up. According to the RA coordinator there is a good and plentiful water supply. There is telephone communications.

There is six monthly generator service conducted. It cost $300 per service.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

Health services are provided by a nurse travelling to homeland on a weekly basis. There is a clinic at a close by emerging community, which is on the road to the larger centre. The RA coordinator is trying to encourage the people to take themselves to the clinic rather than to rely on the nurse coming to them. There is a school located half way between the two emerging communities. Some kids may also be going to school in larger community.

In the case of X and Y’s finances: X gets paid his CDEP in cash, but once his fines have been taken out. Y’s keycard is held by the emerging community’s store. If he wants money, or goods he just rings and asks for it. He always has a car. When X has no car he stays in the larger community.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

People live at the homeland to get away from the violence and hassles in the larger community.

**Planning framework**

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

The Sept 2002 Regional Council Plan is the plan that refers. However, a new planning framework is being touted. The RA coordinator said that if people sign up to it they would no longer be eligible for support from the RA. Each year the Homelands fill in stats that feed into the plan. (It may be stats for CHINs data)

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

The RA coordinator only refers to the plan if he thinks of something it may cover. Mostly he is too busy reacting.

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?

There is a resource agency.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination?
between agencies as it appears on the ground?

The RA coordinator tries to get money from other sources, but it is ad hoc. He got $30,000 from an environmental fund recently and he gets some TAFE money as he has a student there. He is looking for funding for horse mustering and date farming.

### Supplementary questions for outstation coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which homelands do outstation coordinators believe function well, and why do they believe this? In essence, what are the indicators for success?</td>
<td>The RA coordinator believes that the homeland works pretty well and is successful. He hopes to develop a sustainable business there, but he doesn’t know how the business works from a community perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the view of the community to the outstations, and are there people who aspire to move to outstations, but haven’t yet got around to it? We would be interested to know what the reasons are that they give for not moving out of town. Please explore whether issues such as health and education are significant, or the state of roads and vehicle maintenance.</td>
<td>The emerging community, where the RA is located, is also a homeland that has grown. It is the traditional country of a family. Another homeland is also owned by X, but a man currently living in the larger community with some connection to it is looking at moving there and re-establishing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to adequate information about the range of technology choices available for housing and infrastructure development on homelands?</td>
<td>No training was provided to the RA coordinator. He gets his technical advice mainly from the local service provision organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Snapshot 2

**Location**

1.5 hours west of larger community on coast.

**Population and occupancy**

4 adults comprise core population, and another 5 semi-permanent. Up to 10 children semi-permanent. Many family members visit at holidays and weekends. Also seem to have several non-indigenous visitors from southern cities.

**Time established/history**

Established 1979.

### Viability framework

#### Aspirations

Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

It is their home – occupying traditional country.

#### Governance

How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?

Local decisions are made along family based lines. The RA has been established 30 years, and supports 19 outstations in the region. Focus on operational maintenance, planning & training.

#### Livelihoods


Cultural maintenance; outstation maintenance; arts; small fishing/ tourism enterprise.

#### Positive resource flows

Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

Families’ income from CDEP and pensions. Small income stream/ gifts from tourism. Residents pay rent. Housing and infrastructure capital and maintenance grants provided by joint State/ATSIS. Maintenance subsidies are dependent on matching rental collections.

#### Infrastructure

What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

2 houses, water (solar powered bore pump), pit toilets, septic for sink waste, generator, payphone, rubbish tip. Maintained by CDEP (local labour) and by RA.

#### Services

What services do people access? From where? (education, health,
Vulnerability: How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

Homeland has been occupied for over 25 years.

Planning framework

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

The regional plan requires each outstation to develop a homeland strategic plan.

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

The regional plan was approved March 2003, for 5 years. It may not affect existing outstations, but proposes a staged development model for new outstations.

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?

The RA has been established 30 years. Its focus is on construction, maintenance, planning, training services for 19 outstations in the region.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?

Apart from ATSIS, the main agency involved is the joint state/ commonwealth housing organisation.
## Snapshot 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
<th>20 kms from main centre on coast.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</td>
<td>10 people, mostly adults, are permanent residents of homeland. RA services 200 outstation residents in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time established/ history</td>
<td>Homeland established in mid 1990s. Some outstations in the region established over 20 years ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Viability framework

**Aspirations:** Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

Common purpose is occupation of and identification with traditional country. Many residents are clear about not wanting to live in the pressures of town environment.

**Governance:** How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?

Decisions on outstations made by family groups. The governing committee of RA is comprised of outstation leaders/residents, who have a clear commitment to outstation life, and who have experienced the financial costs involved in maintaining housing and equipment in outstations.


Homeland has artists and a small cattle enterprise, and horse breaking. CDEP supports general maintenance work at outstations, much of it done by residents. Other RA outstations operate land and sea management projects, funded by various grants.

**Positive resource flows:** Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

CDEP operational budget provides small level of plant & equipment R&M at each outstation. ATSIS also provides ongoing municipal services funding. NAHS projects have been provided. The artists at the homeland at times generate substantial income from art sales. RA has successfully submitted grant applications to several govt programs on behalf of
outstations undertaking land & sea management projects. Each outstation resident contributes $18 rent and $10 power per fn, thus their overall rental collections meet the criteria to attract the government subsidy. Residents purchase their own vehicles and vehicle fuel, but CDEP sometimes assists with vehicle maintenance. The need to replace 8 generators last year reinforced the need to collect sufficient funds for equipment replacement. Power contributions will be placed in a reserve fund to meet future costs of RAPS battery replacement.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

Homeland has 3 houses, water, generator, pit toilet, rubbish tip. No phone, but within CDMA mobile range. Maintenance done at outstation, with RA support. RA advised all outstations generators will be converting to RAPS solar systems over next year – with lower operational costs. The CAT certificate course in RAPS will assist residents with ongoing maintenance.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial).

There is a (dry season only) school operating at emerging community near homeland which children can use when resident there. All other services are in town.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

Strong commitment to outstations. RA directors enforce the cost recovery systems to ensure there are funds for future equipment replacement, to reinforce the sustainability of the outstations.

**Planning framework**

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

The Regional Council insisted that plans be prepared for individual outstations and RAs (they reduced the CDEP allocations one year to pay for consultants to undertake this task). RA recognises the value of planning for outstations and for attracting other funds – they have also prepared plans for tourism, pastoral and business development. RA has a service agreement with each outstation, inc the matter of residents’ contributions to rent and power. The directors insist that it be followed.

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

The Regional Plan was approved in June 02 for 18 months, then approved for 5 years from December 03. RA uses regional plan to support the need for local cost recovery systems. There are 2 potential outstation groups who will need to satisfy new criteria.

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?
RA has a service agreement with each outstation, inc residents contributions to rent and power. RA supports CDEP activities, housing/equipment construction and maintenance, and sponsors other projects (eg, land & sea management) for some outstations.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?

State/commonwealth funds received. Various land & sea management funds received for specific projects (but these are based on funding applications by RA, not necessarily visits from those agencies).

**Supplementary questions for outstation coordinators**

Which homelands do outstation coordinators believe function well, and why the believe this? In essence, what are the indicators for success?

Residents prefer the lifestyle to that in town. RA works to provide mechanisms for people to do things themselves – eg, will hold pay deductions in trust for people to purchase vehicles. The directors take a firm approach to not assisting outstations which don’t assist themselves, or are not occupied.

What is the view of the community to the outstations, and are there people who aspire to move to outstations, but haven’t yet got around to it? We would be interested to know what the reasons are that they give for not moving out of town. Please explore whether issues such as health and education are significant, or the state of roads and vehicle maintenance.

Outstations supported by community. There are 2 potential outstation groups who have expressed some interest in outstations, but as yet haven’t demonstrated sufficient occupation.
## Snapshot 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South of City, 113km along road of very poor condition, corrugations and waterholes, 82km along alternative dry weather only route. Travel times vary between 75-105 mins according to weather and road conditions. Approx 4km from a larger homeland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core population of 4 (husband (non-Indigenous) and wife (Indigenous), grand-daughter and great-granddaughter). Some grandchildren living in Alice to attend school. Up to 20-30 people might visit at one time and camp for short periods. During CDEP/Training projects might have 5 lads living there for a period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time established/history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X and Y moved out in 1990 and lived under a ghost gum, then in a caravan they bought. The governing body was established around 1994 (has since had funding withdrawn due to mismanagement of funds). Houses built between 1996-1998. X and Y broke away from the governing body due to these events. Their house is located 4km from the main homeland and other houses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Viability framework

**Aspirations:** Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

Purpose is to keep living out there, support children and grandchildren to live out there, ‘get old and grow vegies’. No documented plan.

At the homeland, there is no forward planning. Half the community is pretty old – 60-80 yo, and the young people are not living out there at the moment. The young and old have different ideas on what the future of the place would be.

**Governance:** How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One “champion”? Committee?

The homeland is run by X and Y jointly making decisions. Apparently the elders passed the ‘caretaker’ role for the area onto X when they died (?). The main homeland has some sort of committee (details unknown).


X and Y run a horticulture business. Currently they’ve invested 5 times more into it than they’ve got out of it. No cultural reasons for being there were cited. At times they have employed Level 3 Certificate trainees on CDEP wages, however there’s only enough work to employ a group of 4 or 5 for about 3 weeks, then there’s not much for them to do. One additional person could potentially be employed long term. The trainees are no longer able to come because they cannot afford to pay the new$1000+ fee imposed on apprentices this year by Charles Darwin University. No funding was available to transport the apprentices out to the outstation.
Many young people grew up in towns and don’t have the bush skills to live out on the homelands, plus they prefer a higher standard of infrastructure.

**Positive resource flows:** Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

ATSIC funded house. Apart from that, residents are pretty much self-funded: both on pensions, and make some small amount of money from selling vegetables locally. Bore maintenance, power, etc mainly self-funded. Resource agency may assist with batteries for hybrid energy system etc. Own vehicle.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

- One tin house, one derelict shelter, 2 old caravans.
- Water supply piped from bore 4km away. Water line is just under surface, and above surface in places. During summer, water arrives at house at 90 degrees Celsius. Can’t shower in summer, day or night, as the water is too hot. Last year ATSIC/S had promised funding for a new bore at the house, and Envirofund were going to supply the solar pump, but ATSIC reneged and Envirofund would not support it without the ATSIC funding. Complex situation because the bore belongs to the government, the column to the station, and the pump to X – he does all the maintenance whilst main homeland residents and the station access the water.
- Sanitation: septic tank with stone drain, hasn’t needed emptying due to high evaporation rate.
- Hybrid power system, generator recently gone bung but it will be fixed, solar panels and batteries ok but need more.
- X has long history and good relationship with Telstra, who recently provided a brand new one which is the largest domestic dish in Australia, on a 103 foot tower next to the house.
- X dug a pit for rubbish (using the main homeland front end loader) and they burn it off regularly.

The main homeland has other infrastructure including the front end loader.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

Education: School of the Air available (no school-aged kids there at present, but X was president of School Council for long time). Currently school-aged kids live and attend school in the city.

Health: Congress generally visits fortnightly bringing nurse and or doctor. Feels well-supported by health service.

Trade/technical: if accessed, would be from the city, funded by the RA, only after kicking up a huge fuss.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?
People have a really good sense of security. They are fairly independent for water and power supplies, have a house now. Grandson who grew up there is fully intending to come out after he finishes high school. Difficult to get other young people to come out (even CDEP participants) due to low standard of housing and lack of employment.

Planning framework

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

Did have one for a while, but it is no longer being followed. Homeland have their own vision, but main homeland has no forward planning and received no support in the beginning to develop a plan.

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

Probably is one but it is not being implemented. Resource agency manager holds meetings and lets people know what’s happening.

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?

Support is provided from RA at nearest large community. They have responsibility for the community as well as outstations, and sometimes it is difficult to balance the needs of each. For example, whilst there is a house at the main homeland that has been empty for 7 months, there are houses in community with five families living in them. Social and cultural factors don’t necessarily mesh well with the current service delivery model. There is some dissatisfaction with the resource agency, as the rationale behind the allocation of scarce funds is unclear. Communication between outstations and the resource agency is often poor. No formal agreement, although the RA did originally agree that they would support the main homeland. Services provided at present are very few, due to lack of funds, but include some maintenance (mentioned above). Appears to be understaffed, but it is very difficult to find good staff who do not experience problems eg with social interaction with community, alcohol.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?

Little or no coordination between agencies. Few services from other agencies are provided. Telstra provides phone. Relationship with Charles Darwin University officially discontinued as a result of apprentices withdrawing, but informal support continues through friendship with the lecturer who provides advice and other support. Many programs are short-lived, so even if they are successful they finish. Transport difficulties.
Snapshot 5

Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)
- 12km from larger community (60-75 minutes from city) in desert
- Bitumen road to larger community, then dirt

Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)
- Steady occupation of 20 - 40, with constant toing and froing between homeland, larger community and city. 20 - 40 includes the clients of the detoxification centre.
- Generally it is older people without kids who stay at homeland. The kids go to school in the city and come out at weekends and holidays. Sometimes one parent will be out at homeland while the other stays in town with the kids.
- Some people from the homeland have jobs in town.

Time established/history

Viability framework

Aspirations: Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there?
- Yes. The detox centre is part of their reason to be there. Also, they want to be on their country. They want to be able to take the kids out to country to be with family. There is a strong sense of collective endeavour.

Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).
- No formal plan that we know of, but they constantly have new ideas, eg bee keeping and market garden.

Governance: How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?
- "One senior women is the strength behind it". She is ailing - may be approaching a generational transition.
- Governing body has a paid position - someone who chases funding for the detox centre. Usually this person is a family member.
- Presume there is a council or board that makes major decisions.

- Detox centre - we think some community members get paid to work their. Not sure who funds it.
- Market garden - this is a relatively new project, to provide activity for the detox clients.
- Hunting
- Cultural practice.

Positive resource flows: Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?
- Presume housing and infrastructure were funded by ATSIS. They received several grants for maintenance and expansion of their RAPS system
- Don't know if residents pay anything/collect any money to put towards recurrent costs
- Don't know if any income comes from the detox centre.
- Most maintenance is carried out by RA. They get operational funding from ATSIS.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?
- 5 permanent, contractor-built houses
- 4 temporary dwellings
- rec hall
- dome building intended for arts centre - a bit derelict.
- bore water
- RAPS system
- Household telephones
- HF radio
- Tip?
- Road is 2WD in dry weather.
- All well maintained. People look after things.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)
(i) At times there have been some kids doing school of the air. Now kids are at school in the city.
(ii) May be some health service visitation associated with the detox
(iii) Clinic in larger community, Hospital in city
(iv) Regular flow of people in and out of city - day trip.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?
- There is a sense of security and permanence. The community has some ability to fend for themselves and find resources.

**Planning framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was being worked on 2-3 years ago. Don't know anything about it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, strong RA based just outside larger community, servicing a large number of homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does all basic R&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can help with enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground? |
### Snapshot 6

**Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)**

The homeland is on a river east of the larger community on the coast. It is about 80 km from the larger community.

**Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)**

There is usually a small core of people who prefer to live down at the homeland permanently. This is generally older people. A much larger group of people from the larger community visit on weekends and school holidays. The core group may be 6 - 10 people. The larger group would involve up to 60 people.

**Time established/history**

People were moved from the homeland in the early 1960’s and taken to the missions. They moved back to the larger community area in the 1970’s. From the mid-70’s the people started to visit and camp at the homeland. The homeland has steadily grown since that time.

**Viability framework**

**Aspirations:** Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

The people are down at the homeland because it is their traditional country. They have a very strong connection to that area. The people can practice their traditional ways and teach the younger generations.

The CAT planning work captured a lot of the vision people have for their country. Their ideas are evolving and growing. This was evident even one year after the planning work was finished. People explained they had put more thought into the ideas since the planning work and had come up with new ideas for their place. They have progressed further since that time.

**Governance:** How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion”? Committee?

There is definitely one or two main players who push things along at the homeland. They do connect with their family often about decisions. There is probably some elements of traditional decision-making arrangements still present in the way things are decided. The leaders do not seem to make decisions single-handedly and there does appear to be quite high levels of consultation within the group. They do appear to be good at keeping people involved in decisions. Obviously there must be times when people are unhappy with decisions. From the outside it looks like quite a democratic and inclusive approach to making decisions.

People work on CDEP to maintain the homeland. They also practice cultural activities including some land management such as burning. Also carry out building and new projects at the homeland.

**Positive resource flows:** Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

Funding comes from several different sources. The resource agencies attract funds. The homeland also attracts its own specific funds from ATSIS and other agencies like ILC, state bodies etc. The community centre was constructed by Rotary volunteers from interstate. There is also a chuck-in system for contributing to living costs by the residents.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

Houses and sheds for living (shelter), reticulated water supply with solar pump, toilets in the houses and pit toilets for other camps, generators for electricity, several vehicles, radio/telephones??, solid waste rubbish tip.

Maintenance is sporadic and more on a crisis management approach.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

The quality of service delivery varies. The staff at the local level of the agency can make a big difference to how well the services are delivered to the community. In some cases the staff of government agencies have very little experience and understanding of remote Indigenous situations and lifestyles. Consequently programmes can be quite different to what services people are actually needing. There is not always the capacity to re-orient the programmes to suit the local needs. Mostly when local staff work to make a programme or initiative more appropriate to the community it is by battling very hard against their own bureaucracy. There are also staff in the agencies who have worked with remote communities for a long time. They understand the realities very well and generally know how to ‘work-the-system’ to attempt to make services more useful to the community’s reality. These staff are the gems who are invaluable. They are the ones who put in the extra efforts to improve the outcomes and who are very useful in developing programmes or other initiatives which are much more likely to suit the local community’s needs.

One of the big differences is between programmes to be delivered across a whole region or state compared to projects or initiatives designed specifically for particular locations. The state-wide programmes may have some benefit or use for most locations but they usually miss the particular local needs. Eg. health clinics in each of the communities are very useful. However, each clinic generally gets the same staff and resources. There is no factoring of resources between locations based on the number of homelands that may need servicing. There is often no resources to provide the services to the homelands.

Some government agencies will engage consultants, contractors or other agencies to deliver their services. This can either enhance or reduce the quality of service.
Often when services are tendered out the quality of service is reduced because most projects are carried out by fee-for-service businesses who have to stay quite focussed on their profitability. This is a problem given the complex and unpredictable nature of working with remote Indigenous communities. It is very difficult to accurately quote to complete a particular project when there are many unknown factors. This leads the tenderers to stick closely to their design methodology regardless of how the situation unfolds. This situation significantly reduces flexibility to respond to the needs of the community.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

The people at the homeland have been there for many years now. They have title to the land. The services and infrastructure keep growing so there is definitely a sense of permanence. Access is a major problem during the wet season and limits occupancy levels.

Not sure if they feel vulnerable. Maybe they have a sense that if government funding stopped they would be struggling.

**Planning framework**

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

CAT facilitated a community planning project with the people for the homeland area in 1996. This was quite a comprehensive planning project covering many aspects of the homeland. Over time some things have been followed and some things have been changed. Eg. the location of the community centre was changed from the site shown on the plan. This was because of land tenure issues. Things have also changed where sponsoring agencies haven’t been aware of the planning documents.

It does seem that the people are reasonably committed to the general themes of the plan and think about aspects they want changed. For a year or more after the planning project people would contact CAT to talk about things they want to change in the plan. It is almost 8 years old now so the plan probably needs to be reviewed and updated.

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

No endorsed RCHPP

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?

There are two agencies in the larger community which provide support to the homeland. They are RA and the Land and Sea Management Centre (L&SMC). Each of the traditional groups around the larger community did have their own incorporated organisation. The administration of these organisations was too much work so the groups came together and formed the RA as their representative body. The L&SMC is a newer organisation and has been funded through the National Heritage Trust programme.
The RA provides support to the Indigenous people in the larger community. This includes managing issues in town and also supporting people on their homelands around the community. The RA often attracts general funding which is to be divided up between the different homeland groups. Sometimes funding is specifically allocated to a homeland but is still managed through the RA. There is usually has a project officer or manager employed through the RA to carry out these roles. The RA manages the CDEP programme in larger community which extends to the homelands and includes managing the resources for CDEP programmes on the homelands which extends to vehicle and other equipment repairs and maintenance, etc. The RA previously had a radio system for communicating with the homelands. This was the only way people at the homeland could communicate with the outside world. The people would often use it as a way of communicating with people in the larger community. This radio system has now become defunct as there is a telephone system, although no-one can afford the connection fee so now there are no communications.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?
Snapshot 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 3km from larger community in the tropics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy (is there a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Core population of 6-8 through the dry season (May to December)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time established/history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities constructed in 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viability framework**

**Aspirations:** Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

- There is a shared community vision for the homelands movement at the larger community, with three goals:
  - Look after our country
  - Build stronger families and healthier lifestyles
  - Make a living from our country
  - This is documented in the 2003 Homelands Plan
  - The use of homelands to provide "opportunities and programs for people in difficulty" is part of the vision set out in the homelands plan.

**Governance:** How are decisions made about use and management of Homeland resources? One "champion"? Committee?

- There is no corporation or formal committee for the homeland. Decisions are made along traditional lines within the family.
- At the community level, the larger community has a strong culture of participatory/collective planning and decision making that has developed out of the RA and the elders.


- Livelihood activities have been documented by in a report and assessed for their socio-cultural value, non-commercial economic return and commercial economic value.
- Activities at the homeland:
  - Hunting and gathering of food and maintenance of cultural sites of importance
  - Teaching young people, including diversionary programs for those at risk in the larger community
  - Small scale art and craft production

**Positive resource flows:** Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do homeland residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

- RA gets ATSIC funding, which comes through the larger community council. (The homeland coordinator makes the submission through Council to ATSIC)
- There is no other funding for homelands
- Homeland residents do not pay anything to the RA, but they do have their own bank accounts where they deposit funds to be used for upkeep of the homeland facilities. Council facilitates this through pay deductions
- Income is generated from camping fees. There has been a lot of discussion about whether these funds should go back to the Lands office to pay for the costs
of administering the camping permit system, or whether these funds should go to the homeland group whose land the campsite is on.

- Homelands plan sets a clear direction of working towards greater economic independence. (Assumes that public support for homelands will not go on forever).
- Homelands plan states that every homeland should start working on enterprises.
- Hunting and gathering activity frees up personal income for other uses. Some other outstations have negotiated cattle mustering contracts with Council
- The main driver at the homeland is pretty keen on economic development

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

- Shed
- Carport
- Water tank on stand and water pump
- Tractor and trailer
- UHF radio
- Chainsaw and other tools
- Composting toilet
- RA does regular servicing of equipment as part of its service. Any damage due to negligence is supposed to be paid for by the residents.
- RA provides a kit of information about basic O&M of equipment
- Main problem is road building and maintenance. It is unclear whether the larger community council is treating the maintenance of the homeland roads as a priority

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

- Kids generally stay in town so that they can go to school. They go out to the homelands on weekends and holidays. It would make more sense to have the long school holidays in the dry season. (Note, however that this homeland is only 3km from the larger community).
- Health: the RA provides an extensive first aid kit for dealing with injuries including burns. The ambulance officer delivers first aid training to the homeland residents. No emergency response capability.
- There is a store and bank agency in the larger community
- Mechanical workshop in the larger community

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

**Planning framework**

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

- Yes. The plan was developed during a series of community workshops in February 2003. The basis of the plan was to develop 20 homelands to "Stage 1" and then see which ones are really viable for further development. This is working. The coordinator is able to use this plan to explain why additional sites will not be developed, and it is becoming clear which homelands are viable for further development, based on demonstrated commitment from the residents.
Now there is a need to get a more definite commitment to this plan from the larger community council.

Is there an ATSIC Regional Council Homelands Policy and Plan? Is it relevant or useful?
- Draft plan prepared but not yet ratified. Not in use. Based on my knowledge and others past dealings, people were probably not consulted during the preparation of this plan, and probably have not even seen a copy.
- The RA has been getting outstation funding from ATSIC despite the moratorium, but don’t get what they ask for. Make do with what they get.

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?
- Manages outstation funding from ATSIC
- Provides basic facilities
- Provides transport
- Maintains asset register
- Undertakes routine maintenance
- Tries to help with development of livelihood activities (will look for funding for people’s ideas in the future, but waiting for the groups to get to the point where they are ready to take that step.)
- No MOU, but the responsibilities of the RA and the residents for O&M have been discussed and agreed.
- Level of support based on previous years’ usage of homeland.
- The larger community CDEP also provides services to homelands - employment. The idea is that the individual homelands plans will become the CDEP work plans. There is a “grey area” where coordination is lacking between the RA and the CDEP.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?
- No direct servicing of homelands by other agencies. The hope is that other agencies such as Families will get involved in diversionary/respite activities on homelands.
- Opportunity/requirement for involvement from other agencies was scoped out at the Homeland Negotiating Table, May 2003. In particular:
  - identified need for more roads funding from Dept of Transport
  - Identified need for multilateral funding to develop up youth diversionary activities on homelands.
- To date the Govt hasn’t responded in any way to this agenda.
- Regional Organisation have facilitated some support with the installation of telephone communications.

Supplementary questions for outstation coordinators
Which homelands do outstation coordinators believe function well, and why the believe this? In essence, what are the indicators for success?
- The basic conditions for a viable homeland are:
  - Commitment to be there (usually this comes from old people. Young people are used to town life)
  - Access. The difficulties of access are the biggest constraint to homelands
• After that, what makes a homeland more viable is:
  • Improved, more private living quarters, especially for old people
  • Something to do: social programs (respite or diversionary activities) or enterprise. People have all the ideas, but they need assistance to get started.

What is the view of the community to the outstations, and are there people who aspire to move to outstations, but haven’t yet got around to it? We would be interested to know what the reasons are that they give for not moving out of town. Please explore whether issues such as health and education are significant, or the state of roads and vehicle maintenance.

• Main barrier is access.

Do you have access to adequate information about the range of technology choices available for housing and infrastructure development on homelands?

•

What could be done at a state/national policy/program level to support the homelands movement in this area?

• Support for people to develop up their ideas for social programs and enterprises. People want to develop up these programs. They want to get off welfare, and they want to be doing useful work, but they don't have the skills or knowledge to get started. Doesn't have to be full-time workers in the community - could be people who come in for periods, but they need to be there for 2-3 weeks at a time.
Snapshot 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homeland – 125 kms north of larger centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy</th>
<th>(is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry season use only – inaccessible in wet season (Dec to April). Min population 8-10; max 30. At times, eg school holidays, short term usage can increase. Another nearby smaller outstation occupied by one family, but youth diversionary programs are being established there.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time established/history | Residents started camping in dry seasons in mid 1980s – with some assistance from DAA, inc purchase of 4WD vehicle and building a small shed. Community Council started upgrading access road from community at that time, and annual maintenance/upgrading continues. |

Viability framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations</th>
<th>Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is traditional land and site of original mission established in 1930s. Re-occupation of traditional lands; lifestyle benefits; recreation; hunting &amp; fishing; useful CDEP work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One &quot;champion&quot;? Committee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstation is almost totally reliant on CDEP Corp for tools &amp; equipment, fuel for generators, vehicle R&amp;M, etc – based on nos. of CDEP workers at outstation. CDEP has an operational budget for each outstation group. CDEP supervisor (often a younger person) is responsible for CDEP activities &amp; use of CDEP resources, tools, equipment, etc. Outstation leaders participate on CDEP management committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting &amp; fishing; youth offenders diversionary/preventative programs (mainly at smaller outstation); CDEP work (fencing, maintenance).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive resource flows</th>
<th>Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDEP operational budget for homeland of $25,000 pa covers generator fuel, some vehicle R&amp;M, tools &amp; equipment, etc. Costs above that met by residents via CDEP wage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deductions – with a consequent large admin workload for CDEP. CDEP Corp would like to formalise an outstation financial fund, to which outstation residents would contribute via wage or Centrelink deductions, but has not proceeded due to delays in ATSIS decisions on formation of regional RA.

CDEP Corp operational budget for other outstations is:
- $8,000 – homeland1
- $4,000 – homeland2
- $5,000 – homeland3
- $5,000 – homeland4
- $4,000 - $10,000 each – urban outstations near larger community
homeland5 (just over the state border) also receives similar assistance based on their CDEP participant numbers.

The Justice Group can provide some small funding assistance for groceries and petrol to cater for young offenders who are sent to outstations.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

Two houses and one shed - CDEP coordinator believes more attention needed to housing maintenance. Airstrip (needs upgrading to all weather). Solar power system works (battery problems in first house). No problems with water or sewerage system. Individual families have purchased older vehicles, and CDEP workshop assists with maintenance.

Smaller outstation: Rough shelters and tents. $40,000 allocated recently (by ATSIS ?) for basic accommodation to support diversionary program for young offenders.

**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

Health workers visit monthly (as a day trip), but lack a building for private consultations or storage space for supplies.

All other services accessed in larger community. Discussions held with Education Dept who are prepared to provide a teachers aid wage, if min 14 children would attend regularly. Arrangements deferred until suitable building can be funded.

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

Roads and transport underpin outstations. Homeland is planned to be the centre for RA support to other current and planned outstations in the vicinity.

**Planning framework**

Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

Plans on each outstation were prepared in 2003/04 for (unsuccessful) ATSIC submissions by CDEP Corp. Application was based on the Regional Homelands Plan prepared in
Review of the National Homelands Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 (which included considerable consultation/planning with individual outstation groups).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Regional Homelands Plan was prepared in 2000 – but Regional Policy not formally adopted until 2003. Regional Plan still very relevant to the outstation group – but unclear how much it is used by ATSIS in allocating funds. CDEP Corp continues to assist outstations, in the absence of any RA organised as proposed in Regional Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal RA yet established. CDEP Corp would be happy to support the formation of an RA, but in the meantime, is providing small operational CDEP funds, and has applied (unsuccessfully) for outstation capital funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sate Indigenous Dept provided a one off grant about 3 years ago for water supply. Housing Dept provided some housing capital funding about 6 years ago (one off). See above for Education &amp; Health support. RA believes ATSIS still has unallocated outstation funds from 3 years ago, pending resolution of the matter of the regional RA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary questions for outstation coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which homelands do outstation coordinators believe function well, and why the believe this? In essence, what are the indicators for success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with traditional owners/elders is important in planning and determining budgets and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the view of the community to the outstations, and are there people who aspire to move to outstations, but haven’t yet got around to it? We would be interested to know what the reasons are that they give for not moving out of town. Please explore whether issues such as health and education are significant, or the state of roads and vehicle maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; roads important. Lack of education services prevents some families with children from living there. Health, retail and other services better in town, and better jobs for some.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to adequate information about the range of technology choices available for housing and infrastructure development on homelands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, via external engineers, CAT, etc – engaged when funds available for a project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sometimes not enough attention given to ongoing infrastructure maintenance.
## Snapshot 9

### Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)
Homeland is 20kms from larger community in coastal rainforest

### Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)
Core group of 6 – 12 people with a larger group of up to 60 visiting in holiday times

### Time established/history
People began to move back around 1994

### Viability framework

#### Aspirations: Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

The people know that the area is their traditional country. They have a very strong connection to that area. The people can practice some of their traditional ways and teach the younger generations.

The planning work in 1999 captured a lot of the vision people have for their country. They have progressed further since that time. One clear aspiration is to be living on the country or have access to it and have a role in managing the land.

#### Governance: How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?
- Formally, each outstation has its own corporation.
- Community council has decided that any outstation funding received is to be spread equally between the outstations. RA coordinator then meets with each outstation corporation to work out what they ant to do with their money. This can be difficult as some of the corporations have difficulty in reaching consensus.


People work on CDEP to maintain the homeland. They also practice cultural activities including some land management such as burning.

#### Positive resource flows: Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?
- ATSIC. Funding is sporadic. Don't get what you ask for, get what is available. Makes it very difficult to plan anything. Capital funding only - no recurrent.
- CDEP operational funds are used on outstations.
- Residents don't contribute anything to the resource agency.

#### Infrastructure: What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

The infrastructure at most of the camps at the homeland has been purchased by the residents. Therefore they have had a major influence over the choice. During the
planning project the CAT staff did a lot of work at looking at options for different areas of infrastructure. The project used a hypothetical budget of $1 million for people to think about the kinds of infrastructure they want at the homeland. The budget for the NAHS project which is about to start is also $1 million. It will be interesting to see whether the residents and broader community have a significant influence over what infrastructure is delivered. People were clear during the planning project that they wanted small amounts of infrastructure that they can manage. The sentiment was that they don’t want the homeland to become another large community.

Owner built houses and sheds for living (shelter), water tanks and stand with some pipework, mostly pit toilets, some people have generators for electricity, sometime a vehicle from CDEP, people generally have their own vehicles, most camps have telephones, solid waste is collected and taken to the larger community.

People generally do their own maintenance on their equipment. CDEP equipment is maintained by the larger community council.

| Services: What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial) |
| Mostly the resources come from people themselves or through government funding. The government funding may come through the larger community council or directly to the homeland community. People make a big contribution as does CDEP. These are the main to sources of resource. |

| Vulnerability: How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable? |
| The people at the homeland are part of a larger Native Title claim. This probably serves to give people more security in their entitlement and access to the land. The current tenure is a grazing lease. There is some concern about the strength of this tenure for people’s aspirations for the homeland. The NAHS project which is about to start also provides a bit of security in terms of acknowledging people’s right to the land. The older people are clear that they are living on their homeland and have right to, they will not move no matter what. |
Planning framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT facilitated a community planning project with the homeland community in 1999. This was quite a comprehensive planning project covering many aspirations for the community at the homeland, including management of the special heritage area. Most of the development at the homeland since the planning work has focused at the family camp level and therefore the ideas for the broader community land have not been carried out. Some work has started on facilities for the ranger programme at the special heritage area which is along the ideas in the settlement plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A report that is yet to be ratified has an emphasis on commitment. The RA coordinator thinks that is a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The larger community council has appointed an outstation coordinator. They receive outstation funds from ATSIC and try to deliver development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Snapshot 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelands 1 and 2 are 25 - 40 kms from, the main settlement on a big island.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy (is there a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core population of 5-6 at each – but family members visit at weekends &amp; school holidays. Proximity to town facilitates easy mobility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time established/ history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstations started in late 1980s, with increased Council attention to upgrading roads out of the main town area, and use of CDEP to establish outstations and transport. Houses first built in 1991.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Viability framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations: Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of ownership/ occupation of traditional country. People choose to live there despite inconveniences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance: How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One &quot;champion&quot;? Committee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most outstations reliant on CDEP for operational support, thus need to put their case to CDEP coordinator (and thus ultimately to Council). Previous outstation Corporation was short-lived, and collapsed in late 1990s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some arts production; cultural maintenance; fishing; general outstation maintenance; informal youth cultural teaching activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive resource flows: Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstations reliant on CDEP for wages and operational support, transport and small equipment items – but a couple have used private resources. Small income from arts and crafts. Qld Housing Dept provided ‘community housing’ funds for outstations in early 1990s. Residents contribute to costs of municipal (and outstation) services via the community levy on their CDEP wages. Current bid to ATSIS for housing upgrades and Bushlight equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure: What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I house and shed at each outstation; plus school room at homeland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water from wells (with petrol pump) and rainwater tank. Diesel generators with house wiring, but a Bushlight system for each place is planned. 1 outstation has septic system, 1 has pit toilet. Transport is via CDEP bus (once or twice weekly), but 1 outstation has private vehicle. Communications via 2 way solar radio – but Telstra plans to extend CDMA coverage of the whole island. Small rubbish tip. Management and maintenance of assets is a concern – without a dedicated outstation coordinator.

| Services: What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial) |
| Health clinic in main centre does regular visits to occupied outstations. Education has provided visiting services in the past, and 1 outstation has a room available for schooling. All services provided in town – access is not a large problem if the outstation bus keeps operating. |

| Vulnerability: How do people feel about the viability/ sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable? |
| Outstations residents generally try to stay on their country, but town is available as a back stop. Outstations are a fringe concern for Council, and residents rely on CDEP Coordinator as their advocate for services. |

| Planning framework |
| Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful? |
| Local plan for outstations prepared in 2000, but it was seen as belonging to governing body, which subsequently collapsed. Unsure of extent to which it is used by Council. Work plans prepared for ATSIS CDEP purposes. |

| Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful? |
| The Regional Plan has not been used widely by the outstations, as its relevance may not have been understood. The Plan is probably used by ATSIS as it included comprehensive data on each outstation in the region. |

| Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA? |
| No local RA. CDEP (operated by Council) provides transport, operational support & maintenance. |

| What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground? |
ATSIS is the only agency which has any dealings with outstations, mainly via CDEP and planned capital funds. Qld Housing provided capital housing funds about 10 years ago as a one off.

**Supplementary questions for outstation coordinators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which homelands do outstation coordinators believe function well, and why the believe this? In essence, what are the indicators for success?</td>
<td>The outstations where people commit to living permanently on outstations, and have the expertise to maintain equipment. (A proviso may be that the equipment should be within the capacity of the group to maintain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the view of the community to the outstations, and are there people who aspire to move to outstations, but haven’t yet got around to it? We would be interested to know what the reasons are that they give for not moving out of town. Please explore whether issues such as health and education are significant, or the state of roads and vehicle maintenance.</td>
<td>Only 6 outstations received capital funding several years ago, but there are up to 24 other identified sites where people have expressed a wish to establish an outstation. Some people feel that a house should be provided prior to occupation of the homeland – but this doesn’t fit with govt funding guidelines which require some level of occupation first. People needing access to health and education services in town will be reluctant to move to outstations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have access to adequate information about the range of technology choices available for housing and infrastructure development on homelands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Snapshot 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 kms east of larger community in arid tropics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core population of 16, with occasional weekend/holiday visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time established/history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initially established as an aged persons facility, which was then abandoned. Re-occupied by traditional owners for use as an outstation in 2000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Viability framework

#### Aspirations: Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented)?

Re-occupation of traditional country, inc caring for sacred site. Use the facilities built for the aged persons centre. Residents wish to improve housing to allow enjoyment of rural living, and provide alternatives to town life for children. Steadily build food self-sufficiency from own resources such as fishing, beef cattle, vege gardens, fruit trees, chickens, and plans for a small bakery and small scale tourism/camping area.

#### Governance: How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One "champion"? Committee?

Local decisions made along family lines. Residents (esp women) have higher than usual levels of education and mainstream work experience. CDEP decisions made through RA..


Some residents commute to work in larger community. RA CDEP scheme operates at outstation - gardening & maintenance activities. As above in ‘aspirations’.

#### Positive resource flows: Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

ATSIS funded bore and pump, which is to be maintained by RA. RA operates a community levy of $20 per fn for rent and $5 per fn for power & fuel – not always supported by community. There is private income available from residents working in town.

Some training and computer provided by Women’s Centre in larger community.
### Infrastructure
What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

3 x 2 bedroom shelters, shed, water supply bore, phone, generator. Housing was built originally for aged persons facility, but now needs repair, and it is unclear who has maintenance responsibility.
Lack of reliable energy facility is the major problem – being addressed by an RE system.

### Services
What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

Most services accessed in larger community.

### Vulnerability
How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

Some security provided by having jobs in larger community.

### Planning framework
Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?

No

Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?

Regional Council has a draft regional homelands plan – finalisation is underway. There is no current ATSIS funding (except for maintenance by RA of bore pump).

Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?

RA provides CDEP and some maintenance services.

What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?
# Snapshot 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (distance from nearby centres and from main roads)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger community is 260 kms south-east of main community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 outstations are 12 kms east and 100 &amp;160 kms south east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeland is 80 kms south of main community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population and occupancy (is the a core, permanent population, or is it used intermittently? Who uses it when?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstation 1 – 4 houses, but core population only 2. Others moved away temporarily due to disputes following accidental shooting – but intend to return. Outstation 2 – 3 houses built, but now abandoned. Homeland – population of 76 in 2003 – currently nil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time established/history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Viability framework

**Aspirations:** Is there a sense of purpose? Do people know why they are there? Do they have a plan for the future (in their head or documented).

**Governance:** How are decisions made about use and management of outstation resources? One “champion”? Committee?

Decisions made by families concerned. Governing body at larger community is nominal management body, but receives no outstation funding for such purposes. Homeland has its own incorporated Council.


**Positive resource flows:** Where do the money and other resources come from? ATSIS? Other Government? Private money? Philanthropic? Do outstation residents contribute to the recurrent cost of living there?

Governing body at larger community provides some assistance with fuel for Outstation 1 from its own resources, due to commitment shown by core residents (pensioners). Homeland had CDEP scheme, plus school and health clinic.

**Infrastructure:** What is there in the way of infrastructure? (housing, water supply, sanitation, power supply, transport, communication, solid waste) How does it get looked after and maintained?

Outstation 1 – 4 houses
Outstation 2 – 3 houses built, but now abandoned
Homeland – 14 houses, airstrip, generator, school, clinic, store, etc.
**Services:** What services do people access? From where? (education, health, trade/technical, retail, financial)

People use services in larger community

**Vulnerability:** How do people feel about the viability/sustainability of the outstation? Do they have a sense that they are there to stay, that their occupancy is secure? What makes them feel vulnerable?

Abandonment of community and outstations raises questions about vulnerability and stability.

**Planning framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a documented homelands plan? Is it being followed? Is it useful?</td>
<td>No individual homelands plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a regional plan? Is it relevant or useful?</td>
<td>Regional Council has had a draft homelands policy since 2001 – yet to be finalised. CAT advised Regional Office had mentioned finalising it this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a resource agency? Is there an MOU? What services are provided by the RA?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship with other Govt agencies? Do you get services or funding from other Govt programs? When the various government agencies deliver services; eg DNR for water, ATSIS or ATSI Housing for housing, education and health etc, how well is it delivered, and does there appear to be any cross-linking or coordination between agencies as it appears on the ground?</td>
<td>Dept of Indigenous Affairs does not fund outstations. CEO at larger community wants the Depts involved in COAG trial to address the servicing issues at outstations. To date, ATSIC is the main funding source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>