

**AUSTRALIAN INDIGENOUS
COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION**

MAY 2006

**SUBMISSION ON
BACKING INDIGENOUS ABILITY**

**DELIVERING A COMPREHENSIVE
TELECOMMUNICATION PACKAGE IN INDIGENOUS
COMMUNITIES**

About

The Australian Indigenous Communications Association Incorporated (AICA) is a Canberra based body that represents Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders members of the National Indigenous Media and Communications Industry. AICA advocates for and formulates policy on behalf of the Indigenous communications sector. These sectors include but not limited to:

- Radio
- Print
- Film
- Television
- IT and remote broadcasting

During the 1980s and 1990s, enthusiastic Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and individuals with the help of others in many parts of Australia established community based radio and television stations. The funding allocations have historically all been limited; primarily because of the perceived non-commercial aspects connected with remote Indigenous communities and costs associated with the establishment of real communication technologies.

As communication technology became more widely accessible, albeit limited, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community organisations developed, own and control, subject to funding:

- Over 105 unique, small community radio and television broadcasting facilities (known as BRACS) in remote communities;
- Over 25 community and radio stations in regional and urban centres;
- Several community television services;
- One commercial radio service;
- One commercial television service;
- Many video-conference facilities; and
- Several community and commercial print and multi-media enterprises.

Backing Indigenous Ability Discussion Paper

AICA needs to make the following point clearly understood in considerations of this Baking Indigenous Ability (BIA) Discussion Paper (hereinafter referred to as the **Discussion Paper**).

All *Connect Australia* programs cannot be considered in isolation to each other except for how each does dovetail into the other when dealing with Indigenous communities. Otherwise it will be a continuing mistake for public and program policy to not treat unique structured Indigenous communities in a direct and interconnected framework and dovetail approach.

Disclaimer:

While AICA submission is overall from a national perspective, AICA acknowledge and respects the individual entity status of each of its members and their respective communities. This submission is intended as a stakeholder's response to the BIA Discussion Paper and not intended to fully represent the views of the individual Indigenous community.

Traditional authority and others

AICA can only provide overall comments that hopefully will assist the success of *Connect Australia* programs; but the responsibility of Indigenous communities lie with the authoritative structures in each community. These may vary in each community due to existing complex traditional authority accommodated in other local Indigenous authorities established under respective state and territory legislation.

Main purpose of BIA

The Discussion Paper's main purpose is stated to "*assist DCITA with program development **and promoting an environment** that will continue to improve telecommunications services to Indigenous communities.*"

The Discussion Paper main focus is stated to be on the:

...telecommunications and information technology, rather than the broadcasting aspects of Backing Indigenous Ability. This paper does not directly seek comments on the Broadband Connect or Clever Networks or Mobile Connect elements of Connect Australia. These programs have been the focus of separate discussion papers and stakeholders consultation.

*However, in making submissions in respect of this program and other Connect Australia program, **stakeholders should consider the linkages** between this program and other Connect Australia programs. For example, broadband infrastructure funded through Broadband Connect or Clever Networks could form the basis for the delivery of services to Indigenous communities that are the focus of backing Indigenous Ability.*
[2 of Discussion Paper]

It is AICA's unsurprising view that to create *and promote an environment that will continue to improve telecommunications services to Indigenous communities* needs the direct involvement of the community.

Policy design

AICA's strongly held view is that Indigenous communities or their authorised representatives must be involved in all policy design with this BIA program. AICA should have planned and active involvement with all BIA programs.

Existing Dissatisfaction with CDEP

The Discussion Paper makes it clear that its focus is on only the telecommunication and information technology rather than the broadcasting aspects. AICA views that this approach, though obviously convenient, requires a better appreciation of how an Indigenous community operates in real life.

All employment positions in an Indigenous community are not in isolation to others; they are all connected. Because of the nature of employment where all real jobs are valued, either in office and council work, field and other outside work, or even the unpaid work of elders, Indigenous communities do not function as would a non-Indigenous suburb or small town. .

AICA's comments are applicable across the four programs of Connect Australia. For a practical example, Backing Indigenous Ability cannot be separated from the Clever

Networks programs whose success lies in providing both the technology and new communication infrastructure into Indigenous communities. Both these programs, as do all the others, require a culture of acceptance and ownership in Indigenous communities. One program will not be accepted without formal and identified links with the other. The fact that these programs are dealing with diverse Indigenous communities, many in remote areas, demand that this be borne in mind at all stages of the programs. One approach may not be acceptable for another community. The uniqueness of each focus community will require an agreed approach with each community.

The success of TAPRIC

The Discussion paper reinforces AICA's view of a complete methodology planned with and agreed with the targeted Indigenous community which states that:

The direction of the Telecommunications Action Plan for Remote Indigenous Communities is supported as providing a holistic and well targeted way forward.

Meeting the needs

Meeting the communication needs of the community is the priority of the focus in delivering basic communication services commonly available to all other Australians. Finding ways that will enable the communication sustainability being placed in communities that results from the *Connect Australia* programs is the underlying policy focus.

If *Backing Indigenous Ability* is to build on the key findings from TAPRIC as noted in the Discussion paper, serious consideration needs to be adopted now in how that approach is to proceed. Any "wide ranging and comprehensive approach" to delivering telecommunications into Indigenous communities require:

- mandatory involvement of traditional owners of the community area (this is also a requirement of the *Native Title Act* when physical communication technology such as those associated with *Clever Networks* program.
- mandatory involvement with existing Indigenous Councils established for the area
- mandatory community members participation
- mandatory address language differences and gender requirements
- ensure proper respects to existing cultural protocols
- ensure all funds are effectively directed to achieve community results than to prop up State or territory programs.
- mandatory involvement of all identified existing Indigenous organisations or community controlled facilities in Indigenous communications; and
- priority of funding to all identified existing Indigenous organisations or community controlled facilities in Indigenous communications.

Crisis in Indigenous Broadcasting

In AICA's submission to the Review of The Indigenous Broadcasting Program we stated:

AICA welcomes this review and sees it as a tool which help to overcome a crisis in the

*Indigenous Broadcasting sector resulting from exponential increase in the number of Indigenous broadcasters **and the fact that there has been no increase in the ATSI/ATSIS/DCITA Indigenous Broadcasting Program (IBP) budget which has been pegged at \$13.3 million since the late 90's.***

*The last 15 years has seen the Indigenous broadcasting industry grow from one licensed community radio station to twenty-five (25) in 2006. Some 155 remote area broadcasters compliment these regional community broadcasters. **This growth has not been complimented by a similar growth in the funding dollars available.***

The purposes of AICA bringing the situation of Indigenous broadcasters to the attention with this Discussion Paper are not only to discuss the linkages that are relevant to the introduction of telecommunications and new information technology to Indigenous communities, but to ensure that BIA consider how to factor in real consideration in how BIA can address this crisis situation.

DCITA should not consider this a DEWAR problem because the CDEP is the Indigenous broadcaster's main avenue for wages. The recent review and changes for CDEP mainly affects new participants and leaves those Indigenous broadcasters that have been on CDEP for many years unacknowledged in changing communication technologies and the opportunities that are expected to flow from those changes.

AICA points out that the linkages of the situation of Indigenous broadcasters is connected with how DCITA is to promote a sustainable environment from the Indigenous community level. We reiterate our opening statement:

*The Discussion Paper's main purpose is to **"assist DCITA with program development and promoting an environment that will continue to improve telecommunications services to Indigenous communities***

Linkages of Indigenous Broadcasters in Communities

These individual communication sectors are intrinsically linked to other crucial community goals and priorities. For example, Indigenous broadcasting by Indigenous peoples in their own communities play an important role in the promotion and maintenance of Indigenous languages and culture. They also can play a crucial educative role in ensuring that new infrastructure is not damaged or defaced and becomes a valued service tool for the community.

The damage bill alone in mainstream society on communication infrastructure such as public telephones is enough to warrant involvement and further considerations of the value of Indigenous community broadcasting in establishing new telecommunications and technology services.

Also the status of being an Indigenous broadcaster in a community brings into play other more cultural aspects of respect and obligations acknowledged from both the Indigenous broadcaster personally and the broadcaster's audience. From an Indigenous community's view, the person who occupies the Indigenous broadcaster's position requires also the support and respect from the community.

CDEP Reforms

The position of Indigenous broadcaster is unique in a community environment and deserving of the proper financial and communication technologies support and acknowledgment. As CDEP is normally the backbone of often inadequate funding, the recent reviews which ignores existing Indigenous broadcasters who have been on only CDEP wages for many years, will required *Backing Indigenous Ability* to at least:

- consider how CDEP and reforms will impact onto their programs; and
- how existing and well documented community dissatisfaction in how these Indigenous broadcasters continued to be treated will effect the future community and commercial sustainability of Backing Indigenous Ability
- consider how BIA can address a sustainable introduction of new telecommunication technology into a community with the integral role of Indigenous broadcasters.

It is AICA's view and its national membership that CDEP is not to be considered in any way to prop up telecommunication facilities established in communities. Such an approach will only see telecommunications inherit the same existing culture of dissatisfaction associated with CDEP for Indigenous broadcasting.

AICA recommends all Indigenous broadcasters employment be urgently restructured to represent the crucial multi- purposes they perform in the community commensurate with their responsibilities.

Understanding of daily life

The most important consideration of all is an understanding of daily life in an Indigenous community and how this will or likely to impact onto all *Connect Australia* programs. Included in that understanding is the fact from ABS statistics is the relatively young age of community members.

Generational changes

The Secretaries Group on Indigenous Affairs *Annual Report on Indigenous Affairs 2004-2005* statistics clearly states that policy and programs need to began now to target the growing young population of Indigenous youths. The Report said:

The Indigenous population has a younger age profile and higher birth rate than the non-Indigenous population: some 40 per cent of the Indigenous population are aged under 15 compared to 20 per cent of the non-Indigenous population. Given the number of young Indigenous people who will finish schooling over the next five to ten years, there will be a significant increase in the size of the potential Indigenous labour force. This needs to be harnessed, particularly given the aging of Australia's overall population and the emergence of growing skill shortages. [1 of Report].

Information Technology

AICA views the introduction of basic information technology and associated services as long overdue. Many communities, and particularly the young people living in or from these communities, whether they are due to be school leavers or still in early stages of education, have already suffered severe disadvantaged in pursuing opportunities that others with these technologies have enjoyed for many years.

The generational disadvantaged with information technology for these young will be

sorely felt in forthcoming years by the predictable public costs in known and fully documented social areas connected mainly with health, housing, employment support (CDEP) and crime. Then there is the inestimable loss of cultural costs.

Special measures

In considering the establishment and introduction of new telecommunications and information technology in Indigenous communities, DCITA will require a comprehensive package that deals with immediate increased funding, if needed by utilising special measures with the \$36.6 million to:

- ensuring all community members are given use training and support for new telecommunications and information technology in conjunction with or before
- ensuring a COAG approach to how that training and use support is to happen
- ensuring that the introduction of NITV is properly acknowledged in its potential to deliver and support these use training
- ensuring quality infrastructure and ongoing training and support needs are factored into any the comprehensive package
- ensure extra funding is available directed, if need to, by the use of special measures because of the existing Indigenous community member's disadvantages with new telecommunications and information technology, particularly young Indigenous peoples.
- ensuring that these young Indigenous people do not live an employment future directed only with CDEP.

ACIA recommends a substantial special measure allocation be directed from the \$36.6 million telecommunications element of the Backing Indigenous Ability program to service the infrastructure, training and support needs for Indigenous community members with new telecommunications and information technology.

ACIA recommends that all Indigenous service providers involved with Indigenous communications, such as the formation of the new National Indigenous Television (NITV) be allocated training responsibilities in multi-skilled communications and not solely just an element of communications.

Information Business Plans

As well, each community be funded to develop a realistic and commercial orientated Information Business Plan (IBP) that utilise this new telecommunications and information technology to overcome or assist to overcome, existing commercial disadvantages. Prolonged government support or consultancy support should not be structured into the Information Business Plans. These proposed IBPs should be connected wherever possible to existing Indigenous community controlled communication facilities in communities.

Financial sustainability

AICA does not view pessimistically that Indigenous communities do not have the capacity to achieve a level unique to that community for commercial and financial sustainability with new telecommunication technology. Each community and their community members have the potential to achieve unlimited gains once the establishment of quality infrastructure, initial training and support and proper legislations directed to achieve those gains are in place. The survival of a peoples

does always depend on prolonging government support and nor should programs be directed to prolong that support.

Commonwealth Funding: The States and territories

AICA does not support the view that communications is solely a Commonwealth responsibility. The idea that the Commonwealth only exercise numerated constitutional powers and state exercise their reserved powers left over from the constitution was rejected in the 1920's.

Therefore, it is AICA's view that the States and territories **must** provide the funds for *essential services* or in the shared area of communication, as they do for all their other citizens living in each respective State or territory, provide resources to enable the maximisation of opportunities associated with communications.

The need for State and territories to provide funds to telecommunications and information technology in Indigenous communities are evident when:

- Indigenous services are exercising or delivering essential State or territories service responsibilities
- no matter whether the delivery of these services are dominant or make only a portion of that service
- Indigenous communities do not enjoy the same level and quality of services as enjoyed by other citizens of the state or territory
- Indigenous communities are not given the same commercial opportunities arising from communications, funded mainly by the Commonwealth, as do other citizens living in the State or territory.

The commercial opportunities and services utilised by Indigenous communities will mostly be sought from commercial entities and business companies located in the respective State or territory. On that fact alone, State and territory government needs to become increasingly and urgently involved with Indigenous communities in supporting financially new telecommunications and information technology opportunities.

For example, Indigenous broadcasters, and often through inadequate infrastructures, are often the sole provider of delivering State and territory essential services information. A prime example is where the Indigenous broadcaster is solely responsible in alerting emergency services information to not only their community but to all within its service range, vital information and advice in natural disasters; examples are cyclones. The same can be said for all essential services that are State and territories responsibilities; health, education and legal services are prime examples.

The States

AICA is of the strong view that the allocated \$36.6 million telecommunications element of Backing Indigenous Ability should be directed to Indigenous controlled communications and their communities as a priority. State or territory governments programs are secondary to the funding allocations.

AICA firmly is of the view that States must urgently provide substantial funds from their own budgets for the training, use and support components of new

telecommunications and information technology in Indigenous communities. The Indigenous community members are either Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders or both. The Torres Strait Islanders are those who live in the Torres Strait Islands and the majority of Torres Strait Islanders who reside across the Australian mainland.

Secretaries Group on Indigenous Affairs

The Chair of Secretaries Group on Indigenous Affairs, Dr Peter Shergold, in the opening pages of their *Annual Report on Indigenous Affairs 2004-2005* clearly stated the position that AICA gives qualified support:

We must recognise that better connected Indigenous specific programs will never be enough to overcome Indigenous disadvantage. Indigenous specific programs can only be effective if they complement and supplement (not substitute) mainstream programs. Harnessing mainstream programs for reforms will be critical. We need to ensure that mainstream delivers the same opportunities for Indigenous Australians as we expect for non-Indigenous Australians.

The qualified support of AICA for the above statement is that only the each community will decide and determine if this approach in connecting to mainstream programs is the only way that *delivers the same opportunities for Indigenous Australians as we expect for non-Indigenous Australians.*

Overcoming Indigenous Disadvantage: key Indicators 2005

AICA reminds that this report is to be considered and inform decision making when viewing linkages with the Discussion paper. On a much broader approach, all *Connect Australia* programs need to be informed by this report.

Community Champions

The Discussion Paper raises the ongoing position and involvement, which includes financial involvement, of community champions. AICA supports each community decision for the agreement and involvement of a community champion.

The effective use of these people with special telecommunication and associated information technology skills in Indigenous communities and how they pass/train these skills onto community members are a vital link to the success of the introduction and sustainability of both infrastructure and use of new telecommunication and associated technology.

National Register of Community Champions

There needs to a National Register of Community Champions or equivalent State or territory register, and an evaluation process be regularly maintained that involves the community, the community's existing authoritative structures

Intellectual property concerns

AICA holds strong views that intellectual property as that term is understood requires immediate addressing by DCITA. It is clear that although existing intellectual property rights legislation is notoriously inadequate, enough information to Indigenous communities of how and where their intellectual property rights are either recognised or accommodated in Australia law needs to be a part of the framework of BIA. This is a special program of BIA that deserves urgent attention.

ACIA views the preservation of Indigenous cultural material by new information and communications technology to access that cultural material an enormous and potential benefit for the survival of Indigenous peoples; culture and language and sense of self. The commercial aspects of Indigenous unique cultural material is still untapped.

AICA will not support the unrestricted access and use of Indigenous intellectual property unless firm protective legislation is in place to ensure that Indigenous communities have control of their intellectual property. The digital preservation of cultural material need to proceed only by agreed and informed copyright assignment after a educative community program has been satisfactorily completed.

AICA supports a specific special measure allocation of this BIA program be urgently directed to addressing Indigenous concerns with intellectual property.

Shared Responsibility Agreements

AICA acknowledge and respects the individual entity status of each of its members and their respective communities to make their own decisions on the issue of SRA.

It is AICA' view that any SRA must also have the ability to bind more than a agreement between Indigenous peoples and the Commonwealth; SRA's have that potential but are yet to address communication needs in a community. States, territory and relevant local authorities and councils are crucial components to the sustainable and success of any SRA with communication needs. Maintaining essential communication technologies in Indigenous communities are certainly considered to be a high priority for the introduction of SRAs.

The difficulty will be if the Commonwealth does not insist that states and territories fulfil their own constitutional fiscal responsibilities in areas not the responsibility solely of the Commonwealth. Bilateral arrangement are fine but if they cannot even address the dissatisfaction of Indigenous broadcasters locked on only CDEP 'wages' their overall effectiveness can be challenged.

AICA is supportive and adopts the views and concerns of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner with SRAs. [attached]

Community engagement

AICA supports the COAG approach, wherever appropriate, to addressing all Indigenous issues and will assist wherever possible, under the direction of our members, how to assist with this BIA program in providing long overdue telecommunication technologies to Indigenous communities.

Shared community phones

AICA has qualified support in establishing as a priority shared community phones. Community members deserve the same entitlements to a private phone as do all other citizens. That should be the overall aim and not just to place one or more community places telephones unless there was in place a program to allow all community members the right to acquire a phone.

Community phones are not part of the Telstra Standard Marketing Plan and these types

of phones, only considered for use in Indigenous communities lack other consumer safeguards.

Design

ACIA supports the decision of any Indigenous community that has agreed to a community type phone. The community must be involved in the design and maintenance of these phones. Local Indigenous art will play a significant part in avoiding damages to such phones and increase community ownership of the

Summary

This submission is stated to deal only with the allocated \$36.6 million telecommunications component of the IBA Program. AICA have stated our view about this. It is AICA view that any considered DCITA approach to engaging the Indigenous communities in the delivery of:

- identified telecommunication needs; and
- establishing arrangements for the sustainability, suitability and installation of physical telecommunication equipment will be dependent of the valued acceptance of community telecommunication services
- developing and maintain culturally appropriate delivery of services; and most importantly;
- ensuring community ownership, employment and maintenance of telecommunication services
- ensuring Indigenous controlled entities in communities be given priority in funding and training allocations.

requires an understanding of Indigenous interplay with existing communications services, of which Indigenous communications play a major and often only essential service role.

The latter points of ensuring community ownership of communication infrastructure is closely related to employment considerations being factored in to foster a sense of ownership. These considerations are related significantly to future repairs and maintenance costs associated with potential damage to telecommunications facilities placed in a community.

Simply, establishing a culture of community ownership and employment connected with these new telecommunications facilities, for example, a community telephone, will require a wholistic understanding of:

- other strands of communication outlets, example, Indigenous broadcasters, currently operating from a community
- how those strands of communication are accepted by the community; and
- what are existing problems associated with existing communications outlets.

Integration Communications with Connect Australia

It is clear that Indigenous communications also have a crucial role to play in new telecommunication facilities in a community. Their role has to be considered in how linkages can be effectively used. Education of uses, foster community pride in new communication technologies, and ownership and maintenance are just examples of

how linkages to Indigenous broadcasters can be of advantage to any telecommunication package. The same considerations are associated with the proposal to establish the National Indigenous Television.(NITV).

Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner

Social Justice Report 2005

Shared Responsibility Agreements

The term '*Shared Responsibility Agreement*' (SRA) describes agreements between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and groups and Australian governments based on the principle of mutual obligation. The principle of mutual obligation requires both parties, the community and the Government **to each contribute towards making the agreement work**. This fact sheet looks at SRAs in the light of human rights principles and considers developments during the first 12 months of SRA-making.

Human rights principles and SRAs

SRAs have the potential to improve or undermine Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples enjoyment of their human rights.

There are two main issues to be considered in assessing any given SRA from a human rights perspective: the community's participation in its development and the content.

Quality of participation is important

Only a community knows what their needs are and what might work to address them. There are many lessons from the past that show that when governments force change onto communities, the change is often ineffective or not sustainable. To make change long term and successful, communities must have a sense of ownership and participate in all decision making processes. This is upheld by human rights principles.

The quality of participation is the key to unlocking the potential of Shared Responsibility Agreements. In human rights terms, they should be made with the free, prior and informed consent of the people affected by them.

Free, prior and informed consent means the following:

- *Free* - implies no coercion, intimidation or manipulation during SRA-making.
- *Prior* - implies that enough time has been allowed for meaningful community consultation and consensus building about any given SRA.
- *Informed* - implies that all the information necessary to make a decision about any given SRA has been provided and understood.

- *Consent* - the withholding of consent from any SRA should be a freely available option.

In practice this means that a SRA may be only one option among many considered by a community in response to a specific community need. They should not be imposed or made in an atmosphere of fear, or negotiated with inappropriate community representatives.

When a Shared Responsibility Agreement makes Indigenous peoples' access to core minimum human rights entitlements (such as safe drinking water, essential medicines, sanitation, primary health care) conditional on behavioural changes it is potentially in breach of human rights.

A more complicated area is where governments agree to provide a subject matter through a SRA that is *related* to the delivery of basic entitlements or essential services, such as housing, water supply, education or health. It is crucial to ensure that such a SRA does not make the delivery of the actual service or entitlement contingent on meeting obligations for it to comply with human rights obligations.

It should be noted that a SRA may still breach human rights if: it provides a benefit that is over and above essential services; if it is provided in a manner that is discriminatory; or that makes addressing existing inequalities contingent upon the completion of mutual obligation principles.

Compliance of SRAs with human rights

Over one hundred SRA's have been signed in the past year. I have had the opportunity to visit a number of communities that have made SRA's and I have also received copies of the written agreements.

Great care must be taken in passing judgment on individual SRAs. What may at first appear to be a problematic condition in a SRA may in fact represent a solution to a long term problem faced by the community.

Participation: Most of the communities I visited were satisfied about the way the government had directly engaged with them and about the SRA they had made. However, there are some potential areas of concern:

- 18 months into the new arrangements and there appears to be a continued absence of a comprehensive information campaign to fully engage with communities to educate them about the new processes. This raises concerns about the basis on which communities are entering into negotiations on SRAs and particularly, whether communities are able to proceed on an informed basis.
- A small number of communities perceive that they are being 'processed' into making SRAs. This is not conducive to the community giving free, prior and informed consent to the agreement
- A number of agreements involve the government making Community Development Employment Program (CDEP) scheme places available to complete the activity agreed upon in the SRA. A concern with this is that the obligations for CDEP participants must be understood by the community to be separate from the obligations to be undertaken by the community as part of the SRA. The danger is that SRAs and the receipt of income support benefits may become inappropriately linked by community members.

Content: Consultations with communities who have finalised a SRA revealed that generally, subject matters provided through the SRA, reflect the desires of those communities. Many SRAs completed in the past year resulted in tailored services being delivered to meet the

different needs of communities, culturally appropriate service delivery and/or improved accessibility of mainstream services, or increases to the limited economic development opportunities in remote communities. These are all positives from a human rights perspective.

Other issues

The SRA process is an evolving one. At this stage the process appears to lack some of the key elements necessary to ensure the appropriate engagement of Indigenous communities. In particular:

- There is limited information available publicly about the content of SRAs. SRAs are not made available publicly because of privacy reasons, although summaries of most of the agreements that were finalised in 2004-05 have been placed on a government website at: www.indigenous.gov.au/sra.html.

It is important to find out if SRA's are working for Indigenous communities. In particular:

- Establishing benchmark data and rigorous monitoring are required to make sure governments are transparent in all actions and decisions relating to SRAs - it is important to find out if SRAs are improving the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who live in the communities affected by the SRAs.



© Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission
Feedback welcome. Email: webfeedback@humanrights.gov.au Last updated: 16 February 2006.

[[Top ^](#) | [HREOC Homepage](#) | [Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Home](#) | [Social Justice Reports Home](#)]