

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS COMMISSION

INDIGENOUS FUNDING INQUIRY

SUBMISSION

From: Western Australian Treasury

Submission No.: IFI/SUB/0021

Date Received: 19/04/2000

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	Page 1
2.	Conceptual Issues.....	Page 5
3.	Functions not included in the terms of reference	Page 15
4.	Housing	Page 19
5.	Infrastructure.	Page 29
6.	Employment and Training.....	Page 33
7.	Health.....	Page 39
8.	Education.....	Page 45

Appendix: Draft Agreement for the Provision of Essential Services to
 Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia

1. INTRODUCTION

This submission examines a range of issues that the Commission will need to address in its Indigenous Funding Inquiry. It aims to provide relevant information for each of the functional areas listed in the terms of reference, including the approach of State service providers in assessing indigenous needs and allocating resources.

The submission also highlights as important issues:

- the interactions between those functional areas listed in the terms of reference and other functions not explicitly mentioned;
- the standard of services required by remote communities;
- the high costs faced in providing services to those communities; and
- the unmet needs of many indigenous people.

By almost every measure – health, housing, education, employment – indigenous people are the most disadvantaged group in Australia. In Western Australia this is exacerbated by the majority of indigenous communities being concentrated in areas which mitigate against effective service delivery – low population, vast areas, harsh environments, high unmet needs and narrow or non-existent local economic base. The difficulties in providing services in these areas need to be recognised, as does the current run-down nature of many facilities and service infrastructure in indigenous communities.

Features of Western Australia that affect delivery of services to these communities include:

Demography

Western Australia has about 15% of the indigenous population of Australia and indigenous people represent 3% of the total Western Australian population. Approximately 52.7% (or 30,000) of the indigenous population live in the north-west and central regions of the State, often in communities remote from the nearest town. In these regions, indigenous peoples represent over 15% of the total population. In particular regions, the percentage is as high as 66.75% (Malarabah region) and 52.02% (Wunan region).

Disadvantage

The disadvantaged position of indigenous peoples and communities is well documented. The obvious indicators of this disadvantage are high mortality rates, high unemployment rates, low literacy and numeracy levels, and low school participation and retention rates.

Dispersion

Western Australia is the largest of all Australian States and Territories. Spanning 2,529,880 square kilometres it accounts for nearly one-third (32.89%) of Australia's total landmass. However, Western Australia has only 9.46% of Australia's population. Australia has an average of 2.38 persons per square kilometre. In comparison Western Australia has an average of only 0.697 persons per square kilometre.

Remoteness

Western Australia is characterised by the remoteness of its towns and regional centres. Remoteness is caused by factors including distance, geographic and climatic barriers, lack of infrastructure and population distribution.

Distance

Unlike the eastern seaboard, much of Western Australia's coastline is not settled, resulting in particularly large distances between major regional centres in the northern and central regions of the State.

Climate

During the wet seasons, the largest part of the northwest is isolated through flooding and cyclones. As noted above, much of central Western Australia is encompassed by one of the State's three major deserts - the Great Sandy Desert, Little Sandy Desert and the Great Victoria Desert.

Lack of infrastructure

The high costs involved in servicing remote regions in Western Australia has inhibited the development of many northern and central areas, thus contributing to their isolation. Limited infrastructure impacts on access to:

- air travel, which is infrequent and expensive between major regional centres and non-existent to smaller settlements;
- land travel, which is impossible during certain times of the year because of flooding and the lack of sealed roads;
- expensive communication options - much of Western Australia is not connected to land lines and there are few local Internet service providers outside the metropolitan area; and
- natural water supplies, with water being piped into the State's Wheatbelt, Goldfields and Central Desert regions.

Cultural and linguistic diversity

The indigenous population of Western Australia is characterised by high levels of cultural and linguistic diversity, with many individuals speaking English as a second (or third) language. The sparse and wide dispersion of the indigenous population results in cultural and linguistic diversity that is far more evident than in other States and Territories.

2. CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

This chapter addresses a range of conceptual issues relating to the inquiry that are raised in the Commission's February 2000 Information Paper. Some conceptual issues relevant to specific functional areas are discussed in later chapters.

Deciding the service standard

The terms of reference ask the Commission to measure the needs of groups of indigenous people relative to one another (Clause 1) for the purpose of recommending a funding distribution. To measure relative need for this purpose, it is necessary to have a benchmark or standard on which to determine need. The needs faced by each indigenous group can then be measured as that required to achieve the standard level of service.

Selecting the standard

The standard level of service against which needs of indigenous people should be assessed is the national average standard of services provided to all persons in Australia.

This would be readily measurable and provide equitable treatment of indigenous persons in the provision of government services. Such an approach is also consistent with general moves across all levels of government to integrate services to indigenous communities into mainstream programs. This reflects an aim to ensure services are comparable to mainstream programs and service delivery is progressively normalised.

Use of a standard based on the entire Australian population would also be consistent with the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsement of the *National Commitment to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders* (December 1992). This effectively represents the commitment of all governments to ensure that indigenous Australians receive no less a provision of services than other Australian citizens.

An alternative standard the Commission could select for this inquiry would be a standard based on services currently provided to the indigenous population (ie. use the indigenous average as the standard). However, it is commonly recognised that the needs of the indigenous population are often inadequately met due to funding constraints and other factors. In these circumstances, basing the standard on an existing service level for indigenous people would not help adequate service levels to be achieved and is likely to attract criticism.

Another alternative would be a standard which varies between regions based on the average policy adopted by the Commonwealth and State governments (eg. a different standard between rural and metropolitan regions). In its assessment of State general revenue grant relativities, the Commission has equalised States' capacity to provide services using a standard that reflects reduced service provision in remote regions.

However, the terms of reference for this inquiry ask the Commission to report on "the relative needs ... for each geographic region" (Clause 4(i)). To do this, the same standard is required for each region. Furthermore, a regionally varying standard would add considerably to the complexity of the analysis, as the standard would not be easy to determine and would require considerable judgement.

Without additional funding above current levels, no government can lift service standards for the entire indigenous population to the national average for all Australians. However, for the purposes of producing meaningful measures of relative need as a basis for distributing funding, the Commission seems to have little alternative but to adopt a standard based on the entire Australian population.

Measuring the standard

The standard should be measured in terms of outcomes (eg. the level of adequate housing, health status), rather than inputs (eg. amount of funding spent), because:

- uniform outcomes across regions can be used as the standard, whereas the need for inputs (and even outputs) will vary across regions. For example, the funding required to achieve outcomes will differ between regions for reasons such as that in tropical regions, the environment is less healthy so good health status is harder to achieve;
- if the desired outcomes have not been met, the needs of the indigenous population has not been met;
- funding for indigenous services often is not well targeted, resulting in significant expenditures that do not achieve the desired outcomes; and
- outcomes are often best achieved by a mix of expenditures across different functions.

The terms of reference require the Commission to report on distributions of funding to meet need (Clause 4(ii)). Therefore, the Commission will need to determine the funding required to achieve outcomes.

Identifying needs in terms of high level outcomes, and building a model that leads to meeting these outcomes could be a useful tool. This approach is consistent with Output Based Management (OBM) which is currently being adopted widely by Australian public sector agencies in the development of performance measures and reporting arrangements.

In OBM terms, the key is identification of the right mix of outputs required to achieve the desired outcome. If need is measured according to the extent to which outcomes are met or not met, the questions to pose are:

- what is required to be done to meet the need?
- what is currently being done, and who is doing this?
- what more needs to be done, and who should do this?

An OBM purchasing framework would be useful in mapping out how Commonwealth and State funding can be combined to produce shared outputs and contribute towards common outcomes.

Different standards for different functions?

The overall logic of the needs assessment, and so the selection of the standard, should be the same for all functions (although the technical measurement may vary between functions).

For each function, the standard should be based on national average services (measured as outcomes) provided to the total population.

For some functions it will be possible to do this at a more disaggregated range of sub-functions than in other functions. Also, the available data will enable the Commission to be more precise for some functions.

Interaction of service providers

A mix of Commonwealth, State, local government, community and private service providers are involved in meeting needs of indigenous communities in Western Australia. This reflects a range of historical, legal, constitutional, financial and political factors.

Role of the Commonwealth

The Commonwealth's involvement in indigenous affairs dates back at least to the 1967 Constitutional referendum. This was overwhelmingly passed to allow the national government to legislate for indigenous people concurrently with the States. This mandate effectively provided the basis for the Commonwealth to assume primacy in indigenous affairs. The first national programs were set up in the late 1960s, in education and enterprise developments.

However, while the Commonwealth has primacy for indigenous affairs, the State and Territory Governments (with local governments) have primary responsibility for all programs relating to education, hospitals and health care, child welfare and protection, family services, law and justice, housing and municipal services, roads and other infrastructure, and land use and heritage protection. In delivering these programs States provide services to indigenous people through both indigenous-specific and mainstream programs.

In recognition of their joint involvement in service provision, the rights of indigenous Australians and the continuing lack of significant improvement in the lives of indigenous people, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsed the *National Commitment to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders* in December 1992 (see box).

This effectively represents the commitment of all Governments to ensure that Indigenous Australians receive no less a provision of services than other Australian citizens.

The long-standing lack of significant shifts in socio-economic indicators for the indigenous population reflects their long history of disadvantage. A complex pattern of historical, legal, constitutional, financial and political issues have influenced, and continue to influence the level and quality of government service provision to indigenous Australians.

However, these influences appear to have been hindered by:

- lack of clear delineation of Commonwealth/State/local government responsibilities to indigenous people;
- problems with Commonwealth/State indigenous funding allocations;
- lack of coordination in the planning and development of programs and services amongst different levels of government;
- the inappropriate delivery of programs and services, compounded by the delivery of inappropriate programs and services; and
- problems with access to programs and services.

The Commonwealth has a substantial role in the provision of services to indigenous people due to its Constitutional powers, the greater needs of indigenous persons compared to non-indigenous persons and the higher cost of servicing the significant portion of the indigenous population which lives in remote communities.

NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO IMPROVED OUTCOMES IN THE DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR ABORIGINAL PEOPLES AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS

December 1992

Amongst a number of declarations in the *National Commitment*, the Governments of Australia:

(Principles)

- have as one of the guiding principles, increased clarity with respect to the roles and responsibilities of the various spheres of government through greater demarcation of policy, operational and financial responsibilities;

(Roles and Responsibilities)

- affirm that this *National Commitment* arises from their shared responsibility for the development of national policy, for planning, for funding, and for the provision of government programs and services for Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islanders;
- agree that this *National Commitment* provides the framework for a series of bilateral agreements between the Commonwealth and the State and Territory Governments;
- acknowledge that the Commonwealth Government has accepted a special responsibility for Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islanders following the amendment of the Australian Constitution pursuant to the referendum of 1967;
- recognise that the Commonwealth has a special responsibility arising from Australia's international obligations to its Indigenous peoples; and
- accept that agreements entered into by the States of New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia with the Commonwealth pursuant to the *Aboriginal Affairs (Arrangements with the States) Act 1973* will be replaced by this *National Commitment* and bilateral agreements entered into pursuant to it between the Commonwealth and respective States and Territories.

The *National Commitment* also provides for an agreed framework for improving outcomes for Indigenous Australians in terms of planning, funding, delivery of services, agreements and reporting and review.

The Commission's terms of reference ask it to examine relative need for services both provided by the Commonwealth or funded by specific purpose payments from the Commonwealth (Clause 1). Therefore, if the Commonwealth currently has some involvement in funding services, that funding would come within the scope of this inquiry.

This means, functions within Commonwealth responsibility can be defined on the pragmatic basis of current practice. Note, however, that the Commonwealth may be spending on a particular purpose in one region and not another – in which case the Commission should recognise that the Commonwealth has some responsibility for that purpose, but that the current distribution of funding (zero in one region) may not be needs based.

State Governments

In distinguishing between Commonwealth and State responsibility, the Commission should “draw the line” on a basis that is policy neutral between States. Otherwise, applying any results from the inquiry will penalise States which increase expenditure because it will show a reduced “need” for Commonwealth expenditure, ie. there will be grant design inefficiency. It is important that States not be given incentives to reduce expenditure so as to increase Commonwealth funding. Such incentives could undermine the desire for Commonwealth and State agencies to work together, which is an essential requirement for addressing needs in remote indigenous communities.

An approach the Commission has used in the past in State general revenue grant relativities to reduce incentives to States to alter their behaviour is to “freeze” the assessments, ie. assessments are based on actual practice, but are not updated over time as practice changes. For example, in its 1993 Review of State general revenue grant relativities, the Commission calculated the amount States needed to spend on Aboriginal communities based on historical amounts they actually spent. To remove any incentives for the States to increase expenditure purely to increase grants, the Commission did not update this assessment between the 1993 and 1999 Reviews.

However, we do not support such an approach in this inquiry as:

- it would penalise States which have put in additional effort;
- it would “institutionalise” lower Commonwealth funding in some States, forcing those States to maintain higher effort, which would be unsustainable in the longer run; and
- the assessments would not stay “frozen” in the longer run (eventually they must be updated for new data or they will become irrelevant).

To achieve policy neutrality, the Commission should calculate total need for services and then subtract the need that would be met by State governments if they applied average policies.

Furthermore, when calculating this standardised State expenditure (ie. State expenditure based on standard policy), the Commission should take account of the differences in service provision between, for example, remote and non-remote regions that is reflected in average State policy. All States provide a lower standard of service in remote regions and the Commission's assessment of State general revenue grant relativities reflects this standard policy.

Therefore, the Commission does not provide the funds to States to enable them to provide the same standard of service in all regions – which is a contributing factor to greater need for higher Commonwealth expenditures on indigenous people in remote regions.

Local Government

Local government also plays an important role in providing services to indigenous communities. While Constitutional responsibility for local government rests with the States, the Commonwealth has developed financial and administrative relationships which are important influences on local government and the resources available to it.

Within Western Australia, attention has been given to the difficulties faced in the provision of local government services to indigenous communities (eg. street lighting, roads, building and health inspection). In some areas, consideration has been given to indigenous communities being seen as local government entities in their own right. In other areas, consideration is being given to communities paying rates as part of negotiations for access to mainstream local government services.

Again, in distinguishing responsibilities for service provision between the three tiers of government, the Commission should do so on the basis of local government policy neutrality. However, this may be even more difficult than for States because of the regional spread of local governments. There is considerable variation in the needs of indigenous people in different local government areas and in the capacity of local governments to fund services.

In particular, local governments in remote regions have very little capacity to fund service provision. They are faced by far higher costs compared to less remote regions and their populations have much less capacity to pay rates (particularly indigenous communities, most of which are currently exempt from paying local government rates).

The equal per capita distribution of financial assistance grants between States and the requirement that no local government receive less than 30% of its per capita share of funds means that local governments in remote regions of most States are not equalised to have the same capacity to provide services as local governments in metropolitan areas. This serves to severely disadvantage the residents of remote indigenous communities.

Non-Government Organisations

In some areas, non-government organisations are important providers of services to indigenous communities. Funding from non-government organisations reduces the need for government funding and there are significant differences between regions in the involvement of non-government organisations.

These differences should be taken into account, provided they do not reflect policy differences between State and local governments. To do this, when the Commission identifies total need by region, it should subtract need actually met by private providers (except where this is identified as being influenced by State policy).

Assumptions about the future

The Commission's Information Paper raises the issue of what assumptions, if any, should be made about the future levels and geographic distribution of funding provided by service providers other than the Commonwealth.

Making recommendations about needs-based funding distributions will be hard enough and we do not believe the Commission should speculate about future funding.

Furthermore, future funding by other service providers may be influenced by the Commission's recommendations regarding Commonwealth funding.

It would make more sense for the Commission to identify any issues which may make the assessments less relevant over time and for the assessments to be updated in the future as necessary.

Range of Commonwealth programs considered

The terms of reference explicitly require the Commission to take account of funding available from alternative sources, including mainstream programs (Clause 3(i)). However, it is unclear whether the Commission is to recommend:

- a distribution of all funding which is used to service indigenous persons (regardless of whether or not the funding is indigenous specific); or
- a distribution of indigenous specific funding which takes account of the existing distribution of mainstream funding.

Whichever approach the Commission adopts, it is important that all mainstream programs be taken into account.

The Commission's inquiry should be as comprehensive as possible. The terms of reference ask the Commission to measure need for services (Clause 1). Need for services is not affected by whether those services are met through mainstream or indigenous specific programs.

For example, indigenous persons have high health needs, particularly in remote regions. These needs can be met through indigenous specific health programs or by mainstream funding such as the Medicare Benefits Scheme (MBS). The far lower Commonwealth MBS expenditure on indigenous people in remote regions compared to the rest of the population means that more of the burden falls onto the indigenous specific programs and there is greater unmet need.

Likewise, indigenous people have their housing needs met both from indigenous specific programs and

through a disproportionately high share of mainstream public housing (11% in Western Australia). However, the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement funding for mainstream public housing does not currently take account of the higher usage by indigenous people.

The terms of reference are not clear as to what level of functional dissection the Commission should calculate funding distributions, eg. a distribution by the major functional areas such as health, or a distribution of funding for each program within the health function.

To give meaningful results, the Commission should calculate funding distributions at the most dissected functional level that is practical, even if the final result is an aggregation of those calculations.

Needs for infrastructure

The provision of infrastructure has a direct impact on the welfare of indigenous people. For example, an inadequate water supply will affect health status, a reliable power supply is required for quality education and for livable housing and all service delivery requires roads for access of staff and freight.

There are two aspects of need for infrastructure that the Commission must measure:

- the ongoing provision of infrastructure to meet the standard level of outcomes – the Commission can either measure this through the recurrent cost of maintaining infrastructure and servicing debt on infrastructure, or by the capital cost of providing infrastructure; and

- the need in some regions for a higher initial investment of resources to bring inadequate infrastructure up to an appropriate level to enable a standard level of outcomes to be achieved (this is required by Clause 3(iii) of the terms of reference) - the Commission will need to consider existing facilities and infrastructure, and current unmet need.

Needs-based distribution of funds

The Commission has long applied the fiscal equalisation principle which enables States to provide the standard level of services. This same principle of funding to achieve a standard service level should be applied when determining the distribution of Commonwealth funds to meet indigenous need.

However, the available Commonwealth funding may not be sufficient to provide the same standard of service in highly disadvantaged regions as occurs, largely from mainstream programs, in more advantaged regions. In this case, the best the Commission can do in its assessments is to recommend funds be distributed to the areas of greatest need first.

This will minimise the gap in needs that can be met between regions. Otherwise, more advantaged regions will receive funds to further improve their services at the expense of more disadvantaged regions, leaving a service gap greater than could be achieved.

Costs and efficiency of service provision

The need for services cannot be met equally between regions unless the cost of providing services is taken into account. As currently assessed by the Commission in determining State general grant relativities, the cost of services can even be defined as part of need.

Cost factors are any factors beyond the control of the service provider which increase the cost of achieving an outcome. These include the isolation of regions (which increases costs of attracting staff and transport costs of staff and freight) and cultural factors (such as semi-nomadic practices and lack of English speaking background among traditional indigenous persons in remote regions).

If differences in efficiency are beyond the control of the service providers (eg. less clients serviced per staff member because of travelling time or cultural complexities) they are part of the cost of providing services and should also be taken into account in the funding distribution.

Differences in efficiency which are within the control of the service providers (eg. less clients serviced per staff member because of rostering arrangements) can be considered part of policy and should not be taken into account.

3. FUNCTIONS NOT INCLUDED IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Commission's terms of reference list functional areas it should cover in the inquiry, but also explicitly invites the Commission to include other areas it thinks appropriate.

Experience shows that meeting the needs of indigenous persons requires coordinated effort across functional areas – some of which may be outside the core areas identified in the terms of reference.

Some examples of interactions are:

- the health status of indigenous persons can be improved by increased expenditure on education, infrastructure (eg. improved water supply) and housing (eg. reduced overcrowding);
- improved education can depend on better health (eg. addressing hearing problems can improve learning outcomes);
- improved welfare and policing services can increase educational status (eg. by reducing truancy);
- improved income and employment can reduce needs in most functions; and
- provision of land tenure can influence, and be influenced by, the provision of other services.

Further information on the impact of housing on health is presented in the later chapter on housing.

For all these reasons, we encourage the Commission to address needs in areas beyond the core areas listed in the terms of reference and to take account of the interactions among all these functional areas.

Measuring interactions will not be simple.

One approach might be for the Commission to recognise that indicators of need across a range of functions will be relevant to any area of expenditure (eg. indicators of health status may show a greater need for housing). Similarly, each of the other functional areas listed in the Commission's terms of reference has been shown to have a significant impact on health outcomes.

However, a further complication in measuring interactions arises because experience shows that there exists a lag between the improvement in areas such as housing, infrastructure and education and the improvement in health status.

Income Support

A significant area that has not been listed in the Commission's terms of reference is income support.

The level of income support provided by the Commonwealth to indigenous people, especially in rural and remote areas, should be examined by the Commission.

The Commonwealth establishes the payment levels and weights for rural and remote areas without regard to the higher living costs for indigenous people. The cost of food is between two and three times higher, on certain items, than the city (eg. a kangaroo tail sells for \$9.00 in the east Kimberley, but is treated as pet food elsewhere).

In remote areas, income support is often the sole source of income. There is often no employment in Aboriginal communities and very little in towns. The functional area of income support also includes the ATSI funded Community Development Employment Programs (CDEP) which is essentially 'work for the dole'. Although CDEP wages for remote regions are higher than for non-remote regions, the difference (\$185.73 per week compared to \$167.27 per week) is inadequate to cover the additional cost of living.

A minimal level of income may be adequate in metropolitan areas and larger rural centres, where other avenues of support exist. However, the practical outcome of not including income support as an area within the inquiry is to ignore situations in remote communities where, in the face of high prices and a lack of other support, indigenous people literally starve for a significant part of the fortnight CDEP cycle.

A further reason for examining income support is because currently there is not a consistent application of principles for income support through CDEP. This inconsistency generates frustration across communities. For example, there are some communities which have tried to be self sufficient and in the process have lost ATSI funding or been threatened with that outcome. Understandably, it proves confusing to those communities.

Land Tenure

Another issue which the Commission may need to consider is the impact of land tenure on funding and the need for services.

In Western Australia, the State Government is cautious about granting land tenure to communities. The following two primary issues have restricted progress of applications:

- access to current and recurrent funding to communities for the provision of initial and ongoing maintenance of infrastructure and other services; and
- the impact on overall government funding resulting from a proliferation of new community living areas without proper planning and consideration of long term health, social, economic and living standards.

Current State policy is to give priority to the grant of tenure to those communities that have been established "on the ground" for a number of years and where there is sufficient evidence of likely ongoing funding under current arrangements (primarily through ATSI).

However, difficulties arise because ATSI will not commit to funding without a community holding tenure to the required land.

This results in unmet need for government services from communities that do not have the stability to obtain an expectation of funding sufficient to enable land tenure to be granted. The Commonwealth has a responsibility to ensure adequate funding for these communities.

4. HOUSING

Indigenous Housing in Western Australia

Housing is an urgent and important need for indigenous people in Western Australia. The living environments of indigenous people are well recognised as having a major impact on needs in other areas, particularly health.

Considerable effort has been put into determining indigenous housing need and as better quality data becomes available more accurate assessments will be possible. Notwithstanding this, indigenous housing continues to be characterised by a severe shortfall in financial resources required to meet outstanding needs.

In contrast to the broader community, Australia's indigenous population is young and growing with a high rate of family formation, factors that will increase pressure on housing provision in the near future. In Western Australia, there was a 22% increase in indigenous people during the 1991-1996 inter-Censal period to 50,793. There was also a 33% increase in family formation among the indigenous community.

Despite the increased efforts of Commonwealth, State and community providers, the capacity to address the current need for more houses and support for other strategies (such as training and asset maintenance programs) is limited by funding constraints.

Commonwealth

The Commonwealth provides indigenous housing funding through both the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement's Aboriginal Rental Housing Program (ARHP) and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission Community Housing and Infrastructure Program.

Funding through ARHP has been maintained at \$15.9 million in Western Australia (and \$91 million nationally) annually since 1989-90. The Western Australian Ministry of Housing contributes an additional \$5 million to supplement the ARHP. The ARHP was quarantined from the effects of efficiency dividends and from a \$50 million reduction in overall Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (CSHA) funds in 1997-98, however, funding has not increased in ten years. Since 1989, it is estimated that ARHP funding in Western Australia has decreased \$7.5 million in real terms.

Although Western Australia currently receives 17.4% of the Commonwealth's funding for ARHP, the State only receives 9.5% of the far larger CSHA base funding, which is also used in the provision of mainstream public rental housing to indigenous clients.

Aboriginal clients form an estimated 11% of all mainstream tenancies. The substantial reliance on public housing by indigenous people (well above their population share) shows the importance of including the CSHA base funding in the Commission's analysis. This Commonwealth funding is an integral part of meeting the indigenous housing needs.

State

As well as Aboriginal applicants being eligible for mainstream public rental housing, the Ministry of Housing manages a further 2,500 houses acquired under the ARHP specifically for Aboriginal people.

Through the Aboriginal Home Ownership Scheme, the Ministry provides home ownership opportunities for Aboriginal households. According to the 1996 Census, only 31% of these households fully owned or were purchasing their homes compared with 70% of other non-Indigenous households.¹ This scheme, which receives State funding of \$5 million on an annual basis, has administered over 230 loans since its inception in 1995.

There has also been a shift in recent years to improve housing outcomes for indigenous people by shifting funding priorities. Western Australia now directs a proportion of funds to providing essential 'housing-health' related infrastructure and maintaining and upgrading houses, rather than using all available resources for the construction of new houses.

In 1992-93 the Western Australian Aboriginal Housing Board, with the Ministry of Housing, introduced the Management Support Program (MSP) which focuses on maintenance and upgrade and housing management, rather than the predominant activity of new construction. A major aspect of the MSP is that assistance is tied to improvements in management of housing stock.

The MSP now covers 34 Aboriginal communities in Western Australia. In 1999-2000, the Ministry of Housing will spend approximately \$6.457 million on the MSP. It is intended that this approach will lead to a greater number of habitable dwellings for Aboriginal people throughout Western Australia.

The Ministry of Housing also provides repair and maintenance services for power, water and waste water in 62 Aboriginal communities in Western Australia. This is being implemented in conjunction with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) under a joint program management arrangement with Ove Arup and Partners.

¹ *Public Expenditure on Services for Indigenous People: Education, Employment, Health and Housing*, Neutze, Max; Sanders, Will; Jones, Giff; The Australia Institute, Discussion Paper No. 24 September 1999, p41.

Three regional service providers were contracted from 1 July 1998 for a period of 18 months under the essential services repair and maintenance program. This program requires the regional service provider to develop and implement a training and employment initiative. The purpose of this initiative is to provide the skills required by community members to undertake their responsibilities in regards to the operation of the essential services within their community.

The Ministry of Housing and ATSIC jointly fund a number of Essential Service Operator Positions in nominated communities selected to trial this initiative. It is intended that these positions be filled by qualified operators as they complete the accredited training modules. It is expected that the number of positions, and communities involved, will increase once the effectiveness of the strategy has been demonstrated.

Community

Indigenous community housing organisations, which have been established to manage housing services in all discrete Aboriginal communities, have a particularly important role to play in providing housing to indigenous people. Approximately 280 indigenous community housing organisations in Western Australia (including outstations) manage in excess of 2,700 dwellings.²

These organisations provide housing in all parts of Western Australia, including isolated areas that do not have public housing or private rental housing. They are funded through the Ministry of Housing's Management Incentive Program and through rent received from managed properties.

The indigenous community housing sector is fundamental to indigenous community development and self-reliance. Indigenous control and management of housing enables communities to make or influence decisions about their own future. It also facilitates community ownership of housing resources, provides training and employment opportunities and contributes to the economic independence of communities.

Measuring Needs

Problems with service provision

The indigenous housing sector has faced a range of significant problems and structural impediments in Western Australia. These problems have often resulted in inadequate housing for indigenous people, with associated effects on their health and wellbeing.

² *Indigenous Community Housing Mapping Project*, Community Housing Federation of Australia, June 1999.

Western Australia experiences significant overcrowding in indigenous dwellings and is ranked second after the Northern Territory. Over 8% of the indigenous population in the State live in dwellings with 10 or more persons.³

There are a number of reasons for these problems.

At the State level, efforts have been made to improve delivery of government housing services by removing overlap in program administration, improving coordination among housing and infrastructure and focusing on training and support for indigenous housing organisations. Board or management committee members and staff of indigenous community housing organisations often lack the skills necessary to manage housing and tenancies having limited skills development opportunities. In many areas the high cost of living and poorly maintained houses undermine people's ability or willingness to pay rent. This further undermines indigenous housing organisations' ability to sustain houses and achieve long-term viability.

Where houses deteriorate, there is a commensurate rise in the backlog of unmet housing need. Current estimates of this backlog clearly indicate a problem that is growing and requires urgent action. In a recent study of the 1996 Census, the unmet bedroom need for Western Australia was estimated to be 5,932 bedrooms.

Demand for indigenous housing is also increasing due to the young and growing indigenous population and a high rate of family formation. The generally higher than expected growth in the indigenous population has been attributed to three factors:

1. An increased propensity on the part of individuals to declare indigenous status on the Census form;
2. The population expansionary effects of inter-marriage which results in births of indigenous children being above the level due to indigenous mothers alone; and
3. Improved enumeration by the ABS.⁴

The total number of new dwellings being provided for Aboriginals has been declining. However, while fewer houses are being constructed, more are being maintained in a healthy, habitable state and, therefore, are likely to remain in use for a greater length of time.

³ *The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*, 1999, p48.

⁴ *The Relative Economic Status of Indigenous People in Western Australia, 1991 and 1996*, Taylor, John, CAEPR Discussion Paper No 157, Centre for Economic Policy Research, The Australian National University, Canberra, 1998.

Other reasons for the decline in new dwellings are:

- a reduction over the period of the real value of identified funds (as noted earlier, it is estimated that ARHP funding in Western Australia has fallen \$7.5 million in real terms since the signing of the CSHA in 1989);
- an increase in the cost of construction. In 1995 the average cost of a three bedroom dwelling in the Kimberley was \$110,000 compared to the current average cost of construction of \$155,000 - a 41% increase;
- an improvement in the standard of housing through such initiatives as the implementation of the *National Framework for Design, Construction and Maintenance of Indigenous Housing*;
- the costs of redesigning houses to better meet local need; and
- using housing funds to link training and employment to housing construction.

Of all housing types the indigenous housing sector probably requires the most skills to administer. Indigenous housing faces a range of constraints and complications from the high costs associated with remote locations to the issues relating to social stability. Gaining the skills to deal with these issues can be a daunting task.

A strategy for improving skills in housing management and other areas often faces the problems of literacy and numeracy in some communities. This can be coupled with a relatively high level of complexity in the tasks to be tackled.

Needs Assessment

In April 1997 Commonwealth, State and Territory Housing Ministers convened to discuss indigenous housing issues and resolved to address the impediments to improving housing and related health outcomes for indigenous people.

A Commonwealth-State Working Group on Indigenous Housing (CSWGIH) was established with the mandate to progress the Ministers' resolution to:

- determine and address the unmet housing need of indigenous people;
- improve the capacity of indigenous community housing organisations;
- ensure safe, healthy and sustainable housing; and
- improve the coordination of program administration.

To this end, the CSWGIH commissioned the development of a new, "multi-measure" approach to assessing indigenous housing need and for determining resource allocation through both ARHP and Community Housing and Infrastructure Program (CHIP).⁵ The measures to be used are:

- homelessness;
- overcrowding;
- level of services (water supply, sewerage and power);
- stock condition; and
- affordability.

The CSWGIH has noted that this multi-measure provides a comprehensive and relevant measure of need and has the potential to determine an informed allocation of the total pool of resources available for indigenous housing, subject to no State receiving less than their current allocation.

In applying the multi-measure model, the CSWGIH acknowledges gaps in the data required to support the five measures, but accepts that the model is best practice in determining need.

Experimental estimates of need using this model have been developed with available data and giving each measure an equal weight.⁶ The estimate of the funds required to meet need is in the vicinity of \$287.39 million in Western Australia. Recurrent costs are estimated at \$17.76 million.

These first experimental estimates of need under this model indicate that despite increased commitments from all parties to indigenous housing, the capacity to address the current unmet need for more houses and fully support other strategies, such as training and maintenance programs, is limited by funding constraints.

In reporting these experimental estimates it was acknowledged that a different weight could be given to each of the measures according to Commonwealth and State policy direction, affecting the allocation of resources. Following Ministers' consideration of the multi-measure needs analysis and the CSWGIH recommendations, consideration will be given to weighting options that would take into account the Commonwealth's policy directions and funding priorities for the allocation of any additional Commonwealth resources.

⁵ *Measures of Indigenous Housing Need and Resource Allocation in the ARHP and CHIP*, Dr Roger Jones, Professor Max Neutze, Dr Will Sanders, April 1998

⁶ *Experimental Estimates of Indigenous Housing Need*, Dr Roger Jones, Quantitative Evaluation and Design Pty Ltd, September 1998

A more accurate assessment of this needs model will be made following completion of ATSI's *Community Housing and Infrastructure Needs Survey* due for release at the end of April 2000. This is expected to provide accurate data on two measures - stock condition and the level of services required (water supply, sewerage and power). It will also provide useful data on "improvised dwellings", an indicator of homelessness.

On the best available evidence, the CSWGIH predicts that when the newly agreed data collections are able to give an accurate picture of program efficiency and effectiveness, and assuming that State Governments are performing at an optimal level, meeting current unmet need cannot be achieved within current resource commitments.

The *Environmental Health Needs Survey (EHNS) Report*, launched separately to the CSWIGH work in December 1998, identified Aboriginal communities with priority environmental health needs across seven core indicators of environmental health being water, power, housing, solid waste disposal, sanitation, dust and dog control.⁷ The EHNS is now the framework for needs based planning and resource allocation by government agencies in Western Australia.

Significant gaps, however, still exist particularly in the areas of solid waste disposal, individual dwelling sanitation and dust control and a massive housing backlog. For example, in Western Australia the average population density measure for Aboriginal communities is 7.1 persons per dwelling compared to the public housing average of 2.2 persons per dwelling. Outstanding need is unable to be fully addressed with the resources available.

Any needs based distribution of funding should recognise that regions with greater homelessness and overcrowding are receiving a lesser standard of service, and so funding should be increased to enable the standard level of service to be achieved in those regions.

Interaction between housing and other services

Comprehensive indigenous advancement is influenced significantly by the ability of the government sector to coordinate its activities to maximise the benefits to and achieve optimum outcomes for indigenous people.

This philosophy is the basis which underpins the COAG National Commitment to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders (1992). This approach, which seeks to achieve benefits within existing resources, implies that there must be practical links between housing service delivery and other related services such as health, infrastructure, training and employment opportunities.

The various manifestations of indigenous disadvantage are inextricably linked and efforts to improve outcomes in housing will have benefits in other areas such as health and training and employment.

Housing for Health

The important connection between housing and health has been underscored in a recent report by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. The report stated that:

"adequate housing, clean water, and removing refuse and human waste are important factors in achieving and maintaining good health."⁸

Without these basic services, a variety of infectious and parasitic diseases develop. These infections can also lead to serious health problems like malnutrition, rheumatic heart disease, hearing loss, skin, heart, bowel, kidneys and liver disease.

⁷ *Environmental Health Needs of Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia - the 1997 Survey and Its Findings*, Environmental Health Needs Coordinating Committee, December 1998.

⁸ *The Health and Welfare of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*, 1999, p45.

These problems exist in indigenous communities, in part, because of poor living conditions, which are a result of poor design and construction, and a lack of housing maintenance. In many cases, houses have been designed and built with little regard to harsh weather and conditions, or in ignorance of the social and cultural aspects of indigenous lifestyles.

Accordingly, the Commonwealth, States and Territories and ATSIC have developed the *National Framework for Design, Construction and Maintenance of Indigenous Housing* which aims to assist in building better quality, safer and longer lasting housing, that will contribute to the health and well-being of Indigenous families and their children.

It should be noted though that research based on overseas comparisons concludes that improvements in health hardware are 'necessary but not sufficient' to improve health.⁹ It can be argued that community development is an essential element and that socio-economic conditions, especially the level of employment and education, are key factors.

Training and Employment Opportunities through Housing Programs

In order for permanent housing and its related infrastructure to be maintained in a serviceable condition indigenous communities require certain basic asset management skills and knowledge.

⁹ Moran, Mark (1997) *Technology and Health in Indigenous Communities - USA, Canada, Australia*, Churchill Fellowship.

In other housing tenures a considerable amount of effort and investment is directed at asset maintenance and this includes routine maintenance and up-grades when they are required. In private rental, for example, there is a whole industry devoted to managing properties and in mainstream public housing and community housing there is a raft of administrative structures providing management and maintenance support.

A recent report found that there has been under-investment in the skills base needed to manage indigenous housing effectively.¹⁰ This report concluded that general organisational skills must be improved to manage housing assets and tenancies more effectively and at the same time to enhance the long-term viability of indigenous communities as independent, self-sufficient communities.

It was also found that community members could become more effectively involved and engaged in managing their own affairs and for individuals there are opportunities for employment both within their communities and beyond.

The State Ministry of Housing has recognised the need to improve asset management skills through its Management Support Program and a number of specialised training related programs.

The Aboriginal Community Construction Program encourages local Aboriginal community members to participate in construction projects where practicable and the Ministry of Housing encourages the establishment of Aboriginal building companies.

Since 1996, the Mid West Training Group at Geraldton has been working in partnership with the Ministry of Housing under special contractual arrangements to enable training of Aboriginal apprentices. The Ministry allocates units from the construction program directly to Mid West Training Group who construct, under license, and also train the apprentices on those projects.

The Ministry of Housing is also exploring opportunities through its New Living Program for building apprenticeship opportunities for tenants. Several Group Training schemes have expressed interest in managing the project and subject to negotiations, the project should commence later this year.

The Commonwealth Department of Employment, Workplace Relations and Small Business (DEWRSB) has indicated possible wage support through its Indigenous Employment Program and recommendations on wages and employment conditions are currently being prepared by the Western Australian Department of Productivity and Labour Relations.

¹⁰ *National Skills Development Strategy for Indigenous Community Housing Management, June 1998.*

References

The following documents (quoted in the preceding chapter) are likely to be of considerable use for the Commission in examining Aboriginal housing need.

Indigenous Housing 1996 Census Analysis, Dr Roger Jones, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission 1999

Environmental Health Needs of Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia - the 1997 Survey and Its Findings, Environmental Health Needs Coordinating Committee, December 1998

Measures of Indigenous Housing Need and Resource Allocation in the ARHP and CHIP, Dr Roger Jones, Professor Max Neutze, Dr Will Sanders, April 1998

Estimates of Indigenous Housing Needs: Towards a Modelling Approach for Funding Allocation, Street Ryan & Associates Pty Ltd, January 2000

Experimental Estimates of Indigenous Housing Need, Dr Roger Jones, Quantitative Evaluation and Design Pty Ltd, September 1998

[The first two documents listed above are publicly available, and we can provide them to the Commission on request. The other three documents are not currently publicly available, but we understand that the Commission has been provided with copies.]

5. INFRASTRUCTURE

The Housing chapter covered a number of issues relevant to the provision of infrastructure services to indigenous communities. The following provides some additional comments specifically about the provision of essential services such as water, power and sewerage to these groups.

Provision of Services

The responsibility for the provision of essential infrastructure has been largely subject to historical factors.

The Commonwealth has met substantial provision of essential services to indigenous communities for a number of reasons, including:

- general recognition of the Commonwealth's responsibility for indigenous persons reflecting its Constitutional power to make laws with respect to indigenous persons;
- the impact of Commonwealth initiatives, eg. with respect to land rights and homeland development, which have encouraged indigenous communities to develop and/or move location; and
- the small size of many indigenous communities, which raises the per capita cost of service provision to prohibitive levels.

However, infrastructure funded by the Commonwealth has a history of inappropriate design and materials usage, including poor construction standards (which contributed to short asset life and sub-standard living conditions), and has received little or no maintenance.

The Commonwealth has a continuing responsibility for the provision of infrastructure.

In Western Australia, prior to 1985 the Commonwealth was responsible for all essential services in remote indigenous communities (services to indigenous people not in remote communities have always been provided by the State as part of mainstream service delivery). Since then, the State has been taking responsibility for providing repairs and maintenance to power, water and sewerage services to a number of indigenous communities – currently the State has responsibility for 62 communities and this is planned to increase to 72 (see box).

The State meets this responsibility through regional service providers referred to in the previous chapter. These contractors visit the indigenous communities every 4-6 weeks to provide cyclical maintenance and 24-hour call out service for emergency repairs.

Indigenous Communities Funded by the State for Repair and Maintenance

KIMBERLEY

Balgo
Bardi / One Arm Point
Bayulu
Beagle Bay
Bidyandanga / La Grange
Bobieding (a)
Bow River (a)
Budgarjook (a)
Cherrabun / Djugerari
Christmas Creek
Guda Guda
Immintji
Jarlmadangah (a)
Junjuwa
Kadjina / Milijidee
Kalumburu
Karmulinunga
Kundat Djaru / Ringers Soak
Kupungarri / Mt Barnett
La Djardarr Bay (a)
Lamboogunian (a)
Lombadina / Djarandjin

Pilbara /Murchison-Gascoyne

Bindi Bindi
Burringurrah
Cheeditha
Jigalong
Kunawarriji (Well 33) (a)
Ngurawaana
Parnngurr / Cotton Creek

Kalgoorlie/Central Reserves

Blackstone
Coonana
Cosmo Newberry
Jamieson / Mantamaru
Kiwirrkurra
Mt Margaret
Mulga Queen
Patjarr

Looma
Lundja
Mandangala (Glen Hill) (a)
Mindibungu / Bililuna
Mowanjum
Mulan / Lake Gregory
Muludja
Ngalingkadji
Ngallagunda / Gibb River
Ngumpan / Pinnacles
Noonkanbah
Oombulgurri
Pandanus Park
Pantijan
Warmun / Turkey Creek
Woolah
Wurrenraginy/Frog Hollow (a)
Yagga Yagga
Yakanara
Yarrunga/Chinaman's Garden
Yiyili

Pia Wadjari
Punmu
Tjalka Wara
Wakathuni
Warralong
Yandeyarra
Yulga Jinna (a)

Tjirrkarli
Tjukurla
Tjuntjuntjara
Wannan
Warakurna
Warburton
Wingelina

The Commonwealth is still responsible for capital works and operating (eg. fuel) costs in all communities, including the 62 for which the State has taken maintenance responsibility. Repairs and maintenance outside of those 62 communities is also the Commonwealth's responsibility.

Nationally, responsibility for smaller communities and outstations generally rests with the Commonwealth. The Western Australian Government accepts responsibility for the provision of services to indigenous communities which meet certain criteria (see Appendix to this submission), one of which is population of at least 50 persons. About 200 of the 270 communities and outstations in Western Australia are below this size, although the majority of the indigenous population of remote areas reside in the other 72 communities. This means that despite the State taking more responsibility, there will always be a need for Commonwealth involvement.

Further information on the responsibilities taken by the Commonwealth and State Governments for essential services to Western Australia's Aboriginal communities is available in a draft agreement between the Commonwealth and the State (see Appendix to this submission). This document is still in the process of negotiation between the Commonwealth and the State, but it largely reflects current practice.

Assessment of Needs

To assess needs for infrastructure, the Commission must consider both the demand for infrastructure and the cost of providing infrastructure.

Demand

Under a national average service level, the benchmark would provide infrastructure for essential services to all indigenous persons. Adequate water supplies, reliable power and waste disposal are necessary for the health and welfare of all indigenous people.

However, demand for initial investment in infrastructure tends to be greater in more remote indigenous communities, due to a lack of past investment. The terms of reference specifies that this should be taken into account by the Commission (Clause 3(iii)).

For Western Australia, the *Environmental Health Needs Survey* provides some detailed information on indigenous communities' infrastructure inadequacies.¹¹

For example, of the communities surveyed, 2.8% of the indigenous population had an inadequate water source (and 39% of communities surveyed reported that their water supply was unsatisfactory).

The extent of the problem varied between regions, with adequate water sources for all of the indigenous population surveyed in Perth and the south west of the State, but an inadequate water source for 10.2% of the indigenous population surveyed in the Yamatji ATSIC region.

The problem is far more prevalent in smaller communities. State wide, 14.5% of the indigenous population surveyed in communities with populations of less than 20 had an inadequate water supply. In the Wunan ATSIC region, this proportion is 28.3%.

A similar picture is also shown for power and waste disposal. Inadequate infrastructure is a greater problem in remote regions and in smaller population communities.

As noted above, while the States are involved in the provision of essential services for larger population communities, the Commonwealth is solely responsible for smaller population communities. The proportion of these communities (which tend to have the greatest needs) varies between regions and States.

Therefore, a prime factor for the Commission to take into account in measuring the need for services funded by the Commonwealth is the distribution of these smaller communities. The Commission should also use information such as that provided in the *Environmental Health Needs Survey* to identify which of

¹¹ *Environmental Health Needs of Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia – the 1997 Survey and Its Findings*, Environmental Health Needs Coordinating Committee, December 1998.

these communities have a lack of infrastructure.

Cost

The provision and operation of infrastructure to indigenous communities is very costly. Some of the factors that affect the cost of service provision are:

- distance from the nearest significant town;
- accessibility of the community (eg. costs are far greater if all freight must come in by air);
- the level and condition of existing infrastructure (including poor planning and poor past provision of infrastructure to meet needs); and
- diseconomies of small scale and lack of permanence of smaller population communities (which, as discussed above, tend to be the responsibility of the Commonwealth).

These factors should be reflected in the Commission's measure of need as they drive the inputs required to achieve appropriate outcomes.

6. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Provision of Employment and Training Services

State Government

The Western Australian Department of Training and Employment is the State agency responsible for assisting indigenous peoples and communities to acquire training, skills and jobs.

The Department has two key roles:

1. Strategically manage the Western Australian vocational education and training (VET) system; and
2. Facilitate the delivery of employment services throughout Western Australia.

The Western Australian VET system provides access to training places; facilitates progression through to nationally recognised qualifications; provides appropriate material to facilitate different learning styles; enhances skill levels in relation to requirements of community and industry needs; ensures access to courses to develop numeracy and literacy skills; and provides skills training in formats appropriate to individual lifestyles.

The Department's objectives in regard to employment services are to provide: access to viable, sustainable employment positions; work-based training opportunities; assistance in gaining employment and in developing effective job search techniques; assistance and support to explore and develop enterprising ideas and self-employment options; job matching services to ensure mutually beneficial employment options; advice on employment opportunities including information on possible future work trends; and employment strategies across a range of industries and indigenous agencies.

The Department provides services to indigenous persons both through mainstream programs and through specifically targeted programs.

Training is specifically targeted to indigenous persons through the location of delivery (eg. onsite delivery training to indigenous communities), selection of content (eg. skills necessary for maintaining facilities in local communities) and style of delivery (eg. flexible entry and exit to enable participants to meet their cultural and family obligations).

Commonwealth Involvement

The provision of VET is primarily the responsibility of States, and is governed by State legislation. However, VET is administered within national arrangements.

Commonwealth legislation, the *Australian National Training Authority Act 1992*, formalises a national commitment to cooperation on training matters across State borders. The Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) Act establishes planning and resourcing mechanisms to give effect to national arrangements.

The ANTA contribution to VET funding in Western Australia represents only 28% of total funding (about \$95 million), with the majority of funding (\$241 million) provided by the State Government (70%) and revenue collection (2%), primarily from student fees.

Commonwealth funding allocated by ANTA to Western Australia is based on the Annual VET Plan submitted by the Department. ANTA funding contributes to the provision of services to indigenous persons through the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) system, and through specifically funded initiatives.

The VET Division of the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) is responsible for the fostering national development in entry level training and in further education and training in co-operation with State governments, industry parties and training providers. DEETYA provides specific funding to the State for indigenous persons under the Indigenous Specific Education Program (ISEP).

Assessment of Needs

Demand for training and employment services

Indigenous participation in VET is growing at a much stronger rate than in other forms of post-compulsory education and training. In Western Australia, participation grew from 1,000 in 1990 to 6,200 in 1998. While representing 3% of the Western Australian population, indigenous people now represent 5.4% of the total number of VET students.

This trend is expected to grow, especially in regional areas of Western Australia where technology and more flexible delivery methods are likely to facilitate an increase in participation rates for the general student age population and especially for Indigenous people in remote locations.

Indigenous peoples, particularly those living in remote communities, experience high levels of unemployment and under-employment. In many regional and remote communities, opportunities for employment are generally restricted to those provided under the Community Development Employment Program.

The north west of the State is expected to experience significant economic growth over the next decade. Almost half of the Kimberley resident population of 28,000 (around 1.5% of the State's total population) is indigenous.

The challenge for the training and employment sector is to provide the indigenous population with the skills to benefit from this economic growth so that they are in a position to fill jobs generated by proposed major projects in the region or to establish community based enterprises.

Improved outcomes are needed for indigenous students who currently experience significantly lower pass rates and higher withdrawal and failure rates than VET students in general, and to significantly strengthen the link between VET delivery and employment, particularly in rural and remote areas.

While participation in VET generally increases employment opportunities, indigenous students experience higher unemployment rates after participating in VET than do other VET students and are less likely, particularly in regional and remote areas, to be supported by an employer.

Meeting these challenges will require ongoing and increased consultation with indigenous communities to ensure: the design and delivery of training and employment services are responsive to local needs and aspirations; increased representation of indigenous peoples in decision-making positions across the training and employment sector; and the provision of VET infrastructure necessary to meet demand.

Costs of Indigenous Training and Employment Services

The provision of training and employment services to indigenous people, particularly those in remote areas of the State, is more expensive than elsewhere.

This is due to a range of general factors outlined in the introduction to this submission, including the remoteness of Western Australia's towns and regional centres, particularly large distances between major regional centres in the northern and central regions of the State, natural barriers (during the wet seasons much of the northwest is isolated through flooding and cyclones) and lack of infrastructure (eg. expensive air and land travel and communications).

The principles of self-determination also require that training and employment services must be responsive to the needs and aspirations of indigenous communities. These necessarily vary across communities depending on their geographical location, their proximity to towns, and their social and economic development preferences.

The dispersion of the indigenous population generally provides only small target groups in any one area making economies of scale difficult.

An increasing number of communities, for example, prefer training to be delivered onsite so that participants do not have to leave their communities to attend courses delivered by training providers in regional towns. Such training can include basic literacy and numeracy courses, vocational training courses, and the skills acquisition necessary to maintain facilities in their local communities (plumbing and waste disposal for example) and/or to set up local enterprises.

This training can be provided through a range of flexible delivery modes, including onsite residential trainers, visiting trainers, online delivery (where the necessary communication and information technology is available), or a mix of onsite and offsite delivery. It must also incorporate flexibility entry and exit to enable individuals and communities to meet their cultural and family obligations.

However, often methods of limiting the costs associated with the delivery of VET in remote locations, including online technologies and distance education by correspondence, are not feasible because of:

- the lack of telephone connections in many communities;
- the expense of using Internet services in the regional areas of Western Australia; and
- the need for mentoring and face-to-face contact.

Factors increasing the expenses associated with the delivery of programs on-site include the cost of sending trainers to remote communities and the time and distance being travelled (including the cost of accommodation, food etc). The infrequency of trainer visits to remote communities due to the distances between out-stations also severely limits the effectiveness of programs.

State Allocation of Resources

It is difficult to quantify the costs of delivering services to indigenous communities in remote areas. However, some idea of cost differentials can be drawn from the funding model used by the Department to fund delivery by TAFE colleges across the State.

While the Department's funding model does not provide differential funding specifically for the training of indigenous students it does recognise the additional costs associated with delivery to indigenous populations, particularly where that delivery takes place in remote parts of the State.

This is effected through:

1. Lower student-teacher ratios (reflecting smaller class sizes) for delivery in remote areas. As teaching hours are the prime driver of college funding, this will result in greater funding per hour of training per student in regional areas.
 - eg. the average student-teacher ratio for the Kimberley College of TAFE in 2000 was 9.12 compared to 15.76 for the Central Metropolitan College of TAFE in Perth.
2. Lower student-teacher ratios for courses that are classified as targeted access and participation courses (ie. courses designed to broaden participation of minority groups such as migrants or indigenous persons) or are literacy/numeracy focussed.
3. Funding for non-teaching staff calculated using a 'step rate' which ensures that smaller colleges (which are typically located in remote areas) receive greater non-teaching funding per hour of training than larger colleges.
4. Loadings of between 20 and 25 percent applied to all salary funding for colleges located in remote areas.
5. Non-salary costs for regional colleges funded at a higher rate than for metropolitan colleges. For example:
 - funding for indirect costs (eg. student ID cards) at remote colleges is funded at three times the rate for metropolitan colleges;
 - funding for semi-variable costs (eg. library books, motor vehicle insurance, stationery, administrative and photocopying costs) at remote colleges is funded at around six times the rate for metropolitan colleges; and
 - funding for fixed costs (eg. electricity, water and cleaning) is based on historical benchmarks, which are considerably higher at remote colleges than at metropolitan colleges.

As a result of these arrangements, the funding model provides relatively higher funding per hour of training for colleges with a high indigenous enrolment. For example, the Eastern Pilbara College of TAFE (with a significant enrolment of indigenous students) receives funding of 2.6 times as much per student curriculum hour of training for students studying metals and mining courses, compared with the Central Metropolitan College of TAFE in Perth.

Factors to be used in determining needs

In determining funding needs for the provision of training and employment services for Indigenous peoples and communities in Western Australia, it is recommended that the Commission consider those factors (outlined above) that contribute to the cost of service provision. The key factors for Western Australia are summarised as follows:

- sparse and wide dispersion of the State's indigenous population that make economies of scale difficult to achieve;
- varying prospects for economic growth and employment opportunities across regions;
- high costs associated with meeting the growing demand by indigenous communities for training and employment services (including delivery, as well as infrastructure such as transport, telecommunications, buildings, equipment, and administration);
- self-determination to ensure that training and employment services are responsive to indigenous needs and aspirations and recognise cultural diversity; and
- funding for services such as health, housing, and education to address the underlying causes of disadvantage and improve Indigenous outcomes in training and employment.

7. HEALTH

Provision of Health Services

What the Commonwealth and State Do

The Commonwealth has a major role in the provision of health services to indigenous persons through a diverse range of programs which need to be covered by the inquiry, including:

- Medical Benefit Scheme (MBS) and Pharmaceutical Benefit Scheme (PBS);
- direct funding of Aboriginal Health Services;
- numerous programs funded through specific purpose payments to the States (eg. Home and Community Care, Highly Specialised Drugs) and
- funding for specific health programs and initiatives (eg. childhood immunisation and sexual health), both mainstream and specifically targeted to indigenous people. Some of these programs are funded via specific purpose payments to the State, some are directly funded through the private sector and others are a combination of State and private sector.

The State Government provides a diverse range of health services to indigenous people. These services are provided through mainstream public hospitals and public health programs, grants to community controlled organisations and specifically targeted programs.

A number of the specifically targeted programs provided by the State receive specific Commonwealth funding, such as the sexual health program and the Coordinated Care Trial.

Where basic primary care services are not provided through private sector provision (MBS/PBS) or by direct Commonwealth funding (Aboriginal Health Services), the State also provides basic primary care services, eg. Warburton (Northern Goldfields), Oombulgurri, Kalumburu (North Kimberley), Warmun (East Kimberley) and the Kutjunga Region (South East Kimberley).

Scope of the Inquiry

Western Australia believes that the assessment of Commonwealth expenditure on the health function needs to be considered in the broadest sense, including areas such as environmental health and social and emotional wellbeing (including mental health).

However, general purpose grants are outside the scope of this inquiry - Clause (1) of the terms of reference specifies that the inquiry is to examine need for Commonwealth own purpose outlays and specific purpose payments.

Although funding under the Australian Health Care Agreements is a specific purpose payment, these funds are included in the pool of funds which are distributed by the Commission's general revenue grant relativities. Therefore, these payments may be best treated in the same way as general purpose grants – so the Commission would not calculate a needs based distribution of these payments.

Nevertheless, the findings of this inquiry may be useful in the Commission's 2004 Review of general revenue grant relativities.

Health activities that are a State responsibility, or funded by a State, are also outside the scope of the inquiry (eg. dental health services). These activities vary across jurisdictions due to policy and practical reasons, and in the absence of Commonwealth expenditure are not relevant to this inquiry.

The Commission should include as comprehensively as possible all Commonwealth health programs irrespective of whether or not they are specifically targeted to indigenous people.

Two key programs that need to be included are the MBS and PBS programs.

These two programs are the largest source of Commonwealth funding for health and to exclude them from the analysis of the health function would make any health findings of the inquiry meaningless. The terms of reference ask the Commission to measure need, which is the same regardless of what funding source is available. The terms of reference also explicitly state that mainstream programs should be taken into account (Clause 3(i)).

It is well known that indigenous people are disadvantaged in their access to the MBS and PBS programs. It has been estimated that non-indigenous people access around four times the level of MBS/PBS health services of that accessed by indigenous people.¹² Indigenous people in remote regions have a particularly low access to MBS/PBS, which is reflected in a combination of unmet need and above standard service delivery by the State. A funding distribution based on need should provide additional funds to these regions, to address the lack of access to MBS/PBS funded services.

¹² *Expenditures on Health Services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People*, J Deeble, C Mathers, L Smith, J Goss, R Webb and V Smith; May 1998; AIHW Catalogue no HWE 6; Publication Number 2225, Commonwealth Department of Health and Family Services.

Assessment of Needs

State Allocation of Resources

The Health Department of Western Australia allocates resources across the State on a zonal basis as outlined in the Department's *Purchasing Intentions 1999-2002*.¹³ Under this arrangement the Department allocates the State's resident population by postcode into one metropolitan and six rural zones.

Purchasing Intentions

The Health Department's *Purchasing Intentions 1999-2002* presents data on each zone, its geography, the characteristics of its population and their general health status, identifying any significant variations from State trends. Acute inpatient activity, using the 1997-98 Hospital Morbidity Data Base, is utilised for persons living in the zone regardless of where their treatment may have occurred. This is crucial in developing purchasing strategies linked to geographic populations rather than hospitals or health services.

The Health Department has also developed a specific set of purchasing intentions for indigenous health services which are contained in *Purchasing Intentions for Aboriginal Health 1999-2000*.¹⁴

Data Requirements

It would be desirable to analyse and define health needs at the finest dissection of function and region possible. However, due to lack of available information it may be necessary to limit needs definition to major health functions such as environmental health and primary health care; and major geographic regions such as the Kimberley, Pilbara, Goldfields and Central Desert.

The Office of Aboriginal Health in Western Australia has considerable data available on Aboriginal Health Statistics (see publications listed at the end of this chapter) most of which can be provided on a regional basis. The range of health data includes, but is not limited to, mortality and morbidity data by major disease groups, environmental health data, life expectancy and neonatal data.

There is no detailed indigenous access and utilisation data for most health programs funded by the Commonwealth, especially across all jurisdictions. However, there are several available studies and reports (such as Deeble et al¹⁵) and considerable information is available in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and South Australia. Western Australia would welcome assisting the Commission to identify alternative useful data sources for the inquiry.

Determining Needs

This is a complex area requiring careful analysis.

The key to this task may be the use of the "capacity to benefit concept" to determine need (ie. that communities without basic facilities have the greatest capacity to benefit).

On this basis, funds would be distributed according to greatest need (ie. bringing those communities with greatest need up to a minimum standard before allocating funds to other communities). The benchmark should be that all indigenous people should have access to the same level of health services as other Australians. However, if there is inadequate funding to achieve this, regions which are already closer to the benchmark should not receive funds at the expense of regions which are further from the benchmark.

There needs to be a clear bias in the preferred method for maximising the benefit/impact of funding. For example, communities that suffer from preventable conditions (such as diabetes) should be targeted for a

¹³ *Purchasing Intentions 1999-2002* is available via the Internet at www.health.wa.gov.au/Publications/index.html.

¹⁴ A copy of this publication will be provided to the Commission by the Office of Aboriginal Health.

¹⁵ Deeble (et al) op cit.

higher share of funding to bring them closer to a minimum level of service provision and eliminate high cost tertiary care (eg. renal dialysis).

It will also be important in the Commission's assessments to ensure that the indigenous community, especially in remote and isolated settings, no longer effectively subsidises health services (through its lack of access to services) of non-indigenous people in metropolitan areas who have unlimited access. The design of a number of Commonwealth funded health services such as MBS/PBS favours private service provision in metropolitan settings. Analysis of MBS data by postcode in Western Australia indicates that people in Perth access MBS services at around twice the per capita level of people in rural areas and around five times that of people in remote areas.

The Commonwealth's current practice of allocating funding to areas of perceived need within jurisdictions further inhibits the provision of funding to address areas of most need. Often it is not only a perceived health need, but the ability of a community to effectively organise and lobby the Commonwealth, that attracts Commonwealth health funding.

The health needs for indigenous people vary between and within jurisdictions because of philosophy and history as well as geography. The result very often is different levels of access to universal Commonwealth funded services for indigenous people with the same need. An example of this is Kutjunga Region (South East Kimberley) with no MBS/PBS usage because Kimberley Health (State) provides services; and Ngampa Health Service in the north west of South Australia with some MBS/PBS because they are serviced by an Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Service.

This means that the Commonwealth funding is not distributed on the basis of need – rather it reflects differing efforts between State Governments, historical factors and the relative skill in lobbying from the communities. The Commission therefore should be wary of using existing arrangements as indicative of need.

In addition, the costs of isolation, dispersion and service delivery scale in the provision of services needs to be included in the Commission's calculations. There are clear cost disability factors that are outside the control of governments and in order to provide an adequate level of service, funding needs to be cognisant of these factors. The Commission should consider drawing on relevant information used in the assessment of State general revenue grant relativities for areas such as isolation and dispersion.

Possible Approach

An approach to determining needs could be to treat Australia as one jurisdiction and to group areas that are similar on a number of key indicators of need. Some possible indicators that could be used by the Commission are isolation (distance from regional service centres), disposable income levels, housing (overcrowding), use of English as a second language, levels of education and training, access to essential services and economic health of the area.

These indicators appear to correlate with the health deficit and wellbeing of the indigenous community. It is suspected that there will also be strong correlations between health needs and three or four distinct regional classifications that will cross State boundaries. Consequently, an approach which may be useful would be to classify regions according to their geographical characteristics (regardless of State boundaries) and to identify policy neutral needs by each of those geographical classifications.

References: Office of Aboriginal Health Publications 1995 - 1999

Survey of AMS Diabetes Services in Western Australia. October 1999

Statewide Youth Forum – Summary Report. 1999

Working Together to Stop Suicide and Self-harm. 1999

Purchasing Intentions for Aboriginal Health 1999-2002. April 1999

A Comparative Overview of Aboriginal Health in Western Australia, 1987-96. May 1999

Environmental Health Needs of Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia. The 1997 Survey and Its Findings. December 1998

Aboriginal Food and Nutrition Policy for Western Australia. 1998

Aboriginal Mortality in Western Australia, 1985-89 and 1990-94. November 1997

Hospitalisation for Respiratory Tract Diseases in Western Australia, 1988-1993. A comparison of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Hospital Admission Patterns. August 1997

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Kimberley Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Pilbara Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Central Wheatbelt Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Metropolitan Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Goldfields Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Great Southern Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the SouthWest Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Health of Aboriginal People in the Midwest & Gascoyne Health Region, 1993-94. December 1996.

The Western Australian Aboriginal Environmental Health Survey 1994-95. July 1995.

8. EDUCATION

Provision of Indigenous Education Services

The indigenous student population in Western Australia comprises 6.4% of the total student population. The planning and provision of education services to the indigenous population involves both complexity and cost, reflecting a range of factors, including location, culture, socio-economic disadvantage, health problems, language differences and generally lower educational standards.

The State Government has constitutional responsibility for the provision of school education and, as such, has the major policy role. The State has primary funding responsibility for government schools, as well as providing assistance for non-government schools.

The Commonwealth provides supplementary funding for government and private schools to assist in the achievement of objectives agreed by the State and Commonwealth governments. Commonwealth funding includes general school grants, targeted program grants (for educationally disadvantaged students, study of other languages and school to work transition) and grants under the Indigenous Education Strategic Initiatives Program (IESIP).

The funding and management of publicly funded Aboriginal pre-schools has now been integrated into the government school system, although some pre-schools continue to be located on separate sites.

Attachment A to this chapter provides a list of State Government indigenous education programs, including State and Commonwealth funding contributions. Many other targeted programs (as well as general education) also assist indigenous students, although not targeted on the basis of indigenous status.

In addition to the initiatives in Attachment A, an agreement has recently been reached with the Commonwealth for a Western Australian Implementation Plan for the *National Indigenous English Literacy, Numeracy and Attendance Strategy*. This is a joint agreement with the Commonwealth, the State (through the Education Department), the Catholic Education Office and the Association of Independent Schools WA. The Commonwealth will provide \$6.83 million in new funding over the next three years.

Western Australia is the first State to sign an agreement on this strategy with the Commonwealth. The strategy targets schools (government, Catholic and Aboriginal Independent Community Schools) in the Kimberley region, the Port Hedland township, the Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie townships and the Swan education district.

Addressing the Needs of Indigenous Students

In allocating education resources within the State, the special needs of indigenous students are recognised in a number of ways.

High Cost Locations

A high proportion of the indigenous student population is located in remote areas of the State, where costs of service provision are very high. As shown in the table below, the districts that contain the most remote schools — Kimberley, Goldfields, Pilbara and Mid West - have 47.4 per cent of the total indigenous student population. In these four districts, 25.8 per cent of school students are indigenous.

INDIGENOUS STUDENTS PER DISTRICT — GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS				
Education District	Indigenous students	Total students	% of district students who are indigenous	Indigenous students as % of State total
Albany	499	7 970	6.26	2.93
Bunbury	560	13 095	4.28	3.29
Cannington	1 801	31 971	5.63	10.59
Esperance	233	3 739	6.23	1.37
Fremantle	1 173	37 988	3.09	6.90
Goldfields	1 509	7 355	20.52	8.87
Joondalup	314	21 620	1.45	1.85
Kimberley	2 779	5 426	51.22	16.34
Mid West	1 910	9 643	19.81	11.23
Midlands	642	10 679	6.01	3.78
Narrogin	481	5 484	8.77	2.83
Peel	602	21 211	2.84	3.54
Perth	301	31 525	0.95	1.77
Pilbara	1 864	8 770	21.25	10.96
Swan	2 137	41 869	5.10	12.57
Warren-Blackwood	199	7 826	2.54	1.17
Total	17 004	266 171	6.39	100.00

Many remote schools have all or almost all of their enrolments comprising indigenous students. For example, schools in the Kimberley education district that are classified as “remote community schools” have the following profile:

REMOTE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN THE KIMBERLEY DISTRICT			
School	Indigenous students	Total students	% Indigenous students
Cherrabun Remote Community School	21	22	95.5
Wangkatjunga Remote Community School	80	80	100.0
Bayulu Remote Community School	97	101	96.0
Kalumburu Remote Community School	149	149	100.0
La Grange Remote Community School	177	182	97.3
One Arm Point Remote Community School	105	107	98.1
Oombulgurri Remote Community School	70	72	97.2
Jungdranung Remote Community School	19	19	100.0
Dawul Remote Community School	16	16	100.0
Wananami Remote Community School	48	51	94.1
Muludja Remote Community School	40	40	100.0

The cost of providing services in remote schools was discussed at length in Western Australia’s 1997 submission to the Commission’s 1999 Review of State general revenue grant relativities.

Additional costs for staff benefits include locality allowances, travel allowances, removal expenditures, additional leave entitlements, housing subsidies and air-conditioning subsidies.

Additional service costs include freight costs, telephone costs, local travel costs (including high cost fuel and use of 4 wheel drive vehicles), air travel, and high costs for school construction and maintenance, power (including air conditioning requirements), water and cyclone proofing.

In broad terms, the Education Department estimates that the per capita expenditure on schooling for remote Aboriginal communities is at least double that of the general provision, with expenditures in some of these schools being much higher than this. These higher expenditures reflect the cost factors in remote areas, together with the additional resources provided for indigenous students, as discussed below.

Education Department General Staffing Formula

Student-teacher ratios are significantly lower in schools with significant indigenous enrolments.

The Education Department's new staffing formula, introduced in 1998, contains a Social Disadvantage Index. The index allows for differential staffing for students in lower socio-economic areas. Some schools with predominantly indigenous students have gained an additional 25% staffing entitlement through this formula.

Many rural and remote schools have also had their staffing allocation "rounded up", thereby attracting an additional full time teacher.

Specific Indigenous Education Support Programs

Attachment A summarises Education Department programs (funded by the State and the Commonwealth) aimed at achieving improved educational outcomes for indigenous students, especially literacy and numeracy. There are programs to, inter alia:

- increase retention rates, daily attendance and participation;
- address language differences (see below);
- address health issues, such as otitis media (see below); and
- maximise the employment of Aboriginal people in schools.

As seen in Attachment A, some of these programs involve the employment of substantial numbers of officers (eg. 286 Aboriginal and Islander Education Officers).

A large proportion of the resources provided specifically for indigenous education by the State and the Commonwealth, including for the provision of Aboriginal and Islander Education Officers, is allocated on a submission basis.

However, for 1999, \$2 million of Commonwealth funding (see Attachment A) was allocated to schools according to the number of indigenous students in each school. The funds were used to assist schools achieve improved outcomes for indigenous students.

Programs Targeting Socio-economic Disadvantage

The Commonwealth Literacy and Numeracy Program included \$6 million for Western Australian government schools in 1999, with funding targeted to schools based on their degree of socio-economic disadvantage. Schools are ranked into five groups, based on cumulative numbers of students. The most disadvantaged group is assigned 56% of the funds, the second 33% and the third 11% (the top two groups receive no funding). Within each group, the allocation is also based on the index of disadvantage for each school.

Schools with significant proportions of indigenous students tend to have a low socio-economic status, irrespective of what index is used. Indigenous students, therefore, attract significant funding from this program.

Indicators of Need for Indigenous Students

There are a number of factors which indicate the special education needs of indigenous students and which should be included in any assessment made by the Commission in this inquiry.

Language Differences

A survey conducted by the Education Department in 1992 showed that 43.9% of indigenous students had a main home language other than English, including Aboriginal languages, Aboriginal/station English and Creole.

These students have to be taught standard English, and to “code switch” between their home language and standard English. An example of this was heard by the Commission at Derby District High School in the 1996 Western Australian Workplace Discussions.

As shown in Attachment A, there are also initiatives aimed at promoting parity of esteem between indigenous students’ home languages and standard English.

Health

Indigenous students suffer a high level of health problems, which have a significant bearing on education.

Otitis media, a middle ear infection which leads to conductive hearing loss, prevents up to 75% of indigenous students at any one time from hearing properly and therefore learning effectively.

Another common health problem, particularly in remote communities, is lack of nutrition, sometimes requiring provision of meals (particularly breakfasts) in schools.

Academic Performance

Academic outcomes for indigenous students continue to be well below average standards, as shown in the Western Australian literacy and numeracy assessment undertaken in 1999. Preliminary analysis shows that:

For year 3 students:

- Reading: 57.8% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 87.9% of all students.
- Writing: 48.6% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 80.2% of all students.
- Spelling: 61.4% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 87.3% of all students.
- Numeracy: 60.3% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 85.6% of all students.

For year 5 students:

- Reading: 47.3% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 82.5% of all students.
- Writing: 48.4% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 81.1% of all students.
- Spelling: 58.3% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 85.5% of all students.
- Numeracy: 53.2% of indigenous students met the benchmark compared to 85.6% of all students.

Attendance Rates and Retention Rates

In general, the attendance rates of indigenous students are lower than those of non-indigenous students. The following table provides some information collected from schools on attendance during semester one of 1999. (Note that agricultural colleges, senior campuses and colleges, and a small number of other schools are excluded from this data.)

ATTENDANCE RATES — SEMESTER ONE 1999		
Education District	Non-indigenous students attendance rate (%)	Indigenous students attendance rate (%)
Albany	94.2	84.4
Bunbury	95.1	88.3
Cannington	94.1	83.4
Esperance	93.7	75.3
Fremantle	94.9	85.7
Goldfields	92.6	75.6
Joondalup	93.9	83.2
Kimberley	94.4	79.2
Mid West	93.5	84.0
Midlands	94.5	84.7
Narrogin	95.1	83.8
Peel	94.0	86.4
Perth	94.8	86.3
Pilbara	93.1	75.5
Swan	94.3	85.8
Warren-Blackwood	94.2	88.8
Total	94.3	82.0

Indigenous retention rates are very low, as shown in the following table:

APPARENT RETENTION RATES — 1999		
GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS		
Year levels	Non-indigenous students apparent retention rate (%)	Indigenous students apparent retention rate (%)
Year 1 to 12	54.6	18.4
Year 8 to 12	62.3	19.2
Year 10 to 12	62.9	23.5

Some reasons for the low attendance and retention rates are discussed below under “cultural factors”.

Transiency

Indigenous families exhibit a high level of transiency, reflecting cultural and socio-economic factors.

The “Student Tracking System” project has been developed to improve the attendance and education of mobile students. A pilot program commenced in the Goldfields and Mid West Education Districts in term 1, 1999 and is continuing in 2000, with an expansion into the Kimberley District. This is being funded by the Commonwealth.

Cultural Factors

A number of cultural issues affect the provision of education to indigenous students, mainly in remote

schools. These include:

- cultural obligations to attend funerals;
- cultural obligations to families in need of extended family support;
- cultural law business, which requires periods of absence for boys (primary and secondary school);
- “normative” behaviour — for example, there is an expectation that the eldest girl will stay at home on certain days to look after the family;
- the “rite of passage”, that is, entry into adulthood in the early teens
 - an example of where this has an impact on schools is that girls and boys who are considered adults should not be in the same room. In one of the Lands schools this was resolved by putting in an extra door in the classroom so that the girls could use a different door to the boys;
 - it also leads to school being seen as a place for children, and hence losing its relevance for older school students; and
- cultural skin groups — some girls cannot be in the same room as boys from a different skin group.

Cultural issues such as these contribute to low attendance and retention rates of indigenous students. There are, however, other factors contributing to these low rates, such as the perceived lack of relevance of the school, especially for secondary students, and a low rate of parent and community involvement in student participation or school decision making.

Arguably, the pedagogy used in classrooms needs to take greater account of cultural differences to improve outcomes for indigenous students, but this is a complex issue requiring more research.

A further issue requiring research is whether the assessment materials used in the Education Department's Monitoring Standards in Education and the WA Literacy and Numeracy Assessment programs are culturally appropriate, and are actually assessing the true performance of indigenous students.

Local Provision of Post-compulsory Secondary School Education

The lack of local post-compulsory secondary education facilities is a barrier for many indigenous students who do not wish to leave their communities.

An example of a program which has been set up to address this issue is the Kimberley Multi-campus Program. The program caters for about 150 indigenous and non-indigenous students aged 15 or more who want to continue their education without leaving their community.

The aim of the program is to promote vocational education and training by developing programs to meet the needs of individual students. A coordinator is appointed on a part-time basis at each school to develop individualised programs. A focus is also placed on enhancing numeracy and literacy skills to improve transition to post-school opportunities.

The participating schools are:

- Broome Senior High School
- Fitzroy Crossing District High School
- Halls Creek District High School
- Kununurra District High School
- La Grange Remote Community School

- Looma Remote Community School
- Wangkatjunka Remote Community School
- Wyndham District High School
- Derby District High School

(It should be noted that district high schools only cater for up to year 10.)

High Cost of Providing Services

The many factors leading to high costs of providing services to indigenous students in remote areas have already been discussed, to which may be added diseconomies of small scale in many communities.

The Way Ahead

This chapter has outlined the very substantial needs relating to the provision of education to indigenous students in Western Australia, particularly in remote communities. A better distribution of available Commonwealth resources is urgently needed to assist the State in meeting these needs, and improve education outcomes for these students. We believe the Commission should, in quantifying needs, assess the funding required to achieve outcomes comparable with the non-indigenous population. This will require consideration of the funding needed to address each of the issues discussed above. While the current Commonwealth funding is insufficient to achieve the required improvement in outcomes nationwide, the distribution of the existing pool of funds can best be determined once total funding needs for indigenous students in different regions of Australia are understood.

INDIGENOUS EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

1999

Program	State funding \$'000	Commonwealth funding \$'000
Aboriginal child health survey	–	65
Aboriginal reconciliation program	110	144
Student tracking system	–	380
Aboriginal education awards of excellence	20	–
Aboriginal systemic school	–	30
Aboriginal speakers program	–	100
Early childhood education initiatives	–	421
- Includes, buses, bus drivers, resource grants, etc		
Early literacy and numeracy program	219	388
- 17.5 FTEs & professional development		
Aboriginal education funding to schools	–	2,000
- Per capita grant of \$113 per Aboriginal student		
Deadly ways to learn	–	500
- Trialling two language teaching		
Staying at school promotion	–	80
Early literacy (students at risk)	–	350
Aboriginal studies program	37	–
Otitis media awareness & intervention strategies	36	–
Aboriginal English foundation literacy	95	–
- Collaborative research with Edith Cowan University		
Aboriginal languages program	200	–
- Introducing teaching of Aboriginal languages		
Coordinators of Aboriginal education	401	401
- 16 salaries		
Coordinators of Aboriginal education	–	82
- operational budget		
Aboriginal cross cultural awareness training for Education Department employees	100	–

**ATTACHMENT A
(continued)**

Program	State funding \$'000	Commonwealth funding \$'000
Aboriginal Education Operation Plan district initiatives	–	120
Aboriginal English as a second language	–	280
- 5 FTEs to facilitate learning of standard English for students whose first language is Aboriginal/dialect		
Aboriginal liaison officers	686	154
- 22.6 FTEs & professional development		
Aboriginal and Islander education officers	2,716	3,681
- 286 FTEs & professional development		
Aboriginal Education Policy and Planning Directorate	1,219	–
- 16 FTEs & operational costs		
Aboriginal youth leadership	18	–
- leadership training for Aboriginal staff		
Secondary programs	–	450
- projects to improve participation at secondary level		
Aboriginal education post compulsory projects	180	–
- support for completing TEE		
Aboriginal students at educational risk	68	–
- formation of Perth Aboriginal Reference Group		
Truancy programs	62	–
School support – Lake Jasper initiative	–	65
- for youth not attending school		
Alienated students program	–	117
Self managing schools	–	65
- support for local management		
Parent participation	–	115
- community officer & professional development		
District councils	–	121
Aboriginal education advisory networks	63	–
Support for graduate Aboriginal teachers		20
AIEO traineeship	–	9
Mentoring program for Aboriginal employees	–	71
Aboriginal education professional leadership	38	–

APPENDIX

**AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF
ESSENTIAL SERVICES TO ABORIGINAL
COMMUNITIES IN WESTERN
AUSTRALIA**

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH
OF AUSTRALIA**

-and-

**THE ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT
ISLANDER COMMISSION**

-and-

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE
OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

DRAFT 12 August 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE	
1.0	Preamble	4
2.0	Objectives	4
3.0	Outcomes	5
4.0	Definition of Essential Services	5
5.0	Service Delivery Principles	5
6.0	Overview Roles and Responsibilities	6
6.1	Commonwealth Government	6
6.2	State Government	6
7.0	Framework for Cooperation	7
7.1	Policy framework	7
7.1.1	Town Based Communities	8
7.1.2	Large Permanently Established Remote Communities	9
8.0	Statement of Intent	9
9.0	Co-ordination of Infrastructure Programs	10
10.0	Employment and Training	11
11.0	Monitoring and Review	11
12.0	Duration of Agreement	11
13.0	Extension or Variation	11
14.0	Termination	11
15.0	Signatories to Agreement	12

Appendices

Schedule 1	Large Permanent Remote Communities (defined)
Schedule 2	Aboriginal Communities Funded by the State for Repairs and Maintenance from 1 July 1999
Schedule 3	Additional Communities to be Funded by the State in 2000/2002
Schedule 4	Communities funded by the Commonwealth for Regular Maintenance

THIS AGREEMENT DATED _____ 1999

IS BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING:

THE STATE OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA REPRESENTED BY:

THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING; ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS; WATER RESOURCES

AND

THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA REPRESENTED BY:

THE MINISTER FOR ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER AFFAIRS AND

THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION

1.0 PREAMBLE

In 1985, the State Government assumed responsibility from the Commonwealth Government for the repair and maintenance of power, water and waste water services to 48 Aboriginal communities in Western Australia. The Commonwealth Government continued to provide funding for capital works and power house fuel in these communities and for all aspects of essential service delivery in the remaining communities.

The division of service arrangements has created difficulties in asset management and in the provision of efficient and coordinated services to Aboriginal communities. A history of inappropriate design, substandard construction and uncontrolled development has also contributed to substandard living conditions in Aboriginal communities.

This Agreement formalises a joint approach between the Commonwealth and State Governments aimed at providing more efficient and effective delivery of essential services to Aboriginal communities and improving environmental health outcomes for Aboriginal people. It is entered into in the spirit of partnership and with the understanding that both levels of government are committed to that partnership.

The National Commitment to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal Peoples and Torres Strait Islanders, endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments in December 1992, established a framework for achieving greater coordination in the delivery of programs and services by all spheres of Government. This Agreement is made pursuant to the National Commitment and where necessary, the principles and objectives of that document should guide the interpretation of this Agreement. In addition, the recommendations of the Report of the Chief Executive Officer Working Party on Essential Services to Aboriginal Communities endorsed by State Cabinet in 1995, provide a policy framework for the implementation of this Agreement.

This Agreement seeks to complement existing Bilateral Agreements that have been negotiated in the areas of Health and Housing. It also establishes a framework for the negotiation of further agreements in specific functional areas in order to further reform the delivery of essential services to Aboriginal communities.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The objective of this Agreement is to define the roles and responsibilities of the Commonwealth and Western Australian Governments and to achieve more efficient and effective delivery of services to meet the needs of Aboriginal communities in Western Australia.

The Agreement provides for:

- a) the establishment of agreed service delivery principles;
- b) the establishment of agreed criteria and processes for the allocation of State and Commonwealth funding for the provision of essential services to large remote and town based Aboriginal communities;
- c) the coordination of State and Commonwealth infrastructure programs in order to maximise the benefits from available funds and remove unnecessary duplication.
- d) a commitment by Commonwealth and State agencies to appropriate design and construction standards and approval processes.
- e) a commitment to provide essential services to large permanent Aboriginal communities at a standard comparable to mainstream towns of a similar size and geographic location.
- f) the promotion of increased opportunities for local and regional participation in service planning and delivery.

3.0 OUTCOMES

The Agreement seeks to achieve the following outcomes:

- a) A more efficient and integrated approach to the delivery of services to Aboriginal communities leading to an increased level of resources available for the provision and maintenance of essential services and an improved standard of living for the residents of Aboriginal communities.

- b) The establishment of a partnership between Commonwealth and State agencies, service providers and the Aboriginal community in the provision of services.
- c) The progressive upgrading and normalisation of essential services.
- d) Increased training, employment and economic development opportunities for Aboriginal people and organisations.
- e) Improved planning, design, construction and maintenance practices leading to increased asset life, reduced capital demand and improved reliability of services.
- f) Establishment of an agreed framework and process for the negotiation of further bilateral agreements which recognise the State Government's obligation to provide equitable services to Aboriginal communities and which provide for further reforms in the delivery of essential services.

4.0 DEFINITION OF ESSENTIAL SERVICES

For the purposes of this Agreement essential services shall be defined as the provision and maintenance of power, water and waste water infrastructure to discrete Aboriginal communities in Western Australia. The principles of appropriate design and construction standards and approval processes shall apply to all infrastructure developments impacting on essential services in Aboriginal communities in Western Australia.

5.0 SERVICE DELIVERY PRINCIPLES

The following principles will govern the delivery of programs and services by Commonwealth and State Government agencies:

- a) Empowerment, self-determination and self-management by Aboriginal peoples;
- b) Economic independence and equity being achieved in a manner consistent with Aboriginal social and cultural values;
- c) The need to negotiate with and maximise participation by Aboriginal people through their representative bodies, including the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), Regional Councils, State and Territory advisory bodies and community-based organisations in the formulation of policies and programs that affect them;
- d) Effective coordination in the formulation of policies, and the planning, management and provision of services to Aboriginal peoples by governments to achieve more effective and efficient delivery of services, remove unnecessary duplication and allow better application of available funds;
- e) Increased clarity with respect to the roles and responsibilities of the various spheres of government through greater demarcation of policy, operational and financial responsibilities; and
- f) Aboriginal people have the same right of access to mainstream services as other Australian citizens living in similar geographic circumstances.

6.0 OVERVIEW OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

6.1 Commonwealth Government

6.1.1 The Commonwealth Government has a special responsibility for Aboriginal people pursuant to the Australian Constitution and arising from Australia's international obligations to its indigenous people.

6.1.2 The Commonwealth's special responsibility is exercised through the development and implementation of policies, the enactment of legislation and the funding of programs and services.

6.1.3 ATSIC is the Commonwealth's principal representative in Aboriginal affairs and is the elected representative body of Aboriginal people in Australia.

6.1.4 ATSIC, through its Regional Councils provides policy advice and funding for the delivery of essential services in Western Australia.

6.2 State Government

6.2.1 The State Government has a responsibility to provide mainstream and Aboriginal specific programs and services which are responsive to and appropriate to the needs of Aboriginal people.

6.2.2 The State has an obligation to provide services to large, permanent Aboriginal communities on an equitable basis with those services provided to mainstream communities of equivalent size and geographic location.

6.2.3 The State recognises the coordinating, advisory and funding role of ATSIC at the Commonwealth level and is committed to work in partnership with ATSIC to meet the needs and aspirations of Aboriginal people in Western Australia.

6.2.4 The State, in conjunction with the Commonwealth and local governments will ensure coordination in the planning, delivery and management of programs and services and will facilitate negotiation and participation by Aboriginal people at all stages of program planning, implementation and evaluation.

6.2.5 The Ministry of Housing, through the Aboriginal Housing Board, manages and disperses funds provided by the State for essential services to Aboriginal communities. The Ministry of Housing, in conjunction with the Aboriginal Affairs Department, the Office of Energy and the Office of Water Regulation is responsible for essential services policy and program development, coordination and evaluation.

7.0 FRAMEWORK FOR COOPERATION

The Parties to this Agreement acknowledge that the essential service delivery arrangements that have been in place since 1985 have not provided Aboriginal communities with an effective or efficient level of service. The Parties also recognise that a clearer demarcation of program and funding responsibility as well as improved coordination and integration of Commonwealth and State funded programs will lead to immediate benefits for Aboriginal communities.

It is recognised that there has been considerable progress in recent years in improving the coordination and cooperation between Commonwealth and State Government agencies. The Parties seek to formalise this cooperative approach through the execution of this Agreement.

The State Government acknowledges that it has an obligation to extend the current level of service provided to Aboriginal communities in Western Australia and in conjunction with the Commonwealth will continue to develop appropriate service delivery models to meet the needs of Aboriginal communities in a fair and equitable manner.

7.1 Policy Framework

For the purposes of this Agreement, Aboriginal communities are defined under the following categories:

a) **Town based communities**

Generally located on Aboriginal reserves on the fringes of towns and are connected to mainstream power and/or water and waste water schemes provided by the State utility authorities; Western Power and the Water Corporation.

b) **Large, permanently established remote communities**

Defined as those communities which meet the criteria detailed in Schedule 1.

7.1.1 Town Based Communities

The following policy is agreed for the delivery of essential services to town based Aboriginal communities:

- a) That power, water and waste water services provided by Western Power and the Water Corporation should equate to those provided to the residents of mainstream towns;

- b) that communal power, water and waste water infrastructure should be managed and maintained by the respective utility authority;
- c) that individual dwellings within these communities should be metered and that the payment of consumption and service charges should be the responsibility of the individual householder;
- d) that the collection of fees and payments for services is the responsibility of the respective utility authority which may enter into special collection arrangements in negotiation with individual communities; and
- e) that costs associated with communal facilities and street lighting should be met by the relevant local government.

In order to achieve the above service delivery policy the Commonwealth and State Governments agree to:

- a) provide capital funds to progressively upgrade town based community infrastructure to standards acceptable to Western Power and the Water Corporation;
- b) provide funding for the installation of individual meters;
- c) deliver culturally appropriate energy efficiency and metering education programs for the residents of town based communities;
- d) facilitate the granting of service easements under the Land Administration Act to provide guaranteed access and ownership of essential service infrastructure to the respective utility authorities;
- e) consult with the residents of individual town based communities with regard to the implementation of this strategy and to negotiate future service delivery options; and
- f) negotiate with local government regarding the management of communal facilities and street lighting.

7.1.2 Large Permanently Established Remote Communities

The following policy is agreed for the delivery of essential services to large permanent remote communities:

- a) The Commonwealth and State recognise that the efficient and effective operation of essential service infrastructure is fundamental to the health and well being of the residents of Aboriginal communities;
- b) The State and Commonwealth Governments will work in partnership to ensure maximum value from available funds and appropriate integration of capital works, maintenance and operation of essential services infrastructure;
- c) The State Government is responsible for the provision of planned maintenance and repairs to communal power, water and waste water infrastructure in 62 communities as detailed at Schedule 2;
- d) The State Government will expand the number of communities for which it accepts maintenance responsibility to all communities which meet the criteria detailed at Schedule 1 as funding becomes available. A minimum of an additional 10 communities will be added to this list in the following two financial years (Schedule 3).
- e) The joint Environmental Health Needs Survey data base, or a subsequent jointly agreed data base, will be used to determine community eligibility for State funding;
- f) Community eligibility will be reviewed every 3 years or more frequently if an agreed data source is available;
- g) Subject to Section 8.0, the Commonwealth Government will continue to contribute funding for capital works and upgrading of essential services infrastructure;
- h) Subject to Section 8.0, the Commonwealth Government will continue to contribute funding to assist communities to meet operating costs including power house fuel.
- i) The Commonwealth Government will provide funding for regular maintenance and repair of essential services to an initial ten (10) emerging communities with populations between 40 and 49 as detailed in Schedule 4.

[8.0 STATEMENT OF INTENT (Proposed – still under consideration)

It is agreed that the State will progressively assume increased responsibility for all aspects of essential services delivery to agreed large, permanent, remote, Aboriginal communities.

The first stage of this process shall be the negotiation of a specific Bilateral Agreement between the Commonwealth and the State in the area of power provision through which the management of capital replacement, maintenance and operation of power services to agreed Aboriginal communities shall become the responsibility of the State. This Agreement will establish an appropriate joint funding mechanism in order to subsidise the cost of power provision.

The State agrees to initiate an Aboriginal Community Power Procurement Process in order to coordinate the generation, distribution and retailing of electricity services to remote Aboriginal communities with populations of approximately 200 or greater. A minimum of three communities will be targeted in 1999/2000 as the first stage of this process.]

9.0 COORDINATION OF HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS

The Commonwealth and State Governments agree to collaborate in the development, implementation and evaluation of all major infrastructure and related programs that impact on the delivery of essential services in Western Australia. Such programs would include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following :

- National Aboriginal Health Strategy (ATSIC);
- Remote Area Essential Services Program - Capital Works (ATSIC);
- Remote Area Essential Services Program - Repairs and Maintenance (Ministry of Housing);
- Aboriginal Community Strategic Investment Program (Ministry of Housing);
- Environmental Health Package (Ministry of Housing);
- Other capital programs including housing (Ministry of Housing; ATSIC)

This collaboration will involve:

- a) utilising the information available from the 1997 Environmental Health Needs Survey (or any future jointly agreed data source) as a basis for determining future expenditure priorities;
- b) consultation by Commonwealth agencies with State and local government bodies regarding expenditure priorities, program planning and implementation;
- c) consultation by State agencies with the Commonwealth and local governments bodies regarding expenditure priorities, program planning and implementation;
- d) maximising opportunities to complement respective programs and for the establishment of joint funding arrangements in order to promote a holistic approach to the provision and maintenance of infrastructure to Aboriginal communities;
- e) maximising the functional capacity, durability, serviceability and safety of essential services infrastructure through the development and application of appropriate design, material and construction standards and requirements;
- f) the provision of joint funding to develop community layout plans for all large, permanent, remote, Aboriginal communities;
- g) ensuring that all developments accord with the requirements of local government and, where applicable the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and with approved community layout plans; and
- h) the development of joint strategies and policies to overcome current administrative, legislative or policy impediments to the effective delivery and maintenance of essential services to Aboriginal communities.

10.0 EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The Commonwealth and State Governments agree to:

- a) promote appropriate training and career opportunities for Aboriginal people who wish to be involved in the management and delivery of essential services;
- b) allocate specific funds for the employment and ongoing support of essential services operators who have completed approved training courses; and
- c) promote the involvement of regional Aboriginal organisations and businesses in the management and delivery of essential services.

11.0 MONITORING AND REVIEW

The success of this Agreement will be measured by the following key indicators:

- a) Improved understanding of key stakeholders of the roles and responsibilities of the Parties to this Agreement;
- b) Successful targeting of available resources to meet identified priority needs in Aboriginal communities;
- c) The establishment of collaborative and joint funding arrangements between the Parties;
- d) Improved planning, design, construction and maintenance practices;
- e) Increased asset life and improved reliability of services;
- f) The progressive normalisation of services to Aboriginal communities; and
- g) The establishment of further Agreements between the Commonwealth and the State which resolve long term essential service delivery issues for Aboriginal communities.

The implementation of the agreement shall be overseen by an Aboriginal Community Essential Services Steering Committee comprising representatives from ATSIC, Ministry of Housing, the Aboriginal Affairs Department, the Office of Energy and the Office of Water Regulation.

12.0 DURATION OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement will remain in force for a period of five years from the date of execution or until superseded either in whole or in part by a subsequent agreement.

13.0 EXTENSION OR VARIATION

Extensions or variations to this agreement will be through mutual written agreement by the parties.

14.0 TERMINATION

In the event of any of the Parties wishing to terminate this Agreement that Party shall be entitled to do so upon giving the other Parties 12 months prior written notice.

15.0 SIGNATORIES

SIGNED FOR AND ON BEHALF OF EACH OF THE PARTIES BY:

THE HON DR KIM HAMES MLA
MINISTER FOR HOUSING; ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS; WATER RESOURCES

IN THE PRESENCE OF:

SENATOR THE HON JOHN HERRON
MINISTER FOR ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER AFFAIRS

IN THE PRESENCE OF:

MR GATJIL DJERRKURA OAM
CHAIRPERSON
ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER COMMISSION

IN THE PRESENCE OF:

LARGE PERMANENT REMOTE COMMUNITIES

Large, permanent remote communities are defined as those communities that meet the following criteria:

1. Population.

The normal population should be at least 50 people.

2. Permanency of Occupation.

The community must be the principal residence of the majority of the population for the majority of a twelve month period. (as a general rule 75% of the normal population should be in residence for a minimum of 9 months of the year.)

3. Level and Standard of Infrastructure.

At least five domestic dwellings should be established with power, water and waste water systems connected and to a standard acceptable to State energy and water regulatory bodies.

4. Land Tenure.

Communities should have secure land tenure granted (or agreed to be granted) by the State in accordance with guidelines established by the Minister for Lands. In cases where secure land tenure has not been granted (or agreed to be granted) a community may be eligible for funding if the community meets all other criteria and has in the past received significant funding support from the State.

5. Special Circumstances.

Communities that do not meet all the above criteria, but can demonstrate good reason why they should receive maintenance funding may be considered for addition to the maintenance schedule. Good reason may include:

- Demonstrated environmental health risk
- Proximity to other serviced communities
- Special needs of residents (eg aged population)

SCHEDULE 2

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES FUNDED BY THE STATE FOR REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE FROM 1 JULY 1999

COMMUNITY	REGN
BALGO	K
BARDI / ONE ARM POINT	K
BAYULU	K
BEAGLE BAY	K
BIDYANDANGA / La GRANGE	K
BINDI BINDI	P
BLACKSTONE	C
BURRINGURRAH	P
CHEEDITHA	P
CHERRABUN / DJUGERARI	K
CHRISTMAS CREEK	K
COONANA	C
COSMO NEWBERRY	C
GUDA GUDA	K
IMMINTJI	K
JAMIESON / MANTAMARU	C
JIGALONG	P
JUNJUWA	K
KADJINA / MILIJDIEE	K
KALUMBURU	K
KARMULINUNGA	K
KIWIRRKURRA	C
KUNDAT DJARU / RINGERS SOAK	K
KUPUNGARRI / Mt BARNETT	K
LOMBADINA / DJARANDJIN	K
LOOMA	K
LUNDJA	K
MINDIBUNGU / BILILUNA	K
MOWANJUM	K
MT MARGARET	C
MULAN / LAKE GREGORY	K

COMMUNITY	REGN
MULGA QUEEN	C
MULUDJA	K
NGALINGKADJI	K
NGALLAGUNDA / GIBB RIVER	K
NGUMPAN / PINNACLES	K
NGURAWAANA	P
NOONKANBAH	K
OOMBULGURRI	K
PANDANUS PARK	K
PANTIJAN	K
PATJARR	C
PARNGGURR / COTTON CREEK	P
PIA WADJARI	P
PUNMU	P
TJALKA WARA	P
TJIRRKARLI	C
TJUKURLA	C
TJUNTJUNTJARA	C
WAKATHUNI	P
WANNAN	C
WARAKURNA	C
WARBURTON	C
WARMUN / TURKEY CREEK	K
WARRALONG	P
WINGELINA	C
WOOLAH	K
YAGGA YAGGA	K
YAKANARA	K
YANDEYARRA	P
YARRUNGA/Chinaman's Garden	K
YIYILI	K

Note: "REGN" indicates Service Provider region

- K Kimberley
- P Pilbara /Murchison-Gascoyne
- C Kalgoorlie/Central Reserves

SCHEDULE 3

ADDITIONAL COMMUNITIES TO BE FUNDED BY THE STATE IN 2000/2002

COMMUNITY	REG'N	POP'N	DWELL	TENURE	COMMENT
BOBIEDING	K	55	6	Freehold Bishop of Broome	Power from Beagle Bay. Current capital upgrade in progress
JARLMADANGAH	K	76	5	ALT Freehold 1417/796	
LAMBOO GUNIAN	K	100	20	Koogie Park Station	Lease in perpetuity to be granted. Town power but remote from water/waste water services
WURRENRAGINY/ FROG HOLLOW	K	60	5	ALT Reserve 13944	
MANDANGALA (GLEN HILL)	K	71	13	ALT Past Lease 3114/425	
BUDGARJOOK	K	50	5	ALT Res 22615	Current capital works upgrade.
La DJARDARR BAY	K	50	6	ALT Reserve 1834	
BOW RIVER	K	52	7	Pastoral Lease Juwulinpany Ab. Corp.	
YULGA JINNA	P/M	30-50	(8)	Unallocated Crown Land	Lease in perpetuity to be granted. Eight houses under construction. Stable population expected to increase.
KUNAWARRIJI (WELL 33)	P/M	80	8	Unallocated Crown Land - Canning Stock Route	No secure land tenure but very remote, has health clinic, building school. Regular tourist visitation and potential growth.

Note: "REGN" indicates service provider region
 K Kimberley
 C Central Reserves/Goldfields
 P/M Pilbara/Murchison-Gascoyne

SCHEDULE 4**COMMUNITIES TO BE FUNDED BY THE COMMONWEALTH FOR REGULAR MAINTENANCE**

COMMUNITY	POPULATION	REGION
BARRELL WELL	47	MURCHISON
BIRUDU	40	KIMBERLEY
GALERU GORGE	48	KIMBERLEY
GUDARGIE	39	KIMBERLEY
KAWARRE	40	KIMBERLEY
KUPARTIYA	37	KIMBERLEY
NGURTUWARTA	40	KIMBERLEY
WINDIDDA	40	MURCHISON
WORRIMBAH	40	KIMBERLEY
YARRI YARRI	37	KIMBERLEY