



## WHAT'S NEW IN NATIVE TITLE

### August 2015

1. Case Summaries _____	1
2. Legislation _____	14
3. Native Title Determinations _____	15
4. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate & Prescribed Bodies Corporate ____	16
5. Indigenous Land Use Agreements _____	17
6. Future Acts Determinations _____	18
7. Native Title in the News _____	19
8. Related Publications _____	20
9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities _____	23
10. Events _____	24

### 1. Case Summaries

#### ***Anderson on behalf of the Wullli Wullli People v State of Queensland (No 3) [2015] FCA 821***

---

#### **13 August 2015, Consent Determination, Federal Court of Australia – Theodore, Queensland, Collier J**

In this decision, Collier J recognised the native title rights and interests of the Wullli Wullli people in relation to land and waters covering approximately 5432 square kilometres in central Queensland. Within the area there are two towns, two national parks and a number of pastoral properties. The claim was first filed on 17 July 2000 but has been amended a number of times since. The respondent parties included the state of Queensland, Banana Shire Council, North Burnett Regional Council and Telstra.

There are three separate areas with distinct native title rights and interests. The native title rights and interests in relation to the land and waters in Part 1 of the Schedule covering the general determination area are the non-exclusive rights to:

- (a) access, be present on, move about on and travel over the area

- (b) camp, and live temporarily on the area as part of camping, and for that purpose build temporary shelters
- (c) hunt, fish and gather on the land and waters of the area for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes
- (d) take, use, share and exchange natural resources from the land and waters of the area for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes
- (e) take and use the water of the area for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes
- (f) conduct ceremonies on the area
- (g) be buried and bury native title holders within the area
- (h) maintain places of importance and areas of significance to the native title holders under their traditional laws and customs and protect those places and areas from physical harm
- (i) teach on the area the physical and spiritual attributes of the area
- (j) hold meetings on the area and
- (k) light fires on the area for domestic purposes including cooking, but not for the purpose of hunting or clearing vegetation.

The native title rights and interests in relation to the land and waters in Part 2 of the Schedule (town areas in Cracow) are the non-exclusive rights to:

- (a) access, be present on, move about on and travel over the area
- (b) gather on the land and waters of the area for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes and
- (c) teach on the area the physical and spiritual attributes of the area.

The native title rights and interests in relation to the land and waters in Part 3 of the Schedule (town areas in Theodore) are the non-exclusive rights to:

- (a) access, be present on, move about on and travel over the area
- (b) hunt, fish and gather on the land and waters of the area for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes and
- (c) teach on the area the physical and spiritual attributes of the area.

In her judgment, Collier J made reference to historical, linguistic, anthropological and archaeological evidence. The anthropological evidence showed that the Wullli Wullli people are made up of those descended from identified apical ancestors.

Membership is based upon having a 'blood line to country', self-identification and recognition by others of this connection and this identification. She also referred to evidence provided via 23 affidavits, highlighting the commonality of the evidence provided by each of the witnesses in respect of matter including respect for Elders and old people, the importance of family, bush tucker and bush medicine, hunting and gathering, spirits and totems, relationships within the family and the relationship of the Wullli Wullli people with their country. She also noted at [96] that this lay evidence was highly persuasive, particularly because it was relied upon, to varying degrees, by all of the experts.

The Court was satisfied that it should make the orders agreed to by the parties. The prescribed body corporate is the Wullli Wullli Nation Aboriginal Corporation.

## ***Wyman on behalf of the Bidjara People v State of Queensland [2015] FCAFC 108***

---

**13 August 2015, [Appeal against certain aspects of native title determinations](#), Full Federal Court of Australia – Brisbane (delivered in Melbourne), North, Barker and White JJ**

In this matter, the Full Federal Court heard two appeals, one by the Bidjara people and the other by the Brown River people, to set aside the determination of the primary judge that native title does not exist in the claim area under the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) ('NTA'). The Court dismissed each of the grounds of appeal. The claim area, referred to as the overlap area, includes the Carnarvon National Park and the Carnarvon Gorge in central Queensland, some 600 kilometres north-west of Brisbane.

At trial, the primary judge considered three claimant applications: the first by the Karingbal people was filed in January 2006 and largely limited to the overlap area. The second was that of the Bidjara people, lodged in July 2008 and related to a large area of land including the overlap area. The third was the Brown River people's claim, lodged in August 2011, which largely consisted of the overlap area. The Brown River claimants had initially been members of the Karingbal claim group. However, following anthropological evidence that those members of the group who were descended from claimed apical ancestor Jemima of Albinia, were not for NTA purposes, Karingbal people, they filed their own claim in 2011. None of these three claims succeeded at trial (see [Wyman on behalf of the Bidjara People v State of Queensland \(No 2\) \[2013\] FCA 1229](#)). The Karingbal people lodged an appeal and filed submissions but subsequently discontinued their appeal prior to the hearing. The State opposed each of the appeals.

The following questions were raised:

1. Did the primary judge err in refusing the application of the Bidjara people for an adjournment of the trial on 22 April 2013?
2. Did the primary judge err in failing to take the evidence of the Bidjara Indigenous witnesses and/or the Brown River indigenous witnesses on country?
3. Did the primary judge err in fact or in law in finding that the Bidjara people had failed to maintain their connection with their traditional country in the overlap area by traditional law and custom, from generation to generation, since sovereignty?
4. Did the primary judge err in fact or in law in finding that the Brown River people had failed to maintain their connection with their traditional country in the overlap

area by traditional law and custom, from generation to generation, since sovereignty

5. Did the primary judge err in making certain findings about the Brown River Indigenous witnesses' written statements, and about the revival of laws and customs from the commencement of the native title claim, without putting these findings to the Brown River witnesses?
6. Did the primary judge err in declining to admit into evidence Ms Hickson's affidavit in the Brown River claim?
7. Did the primary judge err in making a determination that native title does not exist?

### **Question One**

The trial had been listed to commence on 22 April 2013 and four weeks had been set aside. The Bidjara people sought an adjournment because they lacked legal representation and the money to hire another because of a dispute with their solicitor. The primary judge refused the application, but did defer the start of the trial to the next day. The Court held at [64] that this appeal ground failed due to a number of factors: the Bidjara people had had extended notice of the trial date, the Court had previously vacated trial dates, the matter was subject to detailed case management and trial programming orders with which the Bidjara people had not complied, the evidence suggested that the Bidjara people had been responsible for the loss of legal representation, the lack of funding had been an ongoing concern rather than a recent development, and finally, the Bidjara people had had more than adequate time to discuss the preparation of the anthropological report.

### **Question Two**

Both the Bidjara people and the Brown River people complained the Court did not take some of their evidence on country. One representative had fallen ill and the Court had subsequently deferred the hearing of evidence from witnesses to a hearing in Brisbane. The Brown River people had submitted they would like to give evidence on country and that they could be recalled for cross examination in Brisbane if required. This motion was refused. The Full Federal Court found no reason to disturb the finding of the primary judge.

### **Question Three**

The primary judge had found that there was a strong Bidjara identity and was satisfied that a Bidjara society had continued to exist since sovereignty, but also held that these traditional laws and customs including knowledge of traditional boundaries had been lost by the time of the generation that included Uncle Rusty, Ritchie Fraser, Bob Mailman and Betty Saylor. The primary judge therefore concluded that the connection maintained by the Bidjara today did not have its source in traditional law and custom. The Full Federal Court held at [302] after a detailed examination of

the primary judge and the evidence presented by the Bidjara people that they had failed to disclose the existence of a contemporary normative system rooted in the pre-sovereignty system and that this ground of appeal failed. The Court noted at [297] that a key factor in this decision was that contemporary Bidjara society no longer exhibited, even in an adapted form, many of the laws and customs that the sovereignty society had observed, and that in relation to the claim area, the pre-sovereignty 'tenure system' had been lost and replaced with a new structure.

#### **Question Four**

The Full Federal Court found that the Brown River people's appeal failed. The Court reviewed the evidence that the primary judge had relied upon supporting her conclusion that the Karingbal society had not had 'a continued existence and vitality since sovereignty'. Justices North, Barker and White noted at [419] that the primary judge had found that there had been a loss of laws and customs about kinship, marriage, a class system and totems, and there was no ceremonial life today.

#### **Question Five**

The Full Federal Court held this ground of appeal failed. At [433] the Brown River people argued that the rule in *Brown v Dunn* (1893) 6 R 67 applied and requires that 'a party or cross-examiner who intends to invite the Court to disbelieve an opposing witness put to the witness in cross-examination the grounds upon which the evidence is to be disbelieved'. The Brown River people submitted two concerns at [436]-[437]: that the primary judge should not have stated that witness statements 'were created by a common hand' without raising this concern with the relevant witnesses; and that in the absence of any challenge in cross examination to the written and oral evidence of witnesses as to the continuity of the Brown River/Karingbal people and their laws and customs, it was not open to the primary judge to reject their evidence and find it had largely been revived and recreated since 2006. The Full Federal Court rejected these arguments and found that the primary judge had weighed up the oral and written evidence, which was heavily challenged.

#### **Question Six**

The primary judge had declined to admit the affidavit of Ms Hickson, a white pastoralist, into evidence. The Full Federal Court upheld this decision noting that it was produced very late which was inconsistent with pre-trial programming orders, and that the affidavit did not address the composition of the Brown River/Karingbal people and the acknowledgement and observance of laws and customs by them as a group.

#### **Question Seven**

The Brown River people adopted the Karingbal submission that it is not within the Court's power to make a negative determination that native title does not exist; and



that alternatively, if the Court does have the power, that the exercise of it in this case was inappropriate. The Full Federal Court held at [502] that this ground of appeal for the Brown River people failed. The Court noted that in the circumstances it was appropriate, if not inevitable, that a negative determination should be made once each of the three claims failed and there was no evidence of another group traditionally asserted with the overlap area. The Court also stated at [491] that a range of factors may guide a court, depending upon the individual circumstances of the case, to decide that native title does not exist. The factors the primary judge had taken into account included that the matters before the court be ‘completely and finally determined’ and that the present claims failed following trial on their merits after a detailed examination of the evidence.

### ***Chubby on behalf of the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura People v State of Western Australia [2015] FCA 964***

---

**27 August 2015, [Application for Joinder](#), Federal Court of Australia – Perth, WA, Barker J**

In this case, the Court dismissed an application filed by Ms Joan Ashburton and Ms Sandra Hayes (referred to as the interlocutory applicants) who wanted to be joined as parties to the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people’s native title claim. On 19 August 2015, the State and claimants had filed a minute of proposed consent determination, this was accompanied by a joint submission that the determination sought were both appropriate and within power, and otherwise in accordance with the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (‘NTA’). The proceedings had been listed for a consent determination hearing on 2 September 2015.

While the Court accepted at [20] that the interests of the two interlocutory applicants would arguably be affected by the proposed consent determination, Barker J ultimately held at [66] that given the circumstances it was not in the interests of justice that they be joined. The interlocutory applicants had argued that there had been no genuine agreement freely made in relation to the consent determination by the Puutu Kunti Kurrama people, and that it was not made on an informed basis because the claimant did not have independent legal representation. For example, the interlocutory applicant’s contended that there was a majority of Pinikura people in the claim group, and that the three areas of control: Kurrama, Pinikura and shared, may fall under control of the majority Pinikura which would be contrary to traditional law and custom.

Justice Barker emphasised at [56] that the NTA operates on the basis that the authorised named applicants make decisions about the claim. Further, unless there is a very good reason to intervene, this process should be respected by the Court and operate without judicial interference. As a result, the Court will rarely intervene. Given the evidence that the existing Kurrama named claimants were authorised by a

claim group meeting to be the group's representatives, and that there was no evidence that independent advice had not been provided. Justice Barker also noted at [62] that the application for joinder could have been brought much earlier, not just before the consent determination.

## ***Strickland v State of Western Australia* [2015] FCA 914**

---

### **21 August 2015, Application for an Extension of Time to Seek Review, Federal Court of Australia – Perth, WA, Barker J**

In this decision, Barker J dismissed an application under s 190F(6) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) ('NTA') on the basis that the claim was unregistered and there was no reason why the claim should not otherwise be dismissed, as well as dismissing an application for an extension of time to seek review. The claim was therefore struck out.

On 17 April 2014, Ms Marjorie May Strickland and Ms Anne Joyce Nudding filed a claim under the NTA in respect of land and waters in the Eastern Goldfields region of Western Australia. This application stated it was made on behalf of the descendants of Kitty Bluegum, often described as the Maduwongga people. A number of earlier applications over the claim area had either been dismissed, or in one case, withdrawn. On 10 July 2014, the claim was refused registration because the delegate of the Native Title Registrar found it did not satisfy all the registration conditions of ss 190B and 190C of the NTA (see the [registration test decision](#)). The claimants were given notice of this decision as required under s 190D (1) of the NTA on 21 July 2014. The claimants sought reconsideration of this decision and provided further anthropological evidence on 13 September 2014. A member of the Tribunal found that the conditions were still not satisfied and that the claim should not be registered.

The claimants failed to seek review in the Federal Court within 42 days after notification of the Tribunal's decision as required under R 34.109 of the *Federal Court Rules 2011* (Cth). On 16 February 2015 the State filed an application that the claim be dismissed because it was unregistered and there was no reason why it should not be dismissed. On 19 March 2015, the applicants filed an application to extend time in which to seek review under s 190F NTA of the decision not to register the claimant application. Registration of a claim is significant because while a claimant application may be heard and determined under the NTA if it is not registered, only applicants with registered claims have the right to negotiate, under the NTA, in respect of future acts.

The claimants submitted that the delay was due to the failure of their legal adviser, who was acting in a pro bono capacity, to file the application for review. Justice Barker took into account the delay in seeking an extension of time to apply for review, the explanation that had been provided and the merits of the application and

ultimately concluded that he would not make an order to extend the time in which review could be sought.

## ***Sambo v State of Western Australia [2015] FCA 954***

---

**26 August 2015, [Application](#), Federal Court of Australia-Perth, WA, Barker J**

In this case, the Court dismissed an application filed by Ms Sambo because the applicant failed to explain how the application would successfully be amended so as to satisfy the registration test. While the Court struck out the claim, it also noted at [85] that this dismissal does not prevent the applicant from lodging a fresh claim and seeking to address the deficiencies identified in the initial application.

The Kaparn people lodged a claim with the Federal Court on 11 November 2013, which a delegate of the Native Title Registrar found did not meet the conditions under s 190B NTA and was therefore refused registration. An amended application was filed on 19 December 2014 and again failed the registration test. The claim failed to satisfy the following conditions under the provision:

- identification of area subject to native title [s 190B\(2\) NTA](#)
- factual basis for claimed native title [s 190B\(5\) NTA](#)
- prima facie case and [s 190B\(6\) NTA](#)
- physical connection [s 190B\(7\) NTA](#)

The delegate also found that the application did not meet the procedural requirement in s 90C(4) authorisation and certification. The applicant did not apply to the Native Title Tribunal for reconsideration within 42 days, nor did they apply to the Federal Court for a review within 42 days. As a result, under [ss 190F\(6\) and \(5\) NTA](#) the Court, put the applicant on notice as to why their application should not be dismissed.

The applicant did not provide further supporting materials or affidavits to the court by the date required. The solicitors who were acting for the applicant ceased to do so prior to the hearing. Ms Sambo applied for a further adjournment but this application was refused by the Court. The Court then went on to determine two questions:

1. Whether the Court must ensure the applicant is aware, in advance of any hearing, which particular elements of the application are to be scrutinised by the Court at the hearing of the motion and
2. Is the application likely to be amended in a way that would lead to a different outcome once reconsidered?

### **Question One**

The applicant argued that there was a procedural fairness requirement for the Court to communicate their 'preliminary opinion' and to identify which elements of the registration test were being considered. The Court held at [30] that it was



inappropriate to say the court had formed a ‘preliminary opinion’ and noted that the section was designed to ensure unmeritorious applications did not clog up the court system. The Court also emphasised at [33] there was a practical onus on the applicant to provide extra information to show the Court that the application is likely to be amended in a way that would lead to a different outcome or that there is another reason why the application should not be dismissed. The applicant had previously been granted an adjournment to provide additional materials and had not done so.

## **Question Two**

The Court concluded at [48] that it was likely the mapping issue will be amended in a way that will lead to a different outcome (s 190B(2) identification of the area subject to native title). However, the Court agreed with the delegate’s decision that the factual basis for claimed native title was not satisfied. Much of the supporting material provided to the delegate was of poor quality, incomplete and at times inconsistent. As a consequence neither ss 190B(6) nor (7) could be satisfied and nothing suggested s 190B(4) should be reconsidered.

## ***Yurriyangem Taam and Others v Baibao Resources Pty Ltd and Another* [2015] NNTTA 30**

---

### **12 August 2015, [an Inquiry into an Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal (‘the Tribunal’) addressed an objection lodged by the Yurriyangem Taam, Ngarrawanji and Yarrangi Riwi Yoowarni Gooniyandi (‘YRY Gooniyandi’) peoples to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Baibao Resources and found that the grant was an act attracting the expedited procedure under s 237 of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (‘NTA’). The licence is approximately 533 square kilometres in size and is located 73 kilometres west of Halls Creek. Yurriyangem Taam’s claim application area overlaps the majority of the central portion of the licence, while the Ngarrawanji and YRY Gooniyandi areas overlap along the east and west borders of the licence.

After considering the evidence presented, the Tribunal held at [18]-[19] that the grant of the exploration licence was not likely to substantially and directly interfere with community or social activities including the gathering of yams, bush plums and bush medicine, and fishing. There was no detailed evidence of the frequency of visits; the numbers of community members involved; or whether this area is used more than other parts of country. As a result, the evidence provided was not specific enough to satisfy the Tribunal that Baibao’s activities would likely substantially affect the community or social activities.

In addition, the Tribunal accepted that sites and areas of particular significance existed on the licence including the badawa places at the Fish Hole Yard,

Blackfellow Spring and Blackfellow Creek; and the ceremonial ‘special man’s place’. However, it held that there was insufficient evidence to conclude these places were likely to be interfered with if the licence was granted and that the Tribunal was satisfied an RSHA will ensure the community are consulted regarding the badawa places and the special man’s place. The grant of the licence, or the exercise of any rights created by the grant, was held not to be likely to involve major disturbance to the land or waters concerned.

### ***John Graham and Others on behalf of Ngadju v Brooke Louise Strindberg* [2015] NNTTA 31**

---

#### **17 August 2015, [An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal (‘the Tribunal’) dismissed an objection lodged by the Ngadju people to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Brooke Louise Strindberg. The Ngadju people native title claim overlaps the licence by 90.5 per cent.

The Tribunal had previously made directions requiring all parties to the matter to produce their contentions and evidence by 28 July 2015 in order that a determination could be made about whether or not the expedited procedure applied to the grant. Neither contentions nor evidence were provided by that date by the Ngadju people. As a result, on 29 July 2015 the State wrote to the Tribunal, Ms Strindberg’s representatives and the Ngadju people, requesting the objection be dismissed. The Tribunal wrote to both parties asking them to respond to this request, but no reply was received. The Tribunal then again wrote to the Ngadju people on 3 August 2015 to advise them that the objection would be dismissed within seven days if they failed to respond to the State’s request. At the date of the determination, no response had been received, either as to why the objection should not be dismissed, nor any requests for an extension, nor reasons for not complying. As a consequence, the Tribunal stated that it would be unfair to prejudice the other parties with further delays and dismissed the objection.

### ***Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha v Breaker Resources NL* [2015] NNTTA 32**

---

#### **18 August 2015, [An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal- Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal (‘the Tribunal’) dismissed an objection lodged by the Wutha people to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Breaker Resources NL. The Wutha people native title claim overlaps the licence by 61.16 per cent.

The Tribunal had previously made directions requiring all parties to the matter to produce their contentions and evidence by 28 July 2015 in order that a determination could be made about whether or not the expedited procedure applied to the grant. Neither contentions nor evidence were provided by that date by the Wutha people. As a result, on 29 July 2015 the State wrote to the Tribunal, the representatives of Breaker Resources NL and the Wutha people, requesting the objection be dismissed. The Tribunal wrote to both parties asking them to respond to this request. The Wutha people responded but did not provide any reasons as to why the dismissal should not go ahead. On 11 August 2015, Breaker Resources NL wrote to the Tribunal supporting the request to dismiss on the basis the Wutha people had not complied with directions. At the date of the determination, no response had been received, either as to why the objection should not be dismissed, nor any requests for an extension, nor reasons for not complying. As a consequence, the Tribunal states it would be unfair to prejudice the other parties with further delays and dismissed the objection.

### ***Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha v Minex (West) Pty Ltd and Another [2015] NNTTA 33***

---

#### **21 August 2015, An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application, National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal ('the Tribunal') determined that the proposed grant of an exploration licence is an 'act attracting the expedited procedure' under s 237(b) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) ('NTA'). The licence covers an area of approximately 152.16 square kilometres and is situated about 67 kilometres north of Sandstone in the Geraldton region. The Wutha's claim area overlaps 47.31 per cent of the licence, and the Yugunga-Nya native title claim overlaps the licence by 98.7 per cent. The Wutha people have objected to the application, while the Yugunga-Nya have not, having reached an agreement with Minex (West) regarding heritage protection.

The Wutha argued that the proposed licence, and the activities that would be conducted under its authority, would directly interfere with the social or community activities carried on in the area; that it is also likely to interfere with areas or sites of particular significance; and that it is likely to involve, or create rights whose exercise will cause major disturbance to land or waters. The Wutha people had requested that oral evidence be allowed, however the Tribunal decided this was not appropriate and that the matter should be decided on the papers provided.

The Tribunal noted that the Wutha people had not provided affidavit evidence as to what community and social activities are carried out on the licence. Again, the Tribunal observed that the Wutha native title claimants did not identify any sites or areas of particular significance. In addition, there were no specific arguments or

evidence raised to demonstrate that the grant of the licence is likely to involve, or create rights whose exercise is likely to involve major disturbance to land or waters.

***Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha v Cue Minerals Pty Ltd [2015] NNTTA 34***

---

**25 August 2015, [An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal ('the Tribunal') dismissed an objection lodged by the Wutha people to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Cue Minerals. The Wutha claim overlaps the entirety of the licence.

The Tribunal had previously made directions requiring all parties to the matter to produce their contentions and evidence by 28 July 2015 in order that a determination could be made about whether or not the expedited procedure applied to the grant. Neither contentions nor evidence were provided by that date by the Wutha people. As a result, on 29 July 2015 the State wrote to the Tribunal, the representatives of Cue Minerals and the Wutha people, requesting the objection be dismissed. The Tribunal wrote to both parties on 30 July 2015 asking them to respond to this request. At the date of the determination, no response had been received, either as to why the objection should not be dismissed, nor any requests for an extension, nor reasons for not complying. As a consequence, the Tribunal states it would be unfair to prejudice the other parties with further delays and dismissed the objection.

***Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha v Colin Robert Neve [2015] NNTTA 35***

---

**25 August 2015, [An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal ('the Tribunal') dismissed an objection lodged by the Wutha people to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Mr Colin Robert Neve. The Wutha claim overlaps the licence by 99.99 per cent.

The Tribunal had previously made directions requiring all parties to the matter to produce their contentions and evidence by 6 August 2015 in order that a determination could be made about whether or not the expedited procedure applied to the grant. Neither contentions nor evidence were provided by that date by the Wutha people. As a result, on 11 August 2015 the State wrote to the Tribunal, the Mr Neve and the Wutha people, requesting the objection be dismissed. The Tribunal wrote to both parties on 11 August 2015 asking them to respond to this request. At the date of the determination, no response had been received, either as to why the objection should not be dismissed, nor any requests for an extension, nor reasons



for not complying. As a consequence, the Tribunal states it would be unfair to prejudice the other parties with further delays and dismissed the objection.

***Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha v Diversity Resources Pty Ltd [2015] NNTTA 36***

---

**26 August 2015, [An inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal ('the Tribunal') dismissed an objection lodged by the Wutha people to the intended grant of an exploration licence to Diversity Resources. The Wutha claim overlaps the licence by 51.17 per cent. The State included an expedited procedure clause in the notice.

The Tribunal had previously made directions requiring all parties to the matter to produce their contentions and evidence by 10 August 2015 in order that a determination could be made about whether or not the expedited procedure applied to the grant. Neither contentions nor evidence were provided by that date by the Wutha people. As a result, on 17 August 2015 the State wrote to the Tribunal, representatives from Diversity Resources and the Wutha people, requesting the objection be dismissed. The Tribunal wrote to both parties on 17 August 2015 asking them to respond to this request. At the date of the determination, no response had been received, either as to why the objection should not be dismissed, nor any requests for an extension, nor reasons for not complying. As a consequence, the Tribunal states it would be unfair to prejudice the other parties with further delays and dismissed the objection.

***Wunna Niyaparli People v FMG Pilbara Pty Ltd and Another [2015] NNTTA 37***

---

**27 August 2015, [An Inquiry into Expedited Procedure Objection Application](#), National Native Title Tribunal – Perth, WA, H Shurven, Member**

In this matter, the National Native Title Tribunal ('the Tribunal') determined that the proposed grant of an exploration licence amalgamation to FMG Pilbara is an 'act attracting the expedited procedure' under s 237(b) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) ('NTA'). The licence amalgamation covers an area of approximately 17.5 hectares in size and is situated about 64 kilometres south of Nullagine in the East Pilbara shire. The Wunna Niyaparli People and the Niyaparli registered native title claims completely overlap the licence. Only the Wunna Niyaparli chose to lodge an objection.

The amalgamation area was not originally included in the licence grant because it was subject to a prospecting licence, surrendered in 2009, then subject to another



licence, and subsequently surrendered again in 2014. Initially when the whole licence was granted there was no expedited procedure asserted. At that time only the Nyiyaparli claim had been lodged and registered. A Land Access Agreement covering Aboriginal cultural heritage and compensation was negotiated between the State, FMG Pilbara and the Nyiyaparli people.

The Wunna Nyiyaparli argued that the proposed grant would directly interfere with the social or community activities carried on in the area; that it is also likely to interfere with areas or sites of particular significance; and that it is likely to involve, or create rights whose exercise will cause major disturbance to land or waters.

The Tribunal noted that the Wunna Nyiyaparli people provided affidavit evidence that the community and social activities carried out included hunting kangaroo, collecting bush tucker and medicines. The Tribunal believed it was likely that given the area was previously subject to a pastoral, as well as mineral exploration, it was likely that these ventures had interfered with those social and community activities. Again, the Tribunal observed at [16] that the evidence provided by the Wunna Nyiyaparli people lacked details such as the frequency of visits and number of community members involved. Therefore the Tribunal concluded the grant was not likely to substantially or directly interfere with their community or social activities.

The Tribunal noted at [21]-[23] that insufficient evidence was provided of sites of particular significance: the existence of 'burial grounds' was stated in the application with no further information provided. In addition, there was nothing in the documents lodged that showed the area has any special characteristics and demonstrated that the grant is likely to involve, or create rights whose exercise is likely to involve major disturbance to land or waters.

## 2. Legislation

### Western Australia

#### [Constitution Amendment \(Recognition of Aboriginal People\) Bill 2015](#)

**Status:** This bill has been passed by both Houses of the Parliament and is awaiting Royal Assent upon which it will come into operation.

**Stated Purpose:** The bill is an Act to amend the *Constitution Act 1889* and to add an acknowledgement in the preamble that recognises Aboriginal people as the traditional custodians of the land and the first peoples of the State. The amendment also explicitly states that 'Parliament seeks to effect reconciliation with Western Australia's Aboriginal people'.

**Native Title Implications:** This bill may inform or be referenced by the State as it seeks to resolve native title determinations in Western Australia.

For further information please see the [Explanatory Memorandum](#) and the [Second Reading](#).

## Heritage Bill 2015 (Draft Bill for Public Consultation)

**Status:** This draft bill has been prepared for public comment and was tabled for the purposes of public comment on 8 August 2015.

**Stated Purpose:** This bill seeks to recognise the importance of and to promote understanding and appreciation of Western Australia's cultural heritage. The bill provides for the identification and documentation of places of heritage significance, as well as for the conservation, use, development and adaptation of such places. It will also repeal the *Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990* (WA).

**Native Title Implications:** The term 'cultural heritage significance' is defined in the draft bill to mean aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for Western Australians or groups within the State. However, the draft bill states in the objectives that it is not intended to apply to a place whose cultural heritage significance is solely derived from its connection with Aboriginal tradition or culture.

Under the draft bill the Heritage Council of Western Australia will continue to be the State's expert body on matters concerning places of cultural heritage significance, except those places where cultural heritage significance is solely derived from its connection with Aboriginal tradition or culture. Nothing in the draft bill will affect the operation of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.

Under the proposed provision s 120, a native title holder will be able to continue to exercise their native title rights and interests at a registered place or a place that is subject to a preservation order without committing an offence, on the condition that the exercise of those rights 'does not detrimentally affect the cultural heritage significance' of the site.

For further information please see the [Draft Bill for Public Consultation](#).

### 3. Native Title Determinations

In August 2015, the NNTT website listed 3 native title determinations.

Short Name (NNTT)	Case Name	Date (NNTT)	State	Outcome	Legal Process	Type	RNTBC/PBC
Freight Terminals Pty Ltd v State of QLD	<a href="#">Freight Terminals Pty Ltd v State of Queensland</a>	21/08/2015	QLD	Native title does not exist	Consent	Non-claimant	N/A
David Noel Weber v State of QLD	<a href="#">David Noel Weber v State of Queensland</a>	21/08/2015	QLD	Native title does not exist	Consent	Non-claimant	N/A
Wulli Wulli People	<a href="#">Anderson on behalf of the Wulli Wulli People v State of Queensland (No 3)</a>	13/08/2015	QLD	Native title exists in the entire determination area	Consent	Claimant	N/A

## 4. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate & Prescribed Bodies Corporate

The [Native Title Research Unit](#) within AIATSIS maintains a [RNTBC summary document](#) which provides details about RNTBCs and PBCs in each state/territory including the RNTBC name, RNTBC type (agent or trustee) and relevant native title determination information. The statistics for RNTBCs as of 14 May 2015 can be found in the table below.

Information on RNTBCs and PBCs including training and support, news and events, research and publications and external links can be found at [nativetitle.org.au](http://nativetitle.org.au). For a detailed summary of individual RNTBCs and PBCs see [PBC Profiles](#).

Additional information about RNTBCs and PBCs can be accessed through hyperlinks to corporation information on the [Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations \(ORIC\) website](#); case law on the [Austlii website](#); and native title determination information on the [NNTT](#) and [ATNS](#) websites.

**Table 1: National Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate (RNTBCs) Statistics (14 May 2015)**

State/Territory	RNTBCs	No. of successful (& conditional) claimant determinations for which RNTBC to be advised
Australian Capital Territory	0	0
New South Wales	4	0
Northern Territory	19	49
Queensland	69	3
South Australia	14	0
Victoria	4	0
Western Australia	32	2
<b>NATIONAL TOTAL</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>54</b>

**Note** some RNTBCs relate to more than one native title determination and some determinations result in more than one RNTBC. Where a RNTBC operates for more than one determination it is only counted once, as it is one organisation.

**Source:** <http://www.nntt.gov.au/searchRegApps/NativeTitleClaims/Pages/default.aspx> and Registered Determinations of Native Title and RNTBCs as at 14 May 2015.

## 5. Indigenous Land Use Agreements

In August 2015, 10 ILUAs were registered with the National Native Title Tribunal.

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
28/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Masig (Yorke Island) Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/026	Body Corporate	TSI	Infrastructure, Residential
25/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Gunditjmara - SEAGAS Port Campbell VIC to Torrens Island SA Pipeline ILUA</u></a>	VI2015/002	Body Corporate	VIC	Pipeline, Development, Gas
20/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Warraber (Sue Island) Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/013	Body Corporate	TSI	Community Living Area, Community, Residential
20/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Moa (St Pauls Island) Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/014	Body Corporate	TSI	Community Living Area, Community, Residential
20/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Mer Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/015	Body Corporate	TSI	Community Living Area, Community, Residential
20/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Poruma (Coconut Island) Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/016	Body Corporate	TSI	Community Living Area, Community, Residential
19/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Wuthathi People #2 and Cook Shire Council ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/020	Body Corporate	QLD	Government, Access, Public
10/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Badu Torres Strait Social Housing ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/017	Body Corporate	TSI	Community, Co-management, Community Living Area
03/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Gangalidda and Garawa People Westmoreland Pastoral ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/007	Area Agreement	QLD	Access, Pastoral, Terms of Access
03/08/2015	<a href="#"><u>Gangalidda People Punjaub Pastoral ILUA</u></a>	QI2015/011	Area Agreement	QLD	Access, Terms of Access

For more information about ILUAs, see the [NNTT website](#) and the [ATNS Database](#).

## 6. Future Acts Determinations

In August 2015, 8 Future Acts Determinations were handed down.

Determination date	Parties	Tribunal file no.	State or Territory	Decision/ Determination
27/08/2015	<u>Betty Peterson and Others on behalf of the Wunna Nyiyaparli People (WC2012/001) (native title party)</u> - and - <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> - and - <u>FMG Pilbara Pty Ltd (grantee party)</u>	WO2015/0174	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies
26/08/2015	<u>Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha (WC1999/010) (native title party)</u> -and- <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> -and- <u>Diversity Resources Pty Ltd (grantee party)</u>	WO2014/0843	WA	Objection - Dismissed
25/08/2015	<u>Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha (WC1999/010) (native title party)</u> -and- <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> -and- <u>Cue Minerals Pty Ltd (grantee party)</u>	WO2015/0331	WA	Objection - Dismissed
25/08/2015	<u>Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha (WC1999/010) (native title party)</u> -and- <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> -and- <u>Colin Robert Neve (grantee party)</u>	WO2015/0320	WA	Objection - Dismissed
21/08/2015	<u>Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and others on behalf of Wutha (WC1999/010) (native title party)</u> - and - <u>Minex (West) Pty Ltd (grantee party)</u> - and - <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u>	WO2015/0093	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies



Determination date	Parties	Tribunal file no.	State or Territory	Decision/ Determination
18/08/2015	<u>Raymond William Ashwin (dec) and Others on behalf of Wutha (WC1999/010) (native title party)</u> -and- <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> -and- <u>Breaker Resources NL (grantee party)</u>	WO2015/0312	WA	Objection - Dismissed
17/08/2015	<u>John Graham and Others on behalf of Ngadju (WC1999/002) (native title party)</u> -and- <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> -and- <u>Brooke Louise Strindberg (grantee party)</u>	WO2015/0483	WA	Objection - Dismissed
12/08/2015	<u>Peggy Patrick and Others on behalf of Yurriyangem Taam (WC2010/013) (Yurriyangem Taam native title party)</u> - and - <u>Connie Jugarie and Others on behalf of the Ngarrawanji People (WC1996/075) (Ngarrawanji native title party)</u> - and - <u>Mervyn Street and Others on behalf of Yarrangi Riwi Yoowarni Gooniyandi (WC2012/010) (YRY Gooniyandi native title party)</u> - and - <u>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</u> - and - <u>Baibao Resources Pty Ltd (grantee party)</u>	WO2014/0425 WO2014/0495 WO2014/0498	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies

## 7. Native Title in the News

The [Native Title Research Unit](#) with AIATSIS published the [Native Title in the News](#) which contains summaries of newspaper articles and media releases relevant to the native title sector.

## 8. Related Publications

### Publications

---

#### Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research

##### ***A critical review of the capability approach in Australian Indigenous policy***

The Working paper by E. Klein is now available for free download from the CAEPR website.

For further information, [please visit the CAEPR website](#)

##### ***Understanding Aboriginal identification in NSW: evidence from the Australian Census Longitudinal Dataset***

The Topical Issue paper by N. Biddle is now available for free download from the CAEPR website.

For further information, [please visit the CAEPR website](#)

##### ***The changing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population: Evidence from the 2006-11 Australian Census Longitudinal Dataset***

The CAEPR 2001 Census paper by N. Biddle and H. Crawford is now available for free download from the CAEPR website.

For further information, [please visit the CAEPR website](#)

#### Central Land Council

##### ***Land Rights News – Volume 5, Number 2***

The August 2015 edition of Land Rights News – Central Australia is now available.

For further information, [please visit the CLC website](#)

### Media Releases, News Broadcasts and Podcasts

---

#### AIATSIS

##### ***Conference presentations now available online***

The National Native Title Conference 2015 conference presentations, video and audio are now available on the AIATSIS website.

For further information, [please visit the AIATSIS website](#)

## **Central Land Council**

### ***Launch of 'Every hill got a story': our history, our words***

Eminent Aboriginal men and women from across Central Australia have launched 'Every hill got a story', the Centre's first comprehensive oral history collection. The book launch at the Alice Springs Telegraph Station on Wednesday, 2 September, was a part of the Alice Desert Festival, and celebrated the Central Land Council's 40th anniversary.

For further information, [please visit the CLC website](#)

## **Kimberley Land Council**

### ***KLC new office complex officially opened for business***

The Kimberley Land Council has celebrated the official opening of its new office complex in Broome. The \$15 million state of the art building brings all of the organisation's Broome operations under the one roof and includes office and storage space for up to 120 staff. Other features include adaptable conference facilities, meeting rooms and a specially designed archive and storage space to protect the KLC's historical documents and library resources.

For further information, [please visit the KLC website](#)

## **Minister for Indigenous Affairs – Senator the Hon Nigel Scullion**

### ***Edward Fry appointed as new Chairperson of ILC***

Mr Edward Fry has been appointed Chairperson of the Indigenous Land Corporation for a three-year period. He is an Indigenous Australian with extensive experience in the resources sector and current Chairperson of Indigenous Business Australia (IBA). Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Nigel Scullion, said Mr Fry's appointment would allow the ILC to drive a strong economic development agenda for the benefit of Indigenous Australians.

For further information, [please visit the Minister for Indigenous Affairs website](#)

### ***Native title recognised over Wullli Wullli country***

The Federal Court has formally recognised native title over 5432 square kilometres of Wullli Wullli country west of Bundaberg, Queensland after a 15-year battle. The recognition covered places such as the Upper Dawson River area around Theodore and Cracow, including Precipice and Isla Gorge National Parks.

For further information, [please visit the Minister for Indigenous Affairs website](#)

## **National Native Title Tribunal**

### ***Native title agreements cover more than a quarter of Australia***

National Native Title Tribunal President, Raelene Webb QC has said that more than 1000 Indigenous land use agreements (ILUAs) on the NNTT Register is strong

evidence of proponents and native title parties successfully negotiating about matters in relation to native title. ILUAs are now part of doing ordinary business in Australia with ILUAs covering more than 25% of Australia, from the remote Islands of the Torres Strait where 60 agreements are registered, to all parts of mainland Australia with the most agreements being registered in Queensland.

For further information, [please visit the NNTT website](#)

## **Northern Land Council**

### ***Keynote speech at Garma Festival***

Transcript of Northern Land Council CEO Joe Morrison's keynote speech that was delivered at Garma Festival on 1 August 2015.

For further information, [please visit the NLC website](#)

### ***NLC welcomes EPA decision***

The Northern Land Council welcomes the decision of the Environment Protection Authority to lay a complaint against Redbank Operations Pty Ltd which operates the Redbank copper mine at Wologorang Station, near the Queensland border.

For further information, [please visit the NLC website](#)

### ***NLC is saddened by the death of Mr Wunungmurra***

The Northern Land Council is deeply saddened by news of the death of its immediate past chairman, Mr Wunungmurra. Having served two three-year terms, Mr Wunungmurra retired as NLC chairman in late 2013. Current NLC Chairman, Samuel Bush-Blanasi said "With the passing of Mr Wunungmurra, the whole Northern Territory community has lost a leader of great distinction. He was a kind and beautiful man."

For further information, [please visit the NLC website](#)

### ***On the recent passing of Mr Illaga***

The Northern Land Council is deeply saddened by the news of the passing of another senior custodian of Aboriginal law and culture, Mr Illaga, who passed away at his home at Minyerri (Hodgson Downs). Mr Illaga served on the Full Council of the Northern Land Council, and provided constant leadership to his family, his clan and language groups and to the Northern Land Council for much of his life.

For further information, [please visit the NLC website](#)

### ***State funeral for Mr Wunungmurra***

The Northern Territory Government has held a State funeral for former Chairman of the Northern Land Council, Mr Wunungmurra, who passed away on 7 August, aged 70. The service was held at Rika Park, Yirrkala Community (via Nhulunbuy) at 10am on Friday 4 September. As a signatory to the 1963 Yirrkala Bark Petitions, Mr

Wunungmurra was a champion of Aboriginal rights who worked tirelessly for Indigenous Territorians, their land and their culture throughout his lifetime.

For further information, [please visit the NLC website](#)

## 9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities

### AIATSIS

#### *Australian Aboriginal Studies*

Australian Aboriginal Studies (AAS) is inviting papers for coming issues. AAS is a quality multidisciplinary journal that exemplifies the vision where the world's Indigenous knowledge and cultures are recognised, respected and valued. Send your manuscript to the Editor by emailing [aasjournal@aiatsis.gov.au](mailto:aasjournal@aiatsis.gov.au). Early submissions will be given preference in the case of review and publication process.

For more information, [visit the journal page of the AIATSIS website](#)

#### *Volunteers needed for an AIATSIS Research Project*

Understanding how native title and other advances have provided livelihood benefits to Indigenous people is a key area of research for AIATSIS. Indigenous employment in the natural resource management sector is an important area of success but we lack much quantitative data to understand who and how people benefited. Jobs and employment are one key indicator so we are exploring historical data sets on employment patterns in natural resource management.

We have collated email job ads from the last 20 years from NRM Jobs and are in the process of converting them from a large 'text dump' into a useable database. Once complete we can analyse spatial and temporal patterns in the data and explore how government and industry investment in natural resource management has translated into jobs and opportunities in remote and regional Australia.

Patterns are emerging but it is slow work and we need volunteers to help process a huge dataset. The work will involve coding and refining the information contained in job ads and then arranging it into particular columns. We will provide you with a manual and software tools such as Google Refine and of course acknowledge you in the research report.

If you are interested, or can think of other volunteers or services that might be of use, please email Tim Heffernan ([tim.heffernan@aiatsis.gov.au](mailto:tim.heffernan@aiatsis.gov.au))

#### **The Aurora Project**

[See the Aurora Project: 2015 Program Calendar](#) for information on training and personal development for staff of native title representative bodies, native title service providers, RNTBCs and PBCs.



## ORIC

ORIC provides a range of training for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporations about the [Corporations \(Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander\) Act 2006 \(CATSI Act\)](#), the corporation's rule book and other aspects of good corporate governance.

For further information on training courses, [visit the ORIC website](#)

## 10. Events

### Puliima

#### ***Puliima National Indigenous Language and Technology Forum 2015***

Puliima National Indigenous Language and Technology Forum is a biennial event aimed at bringing people together from all over Australia to explore pioneering project ideas, exciting products and equipment that can be used in community based Indigenous languages projects.

**Date:** 14-15 October 2015

**Location:** William Angliss Institute Conference Centre, Melbourne

For further information, [visit the Puliima website](#)

### National Centre for Indigenous Studies

#### ***NCIS Graduate Research Retreat***

The National Centre for Indigenous Studies will be hosting its sixth research retreat for Higher Degree by Research (HDR) scholars.

**Date:** 15-16 October 2015

**Location:** Burringiri Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Culture Centre, Yarramundi Reach, 245 Lady Denman Drive, Canberra

For further information, [visit the NCIS website](#)

### 2015 Board of Directors Conferences

The National Indigenous Board of Directors conference focuses on the challenging dynamics of being a member of the Board of Directors of a community organisation or corporation.

**Date:** 19-21 October 2015

**Location:** Mercure, Gold Coast Resort, Queensland

For further information, [visit the Indigenous Conferences website](#)

## **AAS Pre-Conference Assembly**

### ***Pre-Conference Assembly for Native Title Anthropologists***

First held in Perth in 2011, this now regular assembly provides a unique opportunity for practitioners and others working in the area of native title to meet, catch up with long-lost colleagues, and share information about relevant developments in research, law and practice.

**Date:** 1 December 2015

**Location:** University of Melbourne

For further information or to register your interest, please contact Dr Pamela McGrath, [Pamela.mcgrath@nntt.gov.au](mailto:Pamela.mcgrath@nntt.gov.au)

## **AAS 2015 Conference**

### ***Moral Horizons***

The Australian Anthropological Society's conference theme is an invitation for ethnographic research and anthropological theorisations that can contribute, critically or otherwise, to widen and multiply those moral horizons.

**Date:** 1-4 December 2015

**Location:** University of Melbourne

For further information, please contact [catherine.gressier@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:catherine.gressier@unimelb.edu.au)

## **University of Tasmania and Australian National University Workshop**

### ***Indigenous Peoples & Saltwater/ Freshwater Governance for a Sustainable Future***

The University of Tasmania and the Australian National University are convening a workshop to discuss the environmental governance of marine and freshwater areas by and from the perspective of Indigenous peoples. Presentation proposals are due by 1 July 2015.

**Date:** 11-12 February 2016

**Location:** University of Tasmania, Hobart

For further information, please contact Professor Benjamin Richardson, [B.J.Richardson@utas.edu.au](mailto:B.J.Richardson@utas.edu.au), or Lauren Butterly, [lauren.butterly@anu.edu.au](mailto:lauren.butterly@anu.edu.au)

## Children's Healthcare Australasia and National Rural Health Alliance

### *Caring for Country Kids Conference*

Children's Healthcare Australasia (CHA) and the National Rural Health Alliance (NRHA) are joining forces to host a national Conference on quality healthcare for children and young people living in rural, regional and remote communities across Australia. This unique Conference will showcase innovations, models, programs and activities that enhance the health and wellbeing of infants, children and young people in rural and remote Australia.

**Date:** 17-19 April 2016

**Location:** Alice Springs Convention Centre, NT

For further information, [visit the Caring for Country Kids website](#)

## NAISA 2016

### *2016 Annual Meeting*

The University of Hawai'i, the National Indigenous Research and Knowledges Network (NIRAKN), Queensland University and RMIT will host the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association Annual meeting in Honolulu, Hawai'i in May 2016.

**Date:** 18-21 May 2016

**Location:** University of Hawai'i, Honolulu

For further information, [visit the NAISA website](#)

The Native Title Research Unit produces monthly publications to keep you informed on the latest developments in native title throughout Australia. You can subscribe to NTRU publications online, follow @NTRU\_AIATSIS on Twitter or 'Like' NTRU on Facebook.

