

WHAT'S NEW IN NATIVE TITLE

JULY 2014

1. Case Summaries.....	1
2. Legislation	10
3. Indigenous Land Use Agreements	10
4. Native Title Determinations	12
5. Future Acts Determinations	12
6. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate & Prescribed Bodies Corporate	15
7. Native Title in the News	15
8. Related Publications	15
9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities.....	17
10. Events.....	18

1. Case Summaries

[*Willis on behalf of the Pilki People v State of Western Australia \[2014\] FCA 714*](#)

and

[*BP \(Deceased\) on behalf of the Birriliburu People v State of Western Australia \[2014\] FCA 715*](#)

4 July 2014, Native Title Rights of a Commercial Nature, Federal Court of Australia, Perth, Western Australia

North J

In these two judgments, which were heard together, the Court held that, under traditional laws and customs, the applicants had the right to access and take the resources of that country for all purposes, including commercial purposes.

The first matter (the Pilki matter) applied to an application by the Pilki People for a determination of native title over an area of unallocated Crown land in the Western Desert region between the Nullarbor Plain and the Great Victorian Desert surrounding Jubilee Lake.

The second matter (the Birriliburu matter) applied to four applications by the Birriliburu People for determination of native title in the Western Desert region near the centre of Western Australia. The applications are known as:

1. Birriliburu # 1 (which was determined except for a small area that was subject to exploration licences);
2. Birriliburu # 2 (the area subject to the exploration licenses, which was largely determined, except for some remaining areas that were finally determined in Birriliburu # 4);
3. Birriliburu # 3 (an area adjoining Birriliburu # 1 that was subject to a pastoral lease); and
4. Birriliburu # 4 (the remaining area from the determinations in Birriliburu # 1 and # 2).

Both matters relate to the Western Desert region and the same legal issue arose in both proceedings, with the same legal arguments for both cases addressed together by the same counsel. The evidence led in each of the proceedings was separate, save for part of the expert evidence of Dr Cane (an anthropologist) which was relied on by the applicants in both proceedings.

Dr Cane's evidence was heavily relied upon in both matters. It included answers to seven questions provided to Dr Cane by Central Desert Native Title Services. Dr Cane's 17 page answers were accompanied by an 89 page background to explain those answers, so that his answers would be better understood in relation to the tradition of trade and meaning of commerce. The information included discussion about trade both pre and post sovereignty, including recent trading activities, and focussed on trade and commerce with respect to ochre, shell (baler shell and pearl shell), grindstones, ground stone axes, stone knives, wooden implements and tobacco. The Court described this as 'detailed and very helpful.'

The Issue to Be Determined

At issue in both matters was whether the claim groups had established a right under traditional law and custom to access and take resources of the areas for commercial purposes. At [104] in the Pilki matter, North J stated:

At the centre of the case for the State was the proposition that it is necessary to prove that commercial activity has been conducted by the Pilki People in order to establish that the right exists.

North J rejected this proposition. His Honour followed the reasoning by the High court in *Yorta Yorta v Victoria* (2002) 214 CLR 422 and, at paragraphs [118] in the Pilki matter and [89] in the Birriliburu matter, stated:

it is not necessary as a matter of logic to prove that activity in conformity with traditional laws and customs has taken place in order to establish that a right exists. In many cases, proof of activities undertaken pursuant to laws or customs will assist in proving the existence of the right. But evidence of the activity is not necessary.

1. the Pilki matter

North J heard evidence provided by the applicants and, at [46], accepted that any gaps in the elaboration of relevant laws and customs were addressed by the expert evidence of Dr Cane. Insight was also provided to the Court on the nature of the traditional laws and customs by a brief trip onto the country itself.

Dr Cane's evidence included, at [72]:

even while there are no substantial resources in the Pilki area or in the largest Spinifex area that I'm aware that were traded, its material resources and maybe their intellectual ones, they're nevertheless within a system. So, within locations and along potential routes, particularly given some of the large Dreaming Tracks that go through that route, and given the significance of Pilki itself, they'd most likely be part of that broader network.

...

I don't think people generally are aware of how substantial the system of trade was in the Australian continent and how old. So, it was a matter of information transfer really.

Dr Cane's evidence also included details provided by the explorer Richard Maurice, by Daisy Bates (who recorded incidents of trade in 'articles of commerce in 1911-13) and by records of a pastoralists and their employee (see paragraphs [82]-[85]). As evidence of recent trading activities, Dr Cane discussed the trade of animal skins, totemic boards as well as copper that some Aboriginal men mined near Warburton in the 1960s. Evidence also included the sale of articles to tourists, passing through Ooldea on the Trans Australian railway. At [89], the Court set out the following paragraph from Dr Cane's evidence:

By 1932 the trade had become so substantial that railway authorities passed a bylaw prohibiting Aboriginal people from approaching the train and forbidding employees to 'sell, barter, exchange or otherwise make available either directly or indirectly any food, clothing, or money to any aboriginal'.

A summary of Dr Cane's expert opinion was provided at [94]-[99] and included the following statements:

Archaeological evidence points to an ancient tradition of trade and exchange across the Australian continent on a large scale that saw resource extraction, production, and the distribution of raw materials and finished products in a regulated, anticipatory manner. The archaeological record is supplemented by an ethno-historic accounts [sic] that describes both regional and local trade and exchange in a wide range of resources (weapons, tools, decoration, twine, bags, baskets, skins, stone, ochre and pigments, shells, tobacco and drugs in established routes across cultural boundaries and geographic zones] - from and between the tropical north, arid center and temperate south of Australia.

...

The ethnographic evidence strongly suggests that the claim area is within an area (encompassing the Great Victoria Desert and Nullarbor Plain primarily) that was engaged in substantial trade in various materials (flint, fur twine, hair string, hardwoods, weapons, pearl shell, and ochre: [56 and 110-131]) and I suspect that the antecedents from the claim area were similarly engaged in that regional trade.

(references omitted)

2. the Birriliburu matter

At [45], North J acknowledged that the applicants provided specific evidence of commercial activities involving the sale of resources on the country.

North J also relied on the evidence of anthropologist Dr Lee Sackett, provided in a 1994 report for a claim under the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 (Cth)* by Western Desert people as well as his expert report provided for this case in September 2013.

North J referenced Dr Sackett's evidence at paragraphs [46] to [55], including Dr Sackett's following statements:

... claimants could "freely engage with their countries because they own them, and know their physical and mythological attributes." This would mean they and their ancestors could freely take and use the resources of the area.

...

I am not aware of any rules specifying that certain resources could not be taken, that certain resources could be taken but not exchange [sic] or traded with others, and so on.

...

Trade appears to have gone on both within the confines of the Western Desert and between Western Desert peoples and non-Western Desert peoples. Regarding the former, Gould, writing of stone artefacts unearthed at Puntutjarpa Rockshelter near Warburton, remarked that some came from a quarry some 290km to the east.

As discussed above, North J also relied on the evidence of Dr Cane, provided primarily for the Pilki application but tendered also for this matter.

The State's evidence

The State provided substantially the same argument in both matters. As discussed above, the State was wrong in its argument that commercial activity must have been undertaken in order to establish the right. The State also argued that the evidence pointed to a qualitative difference between the traditional use of taking and exchange by an individual (or group) and for "big things" (akin to commercial exploitation) such as mining.

The State's contentions included (at [105]-[107] in the Pilki matter and at [75]-[85] in the Birriliburu matter):

- that constraints on access and taking resources, such as gender, status and personal or community need, demonstrated that there was no right to access and take for any purpose;
- that the taking of resources was the exercise of a right and responsibility to care for land, not the right to access and take resources for any purpose;
- that the making of spears, boomerangs, shields and digging sticks was not for trade but for use in daily living and law business); and
- that where the evidence went beyond the use of resources for personal use:
 - that boomerangs, spears and watis were generally made for "joy" and to hunt for personal use;
 - that although paintings and artefacts may have been sold, this was not a traditional right;
 - that people could sell their *own* spears; and
 - that bush tobacco was not exchanged, just shared (at [41]).

The Court rejected these arguments. North J highlighted that the rules about the exercise of a right are not a limitation on the scope of the right itself.

North J found that the State had not engaged with the extensive evidence of trading activity given by Dr Cane. Also, the State sought to distinguish *Akiba* on the basis that, in that case the claim group were avid traders. In rejecting this, North J set down, at [122] in the Pilki matter and at [92] in the Birriliburu matter, that regard had to be had for the context in which the right is claimed and that the country in question was harsh, with limited resources for trade.

The State raised the prospect that the applicants were relying on an argument that trade is a commercial activity other than as an incident of an underlying ownership of land, which the State contended is contrary to the authority in [Western Australia v Ward \(2002\) 213 CLR 1](#). North J examined the authority and stated, at [134] in the Pilki matter and at [103] in the Birriliburu matter, that the vice being addressed in *Ward* was:

the assumption based on the common law concept of ownership that certain rights flowed automatically from the holding of an underlying title. This criticism cannot be sustained against the applicants in the present case. There was direct evidence of the existence of traditional laws and customs which gave the right to access and take for any purpose resources of the determination area. The right was not said to arise from the occupation of the land. The right was identified, as required by *Ward*, as a particular defined right to use the land in a particular way.

[Lampton on behalf of the Juru People v State of Queensland \[2014\] FCA 736](#)

11 July 2014, Consent Determination, Federal Court of Australia , Bowen, Queensland

Rares J

In this matter, the Court recognised that the Juru people hold native title rights and interests over land and waters extending from the coast near Home Hill, along the Burdekin River in the north-west, south to the head of the Don River, east towards Bowen, and approximately 20 kilometres seaward of the coastline in the Coral Sea, including the lands and waters around Guthalungra.

This area was a significant, but not the entire, area of the lands and waters claimed by the Juru people. Rares J, therefore, made orders under [s 87A](#) of the [Native Title Act 1993 \(Cth\)](#) (NTA), which empowers the Federal Court to make a determination of native title for part of an area. Rares J ordered that separate questions concerning some lands in township areas and some other rural areas would be determined at a later date.

The 12 respondents in this matter included the Commonwealth of Australia, the State of Queensland, Whitsunday Regional Council, Burdekin Shire Council, Telstra and Ergon Energy, mining and development interests such as Gfb Developments Pty Ltd, Energy Minerals Pty Ltd, Aurizon Network Pty Ltd, Aurizon Property Pty Ltd, Hancock Coal Infrastructure Pty Ltd, various pastoralists and other individual persons.

Background

On 26 July 2011, Rares J made orders recognising the Juru people's native title rights and interests over Juru country, known as Cape Upstart (see [Prior on behalf of the Juru \(Cape Upstart\) People v State of Queensland \(No 2\) \[2011\] FCA 819 \(Prior\)](#), summarised in AIATSIS' [Native Title Newsletter July / August, No. 4/2011](#)).

In [Smallwood v State of Queensland \[2014\] FCA 331](#), the Court heard an application by the Juru people under [s 66B NTA](#) to add an apical ancestor and substitute members of the application. On 27 June 2014, one of the applicants, Ms Prior, raised issues about one of the apical ancestors. Dowsett J determined that the apical ancestor had been properly included. Furthermore, he held that Ms Prior acted inconsistently with her authorisation to act as a member of the applicant and, on 7 July 2014, he removed Ms Prior and substituted Mr Vincent Mundraby under [s 66B NTA](#).

The nature of a consent determination

Rares J repeated some of the reasons he applied in the *Prior* case, to explain the nature of a consent determination and as a means for establishing authoritatively for the whole Australian community the legally enforceable native title rights and interests in identifiable lands and waters held by a particular Indigenous people.

Rares J referred to the landmark decision of [Mabo v State of Queensland \[No 2\] \(1992\) 175 CLR 1](#), and the passage of the NTA as recognising and protecting native title and enabling:

indigenous Australians and their descendants to satisfy the very human desire to identify with, enjoy and feel a part of their cultural heritage on land and waters with which they have, and feel, a spiritual and emotional connection.

Rares J also discussed the exercise of judicial power of the Commonwealth, on behalf of the whole Australian community, to recognise the Indigenous claimants' rights and interests as having the force of law in both social systems within the

Commonwealth of Australia. His Honour, expressed in this case, that the native title rights and interests of the Juru people would now be protected by the force of law.

Satisfying s 87A procedural conditions

Under s 87A(4) NTA, the Court may make an order in, or consistent with, the terms of a proposed determination of native title without holding a hearing if such an order is consistent with the terms proposed, is within power and it is appropriate for the Court to do so.

Rares J was satisfied that it was within the Court's power to make the determination. Furthermore, His Honour determined it was appropriate to make the order on the basis that:

- the State had carefully scrutinised the claim in order to protect the interests of the whole community that it represents: *Munn (for and on behalf of the Gunggari People) v Queensland (2001) 115 FCR 109* per Emmett J;
- the beneficial purpose of the NTA and its moral foundation are furthered by such an order; and
- that the agreement is "rooted in reality" (The Hon R.S. French AC, *Native Title – A Constitutional Shift?*, published in: H.P. Lee and P. Gerangelos (ed), *Constitutional Advancement in a Frozen Continent: Essays in Honour of George Winterton*, The Federation Press, 2009, pp 126-154).

In determining that this agreement was rooted in reality, Rares J referred to evidence showing a substantive and real founding. This included evidence of members of the claim group as well as anthropological evidence provided in the *Prior* case by Dr Sandra Pannell as well as a report by Dr Kevin Mayo, prepared with respect to examination of whether four particular family groups were Juru.

Rares J was satisfied that this and other material presented satisfied that a real basis existed for the parties to enter into the agreement for the consent determination and that there is a factual and legal foundation for it to be made under s 87A NTA.

PBC appointed for purposes of s 56 NTA

The Kyburra Munda Yalga Aboriginal Corporation was appointed for the purposes of meeting the requirements of s 56 NTA, to hold the native title rights and interests in the land and waters in trust.

Mosby on behalf of the Kulkalgal People v State of Queensland [2014] FCA 628

19 June 2014, Consent determination, Federal Court of Australia, Thursday Island, Queensland

Greenwood J

In this matter, Greenwood J made orders under s 87 of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (the NTA) recognising the native title rights and interests of the of the claim group as subgroups of the Kulkalgal Peopleover Zuizin Island (known as Half Way Island) in the Torres Strait. In particular, the Court recognised the Warraberlgal, Porumalgal and Masiglgal subgroups of the Kulkalgal People. The court recognised the native title holders exclusive rights to possession, occupation, use and enjoyment of the determination area, and the non-exclusive right to take and use water for personal, domestic and non-commercial communal purposes.

The land area of Zuizin Island is approximately 16.2 hectares. It is located in the Central Torres Strait group of islands, 70 nautical miles northeast of Thursday Island and 15 nautical miles eastsoutheast of Poruma, 30 nautical miles eastnortheast of Warraber and 22 nautical miles south of Masig.

The respondents to the application were the State of Queensland and the Torres Shire Council.

Background

The Kulkalgal People filed an application for a determination of native title, under s 13(1) and s 61(1) NTA, on 29 March 2007 and was duly registered. Following mediation, including a number of directions hearings and case management hearings, the parties reached an in principle agreement, which annexed proposed draft orders. These were filed in the Court on 23 May 2014.

Satisfying s 87 NTA - procedural conditions to claim

At paragraph [9], Greenwood J referred to s 87 NTA, which provides that the parties may file an agreement with the Court and, if the Court is satisfied that making an order in, or consistent with, those terms is within its power, and it appears appropriate to

the Court to do so, the Court may make an order without holding a hearing of questions of fact and law in relation to the application.

In determining that it was appropriate to make orders consistent with the terms of the parties' agreement, Greenwood J emphasised the importance of genuine and informed consent to the agreement. At paragraph [10], his Honour pointed to the State's history in analysing native title rights and interests and the resources and expertise available to the State as indicative of the capacity of the State to examine the content of an application for determination of native title.

Although Greenwood J considered it was not necessary for the claimant group to file evidence of the kind that would be required at a trial proceeding, His Honour stated, at [10] that:

it is, in my view, necessary for the Court to be satisfied that the terms of the s 87 Agreement are "rooted in reality": *Native Title – A Constitutional Shift?*, University of Melbourne Law School, JD Lecture Series, French CJ, 24 March 2009; *Kerindun v Queensland* [2009] FCA 789 at [16]; *Kuuku Ya'u People v State of Queensland* [2009] FCA 679 [12]–[15].

Greenwood J considered, at [11] that determining whether the terms of the agreement were rooted in reality required *some material* to be before the Court. On this basis, Greenwood J undertook an examination of the evidence for connection.

Connection Evidence

At [13], Greenwood J discussed the requirement in s 94A NTA, that an order for determination of native title must include details as set out in s 225 NTA, which must be read together with s 223 NTA in order to give meaning to the terms "determination of native title" and "native title" and "native title rights and interests". His Honour referred also to the High Court's decision in *Members of the Yorta Yortas Aboriginal Community v Victoria* (2002) 214 CLR 422 at [76], to identify the mandatory requirements for the determination of the claimants native title rights and interests as:

- the native title rights and interests must be communal, group or individual rights and interests;
- they must be rights and interests in relation to land or waters;
- they must be possessed under the traditional laws acknowledged, and the traditional customs observed, by Aboriginal peoples or Torres Strait Islanders;
- Aboriginal peoples or Torres Strait Islanders by their law and customs must have a connection with the land or waters, and the rights and interests must be recognised by the common law of Australia.
- the land and water were shown exists and possessed under the traditional laws; and
- customs acknowledged, by the claimant group and were recognised by the common law of Australia

In making his determination, Greenwood J relied on anthropological reports by Dr Garrin Hitchcock and Dr Julie Lahn, an affidavit by a member of the claim group and material read into the record by the claim group's solicitor. This evidence established the claim group as a subgroup of the Kulkalgal People for whom Zuizin Island is a part of their traditional estate.

PBC appointed for purposes of s 56 NTA

Section 56(1) NTA requires that, in making a determination of native title, the Court must determine whether the native title is to be held in trust and, if so by whom.

In this matter, Greenwood J held that the native title was to be held in trust by the Kulkalgal Registered Native Title Body Corporate.

***Smith on behalf of the Kullilli People v State of Queensland* [2014] FCA 691**

02 July 2014, Consent Determination, Federal Court of Australia, Thargomindah, Queensland

Logan J

In this matter, the Court recognised the native title rights and interests held by the Kullilli People in respect to land and waters in south western Queensland. The area is covered almost entirely by pastoral leases and is situated in south western Queensland, centred around the township of Thargomindah, extending south to the New South Wales border, and taking in part of the catchment of the Bulloo River with the western boundary marked by the Grey Range in the south-west and the Wilson River in the north-west.

The 29 respondents in this matter were:

- the State Of Queensland and the Shire Councils of Bulloo, Paroo and Quilpie;
- Ergon Energy and Telstra Corporation;
- Bridgefield Pty Ltd, Circumpacific Energy Corporation, Delhi Petroleum Pty Ltd, Drillsearch Energy Ltd, Magellan Petroleum (Eastern) Pty Ltd, Moonie Pipeline Company Pty Ltd, Oilwells Inc Of Kentucky, Origin Energy Resources Ltd, Vamgas Pty Ltd, and various forms of Santos Pty Ltd; and
- nine pastoral respondents, including various pastoral corporations.

Background

This case has a long history, beginning with an application lodged with the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT) by the Kullilli People in 1996. Changes to the [Native Title Act 1993 \(Cth\)](#) the NTA meant that the Kullilli application had to be re-lodged with the Federal court. The Federal Court dismissed this re-lodged application on 10 March 2000.

The Kullilli People then lodged another three applications with the Federal Court (similar to their original application), which were dismissed or discontinued in 2006.

On 23 March 2009, the Kullilli People brought a new application, incorporating much of the previous three applications, with amendments to apical ancestors and changes to boundaries. The NNTT registered the application on 17 April 2009 and notified parties of the application, as required by [s 66 NTA](#), on 28 October 2009.

On 2 December 2013, the applicant was amended, pursuant to [s 66B NTA](#), to change the named applicants.

Connection Evidence

[Section 94A NTA](#) requires that a native title determination order must satisfy the requirements of [s 225 NTA](#) and set out:

- (a) who the persons, or each group of persons, holding the common or group rights comprising the native title are; and
- (b) the nature and extent of the native title rights and interests in relation to the determination area; and
- (c) the nature and extent of any other interests in relation to the determination area; and
- (d) the relationship between the rights and interests ...; and
- (e) ... whether the native title rights and interests confer possession, occupation, use and enjoyment of that land or waters on the native title holders to the exclusion of all others.

Logan J then considered the definition of native title, under [s 223\(1\) NTA](#) and its interpretation by the High Court in [Members of the Yorta Yorta Aboriginal Community v State of Victoria \(2002\) 214 CLR 422](#) and the Full Federal Court in [Moses v State of Western Australia \[2007\] FCAFC 78](#), and set out the following as the test for native title:

- (a) A traditional law or custom which is the source of native title rights and interests is one which has been passed from generation to generation of a society, usually by word of mouth and common practice.
- (b) The origins of the law or custom from which native title rights and interests stem must be found in the normative rules of the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander society that existed before the assertion of sovereignty by the British Crown – it is only those rules that are “traditional” laws and customs.
- (c) That normative system must have a continuous existence and vitality since sovereignty.
- (d) If that society ceases to exist as a group which acknowledges and observes those pre-sovereignty laws and customs, those laws and customs cease to have continued existence and vitality.
- (e) Only native title rights or interests that existed at the time of the change in sovereignty will be recognised. However, some change to, or adaptation of, traditional laws or customs or some interruption in the enjoyment or exercise of native title rights or interests in the period between the Crown asserting sovereignty and the present will not necessarily be fatal to a native title claim.
- (f) In many cases, perhaps most, claimants will invite the Court to infer, from evidence led at trial, the content of traditional laws and customs at times earlier than those described in the evidence.
- (g) Also, physical presence is not a necessary requirement for continuing connection.

The Court referred to twenty-seven affidavits from members of the claim group, a report and genealogical charts by QSNTS anthropologist Diana Romano and three expert reports by anthropologist Dr Babbage and made orders recognising that:

- claim group comprises a society united in and by their acknowledgement and observance of a body of accepted traditional laws and customs;
- that the present day body of accepted laws and customs of the society in essence is the same body of laws and customs

acknowledged and observed by the ancestors or members of the society adapted to modern circumstances;

- that the acknowledgement and observance of those laws and customs has continued substantially uninterrupted by each generation since sovereignty, and that the society has continued to exist throughout that period as a body united in and by its acknowledgement and observance of those laws and customs; and
- that the claim group still possesses rights and interests under the traditional laws acknowledged and the traditional customs observed by them, and that those laws and customs give them a connection to the land.

Satisfying s 87 NTA - procedural conditions to the Kullilli People's claim

Logan J considered that the requirements of s 87 NTA were satisfied because:

- (a) The parties reached agreement as to the terms (s 87(1)(a)(i) NTA).
- (b) The parties recorded their agreement in short minutes of consent (s 87(1)(b) NTA).
- (c) An order in terms of or consistent with the short minutes of consent would be within the Court's power (s 87(1)(c) NTA) because:
 - (i) the applications are valid and were made in accordance with s 61 NTA; and
 - (ii) the applications are for a determination of native title in relation to an area for which there is no approved determination of native title (s 13(1)(a) NTA).

PBC appointed for purposes of s 56(1)

The Court applied the requirements of s 56 NTA and made Orders that the Kullilli Bulloo River Aboriginal Corporation, registered under the *Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders) Act 2006* (Cth) on 15 July 2009, is to be the prescribed body corporate and hold the native title on trust for the Kullilli People.

Of Note in the Decision

Logan J noted that claims remaining unresolved on a court list are an affront to Australia's system of justice. He also commended the work of the relevant legal advisers and case management by the Court's registrars, which had resulted in this consent determination being achieved in less than five years.

Also, at paragraph [9] of his reasons, Logan J stressed that in making Orders, the Court is declaring that native title exists, which recognises that the applicants have always been the traditional owners of the land.

***Graham on behalf of the Ngadju People v State of Western Australia* [2014] FCA 700**

3 July 2014, validity of mining leases, Federal Court of Australia, Melbourne

Marshall J

This case involved the resolution of issues that had unintentionally not been dealt with in *Graham v Western Australia* [2014] FCA 516 (the initial judgment). In the initial judgment, the Court dealt with the extent to which the Ngadju people's native title rights and interest had been extinguished, including with respect to mining leases granted under various instruments.

The unresolved issues related mainly to the issue of validity of certain mining tenements granted in 2004, 2006 and 2007. Marshall J determined most of the unresolved issues and, for the two outstanding matters, ordered the applicant (the Ngadju people) and the State (first respondent) to case management to resolve:

1. the issue of mining leases granted between 1 January 1994 and 23 December 1996; and
2. an overlap between areas known as the L63/40 and UCL/034 areas.

Marshall J ordered that his reasons in this matter are to be read together with the reasons provided in the initial judgment.

The Court then examined the following issues in contention:

Leases granted 24 December 2004

The WMC State Agreement was a tailor made agreement under which mineral leases could be granted that required leaseholders to undertake obligations not featured in mining leases under the 1904 or 1978 Mining Acts. The WMC State Agreement was terminated in 2008 and WMC mineral leases were progressively "normalised". This meant the leases were released from the terms of the WMC State Agreement and allowed to be developed outside those obligations.

209 mining leases were granted on 24 December 2004 as part of the normalisation process.

An issue was whether the granting of these leases constituted future acts or intermediate period acts or category C past acts under the *Native Title Act 1993 (Cth)* (NTA), so as to extinguish native title in the Ngadju Trial area. Marshall J held that the granting of these leases was invalid to the extent that the leases affected native title in that area on the basis that they could not be considered as:

- intermediate period acts under [s 232A NTA](#), as they were not entered in to between 1 January 1994 and 23 December 1996;
- permissible future acts. The leases were not granted in accordance with the WMC State Agreement and, therefore, they could not be categorised as permissible leases under either [s 241B NTA](#) (a future act that is a pre-existing right-based act) or [241C NTA](#) (a future act that is a permissible lease renewal); and
- category C past acts, for the purposes of [ss 240A and 28 NTA](#), because the leases were too different from the WMC mineral leases. Hence His Honour concluded that because they do not fall in any of the categories under the NTA the leases are invalid to the extent that they affect native title in that area.

Leases granted 6 October 2006

Marshall J also noted that leases granted on 6 October 2006, at issue in this case, could not be materially distinguished from the leases granted on 24 December 2004. Therefore, the granting of the 2006 leases were also held not to affect native title in the area.

Leases renewed on 18 December 2007

There were 75 leases in this category. In December 2007, these leases ceased to exist as WMC mineral leases and were renewed, subject to the *Nickel Ferry Agreement Act 2008 (the 2008 Act)*. The 2008 Act operated so that:

- future renewals would be undertaken pursuant to the *Mining Act 1978* (WA); and
- invalid renewals of some of the leases, including (ML15/150 and ML15/151), were legalised.

Marshall J found that the granting/renewing of the leases under the 2008 Act did not constitute a past act (or a valid future act) and were invalid to the extent that they affect native title because:

- the granting or renewal did not take place on or after 1 January 1994, as required under [s 228 NTA](#);
- the difference in character of the WMC mineral leases to leases granted under the *Mining Act 1978* did not render the leases a past act; and
- the leases cannot be future acts under [s241C NTA](#), mainly because the rights given to the leases in the *Mining Acts* are different from the rights under WMC State Agreements.

Special lease 332/1059, Special lease 3116/3838, Special Lease 0778/42 & Current Road 2

Marshall J found that none of these leases extinguished native title because there was not enough evidence to show they were validly granted., In the case of Road 2, that there was no evidence it existed.

Freehold parcel CT 2683/901

Some of this freehold parcel overlaps the claim area. The respondent's evidence had no relevance to the overlap area and Marshall J found that the area of overlap did not extinguish native title.

Mining leases granted between 1 January 1994 and 23 December 1996

The Court noted that it had dealt with the issue in paragraph [102] and [103] of the initial judgement, however, as the parties were subsequently in dispute on this issue, Marshall J referred it to a case management conference.

[s 47B NTA](#) issue

With respect to unallocated Crown land, Marshall J found that the initial judgment did not sufficiently reflect an agreement between the Ngadju people and the State that, except for two areas, the Ngadju people occupied that land. Marshall J also determined that the two areas would be also occupied by the Ngadju people. Therefore, [s 47B NTA](#) applied to enliven native title.

Acts affecting native title

With respect to public works, the initial judgment did not identify each particular act affecting native title. Marshall J noted that [ss 225\(c\) and 225\(d\) NTA](#) requires that a determination of native title includes 'the nature and extent of any

other interests in relation to the determination area' and their relationship with the identified native title rights and interests. His Honour concluded that, because a native title determination is a determination *in rem*,¹ each particular act affecting native title should be set out in a final determination.

Area necessary or incidental to water bores

The status of seven water bores was not addressed in the initial judgment. It was initially agreed that the water bores were public works, however the outstanding issue in this matter, relates to the area necessary to the water bores. Marshall J concluded that about one quarter of an acre per water bore is an appropriate area necessary or incidental to the water bores.

Typographical errors and omissions

Marshall J then identified and corrected typographical errors and omissions in the initial judgement case. More importantly, in paragraph [36], he notes that the initial judgment did not include 'the right of exclusive possession in relation to land and waters above the high water mark.' His Honour also points out that the initial judgment should have clarified that although historical petroleum tenements cover the entire claim area and distinguish exclusive native title rights and interests, such extinguishment must be disregarded in areas where ss 47A or 47B NTA apply.

Correction to June 2014 Edition of What's New

The NTRU's case summary of *Dempsey on behalf of the Bularnu, Waluwarra and Wangkayjuru People v State of Queensland (No 2)* [2014] FCA 528 referred to Justice Mortimer by the wrong gender. Please accept our sincere apologies for this error.

2. Legislation

There were no bills of relevance presented or actioned in July 2014 in any state or territory.

3. Indigenous Land Use Agreements

The [Native Title Research Unit](#) within AIATSIS maintains an [ILUA summary](#) which provides hyperlinks to information on the [National Native Title Tribunal \(NNTT\)](#) and the [Agreements, Treaties, and Negotiated Settlements \(ATNS\)](#) websites.

In July 2014, 19 ILUAs were registered with the National Native Title Tribunal.

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
28/07/2014	Juru People and Ergon Energy ILUA	QI2014/010	Area Agreement	QLD	Infrastructure, Energy
28/07/2014	Juru People and Local Government ILUA	QI2014/011	Area Agreement	QLD	Access, Consultation protocol, Public
23/07/2014	Anketell Port, Infrastructure Corridor and Industrial Estates Agreement	WI2014/004	Body Corporate	WA	Industrial, Access, Communication, Community
18/07/2014	Yulluna People and Starcross ILUA	QI2014/004	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access, Consultation protocol
18/07/2014	Yulluna People and Local Government ILUA	QI2014/008	Area Agreement	QLD	Government, Consultation protocol

¹ *In rem* is a latin term meaning 'the thing itself'. In property law, the term is used to distinguish a right in relation to personal or real property, as opposed to a right *in personam* (a right against a person).

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
18/07/2014	Yulluna People and Ergon Energy ILUA	QI2014/009	Area Agreement	QLD	Infrastructure, Access, Communication, Energy
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Buckingham Downs ILUA	QI2014/014	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Burham (aka Chatsworth), Chatsworth and Stanbroke (aka Stradbroke) ILUA	QI2014/015	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Cannington ILUA	QI2014/016	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Cukadoo ILUA	QI2014/017	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Fort William ILUA	QI2014/018	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Kheri ILUA	QI2014/019	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Lurnea (aka Two Rivers) ILUA	QI2014/020	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
18/07/2014	Yulluna People/ Pilgrim ILUA	QI2014/021	Area Agreement	QLD	Pastoral, Access
15/07/2014	Ewamian Protected Areas ILUA	QI2014/025	Body Corporate	QLD	Co-management, Access
10/07/2014	Adnyamathanha Settlement ILUA	SI2014/005	Body Corporate	SA	Native Title Settlement, Mining
07/07/2014	Badu Island Transfer ILUA	QI2014/007	Area Agreement	QLD	Government
04/07/2014	Kuruma Marthudunera and Yaburara and Coastal Mardudhuera Indigenous Land Use Agreement	WI2014/001	Area Agreement	WA	Co-management
02/07/2014	Hazelwood, Crown Allotment 2037 ILUA	Vi2013/011	Body Corporate	VIC	Extinguishment

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

4. Native Title Determinations

The [Native Title Research Unit](#) within AIATSIS maintains a [determinations summary](#) which provides hyperlinks to determination information on the Austlii, [NNTT](#) and [ATNS](#) websites.

In July 2014, 2 native title determinations were handed down.

Short Name (NNTT)	Case Name	Date (NNTT)	State	Outcome	Legal Process	Type	RNTBC /PBC
Juru People (Part A)	Lampton on behalf of the Juru People v State of Queensland [2014] FCA 736	11/07/2014	QLD	Native Title exists in parts of the determination area	Consent determination	Claimant	Kyburra Munda Yalga Aboriginal Corporation RNTBC
Kullilli People	Smith on behalf of the Kullilli People v State of Queensland [2014] FCA 691	02/07/2014	QLD	Native Title exists in the entire determination area	Consent determination	Claimant	Not registered

5. Future Acts Determinations

In July 2013, 19 Future Acts Determinations were handed down.

Determination date	Parties	Tribunal File No	State or Territory	Decision/Determination
31/07/2014	FMG Pilbara Pty Ltd (grantee party) - and - Thomas Jacob, Stanley Warrie, Allum Cheedy, Kevin Guinness, Angus Mack, Michael Woodley, Joyce Hubert, Pansy Sambo, Jean Norman, Esther Pat, Judith Coppin and Masie Ingie on behalf of Yindjibarndi #1 (WC2003/003) (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party)	WF2013/0015, WF2013/0016	WA	Future Act - Can be done subject to conditions
30/07/2014	Kevin Cosmos, Robert Boona and Valerie Holborrow on behalf of the Yaburara & Mardudhunera Native Title Claim Group (WC1996/089) (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Croydon Gold Pty Ltd (grantee party)	WO2013/0885	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies
30/07/2014	Raymond William Ashwin, June Rose Ashwin, Geoffrey Alfred Ashwin and Ralph Edward Ashwin on behalf of the Wutha People (WC1999/010) (first native title party) - and - Evelyn Gilla, William Shay, Rex Shay and WG (name withheld for cultural reasons) on behalf of the Yugunga-Nya People (WC1999/046) (second native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Dourado Resources Ltd (grantee party)	WO2013/0590, WO2013/0675	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies

29/07/2014	Muccan Minerals Pty Ltd (grantee party) - and - Johnson Taylor & Ors on behalf of Njamal (WC1999/008) (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party)	WF2013/0027, WF2013/0028 & WF2013/0029	WA	Future Act - NIGF Not Satisfied - Tribunal does not have jurisdiction
29/07/2014	Raymond William Ashwin, June Rose Ashwin, Geoffrey Alfred Ashwin and Ralph Edward Ashwin on behalf of the Wutha People (WC1999/010) (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Verona Capital Pty Ltd (grantee party)	WO2013/0789	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies
25/07/2014	Native title parties as listed in the attached schedule (native title parties) - and - State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Grantee parties as listed in the attached schedule (grantee parties)	WO2013/0926; WO2013/0928; WO2013/0929; WO2013/0930; WO2013/1221; WO2014/0031; WO2014/0036; WO2014/0171; WO2014/0466; WO2014/0511	WA	Objection - Dismissed
25/07/2014	St. Ives Gold Mining Company Pty Ltd (grantee party) - and - Jack Schultz, John Walter Graham, Katie Ray, Sonny Graham and names withheld for cultural reasons on behalf of Ngadju (WC1999/002) (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party)	WF2014/0005	WA	Future Act - Can be done
25/07/2014	Areva Resources Australia Pty Ltd (grantee party) - and - Walalakoo Aboriginal Corporation (native title party) - and - The State of Western Australia (Government party)	WF2013/0012	WA	Future Act - Can be done
25/07/2014	Western Desert Lands Aboriginal Corporation (WCD2002/002) (native title party) -and- The State of Western Australia (Government party) -and- Goldstone Holdings Pty Ltd (grantee party)	WO2013/1139	WA	Objection – Dismissed
24/07/2014	Western Desert Lands Aboriginal Corporation (WCD2013/002) (native title party) -and- The State of Western Australia (Government party) -and- Chad Graeme Johnson/Neale Graeme Johnson (grantee party)	WO2013/1147	WA	Objection - Dismissed
21/07/2014	Native title parties as listed in the attached schedule (native title parties) - and - State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Grantee parties as listed in the attached schedule (grantee parties)	WO2014/0134; WO2014/0358; WO2014/0572; WO2014/0573	WA	Objection – Dismissed

16/07/2014	<p>Native title parties as listed in the attached schedule (native title parties)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>Grantee parties as listed in the attached schedule (grantee parties)</p>	<p>WO2013/0559; WO2013/0945; WO2013/0965; O2013/0993; WO2013/1087; WO2013/1200; WO2013/1201; WO2013/1202</p>	WA	Objection – Dismissed
16/07/2014	<p>Cyril Barnes & Ors on behalf of Central East Claim Group (native title party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>See attached schedule (grantee parties)</p>	<p>WO2013/0720; WO2013/0721; WO2013/0722; WO2013/0829; WO2013/0991; WO2013/0992; WO2013/0994; WO2013/1030; WO2013/1171; WO2013/1315; WO2013/1317; WO2014/0027; WO2014/0144; WO2014/0280</p>	WA	Objection – Dismissed
10/07/2014	<p>Buurabalayji Thalanyji Aboriginal Corporation (WCD2008/003) (native title party)</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>Tungsten Mining NL (grantee party)</p>	<p>WO2013/0767</p>	WA	Objection – Dismissed
10/07/2014	<p>Buurabalayji Thalanyji Aboriginal Corporation (WCD2008/003) (native title party)</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>-and-</p> <p>GTI Resources Ltd (grantee party)</p>	<p>WO2013/0514, WO2013/0515, WO2013/0516</p>	WA	Objection – Dismissed
08/07/2014	<p>Native title parties as listed in the attached schedule (native title parties)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>Grantee parties as listed in the attached schedule (grantee parties)</p>	<p>WO2013/0766; WO2013/0868; WO2013/1151; WO2013/1260; WO2013/1261; WO2013/1262; WO2014/0091; WO2014/0227; WO2014/0298</p>	WA	Objection – Dismissed
07/07/2014	<p>Balangarra Aboriginal Corporation Registered Native Title Body Corporate (WCD2013/005) (native title party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>Bar Resources Pty Ltd (grantee party)</p>	<p>WO2013/0852</p>	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Does Not Apply
07/07/2014	<p>Raymond William Ashwin, June Rose Ashwin, Geoffrey Alfred Ashwin and Ralph Edward Ashwin on behalf of the Wutha People (WC1999/010) (native title party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>The State of Western Australia (Government party)</p> <p>- and -</p> <p>Breaker Resources NL (grantee party)</p>	<p>WO2013/1128, WO2013/1129, WO2013/1130</p>	WA	Objection - Expedited Procedure Applies

04/07/2014	<p style="text-align: center;"> Native title parties as listed in the attached schedule (native title parties) - and - State of Western Australia (Government party) - and - Grantee parties as listed in the attached schedule (grantee parties) </p>	WO2013/0906; WO2013/0971; WO2013/1131; WO2013/1122; WO2013/1293; WO2013/1294; WO2013/1299; WO2013/1300; WO2013/1344; WO2014/0110; WO2014/0331; WO2014/0358; WO2014/0367	WA	Objection - Dismissed
------------	--	---	----	-----------------------

6. 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.

Information on RNTBCs and PBCs including training and support, news and events, research and publications and external links can be found at nativetitle.org. 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.

7. Native Title in the News

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

8. Related Publications

NIRAKN

Aboriginal Peoples, Colonialism and International Law: Raw Law

Raw Law is written by an experienced legal practitioner, scholar and political activist, Irene Watson. It is the first work to assess the legality and impact of colonisation from the viewpoint of Aboriginal law, rather than from that of the dominant Western legal tradition. It is available for pre-order.

For further information, visit [Routledge](#)

McGill-Queen's University Press

Reclaiming Indigenous Planning

A book titled 'Reclaiming Indigenous Planning' was published in 2013. Ed Wensing has recently published a book review about this book: 'I am not aware of any comparable edited volume of papers of such depth and breadth that analyses approaches to Indigenous planning practice and scholarship across these four countries. Hence, this book is a remarkable collection and makes a very valuable contribution to the field of planning theory and practice with respect to Indigenous peoples' values and aspirations and their just accommodation in contemporary planning. It also sets a high benchmark for future comparable reference.'

For more information about the book, please see: <http://www.mqup.ca/reclaiming-indigenous-planning-products-9780773541948.php>

Media Releases, News Broadcasts and Podcasts

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS)

AIATSIS farewells a friend – 24 July

After nearly 40 years with the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), ethnomusicologist and sound archivist of national and world renown, Grace Koch retired this month. AIATSIS Principal, Russell Taylor said that as a respected colleague and a friend, Grace would be sorely missed by everyone at the Institute.

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

Central Land Council

Council moves to end destabilisation – 25 July

At their meeting in Tennant Creek on 22 – 24 July, the Central Land Council has resolved to end months of destabilising and distracting leadership tensions. The council agreed on a range of measures to strengthen the land council's governance and approved one month's leave for the CLC chairman.

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

Willowra's Community Learning Centre wins Architecture Gong – 14 July

The Wirliyajarrayi Learning Centre in Willowra which opened last year, has won a commendation for Indigenous Community Architecture in the 2014 NT Architecture Awards.

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

Northern Land Council

NLC Fracking submission supports Traditional Owner's rights – 2 July

The Northern Land Council's Chief Executive, Mr Joe Morrison, launched the NLC submission to the NT Government's Inquiry into hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"). Mr Morrison described the submission as providing information at how Traditional Owners can be supported to make sound, information-based decisions on their land regarding fracking proposals.

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

North Queensland Land Council

Title win for Juru people – 23 July

The Juru people of north Queensland have won non-exclusive native title rights and interests over both land and waters between Bowen and Ayr. The determination covers about 176,000 square hectares of land and water and covers an area 10km out to sea.

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

A Little Step Closer – 7 July

On the 20th of June, the title deeds under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991 and 1994 for the transfer of lands in the Goldsborough Valley, just outside Cairns, was official handed back to the Dulabed, Malanbarra and Yidinji Aboriginal Corporation (RNTBC).

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

Torres Strait Regional Authority

Launch of Torres Strait Climate Change Strategy – 23 July

The Torres Strait Climate Change Strategy has been launched by the Torres Strait Regional Authority, Torres Strait Regional Council, Torres Strait Council and the Reef and Rainforest Research Centre in response to the impacts of climate change for the people of Torres Strait.

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

Malu Lamar 21st prescribed body corporate in the Torres Strait – 20 July

On 26 June 2014, Justice Greenwood of the Federal Court, appointed Malu Lamar, meaning deep water spirit, as the Registered Native Title Body Corporate (RNTBC) for Part A of the Sea Claim.

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

Torres Strait Regional Authority announces funding for local initiatives – 14 July

The first round of the TSRA Common Funding for 2014 has been completed. 51 applications had been received for the grants, with 29 of them being funded. The financial support totalled \$2.2 million and was given to various PBCs, broadcasting and health and safety initiatives throughout the Torres Strait region.

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

Workshop to explore impacts on infrastructure through rising sea levels - July

From 21 – 23 July a workshop will be held for decision makers to look at the effects of rising sea level and sea temperatures on vital infrastructure in the Torres Strait. The workshop will be held on Thursday Island.

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

9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities

AIATSIS

The 2015 Stanner Award is now open. Applications close on 30 January 2015. The award, provided by AIATSIS, is for the best academic writing by an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander writer. The winner will be given a glass statuette, \$5000, up to 50 hours editorial and mentoring support – and publication by Aboriginal Studies Press. This year any theses which are hosted on a university repository will be eligible.

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

The Aurora Project

[See the Aurora Project: 2014 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

Liquid Learning

Liquid Learning is delighted to present the Indigenous Women's Leadership Summit 2014, an uplifting and inspirational leadership development opportunity designed for emerging and established leaders across all sectors.

Date: 19 – 20 August 2014 & 26 -27 August 2014

Time: 8.30 a.m. – 5.00 p.m.

Location: Perth & Sydney

Further information can be found on the [Liquid Learning](#) website.

Engaging Indigenous Economy Conference and Dinner

The Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR) is pleased to announce that registrations are now open for the Engaging Indigenous Economy: Debating Diverse Approaches Conference.

Date: 4 – 5 September 2014

Location: ANU Commons, Canberra

Further information can be found on the [CAEPR website](#)

Strehlow Conference

Where do we go from here?

Australia is currently going through an unprecedented period of change in its attitude to its Indigenous peoples and their cultures, opening up new possibilities for everyone. The quality of this change, and the extent to which it is embraced by the population at large, will depend in the first instance upon reliable information about what has been attempted in the past, both what has succeeded and what has failed.

Date: 24-26 September 2014

Location: Araluen Centre, Alice Springs, Northern Territory

For further information contact the Strehlow Centre on Tel: (08) 8951 1111, Fax: (08) 8951 1110, Email: strehlow@nt.gov.au

NIRAKN

2014 Scopus Young Research of the Year Award (SYRA)

The Australasian Research Management Society (ARMS) and Elsevier are proud to announce the 2014 Scopus Young Researcher Award (SYRA). The SYRA awards are part of an Elsevier global initiative to recognise outstanding young scientists and researchers in Australasia who have made significant contributions in their areas of research. The awards ceremony will be held at the ARMS 2014 Conference in Canberra.

Date: 19 September 2014

Location: National Convention Centre, Canberra

Further Information can be found on the [ARMS](#) website.

National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility (NCCARF)

Future Challenges

The National Climate Change Adaptation Research Facility invites you to its annual conference, **Climate Adaptation 2014: Future Challenges**. This is a national conference focused on the information needed to ensure Australia is adapting well to climate change.

Date: 30 September to 2 October 2014

Location: Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre, Gold Coast, Queensland

Further Information can be found on their [website](#).

Australian Network of Student Anthropologists (ANSA)

AAS/ANSA Postgraduate Travel Grants

The Australian Network of Student Anthropologists (ANSA), in conjunction with the Australian Anthropological Society (AAS), offers a number of travel grants for current and recent postgraduate by research students, to assist them with meeting costs incurred in travelling to the annual AAS conference. In 2014, the conference will be held jointly with the Association of Social Anthropologists of Aotearoa / New Zealand (ASAA/NZ).

Date: 10 -13 November 2014

Location: Millenium & Cophthorne Hotels, Queenstown, New Zealand

Further Information can be found on the conference [website](#)

ACRAWSA Conference 2014

ACRAWSA is calling for scholars working on any aspect of critical race or whiteness studies to submit papers for our annual conference. This year's conference has an open theme, and we encourage scholars working in relevant areas to attend and reflect upon the field. This conference aims to reinstate the importance of the study of race

Date: 4-5 December 2014

Location: Brisbane

Further Information can be found on the ACRAWSA [website](#).

World Indigenous Domestic Violence Conference

The world Indigneous Domestoc Violence conference will be held in Cairns in early December. Registration is filling quickly and conference organisers has recommended interested delegates should register as soon as possible for the conference.

Date: 8-10 December 2014

Location: Pullman Cairns International Hotel

Further Information can be found on the Indigenous Conferences [website](#).

World Indigenous Health Conference

There are more than 50 speakers confirmed to attend the World Indigenous Health Conference. Registration is filling quickly and conference organisers has recommended interested delegates should register as soon as possible for the conference.

Date: 15-17 December 2014

Location: Pullman Cairns International Hotel

Further Information can be found on the Indigenous Conferences [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.

