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Executive Summary
The Central Land Council is an Aboriginal organisation governed by a council of 90 elected Aboriginal members. In 2005 it created the Community Development (CD) Program and a dedicated Unit to implement community development projects involving Aboriginal income flowing from land-use agreements, including royalties, rent, lease and compensation payments, plus affected area payments. The unit utilises a community development process to work with groups and communities. Its overall intent is to partner with Aboriginal people in processes that enable them to both maintain Aboriginal identity, language, culture and connection to country, as well as strengthen the capacity to participate in mainstream Australia and receive benefits around improved health, education and employment.

The CLC undertakes annual monitoring and assessment of the quality and outcomes of its CD program. This is undertaken by an independent consultant through a mixed methodology. It includes assessment of all the work areas as well as selected research around various projects and with different Aboriginal communities. For this year, particular monitoring focus was given to three project areas including the Community Lease Money project, the community pool funded in Mutitjulu and the Warlpiri Education and Training Trust (WETT) funded school program.

In 2014 the CD Program supported the implementation and development of six major ongoing, and five new, projects funded through $11,977,019 allocated by Aboriginal people for community benefit.

The information collected in 2014 shows that there has been considerable increase in the number of projects and resources under Aboriginal control as a result of the facilitation and support provided by the CDU. In line with the increased number of projects there has clearly been a considerable rise in the benefits for Aboriginal people throughout Central Australia, generated by their own resources. The benefits are wide-ranging and include those for health, education, employment and cultural and social well-being.

The WETT project, funded by the Kurra Aboriginal Corporation, continues to support high quality programs for young people. The project is providing support to schools leading to improved learning outcomes for young Aboriginal people and increasing their likelihood of staying in the education system. Kurra also uses some of its gold mining royalties to support a dialysis service in the Tanami Desert, which has been independently assessed as national best practice.

Assessment in Mutitjulu indicates that the community pool, which was built and operates as part of the Uluru Rent Money project, is making a positive difference to children and families in the community and has reinforced community confidence in its ability to make decisions and influence development outcomes.

The GMAAAC project has now well-established governance processes which are leading to regular and substantial benefit for several Aboriginal communities. In a similar way, the Northern Territory Parks Rent Money project has now well established decision-making and governance processes and there is a strong expectation that 2015 will see considerable benefit across the 16 locations.

Finally, assessment of the Community Lease Money project indicates that the CLC now has a well-developed and good quality community development product which is able to be effectively modified to different contexts.
The increasing number of new projects indicates that demand for a community development approach is growing among Aboriginal communities. Aboriginal people are increasingly allocating their money to support these processes across an ever-growing range of locations.

CLC staff continue to try to communicate the value of these processes and the importance for good community governance and decision making in all services and activities with Aboriginal communities. In 2014 staff have spent considerable time seeking to influence senior ministers and staff at Federal government level including communication of the findings from the 2014 evaluation report.

There is a sense from all reports and programs that notwithstanding ongoing challenges, the Community Development Unit is now well positioned to move beyond program management towards greater facilitation of development processes. This includes working together with Aboriginal people to create new development opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>Aboriginals Benefit Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIITE</td>
<td>Bachelor Institute for Indigenous Tertiary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Centre for Appropriate Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Central Desert Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU</td>
<td>Community Development Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Central Land Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAAAC</td>
<td>Granites Mine Affected Area Aboriginal Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWG</td>
<td>Mutitjulu Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTER</td>
<td>Northern Territory Emergency Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Traditional Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKTNP</td>
<td>Uluru – Kata Tjuta National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM</td>
<td>Uluru-Kata Tjuta Rent Money Community Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDNWPT</td>
<td>Western Desert Nganampa Walytja Palyantjaku Tjutaku Aboriginal Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETT</td>
<td>Warlpiri Education and Training Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETT AC</td>
<td>Warlpiri Education and Training Trust Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPKJ</td>
<td>Warlpiri-patu-kurlangu Jaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVA</td>
<td>World Vision Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYDAC</td>
<td>Warlpiri Youth Development Aboriginal Corporation (Mt Theo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The Central Land Council (CLC), a Commonwealth corporate entity originally established under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act (Northern Territory) 1976, is an Aboriginal organisation governed by a council of 90 elected Aboriginal members. The CLC has been operating for nearly 40 years, working with Aboriginal people to support them to achieve recognition of land and native title rights. The CLC also supports Aboriginal people to manage land and to negotiate agreements with others seeking to use their land, which includes payment of rent and royalties to traditional owners.

In 2005 the CLC created the Community Development Unit (CDU) to lead the development and implementation of the CLC CD program. This involves implementing community development projects involving Aboriginal rent and royalties from land-use agreements and affected area payments. The CDU utilises the CLC Community Development Framework, which articulates community development goals, principles and processes for the CLC.¹ Other sections of the CLC are also involved in supporting the CD Program to varying degrees, including legal, finance, regional services, policy, the Aboriginal Associations Management Centre, anthropology and mining.

The overall intention of the CLC’s community development approach is to partner with Aboriginal people in processes that enable them to set and achieve their dual objectives of maintaining Aboriginal identity, language, culture and connection to country, and strengthening their capacity to participate in mainstream Australia and in the modern economy, through improving health, education and employment outcomes.

This report outlines the monitoring and assessment of progress for the work of the CD Program with Aboriginal communities in 2014. It builds upon previous annual reports since 2009.

Context and CLC approach

The CDU’s approach is based on development principles and assumes that improvements in the well-being of people in remote Aboriginal communities will only be achieved through partnerships with those communities based on mutual respect. The CLC community development approach is characterised by a focus on community ownership, Aboriginal control, trust-based relationships, respect for local values and processes, and an understanding of cultural differences.

Drawing upon the resources provided by Aboriginal groups and communities, that is through projects undertaken with royalty, rent and affected area money, and with Aboriginal leadership and governance arrangements, the CD Program works through various projects to support Aboriginal people. The overarching goal of the work is that Aboriginal people will be strong and resilient and able to live well in both the remote Aboriginal context and mainstream Australian society.

There are four intermediate objectives:

1. Maximise opportunities for Aboriginal engagement, ownership and control, particularly in relation to the management of resources that belong to them.
2. Generate service outcomes which benefit Aboriginal people and are valued by them, including social, cultural and economic outcomes.

3. Build an evidence base for the CLC’s community development approach and the value it has for contributing to Aboriginal capabilities.
4. Share lessons learned with other government and non-government agencies.

The CD Program is currently implemented through six major projects each with numerous sub programs and projects. The various projects have different management arrangements, decision-making models and implementation processes. However, all the projects are characterised by the nature of the funding, which comes from Aboriginal peoples’ own money and the fact that they focus on achieving outcomes sought by Aboriginal people. In addition, all the projects are governed by Aboriginal decision-making bodies. The projects include the following:

- The Warlpiri Education and Training Trust project (WETT)
- The Tanami Dialysis project
- The Uluru-Kata Tjuta Rent Money Community Development project (URM)
- The Granites Mine Affected Area Aboriginal Corporation project (GMAAAC)
- The Northern Territory Parks Rent Money project (NT Parks)
- The Community Lease Money project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uluru Rent Money (URM) Project</td>
<td>Put rent paid to relevant traditional owners towards a range of sustainable initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlpiri Education and Training Trust (WETT) Project</td>
<td>Use mining royalties for sustainable education and training benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tanami Dialysis Support Service Project</td>
<td>Support dialysis facilities in remote communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granites Mine Affected Area Aboriginal Corporation (GMAAAC) Project</td>
<td>Support nine communities to apply ‘affected area’ monies from mining towards broad community benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT Parks Rent Money Project</td>
<td>Put rent paid to relevant traditional owners towards a range of sustainable initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Lease Money Project</td>
<td>Use rent paid for community leases for a diverse range of development activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also some newer projects. These include:

- Rover CD project
- Wangarri-Kari CD project
- Nolan’s Bore CD project
- Twin Bonanza CD project
- Areyn CD project.
Money approved for community benefit initiatives through all the projects in 2014 totalled $11,977,019.

This compares to $5,658,692.81 in 2012 and $10,617,646 in 2013, indicating increasing allocation by Aboriginal people of their own resources for community benefit.
Location of 2014 CLC community development projects

Locations of 2014 CLC Community Development Unit Projects

- Uluru Rent Money Community Development Project
- Warlpiri Education and Training Trust (WETT)
- Tanami Dialysis Support Service Project
- Granites Mine Affected Area Community Development Project
- NT Parks Rent Money Community Development Project
- Community Lease Money Project
- New Community Development Project
Monitoring focus for 2014
The intention of the CD Program monitoring is to track change over time through quantitative and qualitative assessment. Information is generally drawn from a mixture of sources including regular project reporting, independent evaluations and community-based monitoring.

In addition each year particular projects or areas of work are selected for additional attention. This usually involves some focused research in some locations, through interviews and observations by an independent consultant.

In 2014 it was decided that there were several areas which should be the subject of additional monitoring. These include:

1. The Community lease Money project, an area which has consumed considerable CDU time and attention and where a large amount of Aboriginal money had been disbursed.
2. The pool in Mutitjulu. This service was the subject of baseline study two years ago and it now seemed timely to follow that study to inquire about the impact to date.
3. Finally, additional attention was given to the WETT funded schools program. This area of work has been ongoing for some years and regular receives positive mention in general community monitoring. However it has never been the subject of systematic inquiry, and was therefore another area of focus for 2014.

Annex One outlines the detailed methodologies developed for each of these three areas.

In addition in 2014 a new staff reflection process was introduced, which changed the approach to staff reporting. This was designed to support the regional team approach developed in 2013 and enabled staff to look at both projects and their geographic areas of responsibility. Annex two has details about the new staff reporting format developed for this process. Experience in 2014 saw some benefit from this formal reflection process. However, this will be further developed in coming years.

Analysis
In previous years the material from all sources was collated and initially analysed by an independent consultant. This analysis built on previous year’s information as well as the framework of the four objectives of the CD Program.

In 2014 there was an intention to present both a project and geographic summary of results. In the end the geographic information was too limited to allow for this. Therefore the results and initial analysis are presented by project, with some discussion about the interaction of these at the conclusion for the document.

Following this analysis further exploration and assessment of the results was undertaken with CDU staff. This contributed to this final analysis and report.

---

2 In 2014 this was undertaken through a subcontracting arrangement with La Trobe University.
The Warlpiri Education and Training Trust (WETT)

The WETT project utilises gold mining royalties to support education and training initiatives in the Tanami region, primarily across the four communities of Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra and Nyirrpi. The project has five subprograms which include the Early Childhood Care and Development program (completed as a regional initiative in partnership with World Vision in 2014), the Youth and Media program, the Secondary School Support program, the Language and Culture Support program and the Learning Community Centre program. In 2014 the Kurra WETT directors approved $2,429,845 to support a range of programs as outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Implementing Organisation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Yuendumu Learning Centre Program, Years 1-2</td>
<td>BIITE</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra Learning Centre Program, Year 3</td>
<td>BIITE</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra Learning Centre Fencing Project</td>
<td>Wallcon</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Development Program</td>
<td>World Vision Australia</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra Early Childhood Care and Development Program, two year funding proposal</td>
<td>BIITE</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra Early Learning Centre, Use of unexpended funds for research and production of research materials</td>
<td>BIITE</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra Early Childhood Shade Structure</td>
<td>Wallcon/Shadetech</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>BRDU increase in funding for Year 4</td>
<td>Yuendumu School</td>
<td>Completed on time but report not yet received</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Willowra school vehicle repair</td>
<td>Willowra School</td>
<td>Completed on time but report not yet received</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Yuendumu school vehicle fuel and maintenance costs 2013</td>
<td>Yuendumu School</td>
<td>Completed on time but report not yet received</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Ongoing fuel and maintenance funding for WETT school vehicles 2014 - 2016</td>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi schools</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Projects funded in 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi</td>
<td>WETT Country Visit and Elder Payment Program 2015 and 2016 funding</td>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi schools</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu, Lajamanu, Willowra, Nyirrpi</td>
<td>WYDAC Youth and Media Program Independent Evaluation</td>
<td>WYDAC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Extension of the Willowra Community Mapping Art Project</td>
<td>CLC Anthropology Section</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WETT Governance**

There have been some positive developments in the overall governance of the WETT project in 2014. There has been a sense of increasing maturity in governance, with people taking more responsibility and looking for ways to improve and develop their ability to direct the work.

In 2014 the independent evaluation by La Trobe University of the CLC’s community development work, reported that there was some confusion in Lajamanu about how decisions are made in WETT. In response to that finding, a WETT community barbecue and information night provided information around WETT processes and outcomes, leading to increased community knowledge and celebration of pride about those achievements.

In 2014 there were growing signs of the Kurra WETT Directors holding committee members to account by instigating their own meeting to deal with a Director who wasn’t behaving appropriately and following agreed meeting protocols.
The WETT Early Childhood Care and Development Program

The partnership that existed between WETT and World Vision Australia (WVA) to deliver this program has operated since December 2008. Over this time $2,381,657 was expended on the program from WETT funds. In October 2014, the program successfully transitioned to a new phase after a review by WETT, the CLC and World Vision Australia (WVA) led to a decision for WVA to fully fund and implement the program across the four communities in the Tanami region without WETT’s involvement. The WETT Early Childhood Program is now focused only on the Willowra Early Childhood Centre and local playgroup, which is being managed by the Batchelor Institute for Indigenous Tertiary Education (BIITE) with some support from WVA.

There was no independent monitoring of this program in 2014. Reporting received from WVA for the period preceding the handover shows ongoing work to engage families and communities in the four locations of Yuendumu, Willowra, Lajamanu and Nyirrpi. Although notably there was much less progress made in Lajamanu.

The graduation of this program is a positive outcome after the extensive engagement and support offered by the CDU throughout the WETT funding period. Given the considerable work and investment in this project over the five years of operation there might be merit in some further reflection on the value of the investment for communities and against the overall objectives of WETT, as information becomes available through wider monitoring in the relevant communities.

WETT Learning Community Centre Program

The Learning Centre program is supported in the four communities and managed by BIITE. The intention is to create a culture of learning through a mixture of formal and informal opportunities utilising both group and individual styles of learning. Learning centres are important social assets. While they provide opportunity for formal training delivery on tangible
outcomes in terms of ongoing study and employment, they are also intended to be places for people to gather and pursue their own activities in a safe and acceptable location.

The information provided for 2014 is not as detailed as in BIITE reports from previous years. This reflects the various staff changes that took place across the year within BIITE, resulting in reduced activities particularly in Lajamanu and Willowra. A consistent pattern in the reports provided is the difficulty in maintaining both formal and informal attendance at the centres without having qualified and consistent staff able to build stable and long-term relationships with communities. This appears to have become a significant problem for the learning centres and suggests some more attention ought to be given to this area of WETT funding in the future.

Above: BIITE lecturer Mike Gregory and Sheree Anderson celebrate her graduation in Certificate III Children’s Services and new job at the Lajamanu Safe House.

Lajamanu

In 2013 this Learning Centre was reporting positive operations with a permanent coordinator and other locally engaged staff. The reports up until February 2014 paint a picture of a vibrant and busy centre. There appeared to be a good mixture of formal and informal activities in the centre. This included formal courses such as children’s services, business courses, conservation and land management, primary health care, primary teaching, and short-term training such as learner driver courses and courses for people to obtain their White Card. Altogether 97 people were attending these formal training opportunities. The report shows that a number of people were moving from the formal training into local employment.

Unfortunately in February 2014 the permanent coordinator finished and the centre was being kept open by staff employed on short-term contracts whose main responsibility was to keep the centre open for computer access. This appeared to be limiting community engagement with the centre.
Nevertheless the report for the period September 2014 to February 2015 shows some ongoing activity. Four formal courses were undertaken throughout that time, with a total of 85 enrolments.

A recorded highlight in the second half of 2014 was the successful pre-employment training, which was run as a target program focusing on local workforce development within the family and children sector. In total, 26 people completed the Certificate in Community Services and 24 completed the Certificate in Family and Well-Being.

With the lack of a Learning Centre coordinator, the local reference group did not operate. There is no information available about the informal use of the centre in the second half of the year. But the reports suggest the centre was not functioning as a community hub as in previous times.

**Nyirrpi**
The major challenge for this Learning Centre in 2013 was the limited engagement in formal learning opportunities.

Reports from early in 2014 suggest that people were increasingly accessing the centre, still with a large focus on informal activities. Throughout the year formal learning was offered, with some better outcomes, 53 people engaged in five different learning opportunities (more than half of these were older than 24 years old). The major activity was formal training to assist people to apply for a learner driver’s license.

The coordinator for the centre left in the first week of February 2014 and the new coordinator started in early 2015. Significantly in the six-month period reported from September 2014 until February 2015 the local reference group did not meet. Further reports suggest that informal use the centre stagnated over this time.

**Willowra**
This centre opened in 2013 to high expectations in the community. Particular strengths identified at the time were the active reference group and their keen engagement in bringing the centre into existence.

In some contrast, the centre opened only intermittently between March and June 2014. Reports suggest that there were some formal and informal activities in that time but no numbers are provided about the scope of these activities. For the period September 2014 - December 2015 there were 14 enrolments across three formal courses, suggesting that despite the high expectation of community members formal training has not been taken up in a significant way. In addition, it is noted that the local reference group did not operate in that period.

On the other hand the reports indicate increased informal use of the Centre with a variety of activities and community meetings, suggesting that people’s engagement has increased at least at the informal level.
Yuendumu
In 2013 this community was discussing the possibility of a WETT funded Learning Centre. In the meantime, in cooperation with WYDAC, a Jaru Learning Centre has opened, providing both formal and informal training. The centre’s operations are now funded by WETT through a funding agreement with BIITE as part of the WETT regional learning centre partnership.

This centre has also struggled with getting a permanent coordinator. According to the latest reports, in 2014, 49 people were enrolled across nine different formal training courses. Thirty-eight of these people were older than 24 years of age. There was limited informal use of the centre except through the WYDAC program.

Above: Azaria Robertson puts the finishing touches on the community mural at the new Jaru Learning Centre.

WETT Youth and Media Program
In 2014 the Youth and Media program operated by Warlpiri Youth Development (WYDAC) continued in the four communities. This program has focused on both diversionary programs for young people as well as youth development to create more formal life pathways, including training and employment for young people.

As noted previously, diversionary programs continue to be the major focus for contact with young people. In the recent reports WYDAC staff note that while they have continued to try to focus on the development program, families and communities consider that the diversionary program is very important. The feedback is that the regular and reliable interaction between children and teenagers with the various youth programs continues to be an important process of development and security for those young people in each of the four communities.

As discussed below, each of the youth programs continues to grow and mature. A significant challenge remains consistent and reliable funding for what is clearly an essential service within
each location. In recognition of the long-term and significant work of this program, in 2014 planning was undertaken for a major program evaluation to be implemented in 2015.

**Yuendumu**

As the central base for WYDAC work the program in this community continued to flourish and grow in 2014. Significantly it is becoming part of a much wider community service focused around young people and their families. 2014 saw the opening of the WETT funded Jaru Learning Centre which, combined with the swimming pool and forthcoming Child and Family Centre, is providing a well-resourced youth and family precinct in the community. This has clearly supported increased engagement and provided for a much wider range of activities and educational opportunities for young people.

This is reflected in the growth in the program, which sees an average of 1,311 participants per week coming to various activities. Of these 55% were male and 45% were female. The age group of people using the centre continues to be relatively evenly split between people aged 5-9, 10-14 and 15-19.

The diversionary program has increased its range of activities in order to cater for different young people. The youth development program now has 121 active Jaru trainees. At the new Learning Centre formal training is being offered by BIITE through its partnership with WETT. A range of informal activities are also being offered as part of the development program, engaging people in training and work routines.

The major challenge for work in this area appears to be ongoing sustainability of funding. For example the swimming pool in the community, considered an important service both for diversionary activities and to provide employment for young people, is searching for secure funding (in 2014 the community lease money working group approved operational funds from a one-off lease money payment under the CLC’s Community Lease Money Project). There appears to be limited government funding available for this and other services.

The program has been working very effectively to address issues for young people in the community. Early in 2014 there was a spike of break-ins and vandalism in the community. WYDAC worked together with night patrol and parents to address the issue, making use of the Mt Theo outstation. As a result, the police report that break-ins have dropped from 35 to 2 between the first and second quarters of 2014. This is an important example of communities working with their own resources to address problems.

The outstation, combined with a dedicated counselling and mentoring program for young people in Yuendumu, is addressing significant problems around relationships, behaviour and mental well-being. While not directly funded under WETT, it ensures a comprehensive and integrated service for young people in this community.

**Lajamanu**

Lajamanu is one of the larger outreach communities and caters for a significantly higher number of young people. 2014 saw an increase in activity with an average of 851 people coming to youth centre activities each week. 54% were male and 46% were female. Most users of this centre are aged between 10 and 14 years.

There has been a focus on increasing the range and quality of activities in the centre with particular attention to including more challenging and educational activities in the diversionary program.
The number of active Jaru trainees is 42, which is down from 2013, possibly due to the high number of graduates in the previous year. Development and educational activities are being offered under the program in cooperation with the WETT Learning Centre in Lajamanu.

**Willowra**

The service in Willowra continues to provide a safe and peaceful place for young people. In the first half of 2014 some difficult community issues and unrest continued, leading community members to leave the community and some services not being made available. During this time however, the total number of participants at WYDAC was maintained and across the year slowly increased. In the second half of 2014 the average number of participants per week at the centre was 557. 49% of these were male and 51% female. The highest number of users was between 5 - 9 years old (31%) closely followed by the 10- 14 year age group (28%).

There were 52 active Jaru trainees but youth development activities were affected, and some training activities needed to be cancelled because of community unrest.

**Nyirrpi**

2014 was a positive period of growth and development for the work in Nyirrpi. There is an average of 505 people attending activities per week at the centre. 58% male and 42% female. Significantly the profile of these users is different to the other communities. There is a greater number of people aged between 5-9 and 20-24. This reflects the fact that this centre is more family and community-based and attracts families together with young people.

There were 64 active Jaru trainees in 2014.

**Warlpiri Language and Culture Support Program and the Warlpiri Secondary School Support Program**

The country visit and elder payment program provides school students with the opportunity to learn from the community elders both in the classroom and on bush trips. The secondary school support program provides direct support for Warlpiri secondary students (living in and outside Warlpiri communities) attending boarding schools, as well as funding for interstate school excursions.

Considerable funds were allocated by WETT to both these programs in 2014, although as shown below, not all of the funds were utilised by the eligible schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Allocated Budget</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Excursion Support 2014</td>
<td>$158,147.87</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$41,852.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Visits and Elder Payments 2014</td>
<td>$11,684.13</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$88,315.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schools 2014</td>
<td>$25,150.96</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$174,849.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Resources 2014</td>
<td>$15,333.07</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$666.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and R&amp;M WETT School Vehicles 2014</td>
<td>$19,477.30</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$20,522.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$229,793.33</td>
<td>$556,000.00</td>
<td>$326,206.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly in 2014 more schools applied for funding than in previous years, suggesting both greater knowledge of the program and a growing sense of its value for Aboriginal students. The
reporting from schools across this period has increased from previous years. Reports show a wide range of excursions and activities with an increased focus upon broadening children’s access and opportunity through new and varied experiences. Student essays show enthusiastic participation. Some attention has been given to using excursions as a way of exposing children to secondary school options outside the community.

Some reporting on the support for secondary students indicates the diverse but effective use of this money to support individual student needs.

WETT has started discussion about how to better tailor this support and more systematically extend assistance to school children. In recognition of the long-term investment in these programs additional monitoring was undertaken in 2014, with questionnaires being sent to each of the four school principals requesting their feedback both about the secondary school support program and the language and culture support program. Questionnaires were not completed due to time limitations and instead CDU staff interviewed two of the principals based on the questions in the questionnaires.

Feedback focused around the value of the excursion programs. In particular the school principals identified the increased confidence the excursions generated and the opportunity for children to gain a wider perspective on options beyond their community. Given limited employment opportunities in some of the communities it was a chance for children to see alternative life pathways which might include education and employment.

The principal from one school identified that the excursions have contributed to improved learning and to greater sense of self.

*The excursions that we have conducted over the past 4 years have coincided with increased attendance, improved behaviour and improved work ethic.* (School Principal)

The principals reported that the excursion programs increased the likelihood that children would continue to secondary education outside the community.

*I see the benefit of kids seeing that secondary education is where they can go…. Last year our kids went to Narrabundah and they knew some kids cause they have visited there. The kids feel more comfortable if they know someone. In the past we struggled to get kids to stay for one term at secondary College.* (School Principal)

*Over the four year period of excursions the learning achievements of the students improved quite significantly. This led to 50% of the class deciding to continue under secondary education outside of the community. To our knowledge this is the first time such a high percentage of students have chosen this pathway.* (School Principal)

The school principals reported that the regular and reliable support received for the excursion program was excellent. The flexibility of the money to meet individual and different student needs was highly valued.
The Tanami Dialysis Project

This project provides remote dialysis services to meet the physical needs of Warlpiri people, through an approach that seeks to maintain cultural and family connections. The project is auspiced by the Western Desert Nganampa Walytja Palyantjaku Tjutaku Aboriginal Corporation (WDNWPT), based in Alice Springs. The project has two remote sites, Yuendumu and Lajamanu. Each site has received support from the Kurra Aboriginal Corporation through the successive stages of development. In 2014 $342,375 was allocated for the service in Yuendumu and $113,308 was provided for the service in Lajamanu. The project also receives funding from the Aboriginals Benefit Account (ABA) as well as funding from other sources such as GMAAAC, the Lajamanu Progress Association and funding from the Northern Territory and Commonwealth governments.

An extensive review of the service was undertaken in 2013, as reported in previous monitoring reports. Overall the service was found to be highly effective, meeting a significant tangible need and able to address cultural concerns in communities. The service was assessed by external reviewers as highly cost-effective and valued by those who use it.

This effective and efficient service continued throughout 2014. The remote dialysis services in Lajamanu now operates six days a week serving people living in both Lajamanu and Kalkarindji. This service commenced operation in 2013. In the months from July 2013- June 2014, 25 patients were provided with safe and consistent dialysis, increasing to 31 in the following 12 months.

Since its opening the service has worked hard to develop good working relationships with other service providers. It now provides regular support for all patients, including regular patient led teleconferences to ensure services are meeting the particular needs of each person. The service is recognised by NT Renal Services and other organisations as having a distinct and effective approach. It is being approached to provide information around the community governance model and its patient led service provision.

In Yuendumu the funding provided by Kurra in 2014 was utilised to support employment of an Aboriginal liaison officer and a social support worker and for client services more generally.

In this community, in the six months to June 2014, 20 patients were able to return home and received dialysis in the community. The July –December report notes that all the Yapa dialysis patients received support and assistance with short trips to country and other social services as required.
The Uluru-Kata Tjuta Rent Money Community Development Project (URM)

This project started in 2005 with the purpose of developing projects and planning for business enterprises to benefit the traditional owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and the communities in which they live. These include Mutitjulu, Kaltukatjara (Docker River), Utju (Areyonga), Aputula (Finke), and Titjikala (Maryvale) in the Northern Territory, and Pukatja (Ernabella) and other communities in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands of South Australia. In 2006 the Mutitjulu community chose the Mutitjulu Working Group (MWG) members to progress projects addressing the needs of that particular community.

In 2014, in some contrast to the many meetings in 2013, only two meetings were held with traditional owners and two additional meetings with the pool committee in Mutitjulu. As shown in the following table, 5 projects were funded in 2014 with three completed within the year on time and with timely reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community / Regional</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Status - Approved, In progress or Completed</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Ara Iritija Project</td>
<td>Pitjantjarra Council</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Hole</td>
<td>Cave Hole Solar Power Project</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and report received on time</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s Well</td>
<td>Young’s Well House Repair &amp; Fence</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and report received on time</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tjuninanta</td>
<td>Tjuninanta Outstation repairs</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and report received on time</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Hole, Young’s Well, Tjuninanta</td>
<td>Contingency Outstation repairs</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total project funding for 2014 amounted to $259,378, of which 73.4% was committed to outstation (homelands) upgrade and repairs. This is similar to previous years where traditional owners have prioritised outstation repairs for the use of these funds.

Alongside these projects, four projects funded in previous years were completed in 2014 as indicated in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community / Regional</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Completion data</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Mind Matters</td>
<td>Principals Australia</td>
<td>Completed on time but report received late</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Ara Iritija</td>
<td>Pitjantjajarra Council</td>
<td>Report not received</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilanitja</td>
<td>Fencing outstation</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and reported on time</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulpanyali</td>
<td>Wicking beds</td>
<td>Centre for Appropriate Technology</td>
<td>Completed on time and reported on time</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports received indicate that the outstation work continues to be achieved according to agreed standards in cooperation with traditional owners. The contractor seeks as far as possible to use local community people as employees. CDU staff are continuing to work with local communities to improve governance arrangements in this project.
The Ara Irtitja project, where URM has provided funding to support a field officer to promote the use of the cultural heritage archives in eight community locations, is now complete. Reports received prior to completion suggest that ongoing work is required to ensure a strong transfer to community ownership. However at that time the archives were being regularly accessed by community members and appear to be considered a positive community benefit.

Photos: Cyril McKenzie and Darren Pan from Ernabella and Luis Delacruz from Mutitjulu working at Pilanitja (top) while Constance Kirkman enjoys pool games with Swimming Australia in the Mutitjulu Pool (bottom).
Mutitjulu Pool

In September 2013 the swimming pool was opened in Mutitjulu after considerable community effort and representation. Baseline research undertaken prior to the pool opening identified high expectations by the community around the ownership of the pool and the expected benefits for the community, particularly for children.

Community members anticipated that school attendance would increase, children would be taught to swim, there would be an increase in health and fitness and that training and employment would be made available, all as result of the pool. They expected to have a strong local voice in the management and that the pool would be run in a way that was safe for all concerned.

Formal reports on the pool operations from CASA Leisure throughout 2014 show that there has been regular use of the pool. There was some drop in attendance across cooler months but otherwise regular participation, particularly from children under 12. The reports indicate that there has been ongoing efforts to attract local people to work at the pool with some success finally late in 2014.

Interviews undertaken in October 2014 with service providers and community members provided a more comprehensive picture of the benefits for the Mutitjulu community. 59 interviews were undertaken altogether: 29 interviews with community members (18 women and 11 men); 13 with service providers, including people employed to manage and operate the pool; and seven with people on the Mutitjulu working group.

In terms of benefits from the pool, community members were clear that the pool provided a safe and healthy activity for young children in the community. Most people identified that the pool had had a positive impact on school attendance.

*Numbers have gone up since pool opened in September. Standard attendance was 66%, now getting higher – 80%. If kids come late they can’t get in. I have 45 children enrolled.* *(Primary school principal)*

Interviews with both school principals indicated that while primary school attendance appears to have increased during the times of the pool operation, there has been no noticeable increase in attendance at high school.

*Totally ineffective in changing attendance rates at school.* *(Secondary school principal)*

This fits with the overall view that the pool has served families and young children more effectively than other groups in the community. However it is also important to note that the high school is 20 km away and therefore an incentive system using pool attendance is likely to be less effective when the students peer group is not easily able to use the pool.

There is anecdotal evidence that children who are using the pool are healthier, with less issues around conjunctivitis and skin complaints. There is some suggestion that there has been a slight increase in ear infections according to health provider observations. People make the point however that the exercise and activity and children staying away from other swimming sites which were less clean, would clearly be having a positive benefit on children’s health.

People identified that the pool was well-run, that there was a high level of safety and good quality supervision. This is significant given that the original survey about community
expectations of the pool identified that people were concerned about safety, supervision and management. Significantly people in the community retained a strong sense of ownership and some degree of ongoing pride in obtaining what they saw as their pool.

We talked and talked to have that pool and now they put it there. Before they had a pool at Yulara and people going there would told off by whitefellows. We used to go to Yulara but now it’s much better here. My grandkids can go into the pool, and my great grandkids. I have 5 great grandkids and 5 little uncles. We are happy with the swimming. If you want to you can go for a swim. Good for the kids. (Community member)

Yulara pool belongs to them – whitefellas. There was no pool in school holiday time – we wanted to have one here. It’s alright to have it closed in the winter. It’s running well and it’s really good now the pool is here. The children are really pleased with the pool. Kids – grandkids, yes it’s making them healthy and their skin – pool water cleans up their skin. The kids aren’t going in the rockholes anymore so they are good for drinking. (Community member)

We got the pool because kids were swimming in the waterhole at the rock. We had to fight for a long time to get it. Now the kids are swimming here and it’s good. (Community member)

Despite numerous efforts by CASA and the CLC it has been difficult to attract permanent staff from the community, although there has been some recent success. People give various reasons for this. What seems to be clear is that it will take time and needs local solutions and local ideas. Experience from elsewhere suggest that it will be a slow process, requiring people to build up confidence in the pool management and the value of the employment offered. The pool committee have more recently started a range of initiatives to address this area.

Many respondents had creative ideas about how the pool could serve as a basis for wider community activities. This included a more diverse use of the pool, something which the pool committee and staff have tried to do with limited resources. In the 2014 to 15 season activities for mums and babies were increased and there was a focus on increasing access for teenagers with separate nights for girls and boys. It is clear that with some more resources a much wider range of activities could be included. Beyond this people saw ways in which the pool could be used as an adjunct to other activities both for young people and others in the community.

We would like to be able to have kangaroo tails and so after swimming we can have a feed. Kids would enjoy. We could have a fire outside and leave them to cook while we swim. ...... It is a good way to teach the kids (traditional knowledge) while they are having a good feed.......We’d quite like to make a little store – tuckshop there. After that swim the kids get hungry and go home and maybe mothers don’t have food and kids get hungry. (Community member)

It would be good to have a school holiday programme based around activities at the pool. There’s a high level of employment here so good for parents to know that there was something for the kids. (Service provider)
Pool needs to be more diverse – have water polo and games. More structured activities in the pool are needed. Mums and babies class would be great. The kids out here need high energy activity. (Service provider)

We’d like to develop a lot of things around the pool. Get adult education – make it multi-purpose community hall, with adult education, bring it back so it’s alive. Kids in pool -adults at education at night. (Community member)

The pool and its successful operation has clearly been a boost to community confidence and sense of achievement. At the same time people noted that the pool was one step towards addressing a complex set of community problems and issues. For example, while the pool has been effective in occupying young children in a positive and healthy activity, it appears to have made less difference to teenagers. Community members continued to be concerned about behaviour and supervision of teenagers and young people.

Naughty ones are still naughty – they are already excluded because they are not going to school and so they break in. They see themselves as hard done by. (Service provider)

The pool can’t solve everything. Youth services are failing us here. (Community member)

Added to this, some service providers suggested that the families who are likely to use the pool, bringing the children along and supervising them, as well as ensuring that they attend school, are not necessarily the families where there is the most disadvantage.

The pool is clearly a positive difference to people in Mutitjulu and is a source of pride for people in the community.

It’s definitely had a positive effect on the community. They are proud of the asset and the decision making process that lead to the pool. People committee have a degree of ownership of the pool and sense of governance—it’s paid dividends. (Service provider)

Everything they wanted has come about, a lot of money – community got what they want. It was a struggle to get Parks on side. We persuaded them that water tank would be refilled. I really enjoyed this journey to success. We fully succeeded – it’s been a long time. We finally see a smile on parent’s faces. Uncle Reggie attended every meeting. Tjikatu really wanted the pool. Knowing what we’ve achieved we can do other projects. (Community member)

This project is a good example where well managed projects facilitate a community development outcome. Ongoing development in the community then requires effort to build on this outcome, broadening and multiplying the activity in other areas of people’s lives. Clearly the work of CDU is limited through its current project focus and it is not in a position to facilitate ongoing and broader development processes. However the positive example of community development through the process of establishing, and now running, the pool could be used to challenge and influence the approach of other service providers in this community.
The Granites Mine Affected Area Aboriginal Corporation project (GMAAAC)
The purpose of GMAAAC is for community benefit and development across nine communities through: helping with housing, health, education, employment and essential services; with employment and training; and promoting Aboriginal self-management.

In 2014 the project continued to be active with 14 committee and community meetings across six of the nine communities (with no meetings or new activities undertaken in Balgo, Billiluna or Ringer Soak).

31 projects were funded in 2014 amounting to a total of $642,067. This was the lowest amount ever available for GMAAAC since the CDU began facilitating the project in 2008, and CDU staff have been working with communities to prepare people for this over the past four years. The diagram below was part of the ‘Money Story’ discussed with communities to explain the changing funding availability. In this case the diagram demonstrated to the community the different sources for money over time and how they might need to consider funding for particular projects beyond GMAAAC in 2014.

![Diagram showing the 'Money Story' for GMAAAC in 2009-2014]

*Presentation prepared for community meetings in Nyirrpi.*
GMAAAC typically funds a diverse range of projects ranging across health, education, employment, housing, self-management and essential services, and this diversity is well represented in the 31 projects funded in 2014.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community / Regional</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Status - Approved, In progress or Completed</th>
<th>GMAAAC Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>CDS Oval Upgrade Project</td>
<td>Central Desert Shire</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Warnayaka Arts Centre support</td>
<td>Warnayaka Arts Centre</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Aboriginal self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Old women’s vehicle R&amp;M</td>
<td>Warnayaka Arts Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Milpirri elders</td>
<td>Warnayaka Arts Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Knuckey Lagoon Warlpiri Baptist Church bus repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>KWBC</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Aboriginal self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Knuckey Warlpiri Baptist Church bus repairs and maintenance</td>
<td>KWBC</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Aboriginal self-management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Shed top up</td>
<td>AOG Church</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Sorry</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Ceremony (M)</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Ceremony (W)</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Women’s sport</td>
<td>Northern Warlpiri (Lajamanu) Sporting AC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Men’s Sport</td>
<td>Northern Warlpiri (Lajamanu) Sporting AC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Men’s Sport Operational</td>
<td>Yuendumu Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Women’s Sport Bus and Maintenance</td>
<td>Yuendumu Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Funeral project</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Sorry project</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Ceremony project</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowra</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 In past reports a significant feature has been comparing project applications to projects funded under the GMAAAC project. This gave some indication of the degree to which people both understood and were prepared to comply with the rules introduced for project funding. It has become clear across 2013 and 2014 that the rules are now well understood and the people are clear about how the funds can be used.
In 2014 five projects funded in previous years were completed, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Completion data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Oval project</td>
<td>Central Desert Regional Council</td>
<td>Completed late and reported late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Milpirri Cultural Festival</td>
<td>Tracks Dance</td>
<td>Completed on time and report received late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Dog health program</td>
<td>Warlukurlangku Artists</td>
<td>Completed late and reported late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balgo</td>
<td>Community garden</td>
<td>Boys Town</td>
<td>Completed late and reported late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiluna</td>
<td>Community bus maintenance</td>
<td>Mindibungu Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Completed late and reported late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports from these projects indicate that people are satisfied with the outcomes and the completion of the work. Projects as diverse as vaccination and desexing of dogs, alongside bus maintenance and community gardens, for example, met the diverse health, cultural and educational needs in different locations.

The reports also pointed to the need for regular and long-term project management by CDU staff. Added to this, all but one of the projects were completed late, and reporting was received
late for all the activities. This adds to the administration work for CDU staff, requiring them to follow up reports to ensure accountability to Aboriginal communities.

The underlying governance process for GMAAAC appears to have matured further in 2014. In various communities young people are now moving on to committees and are interested in improving and learning about the processes. There are examples of people holding each other to account and asking questions about the value for money of particular projects. It is clear that comprehensive preparation for meetings, giving people in the governance groups the opportunity to think through their role and their contribution in advance of meetings, is beneficial.

In 2015 CLC is looking to undertake a study into transport for remote area communities. Given the ongoing interest in using GMAAAC and other funding for vehicles, this is likely to be highly relevant to future management of these funds.
Above: GMAAAC funded Milpiri festival performers

Right: GMAAAC funded the establishment of a community garden at the Kutjunka Trade and Training Centre, Balgo

Below: Senior students from Luurnpa Catholic School got the community garden under way with support from Boys Town
Northern Territory Parks Rent Money Project

The purpose of this project is to implement the CLC council resolution that all rent and income generated from 16 national parks, conservation areas, historic reserves and nature parks across the CLC region be paid only for the benefit of traditional Aboriginal owners of the land, via community benefit projects. The project aims to achieve this by establishing a community development planning process with each of the groups, in order to achieve broad ranging social, cultural and economic benefit. The project commenced in 2010 following several years of consultations with Park traditional owners about the option of using future rent for community benefit. Based on the positive response from a range of park traditional owner groups the full Council passed a resolution to direct all rent to community benefit over two days at their November 2010 Council meeting.

The highlight for the project in 2013 was the completion of the first round of decision-making process in all 16 parks. In 2014 consultation with traditional owners and others continued with 42 meetings in total across the 16 locations. This included meetings with traditional owners and with working groups. 24 new contracts were executed in 2014. Progress towards outcomes remains slow, with only four completed projects by the end of the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects funded in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Pillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulcie Ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Oliver family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Oliver family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Williams family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Williams family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Ryder family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macs cluster - Ryder family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napwerte/Ewaninga Rock Carvings CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napwerte/Ewaninga Rock Carvings CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects funded in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napwerte/Ewaninga Rock Carvings CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uremerne shelter #3 and ablution block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napwerte/Ewaninga Rock Carvings CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uremerne repairs and maintenance fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napwerte/Ewaninga Rock Carvings CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uremerne power bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finke Gorge NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finke Gorge NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Hot Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyunba Conservation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Gap Conservation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watarrka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macs West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeperenye/Emily and Jessie Gaps Nature Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeperenye/Emily and Jessie Gaps Nature Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed monitoring for this project in 2013 indicated a growing satisfaction with the approach, particularly as projects were implemented and completed. A large proportion of the projects focused on support for outstations indicating the importance of these locations to the traditional owners. Many of the projects related to infrastructure improvement and provided opportunities for local employment and training.

After a slow start, due to a change in staffing, 2014 appears to have seen further maturing of governance and other processes. Considerable work was undertaken to catch up with meetings and oversee project completion. As a result there were a large number of meetings in 2014, including a number of big traditional owner meetings. There was significant progress in allocation of money and approval and implementation of projects.

Staff observed that people are more actively utilising a community development process to address issues in the communities. Community development staff have worked to prepare groups for meetings through a process of pre-meeting consultations with people in family groups. This is leading to better understanding and engagement. Relationships between community development staff and project groups are developing and trust is improving. In part this may be due to the regional allocation of CDU staff which sees them able to be in more regular contact with the same communities.

The benefits are being celebrated in some locations and there is more concern with holding contractors and others to account for how projects are delivered. This is an important part of the development process for the groups involved.

Overall 2014 saw shifts in governance and decision making and positive progress in project implementation. It is expected that increased outcomes in both process and community benefit will be evident in 2015.
Above: Outstation resident Kunmanara Ungwanaka using the mobile hotspot

Right: Chambers Pillar working group members l-r Reggie Kenny, Peter Kenny, Dennis Kenny
Community Lease Money Project

In 2007, as part of the Northern Territory Emergency Response (widely known as ‘The Intervention’), the Commonwealth Government compulsorily acquired five-year leases over 20 ALRA and 10 Community Living Area (CLA) Aboriginal communities. In 2008 the government promised it would pay fair rent for these communities, and in 2011-12 approximately $1 million was distributed to traditional owners of the 20 ALRA communities. Following protracted negotiations with the Commonwealth, Council and all affected Aboriginal land trusts in the CLC region accepted the Commonwealth’s final multi-million dollar five year lease money offer in late 2012. Under this agreement, the CLC has received one-off amounts of between $202,000 and $2.25 million per ALRA community to distribute “to or for the benefit of” traditional owners.

Since late 2011 CLC staff have been meeting with traditional owners and community residents to talk about how the rent money could be split between individual distribution, community benefit and investment.

In November 2012 the full Council passed a resolution that ensured that at least half of the final valuation of the lease amount for all of the 20 communities would be applied for the benefit of the traditional Aboriginal owners of the land for community purpose projects. Council also resolved that those communities that stood to receive over $1 million could allocate no more than $500,000 for individual distributions. Council passed this resolution, which was developed over several months with input from Executive members and supported by the Executive at their meeting preceding the November Council meeting. The intention was to promote the use of the money for community benefit and reduce disagreement and harm within groups. The Council resolution was passed unanimously, suggesting strong support from the delegates for the community development approach and the recognised benefits for their communities.

In addition, the 10 communities on Community Living Area (CLA) title decided to work with the CLC to use their five year and other lease income exclusively for community benefit.

In 2013 CDU increased the number of staff working on this project to support enhanced engagement with communities around both their decision-making process and their allocation of funds. Data available for 2013 showed that there has been considerable engagement and meetings across communities. This pattern continued in 2014 with 85 meetings undertaken across 25 communities. This included 71 working group meetings and a further 14 community meetings.

As a result, 89 projects were funded in 2014 as illustrated in the following table. Total project funding approved for the year amounted to $6,093,270.43.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Status - Approved, In progress or Completed</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alekarenge</td>
<td>Sports Ground Upgrade</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alekarenge</td>
<td>Wifi Hotspot</td>
<td>Barkly Regional Council</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alekarenge</td>
<td>BRACS Room employment</td>
<td>Barkly Regional Council</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Business/Employment Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpurrurulam</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Red Centre Homes</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Church upgrades and cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpurrurulam</td>
<td>Water treatment</td>
<td>Power Water Corporation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Water Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpurrurulam</td>
<td>Water infrastructure</td>
<td>Power Water Corporation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Water Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>Church repair/upgrade</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Church upgrades and cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>Community bus with maintenance</td>
<td>Areyonga Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>School excursions</td>
<td>Utju School</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atitjere</td>
<td>Church Project</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Church upgrades and cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daguragu</td>
<td>Resurface basketball court project</td>
<td>Benzac building and construction</td>
<td>Completed on time but report was late</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daguragu</td>
<td>Basketball court R&amp;M</td>
<td>Victoria Daly Regional Council</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daguragu</td>
<td>Band equipment project</td>
<td>Karungkarni Art Centre</td>
<td>Completed on time but report was late</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daguragu</td>
<td>Sports uniforms project</td>
<td>Karungkarni Art Centre</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engawala</td>
<td>Patient Transport Vehicle with maintenance</td>
<td>Engawala Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engawala</td>
<td>Sports Ground Upgrade</td>
<td>My Pathway (RJCP provider)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haasts Bluff</td>
<td>Community culture vehicles with maintenance</td>
<td>Kanparrika Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Ranger support and school workshops</td>
<td>Munguru rangers</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Community transport service</td>
<td>Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Gurindji Corp Manager wages</td>
<td>Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Business/ employment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Fix up old clinic building</td>
<td>Karungkarni Art Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Other building construction/ repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Young mothers bush trip</td>
<td>Families As First Teachers and Kalkarindji school</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Contractor fee</td>
<td>Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Business/ employment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Business/ employment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Business advice project</td>
<td>Mark Lewis Corporate Services</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Business/ employment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalkarindji</td>
<td>Gurindji eagles football team project</td>
<td>Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintore</td>
<td>Walungurru School excursion</td>
<td>NTDET Tanami Group school</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintore</td>
<td>Funeral support</td>
<td>MacDonnell Regional Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Funeral Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintore</td>
<td>Church upgrade - Bell and bell tower</td>
<td>Finke River Mission of Lutheran Church of Australia</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintore</td>
<td>Community Christmas celebration</td>
<td>Pulikutjarra Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Food and cleaning project</td>
<td>Lajamanu Baptist Church</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Ranger swags</td>
<td>Wulaign rangers (CLC)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Childcare vehicle</td>
<td>Life Without Barriers</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Church bus</td>
<td>Lajamanu Baptist Church</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Softball bus</td>
<td>Northern Warlpiri (Lajamanu) Sporting AC</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Football bus</td>
<td>Northern Warlpiri (Lajamanu) Sporting Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Domestic violence vehicle</td>
<td>Catholic Care</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lajamanu</td>
<td>Old people's vehicle</td>
<td>Warnayaka Arts Centre</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramba</td>
<td>Footy uniforms</td>
<td>Laramba Community Sports Inc</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramba</td>
<td>Music Room project</td>
<td>Central Desert Regional Council</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramba</td>
<td>Church renovations</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Liebig</td>
<td>Music Project</td>
<td>Animpirrinpi Yututju Aboriginal Womens' Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Liebig</td>
<td>Community bus project with maintenance</td>
<td>Animpirrinpi Yututju Aboriginal Womens' Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Liebig</td>
<td>Melbourne Education forum</td>
<td>Animpirrinpi Yututju Aboriginal Womens' Corporation</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Liebig</td>
<td>Community sports weekend</td>
<td>Animpirrinpi Yututju Aboriginal Womens' Corporation</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>2014 Healthy Living Sports Carnival</td>
<td>AFL NT</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>Cemeteries Upgrades</td>
<td>Tjuwanpa Outstation Resource Centre</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Church upgrades and cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>组织实施者</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>部门</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>School excursion</td>
<td>Ntaria School</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>Korparilya fencing</td>
<td>Ngurratjuta Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>School excursions years 2-4</td>
<td>Ntaria School</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>Language centre – bilingual bush trips</td>
<td>Ntaria School</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>Anildika culture program infrastructure project</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Other building construction/ repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntaria</td>
<td>Church hall survey</td>
<td>Brian Blakeman Surveys</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Women's sport</td>
<td>Nyirrpi Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Maintenance Community bus</td>
<td>Nyirrpi Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Rescue vehicle with maintenance</td>
<td>Nyirrpi Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyirrpi</td>
<td>Men's sport</td>
<td>Nyirrpi Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Community Bus project with maintenance</td>
<td>Papunya Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Sporting facilities upgrade - Stage 1 ground levelling</td>
<td>Papunya Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Sporting Upgrades- Stage 2 grandstands</td>
<td>Dibing Consultancy Pty Ltd</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Community Christmas Celebration</td>
<td>Papunya Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Knowing and Maintaining Culture vehicle with maintenance</td>
<td>Papunya Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>Church bus with maintenance</td>
<td>Papunya Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Church Project</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and reported on time</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titjikala</td>
<td>Football Team Project</td>
<td>Titjikala Community Association</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titjikala</td>
<td>Rec Hall Equipment</td>
<td>Titjikala Community Association</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titjikala</td>
<td>Sports Ground Upgrade</td>
<td>Tangentyere Constructions</td>
<td>Completed on time and report received</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wutunugurra</td>
<td>Band equipment project</td>
<td>Wettenngerr Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wutunugurra</td>
<td>Church Opening Project</td>
<td>Wetenngerr Community Store Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Completed on time</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Video Production and animation</td>
<td>PAW Media</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>PAW Media</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Language and Culture Centre</td>
<td>PAW Media</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Yuendumu Pool 1 year operation funds</td>
<td>Warlpiri Youth Development Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Purchase and installation of dialysis equipment</td>
<td>Western Desert Nganampa Walytja Palyantjaku Tjutaku</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Renovation and extension of existing dialysis unit of</td>
<td>Western Desert Nganampa Walytja Palyantjaku Tjutaku</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Other building construction/ repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Warlpiri Drawing Exhibition Canberra</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>Completed on time but report it was late</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Strong women strong babies vehicle</td>
<td>Yuendumu Clinic</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Sports weekend</td>
<td>Magpies Sports Club</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sporting grounds, sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Faithwalk Church support</td>
<td>Faithwalk Church</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Catholic Church support</td>
<td>Catholic Church</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>United Pentecostal Church support</td>
<td>United Pentecostal Church</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>AOG support</td>
<td>AOG Church</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Salt Church support</td>
<td>Yuendumu Salt Church</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Community Transport - Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Ceremony support</td>
<td>Yuendumu Social Club</td>
<td>Completed on time but no report received</td>
<td>Language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Warlpiri College Planning</td>
<td>Warlpiri Education Board</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Baptist Church support</td>
<td>Baptist Union of the NT</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Church upgrades &amp; cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>Homelands Resource Centre Planning Stage 1</td>
<td>YKNAC</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Business/ Employment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>WYDAC Vehicle Repairs &amp; Maintenance Project 2014 x 3</td>
<td>Warlpiri Youth Development Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Community Transport - General Purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2013 the monitoring pointed to significant progress and positive outcomes across many communities. However limitations were also identified, including the five-year leasing money being a one-off payment. In these situations it was more difficult for CDU staff to build relationships and community understanding of the development process over time. Staff reported that the project work had been very demanding and resource intensive. In response to need they had worked creatively. CDU staff have had to develop different strategies to engage with the wide variety of communities and to accommodate peoples’ different experiences and understanding of the community development process. Communities have effectively and successfully utilised funding available to them but in many and various ways.

In light of this it was proposed that CLC should look carefully at the implications for this work in terms of the value for communities and the resources required to effectively implement a community development approach. Therefore in 2014, research was undertaken to consider what features shaped the positive community development outcomes experienced in different communities. The purpose of this research was also to understand how community development processes were adapted and implemented by CDU staff in response to existing strengths and resources in communities, to bring about effective change.

Five communities were chosen where positive outcomes had been identified from the projects undertaken in those communities. Attention was given to obtaining a mixture of communities from different regions, different size communities and locations where there had been previous experience of community development processes versus those where the process was new to the community. Building on existing CLC staff knowledge about each community, tailored interviews were undertaken with working groups and other community members. The aim was to explore all of the features that shaped positive outcomes. The hypothesis was that this would be a mixture of previous history and current strengths in the community as well as the skills and strategies introduced by CDU staff. The full details of the methodology utilised are outlined in Annex One. The results of the research in each community are presented below.

**Titjikala**

**Introduction**

This community received $402,606.13 from the five-year lease money for community benefit projects (all of the money was allocated to community development in this community because it is a CLA). The community formed an 11 member working group to plan and implement projects. Working group meetings have been open to the broader community with other people attending and working well together.

Until the end of 2014 nine meetings have been undertaken including full community meetings, towards project selection and funding allocation.

Five projects have been approved to date. This includes:

- A bus project for the community to help with football and sports carnival transportation
- A fuel fund for the bus
- Registration fees and new uniforms for the local football team
- Band equipment and a pool table
- Upgrading of the football oval and softball field.
Above: The Titjikala football oval upgrade starts with local works building a fence.

Below: Mt Liebig. Jordan Marshall and Marcus Wheeler race to the ball (Marcus McDonnell coming through to right) at the sports weekend funded with community lease money.
Research Findings

Altogether 20 people were interviewed in this community. Seven were from the working group, seven were community members and a further six people who worked in some type of service provision in the community.

People were clear that this is a good community, strong and able to organise itself. A number of people referred to the history of the community when things had not gone well and where there had been particular problems with alcohol and unrest between community members. People identified that the community is now different, is strong. It is a place where people know each other and know how to relate effectively together.

*People know each other here. They have been living here a very long time and they know how to approach people and not get shamed. They love to see the people come in and know that good things will happen to the community. This is our community.* (Working group member)

*This is a very strong community. People work well together. It is transparent and accountable. It’s to do with its history. This is a very strong community. If they’ve got something to say they’ll say it. The old ladies at the Art Centre, the grandmothers, are very strong.* (Service provider)

People referred to the long history of learning to live together as important to where the community is today, as well as particular leaders who are strong in the community and provided cohesive direction. There was a strong sense of the community knowing its own mind. Many respondents pointed to the physical appearance of the community and their pride in good physical appearance.

*We are all together here. We aren’t bad friends. We are going slow but thinking about things. It is a strong community, we help each other. We’re tidy town.* (Working group member)

*We remember that it was a bad time with old tin home in old village.* (Community member)

While all respondents were aware of the projects, working committee members had a much better understanding than others about the detail of these projects and how they had come about. Apart from the bus project, which has created some difficulties, other projects were seen as positive and examples of the community able to operate together to achieve shared outcomes.

Significantly when asked about who would help them to achieve these projects, people referred to leaders and other participants in the community.

*We have strong leaders who talk to ladies and come together as one.* (Working group member)

*We all got involved. Women talked about their plan for women and men for men, and then we got together to make a plan for young men. Older people was involved. They all talked to younger ones—they were all happy about that.* (Working group member)

*I’ve been on committee for a while. I used to do minutes for Local council meetings before the Shire came. I was a shy person but listening to strong people in the room and how they do it made me want to do it.* (Working group member)
We’ve learnt a lot from our local land Council delegates. Ours is a strong community member and speaker. He came back and told us “this is what’s happening in other communities: they are spending it the wrong way, we should not do it their way”. We were listening to stories from other communities and trying to do it the right way but our way. (Community member)

When asked specifically about CDU staff, a common responses was that people from CLC listened to the community, and took direction from the community. People said that they provided necessary and clear information, particularly about budgeting and that they operationalised community wishes. This is in contrast, according to some respondents, to the way other external groups worked with them (in particular the Regional Council).

*It was all our idea. They only just listen to what we come up with. They helped getting quotes and tenders. (Working group member)*

*CLC were good at explaining and they helped really well. (Working group member)*

*CLC did lots of listening and asking “Are there other stakeholders in the community?” “How can the stakeholders like Catholic Care and shire help?” (Working group member)*

People in the working group were most clear about the way that CLC had worked. Others were less clear but generally well-disposed from what they had heard.

What appears to be common across the responses was that the CLC has worked respectfully with this community, listened to their views and supported them to bring ideas to fruition based around shared community priorities.

*CLC worked in front of us. (Working group member)*

*They are not telling Anangu what to do. They are only bringing what they want to say from town. They are respectful and work well with Anangu. (Working group member)*

*But I can say that CLC’s staff attitudes are terrific. CLC is friendly. They don’t just walk in. they always say hello and acknowledge that you live and work here. They always let you know what they are here for. They don’t just take people away or have meetings without asking. Treat people as equals… CLC are probably more structured in terms of having a purpose, knowing what they have to do, which is good because we don’t have time. (Service provider)*

Significantly more than one respondent talked about continuing to work with CDU staff on other projects and developments in the community as a result of this experience.

*We’d like CLC to keep working as they are but on different, new things. (Working group member)*

Alekarenge

Introduction

In this community $526,203 was made available through the five-year lease money for community benefit. A working group of six was formed in 2012 and three additional members were added in late 2013 to increase the representation of the group. The working group has been active in presenting projects at community meetings for the community to decide how to
allocate funds. The working group intentionally chose young people is the priority target area. In total eight community and working group meetings were held between 2012 and 2014.

The community decided on allocation of funds to five subprojects:

- A Wi-Fi hotspot
- A multimedia project and equipment designed to facilitate work with young people
- Wages for two youth media officer positions, allowing two local Aboriginal people to work part-time
- A contribution to a proposed waterpark project (this project to be undertaken by the Barkly Regional Council has been under discussion for a number of years and was intended to be built in 2014. To date nothing has happened.)
- Sportsground upgrade and maintenance.

Above: Alekarenge working group members l-r Graham Beasley, Peter Corbett, Dyllis Wilson, Zeza Egan.

Research Findings
Interviews were undertaken with three working group members, 16 community participants and three service providers.

This community presents as strong and cohesive.

_Things work well because there are four language groups but the people from here were born here and belong to the community, even though they are not Kaytetye. (Community member)_

However many respondents also identified community problems, especially those associated with alcohol and unemployment.
I think it’s a very good idea to use lease money for community projects. A lot of mothers are busy drinking and playing cards. I look out for the kids on Night Patrol. If there are no parents at home we take them to their other family—and look after them.

(Community member)

Virtually all respondents supported the projects selected, even if they had not been part of the working group or community meetings. Not all respondents had full details or necessarily understood the process of project selection and implementation, but most people supported the idea that projects would provide services and activities for young people in the community. There appears to be strong support for the notion of community benefit.

The working group decided to do things for young people because they worry for them. Traditional owners don’t get jealous for that lease money here. They think about for the community and what it needs. (Working group member)

We asked the community for ideas and what they thought. They were happy with what was chosen. We told them we need to put money for projects for younger people. Community really happy about this. (Working group member)

We are really happy they are using the lease money for the community. It’s better that it goes for things for community. (Community member)

Lease money projects for community are a good idea—builds up community and is for the good of the community. Maybe keep going with this. (Community member)

There was a common perception that young people needed activities in order to alleviate boredom and limit the use of drugs and alcohol. There was a particular concern among older people about the lack of opportunity for young people.

These projects are especially for young people, because Shire doesn’t give them jobs. We need them to get a job. We are worrying about young people because they don’t have a lot to do and grow up drinking all the time. We need them to do something else—like these things. (Community member)

Kids need things to do. Kids here are sniffing petrol and drinking. My granddaughter is under 18 and drinking in Tennant Creek. We worry for them. (Community member)

For our young fellas these projects are great. Music room and Wi Fi Hotspot is really good idea. Music and culture project was great because older people want to keep culture going. Otherwise young people got nothing to do here at day and night. (Community member)

Many of the respondents, especially those not part of the working group, did not fully understand the process by which projects were allocated or implemented. There was concern by many people about how long it had taken for projects to be up and running, with regular references to the failure to implement the waterpark project (notwithstanding the fact that this was outside the control of either community or the CLC).

The sense from the answers was that people were confident in their own community and that decisions would have been made independent from the CLC or other influences. At the same time, some people expressed the view that representation on the working group still needed further improvement.
We talked amongst ourselves and talked with community about what they want. We had community meeting. We listened to community and made decisions about what they wanted. (Working group member)

The community know what we are doing. If they don’t agree we change to what they like. It has to be of benefit to the community not just an individual. (Community member)

The TOs and Working Group must have talked about it and listened to community. We think it’s a really good idea to put lease money into these sort of projects. (Community member)

Service providers had much to say about the problems in the community and the failure of government services and others to adequately support and address those problems. But the same service providers also pointed to the strength and resilience of the community.

People here know who they are and what they are. (Service provider)

People did not have a lot of feedback on the role played by the CLC in this community. People noted that they manage the meetings and provided budget and other information. A small number of people blame them for projects not happening fast enough. But generally people were positive about the CLC without having a strong view about the detail of their role. It was a view that the CLC would be there to support the community but very limited detail about how this happened in practice.

CLC is a good help. They organise meetings for us and we ask them questions about ideas we come up with and what we are spending and how much is left over—the budget. And we talk about what we will do next year. (Working group member)

They’ve been helping us decide what we need and how much it will cost. I’m happy with the way Land Council works with us. (Working group member)

Land Council help with money side for community projects. They work well with people. (Community member)

They manage the meetings and help people decide what they can get and look at the budget. They listen and talk with people in the community. (Community member)

Nyirrpi

Introduction

In this community $178,773 was allocated from lease money in 2014 (50% of Nyirrpi’s community lease money was allocated for community development purposes). Significantly in this community the existing eight member GMMAAC committee was nominated as the working group to plan and make decisions for community projects using leasing money, rather than setting up a separate committee. The group was delegated the power to plan and approve projects funded either by the leasing money or GMMAAC or a combination of both.

Across 2014 a new GMMAAC committee was elected. Altogether since the beginning of the community leasing money project, five meetings were held, both community meetings and GMMAAC committee meetings, to plan and approve projects.
Significantly, while the amount of money utilised from both sources is not large, a wide variety of projects were approved across 2013/14. These included:

- Men’s sport bus
- Community Bus repairs and maintenance (jointly funded with GMAAAC: GMAAAC $18,336.16 and $14,207 CLM)
- Support for men’s sport (jointly funded with GMAAAC: $8,000 GMAAAC and $17,880 CLM)
- Support for women’s sport (jointly funded with GMAAAC: $4,990 GMAAAC and $30,950.53 CLM)
- Cemetery repairs
- A church bus
- Music equipment
- A shipping crate for storage
- General repairs to the recreational hall
- Search and Rescue vehicle.

Notably many of these items are those which would in the past have been funded under GMAAAC, and the GMAAAC funds being very low in 2014.

Interviews were undertaken with 18 people in this community. Four from the working group, nine community members and four service providers. Notably some of these interviews were short and, due to other events occurring outside the community, not a wide range people were available for the interviews.

Research Findings
The interviews with community members show that most people were aware of at least some of the projects that have been funded and most were happy with the outcomes. While there appear to be some problems with use of vehicles, this appears to be confined to one particular vehicle which was for general community use.

I didn’t go to any working group meetings or where they decided this. But I think those lease money projects are a really good idea for the community. (Community member)

Recovery Vehicle not going well. If someone breaks down half way to a place with little kids we should help them with that. But they using it wrong way for private use. It’s supposed to help rescue people and families. (Community member)

Significantly people pointed to the difference between lease money and money that comes from GMAAAC. A number of people referred to the lease money as belonging to traditional owners and the need to reference their wishes in deciding on the use of this money. This seems to reflect a desire to ensure traditional owners are included.

The lease money and GMAAAC money were two different buckets GMAAAC is run differently to lease money. We use it for different things. But it’s the same process used. (Working group member)

The money is given on behalf of the TOs and they—committee- manage it for the community. GMAAAC money is different— it’s given by Government for the community. The lease money—TOs get more say, because they are the ones
giving the money to the community. They could take it all for themselves if they wanted. It’s important that community get what they want because lease money is for everyone. (Community member)

People were obviously aware of the different sources of funding and the implications. While the same group made decisions about both sources of funding they were able to clearly allocate the money in a considered and differentiated manner.

One of the hypothesis about why this community was able to manage the community leasing money effectively was because of its previous experience in managing funds through GMAAAC. People certainly make reference to this experience and their learning from previous working on committees and being able to make decisions.

They put me on GMAAAC as an elder who knows how to speak up. We got a lot of experience working on that so can bring that to lease money projects. (Working group member)

Some people worked on GMAAAC before and got a lot of experience doing that.......they are good at it, they speak up. People have good experience working on GMAAAC committees and other Council committees. (Community member)

Because GMAAAC is a strong committee and it improved everything. When there are projects happening people look at those people who are looking after money properly. It’s all about being a role model. It’s working well because everyone had experience at GMAAAC. (Working group member)

In addition, people referenced the strength of the community and the comfort and ability of its members to work with each other. This was reinforced by service providers who observed that the community is strong and stable and that people appear to be able to resolve differences effectively. Both service providers and community members pointed to strong leadership and people’s good connection to culture as being important strengths, enabling this community to work together and make decisions.

People felt that the CLC worker had provided information and facilitated the community meeting and understanding of what decisions could be made. There was almost a sense that people took for granted the role CLC would play in facilitating this process.

[The CLC staff member] listened to people and what their ideas were. She wrote down their ideas—what they wanted. People are getting used to meetings because we have community meetings. (Working group member)

I know [the CLC staff member] and I went to community meetings a couple of times. [the CLC staff member] worked well with people, listening to their ideas. She talked with people about what they could get with the money. (Community member)

When we have that meeting we have lunch too, with sandwiches. [The CLC staff member] puts things up on a board—how much money they have. They talk about money and what they want and how much it cost. (Community member)
At the same time there was some reflection that the lease money should be more controlled by traditional owners. There was some reflection that people felt too much control was exerted by others over their decision making.

*I want a different structure for the lease money. TOs for this community should get the lease money themselves. GMAAAC money is different—it’s for affected areas.* (Community member)

CD staff reports suggest this sentiment seems to be related to the fact that it’s a transient community where leadership is not stable. People are anxious about decisions and therefore stable leadership through traditional owners is an important process within the community.

In this community, people do not necessarily distinguish CDU workers from their other engagement with the CLC more generally. This is not necessarily a bad thing but it does suggest attention needs to be given to ensuring consistent messages among different CLC departments working in this location.

**Ntaria**

**Introduction**

Prior to any council resolution, in April 2012, a meeting of Ntaria traditional owners allocated $1,108,513 of their five-year lease money, and all of their section 19 lease money for three years, to community benefit projects. It was at this point that the working group membership was selected and therefore why the working group is predominantly made up of traditional owners.

After the November 2012 Council decision, and when the final amount of money was known, the final decision was in line with the council resolution with a maximum of $500,000 going to individual distribution. In total, $1,656,006 was available from the five year lease money of which $662,190 has been spent to date. Alongside these unspent funds, section 19 lease money received between 2012 and 2014 is also available for community benefit...

The traditional owners determined that the working group would be delegated authority to plan and fund projects and traditional owners chose the seven working group members. (Note that six of them are men.) The down side of this arrangement has been that there has been no further community input around the work and therefore no ongoing accountability to the wider community for project outcomes. In part this seems to have been a deliberate move by traditional owners because there has been ongoing conflict in this community. These leaders in the community wanted to avoid that conflict spilling into the decision-making process around funding applications.

The working group met regularly throughout 2012, then in 2013 started planning and eventually agreed to allocate funds. This continued in 2014. In total 15 meetings were held up until December 2014 to resolve funding to that point.

As a result this community has allocated funds for the following projects:

- A healthy living sports carnival (2013 and 2014)
- Funeral fund
- Emergency beacon
- Community bus
- Cemeteries upgrade
• School excursion
• Outstation repairs
• Church hall survey
• Language bush trips and learning materials.

Monitoring for this community was conducted across three days of talking to 19 people. This included five members of the working group, four service providers and 10 other community members.

Research Findings
This is clearly a complex community with many other influences and wider engagements. The interview process itself was mixed, with some people not as relaxed and open to being interviewed as in other communities. Clearly this community has wide-ranging engagement with many other service providers, government and other agencies which has influenced their attitude towards external groups.

Overall however the community were happy with the projects that have been selected and the outcomes to date. This included community members outside of the working group.

The working group members are clearly an impressive group of people with many strengths drawn from previous experience and work in other situations. They are dedicated and bring a lot of expertise to the task.

We didn’t know how, what, or who with the lease money at first. But we had pretty good training. Our thinking and good thinking. We all agree on what we talk about. I am meeting all the time. I’m the one that helps make decisions. Well this is my community. I want it strong. I’m traditional owner. (Working group member)

I don’t know—it’s just in my head. You got to do it step-by-step, can’t rush and do it in one. I’m used to doing this sort of thing, but it’s a good experience for others to learn. I’m showing to other members how to do things. Because I’ve been on ATSIC... and... ABA. And I’ve been a delegate for CLC. (Working group member)

Working group decide which way they want to go to make a better community. Everyone talks and shares ideas and decides on something and makes it happen. There’s a lot of things we’ve been doing. It’s a good experience working in groups. I learnt by talking and pushing up a lot of ideas. People put in different ideas; it’s a little bit of a competition to see who gets what because we have five land trust areas on the community. Working group made up of people from the land trusts. (Community member)

However there was some, quite strong, feedback about the limited engagement of women in the working group and in decision-making more generally in this community. This was linked in at least one response to a high degree of domestic violence and more general limits placed upon women in the community.

We are not involved. It’s only men making the decisions. The things we asked for they haven’t agreed to. There are no women at the working group meetings. (Community member)

The community development projects are a good idea. The buses are good and cemetery projects and school excursions. But CLC should work with women also. Work with women. If it is community lease money and community money then the community
should be deciding what should happen with it. We should be able to use it for things we want. Not just for traditional owners. (Community members)

All of the women feel that they were left out of the process—they felt sidelined. They wrote to community lease group—use female proxy. They were sidelined and rejected. They put up proposal for $25,000 for women’s centre caretaker but it was rejected. They felt disengaged. There are no women on working lease group here. They say “how can these men do it?” (Service provider)

CDU staff have worked to try and understand and address the representation and views of women in this community. In contrast to some of the comments above there has been one woman attending consistently as a working group member, and three of the six male working group members have female proxies. Nevertheless it is clear that there are divisions and differences in this community and issues such as gender relations and representation can easily become a focus for some of those divisions.

There are clearly other meetings and groups operating here that support and facilitate the activity in this community. This includes a strong relationship with the school. There is also a sense that many members of the community have an interest in the development of their children and other development opportunities and are keen to use resources towards these. The sense is that it is a strong and very active community.

It’s a good place to live because we got our own groups coming together, talking together; talking with police, school, shops and workers. Mainly our working group is talking with school. Kids are running amok still but we are doing our best. Night Patrol works for certain hours, helping with kids. Police are really good. Like they are helping us with Korparilya Day, the 1st week in October. The organizations work well together here at Ntaria; more-or-less. (Working group member)

It went well because of team work. Committee team work. We want to improve Ntaria to show that Hermannsburg community can do it. Other communities might get ideas from us. (Community member)

People saw CLC as helpful, able to provide information and to meet as required. However the strong sense from this community is that community made the decisions, or at least decisions were made by the responsible working group, and that they are in control of the projects.

CLC has been pretty good but they got too much on their hands. 90 delegates out there. This one would be the biggest project. (Working group member)

CLC has been a big help. Elke worked good with us on that project for emergency beacon and others. They help us plan; go through the money story and meeting agreements and we talk about our ideas. We talk about what’s going to happen. We make things happen—some things still not yet happening. (Working group member)

CLC helped with transport and things for meeting like with budget. They report back to us about budget side. (Community member)
Above: NTES volunteer Max Baliva surveys the footprint of the UHF receiver at Mt Hermannsburg.

Below: Lunch time BBQ for Kalkarindji and Daguragu communities during Freedom Day Festival. Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation organised this year’s festival. GAC receives funding from the CLM Project.
Kintore

Introduction

In this community $196,142 was allocated from the lease money (this community allocated 50% of its five-year lease money to community benefit), of which $46,300 has been spent on five projects to date. The community and traditional owners came together to form a working group and delegated the authority to that working group to plan and fund projects. Significantly the membership was increased at a later time from seven to 11 to ensure more senior people, in particular senior women were involved.

Altogether eight meetings have been undertaken with the community and the working group since the beginning of 2012, to make decisions around funding allocations. This included a meeting late in 2012 where traditional owners decided to set aside half of the five-year lease money for community development prior to the overarching Council resolution. This community, like Ntaria, was therefore ahead of other decisions around leasing money.

The projects funded throughout 2014 are not large. They include:

- Funding for two school excursions
- Funeral support
- A church upgrade
- A Christmas celebration.

Significantly the working group chose different project partners for each project. They have the benefit in this location of having a range of organisations with strong capacity and therefore the opportunity to make different choices. But the process was also a deliberate one by the working group in order to engage with different organisations and ensure the best outcomes across the individual projects.

Altogether 22 people were interviewed from this community. This included six people from the 11 person working group, 12 community members and four service providers.

Above: Kintore school excursion. Lawrence Brown, Maureen Wheeler, Lydia Willy, Selma Sampson visiting the National Gallery in Canberra
Research Findings
Significantly this community has a long history with governing their own Aboriginal Corporations.4

There are a significant number of strong senior men and women living in the community and, because of geographic isolation, there may have been less government service provision here than in other communities in the region. There is a view that this has led to more community self-reliance.

“We are running good, these projects. Shire is no good... That’s why we are making things happen with lease money, like school excursions, bell, funeral fund and all those things we decided on... Why are they going good? Because we come up with ideas and make it happen. (Working group member)

“It’s a good place also because we raise money for our people. Government told us we can’t help you for renal—to too much rubbish, bad water and dust here. We raised money for dialysis centre ourselves and grew up the swimming pool and basketball court and childcare—that belongs to old people who grew these things up. (Community member)

While projects funded in this community were not large, people were certainly aware of them and very positive about the benefits. Even those people who had had little contact with the working group and the decision making, once informed about the projects felt they had been positive for the community.

“Our projects are going very well. We don’t spend it on [just] anything—just on projects benefiting all the people. We make things good for community. (Working group member)

“We are happy. We talk about what we need and what we’ve got. We come up with our ideas. We have good ideas for what’s needed. We know Government can’t give us money for these things, so we thought about what we needed. (Community member)

There is a strong sense in this community that people are concerned with the overall good and benefits for everyone.

“We tell the elders we don’t want to be like other communities. We don’t want to spend money on cars or buses just on things for community. And funerals; we help people with funerals—pay for them. We are still waiting on that. [CDU staff member] is coming next week and I’ll talk with her. We still got money left. We are using money proper way—not spending it on one or two things. (Working group member)

Community development projects are a good idea. We work together—me and Monica and others on working group. We all in one working group. Sometimes I go to the meetings. I talk up—I don’t sit down quiet. Cause all those ideas are from us. (Working group member)

This includes the Ngintaka Women’s Council, the Pintupi Homelands Health Service, the Western Desert Dialysis Aboriginal Corporation, the Pulikutjarra Aboriginal Corporation and the Papunya Tula Artists cooperative.
People here are talking about things strong way, working together. They are getting different ideas. When we start the meeting we talk about different projects. We also get proxy and we get more ideas that way to help the community. (Working group member)

While things are not easy for people, it would appear that the working group members have good experience and bring good strengths to their role. Overall the community is described by virtually everyone as a good and peaceful place to live. External service providers generally also recognise it as a place where issues can be resolved and matters addressed.

The relationship with CLC seems to be very much about the personal connection with the staff member involved. That staff member is well known to people because of previous work. She is able to speak the local language and is well respected by people in the community. That long-term relationship means that there is a high degree of trust in her as a person.

[CDU staff member] from CLC is always giving us information. She comes to Kintore for meetings and talks about plan—[about] what we need and how much it will cost. She goes through the money and adds it up. She listens to our ideas and helps organize things. (Working group member)

She lets us know that she’ll be coming. Sometimes she comes around and sees me at Bath Street. She learnt Pintupi here and talks in language. We know here since she worked at Age Care with ladies, and she understands our language when old people talk and what they want. (Community member)

Overall there is a sense in this community of the potential to do more given the opportunity to work further on the development processes.

We are working as a team for this community. We think about “what’s better for this place?” We are trying to get a town hall and basketball stadium for kids. We need projects for kids. We older ones got to look after younger kids—get them to school. (Working group member)

We want [CDU staff member] and CLC to keep on working with us and the working group. (Community member)

Discussion

The intention for this monitoring of the Community Lease Money Project was to identify the key points of interaction between community development actions and interventions and existing community strengths and abilities, in order to better understand how the community development process operated. As the examples above illustrate however, this has not been as simple as anticipated, in large part because the communities are complex and quite different.

It is clear that in each location there have been benefits. Not all these benefits are being sustained, with reports about equipment being broken and some vehicles being damaged. But in all the communities some projects continue and people have valued these and are positive about the community benefits obtained. This is a considerable achievement given that the community lease money project was mostly a one-off opportunity, with less experience for people to learn from previous and ongoing processes. Further, in all communities the decision making involved a substantial number of meetings and effort by both community and working group members, but it appears that people considered this a worthwhile investment of their time.
It does seem that the more cohesive and organised a community, the better placed that group of people is to make use of the funding opportunities and the community development process. Looking more particularly it seems that leadership is important. Where there is good leadership by men and women, that includes an ability to contest and debate decisions, there seems to be higher community satisfaction with the outcomes.

In addition, the experience of people in the community in being able to manage and direct their resources seems to be important. People who have had long-term experience on committees and with other services, either in the community or elsewhere, bring that experience to bear on this new opportunity. This is important because it suggests that processes of good community governance have both immediate and long-term benefits. It suggests that the CLC support for good community development decision-making processes might not only be important in the short term but may also be contributing to much longer term and sustained change.

It is clear from the examples above that service providers and others engaged in communities can facilitate community control and governance or can undermine that. The positive example of cooperation with schools and other groups in some communities clearly facilitated good benefits and an increased sense of community control. This suggests that the CLC interaction with service providers and others in order to influence their way of working, is a necessary part of facilitating the community development process.

Overall the CLC is considered by people in all communities to be a trusted body, and this clearly facilitates engagement for CDU staff.

It is clear that personal relationships matter and that taking the time to build these makes a difference. Not only do communities have a greater trust in people they know, but staff have a better understanding of the way communities work and how to adapt the community development process to existing strengths and processes.

As discussed in the 2013 monitoring this project has required considerable resourcing by the CDU and raised questions about the benefits, particularly given the limited opportunity for community development processes to be employed. While this additional monitoring in 2014 was not directed specifically at those issues, it does suggest that in these five communities at least, benefits were significant for people. Further that it was possible to utilise good governance and decision-making processes which encouraged and supported good development processes in the communities, particularly where there was existing experience around these. This is a significant finding which suggests the CLC now has a well-developed and good quality product, able to be utilised in a variety of contexts to support good outcomes for Aboriginal people.

However the research also shows that where there are existing tensions and problems in communities, a short term development intervention cannot by itself address these more serious divisions. Further that divisions and exclusions in communities are difficult to address and there is some danger that brief development interventions might only serve to reinforce existing power arrangements.

The best outcomes seem to come from a combination of a strong and cohesive community together with a longer term engagement with development staff.
New projects
Alongside the six major projects described above, the CDU also has responsibility for a number of small or emerging project areas, as outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community / Regional</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Status - funded, ongoing, completed</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rover CD Project</td>
<td>Parntaparinji House</td>
<td>Tangantyere Constructions</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rover CD Project</td>
<td>Kantaji House</td>
<td>Tangantyere Constructions</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rover CD Project</td>
<td>Karliwampa</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>On hold</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Funeral - Glenn</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Funeral Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Funeral - Atyelp</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Funeral Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Funeral - Eagle</td>
<td>AAMC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Funeral Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Ti Tree Roosters</td>
<td>Central Desert Regional Council</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Aluyen Laundry – Construction</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan’s Bore CD Project</td>
<td>Aluyen Laundry – Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyn CD Project</td>
<td>Road Grading</td>
<td>Bluegloss</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Homelands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CLC has continued to receive requests from traditional owner groups to work with them to plan and implement projects with their income. In 2014 $379,035 was allocated to 11 projects, with one of these projects completed in the period. During this period the CLC started working with two new groups. Overall there is an increasing interest in more community development work as a way to best utilise Aboriginal resources, but the opportunity to respond to this is limited by available resources.

The traditional owners for Areyn community living area near Ampilatwatja set aside $34,359 from mining exploration compensation income from Rum Jungle Resources to repair the road into Areyn outstation. The group are also hoping to repair the bore at the outstation but know they need to save more money to pay for it.

The Ilarte traditional owner group allocated $299,416 to community projects from mining exploration it received from exploration company Texalta Petroleum Ltd. Their first priority is improving Urlampe outstation, close to the Northern Territory-Queensland border where many of the traditional owners live.

The CDU continued to work with three other groups who had allocated income to community projects in previous years. The traditional owners for the proposed Rover mine finalised their...
planning and allocated money for three outstation projects to enable their family groups to spend more time on country. Many of the traditional owners for the proposed Rover mine expressed a desire to allocate future income to community development to continue with their work they have done on these outstation projects. The resources required for the CLC to continue working with a group like this, including facilitating meetings to allow the traditional owner groups to make an informed decision to allocate funds for community projects is quite intensive. For this work to be able to take place in the future will require more resources for the CDU.

The Nolan’s Bore CD Project started planning and the group have allocated funds to their first seven projects. Three of these projects were funeral support projects to assist with the burial costs for traditional owners. The main project for this group has been the construction of a laundry block at Alyuen outstation. This residents of Alyuen have been wanting a laundry block for their own use and that of visitors for many years and have included local employment and training in the project.

The Twin Bonanza CD Project
In March 2014 Traditional Owners agreed to allocate 25% of future royalties from Twin Bonanza, a new gold mine in the Tanami, to lasting community benefit. In November the same year the newly established Warlu Ngarlu Corporation agreed to sign up AAMC to administer the royalty funds. A detailed project plan was prepared to guide the CD work in 2015 including setting up governance arrangements and commencing the community planning process.

Regional program management
In 2013 the CDU moved from a project based management style to allocation of staff across three regions (East, West and Tanami). The intention was to provide for better knowledge and
relationship building between staff and particular communities, as well as provide a more comprehensive investment in governance in each of the locations.

In 2014 the benefits of this process are beginning to emerge. While it is still too early to provide locational ‘stories’, staff reports show benefits both for relationships and for community governance processes.

People trust individuals and like the arrangement with the same people coming back on a regular basis. It appears that people are then more prepared to work with the same staff in other locations and on other projects. Staff report that working on a regional basis enables them to visit communities more often and to spend more time with people. This includes informal time to build relationships and to provide opportunities for learning about how the community functions. Staff also report that because they are aware of the different project processes they are able to be more mobile across the different locations addressing different concerns. It also provides the opportunity to share tools and systems between projects.

In addition the regular and more frequent interactions provide an opportunity to resolve issues and follow up on matters in a more timely way. This supports the community development process and builds peoples’ sense of the process being reliable and responsive.

People are addressing funding allocations with various pots of money in mind. In a few communities the opportunity to talk about funding from different sources with the same staff member is leading to those communities bringing funds together and considering how to use the money in a more comprehensive way. This is fledgling and not happening in all communities. However it does suggest that this could be a basis for building the development process in the longer term. It could be that more work could be done on how funding is presented to communities and to provide explanation about long-term options and funding viability. This in turn may assist the planning processes in communities.

There are some disadvantages to the regional process. For example, complex and long-term programs such as WETT have not received the same level of attention, lacking the specialist staff focus.

General discussion
CD Program objectives

1. **Maximise opportunities for Aboriginal engagement, ownership and control, particularly in relation to the management of resources that belong to them.**

The information collected in 2014 shows that there has been a considerable increase in the number of projects and resources under Aboriginal control as a result of the facilitation and support provided by the CDU.

The staff reflections and reports from communities suggest that the community development staff are becoming increasingly clearer about the governance processes and about how to support and develop these further. Staff point to their work preparing decision-making groups and meeting with them in advance of the formal meetings. They have developed and are

---

5 The intention for this year’s monitoring report was to combine information around particular locations and present it as community or regional monitoring. However, the information received is still too spread and disconnected to provide for this to be done easily. Some more focused attention needs to be given to information collection and aggregation in future monitoring for this to be achieved.
utilising visual tools (see Annex Three) and providing more time for explanation and understanding within formal meetings, all designed to promote further control by Aboriginal people. Clearly the regional process, which has allowed for staff to spend more time with specific communities, has supported better working relationships.

As a result it is reported that there is more engagement by communities with governance and decision-making, perhaps best seen in the long-term programs such as WETT and GMAAAC. In the GMAAAC committees more young people are now stepping up to become members. Staff are reporting that people are taking forward good governance processes themselves. Significantly there are reports that people are now starting to assess the outcomes of projects and look to understand the value of what has been achieved.

The sense from the 2014 monitoring is that the governance processes are now ready to be taken to a new level, seeking to embed them more into wider community practices. This clearly requires conversations with those communities to talk first about the elements of good governance and decision making that they would like to duplicate. And then to explore with communities what opportunities exist to implement those good practices. This might lead to engagement with service providers to see those practices duplicated in management of their services.

The research undertaken around the community lease money project indicates that people’s experience and long-term exposure to good governance is important in their ability to take these processes forward. This raises the question about what further effort CDU should put towards influencing the decision-making processes used by other service providers? Influencing the approach of organisations where there is some alignment to the intentions of the CLC might be an important contribution to maximising the long term outcomes of the governance development in communities. The Community Development News is read by service providers and might be one method whereby the community development approach could be more widely shared.

In addition, maybe now is the time to give more attention to the quality of the governance processes. How can these processes be improved to give more attention to the inclusion of men and women as well as opportunity for young people to develop into leadership positions? Further, how can the governance processes be further developed to be more in line with appropriate community processes. For example in Lajamanu, the Kurdiji leadership group instructed the CLC staff member about how the meetings should be conducted in that location.

Finally, the opportunity provided by the regional approach, where multiple sources of money are available to some communities, may be the basis for engagement of more community members and discussion around larger community projects. Some planning around how this might be facilitated and taken forward within regional teams might be another avenue for further development of work under this objective.

2. **Generate service outcomes which benefit Aboriginal people and are valued by them, including social, cultural and economic outcomes.**

In line with the increased number of projects there has clearly been a considerable rise in the benefits for Aboriginal people throughout Central Australia, generated by their own resources.
The benefits are wide-ranging and include those for health, education, employment and cultural and social well-being.

It is clear that the benefits are often very important for people but for reasons which are not always clear to outsiders. For example in one community there was a decision to direct money towards sport for men particularly over the Christmas period. Further discussion with that community indicated that they were concerned to provide occupation for young men and therefore prevent the possibility of domestic violence problems across the holiday period. In other communities repairs to churches and accompanying celebrations to mark the refurbished buildings have been very important ways for communities to come together in safe and shared locations. Similarly Christmas celebrations have been effective ways to build community cohesion. For a long time the value of outstations for families’ health and sense of location and identity, have been important, with people regularly allocating funds towards this end.

In contrast, some service providers within communities often have a different perspective and see project benefits as trivial or irrelevant to real community needs. They assess value from a different framework and therefore underestimate the significance of the outcomes for Aboriginal wellbeing.

The issue is how to effectively capture and communicate the value of particular projects for particular communities? Simple aggregation and description can fail to communicate the considerable thought and balancing of priorities that working groups and community members undertake to decide how to allocate the resources. This might be a basis for exploration in future monitoring, perhaps through some comparisons of the respective value of different inputs and activities in communities.

At the same time, not all resources and benefits have been sustained or valued by all members of the community. There were a number of reports about community lease money project goods in particular being vandalised or destroyed in the short term, particularly vehicles. So the process of ensuring ownership and value is not simple.

More importantly the example from Mutitjulu indicates that even good quality and substantial project outcomes such as a community-run pool, do not necessarily meet all community expectations or address major community problems and concerns. The benefits for people from the community development projects are not necessarily able to address larger dysfunction and damage within those communities.

The challenge for the future seems to be how to maximise and multiply benefits or align them and bring them together in order to provide short-term tangible outcomes that people want, as well as contribute to meeting more broad community needs. This may need to be a process of some greater consideration with some more functional and interested communities.

3. **Build an evidence base for the CLC’s community development approach and the value it has for contributing to Aboriginal capabilities.**

In 2014 the CDU instigated a formal staff reflection process to increase the utilisation of monitoring and other information by staff towards changes and improvements in practice. In
consultation with La Trobe University attention was given to critical reflection on key practice issues and regular processes of staff review.

In 2014, the CDU identified the need for WYDAC to undertake a formal evaluation of its work to assess outcomes of the Youth and Media program after several years of support from WETT. Support was provided to WYDAC to draft the evaluation proposal and to work with WETT to consider funding the activity. This follows a successful evaluation process of the Tanami dialysis project in 2013.

These additional evaluations and reviews, focusing on specific project areas that are funded through Aboriginal resources, provide good learning for the CLC and other organisations. They may also provide an opportunity to combine some shared learning and messaging around the processes of community governance and the benefit of focusing on Aboriginal control and Aboriginal directed services, and share this more widely. This may in turn build the legitimacy for locally driven development processes which are wider than the CLC. In the current political climate these sorts of alliances might be important both to build an evidence base and an argument for maintaining funding support.

4. Share lessons learned with other government and non-government agencies.

It continues to be important for the CDU to share lessons and seek to influence government and others. This includes the ongoing challenge of influencing other parts of CLC. It is clear from some of the monitoring undertaken in 2014 that in many locations CDU are understood as being one part of CLC and not necessarily distinguished from other sections in the same organisation. While this might change with longer term relationships, in terms of short-term engagement the overall approach of CLC and its staffs’ ability to work in developmental ways, are important to facilitating the approach fostered by CDU. If good governance is a cumulative learning experience, then influencing the development approach that is practised by all of the CLC might be very important for long-term change.

In addition, engagement with other service providers, including government, in ways that influence their behaviour continues to be an important area for CDU development. In 2014 staff have spent considerable time seeking to influence senior ministers and staff at the Federal government level, including considerable communication of the findings from the 2014 evaluation report.

There has been some effort made to increase partnership with Regional Councils (formerly Shires) in order to start to influence their approaches. Building on the good experience of working with other implementing partners, the CDU is well-positioned to develop strategies for influence of other services. This could be a further deliberate strategy for the coming years.

Alongside this work CDU continue to present reports and participate in conferences to spread information about the community development approach and outcomes (see Annex Four).
Monitoring for 2015
Given the growth and ongoing complexity of the CD Program, regular monitoring needs to continue into 2015. However there are some areas which could be considered for greater and more significant attention in the coming year.

Working in regional teams, with staff managing across different projects in the same location, should be a focus of future monitoring. There is a good opportunity to look at a small number of locations in some detail to understand the way in which increased overall funding and increased familiarity with governance processes, together with more regular interaction with CDU staff, is changing the development processes in those locations.

Further, given some of the important partners funded through Aboriginal resources are now themselves beginning to look in more detail at their performance and outcomes, there may be some merit in joint monitoring of activities and the process of facilitating those activities, in particular locations. This could obviously build on the evaluation currently underway by WYDAC, or the previous assessment work that has been undertaken by the Tanami Dialysis Project.

Joint assessment could potentially also extend to those partners that have been less engaged in self-assessment, such as the Regional Councils or other implementing organisations. This might be an opportunity to extend the monitoring to look not only at what Aboriginal people are able to achieve with their resources but how this compares and contrasts to what other service providers are managing to achieve. One way to help outsiders understand the value of activities would be to engage them in an assessment process so that they hear the voice of Aboriginal people directly.

In addition, given the development of governance in many locations and the growing interest by young Aboriginal people in participating in decision-making, it seems timely to consider ways to engage Aboriginal people in the monitoring process themselves. In some ways this is a natural extension of working groups’ current activity. Probably, in many locations, people are already undertaking their own monitoring and assessment about the value of outcomes and how this could be maximised. Therefore while the process needs to be light touch and comfortable, it may not be difficult to naturally extend the reflection process that staff now use to include more deliberate reflection and assessment in working group meetings or other opportunities.

Finally, there is a sense that the development process utilised by the CDU is now well understood and able to be passed to new staff as a comprehensive set of tools and processes. Considering how best to articulate that process further for a wider audience is important. Further, it may be timely to consider how to move and deepen the process. This might include, as suggested above, attention to challenging inequalities and exclusions in some communities, considering how to engage Aboriginal people in extending their governance ability to other areas, and being more proactive about opportunities for them to exert control in project management. This could be an action reflection process as part of future monitoring.

Conclusions
2014 has been an important year with the CDU bringing to some conclusion the large amount of work that was required for the Community Lease Money Project while also continuing management of the other five major projects and newly emerging areas of work. The way in which staff are using a reflection process to regularly assess their work and consider major areas for further attention seems to have been a useful addition to ensuring ongoing high-quality development processes.
The development work in 2014 has seen some significant achievements. The WETT project continues to support high quality programs for young people. In addition, the project is providing support to schools leading to improved learning outcomes for young Aboriginal people and increasing their likelihood of staying in the education system. The Tanami Dialysis Project has been independently assessed as national best practice.

Assessment in Mutitjulu indicates that the community pool is making a positive difference to children and families in the community and has reinforced community confidence in its ability to make decisions and influence development outcomes.

The GMAAAC project has now well-established governance processes which are leading to regular and substantial benefit for several Aboriginal communities. In a similar way, the Northern Territory Parks Rent Money project has now well established decision-making and governance processes and there is a strong expectation that 2015 will see considerable benefit across these 16 locations.

Finally, assessment of the Community Lease Money project indicates that the CLC now has a well-developed and good quality community development product which is able to be effectively modified to different contexts.

Demand for community development approach and support is growing among Aboriginal communities. There is increasing allocation of Aboriginal people’s own money to support these processes across an ever-growing range of locations.

There is a sense from all reports and programs that notwithstanding ongoing challenges, the CD Program is now well positioned to move beyond program management towards greater facilitation of development processes. This includes working together with Aboriginal people to create new development opportunities. While limited resources will always be a restriction in this area, there is a strong sense of the potential and ability to move into new methods and approaches in 2015 and beyond. The CLC CDU have a well-established product which could now be communicated more widely to change the practice of other service providers.
Annex One: Methodologies for Monitoring

Community Lease Money Project

Purpose of the monitoring

The community lease money project engaged CDU staff in extensive community interaction across more than 30 locations. The CDU was required to initiate community consultation and community development processes in all communities, with the opportunity in some of those locations for the engagement and process to be ongoing.

There was mixed experience in communities of using a community development approach. In many locations the process was quite effective, but not all. There are no simple and obvious reasons why the process worked better in some locations than in others.

The purpose of this research is to utilise a sample of communities where the community development approach worked well, and try to understand all the features that shaped this more positive outcome. We think this would be a mixture of what else was happening or had happened in the community, the skills and strategies that CDU staff introduced into the community and how well these strategies were adapted in each particular context. While it is not possible to generalise from one community to the next we are trying to understand is:

a. Why did things go well?
b. How did CDU practice contribute to this?
c. In what way did CDU staff have to adapt their practice to existing strengths and challenges in the community?
d. What are the implications for community development practice in the future?

Approach

A small sample of communities have been selected which provide a cross-section of experience and location. The major criteria for selection was that a positive community development process was eventually achieved in the particular community (i.e. the process may not have been so positive at the beginning).

CDU staff were asked to analyse the community from their perspective and identify what they think has been critical in achieving a good community development process. This serves as our hypothesis about the community. In addition CDU staff were asked to identify the skills and strategies they utilised in the community.

Community research will focus upon testing the ‘hypothesis’ for each community. That is, we will frame questions for each community that explore the reasons why staff think community development processes worked well in the community. (So the questions for each community will be slightly different)

In addition we will look to explore community perspectives, providing space for new information and new ideas about both the underlying causes of community development effectiveness and the CDU contribution.

Finally, where possible, we will look to cross check this information with other respondents in the community, generally other service providers, who can comment on broader community processes and how these might have shifted throughout the project consultation and implementation process.
Given the process is necessarily experimental, we will trial it in one community and then further refine the approach and proposed questions.

**Trial community: Titjikala**

The questions for community members include *(Suggest we tried to ask a mixture of people who are involved on the decision-making committee and those outside the committee. As usual try to get a mix of men and women. As far as possible, a mixture of old and young people):*

1. Please tell us about this community. Why is it a good place to live?
2. You have now completed many projects. What has gone well and why? Where did you learn how to do this?
3. When CLC came to talk to you about the community leasing money how did you decide what to do with the money?
4. Who helped to do this in the community?
5. What else helped you to decide what to do about this money?
6. What did CLC do to help you? What should they do in the future to be more helpful?

Questions for others, identified by CDU as people able to provide information about Titjikala *(we are not going to ask other service provider sin the community necessarily. CDU will identify other people who know about the community and can provide informed responses to the following questions):*

1. Please describe what you see as the strengths of this community. Why is the community strong in this way? What do you think have been the influences or the people that have contributed to this?
2. What is hard for this community? What has contributed to these challenges or difficulties in the community?
3. Did you observe the community’s management of the community lease money? If so can you tell us what you observed about that process; both strengths and weaknesses?
4. What did you see CLC staff doing in that process? What did they bring to the situation? How do you think these ideas helped or hindered the community obtaining the outcomes and benefits that they wanted?
5. What else do you think is important to know and understand for people who are going to work with this community in the future?

**Kintore**

The hypothesis for why things went well in this community appears to be related to:

- The considerable governance experience that exists in the community.
- Community leadership
- Existing self-reliance
- Good quality relationship with CDU staff

Proposed questions for the community include:

1. Please tell us about this community. Why is it a good place to live?
2. As part of the Community Lease Money Project you have now completed some projects here in Kintore. What has gone well and why?
3. How did people in this community learn how to manage projects in this way?
4. How did you make the decisions about how to spend the money?
5. Who helped in the community?
6. What did CLC do to help you?
7. What should the CLC do in the future to be more helpful?

Questions for others, identified by CDU as people able to provide information about Kintore:

6. Please describe what you see as the strengths of this community. Why is the community strong in this way? What do you think have been the influences or the people that have contributed to this?
7. What has contributed to challenges or difficulties in the community?
8. Did you observe the community’s management of the community lease money? If so can you tell us what you observed about that process; both strengths and weaknesses?
9. What did you see CLC staff doing in that process? What did they bring to the situation?
10. What else do you think is important to know and understand for people who are going to work with this community in the future?

Alekarenge
The hypothesis for why things went well in this community seems to be a combination of a number of things:

- The community came together around a shared concern related to petrol sniffing which meant that the focus of activities was clearer and there was generally strong community support
- The initial consultation process seems to have been effective in building broad-based support for the projects. This seems to have been a combination of spending time getting the working group right and providing a lot of information to the working group and the wider community.
- CDU spent a lot of time in this community, through different people but in consistent ways. There were strong relationships built and people felt understood.
- CDU facilitated the detailed process with a working group enabling them to present projects and ideas to the community. The community was therefore able to make the decisions.
- Most projects have been well delivered. Although not all.

So proposed questions for the community include:

1. As part of the Community Lease Money Project you have now completed some projects here in Alekarenge. What has gone well and why?
2. Most of these projects have focused on young people. Can you explain why people in Alekarenge decided to spend their money in this way?
3. How did the community make decisions?
4. Who managed the projects on behalf of the community?
5. What did CLC do to help you?
6. What should the CLC do in the future to be more helpful?
7. What do you think the community should do in the future?
Questions for others, identified by CDU as people able to provide information about this community:

1. What are some of the current challenges in this community? What do you see as the strengths of Alekarengie?
2. Projects undertaken with the community leasing money focused on activities for young people. Why do you think people made the decision to spend the money this way?
3. Did you observe the community’s management of the community lease money? If so can you tell us what you observed about that process; both strengths and weaknesses?
4. What did you see CLC staff doing in that process? What did they bring to the situation? How do you think these ideas helped or hindered the community obtaining the outcomes and benefits that they wanted?
5. What else do you think is important to know and understand for people who are going to work with this community in the future?

Nyirrpi
The hypothesis why things went well in this community seems to be related to two issues:

- The overall influence and long term experience with GMAAAC processes
- The considerable time and energy by CDU workers to ensure people listened to and understood the process

Questions for community members:

1. This community has completed many projects. What has gone well and why?
2. The existing Nyirrpi GMAAAC committee is the working group to plan and make decisions on community projects from the leasing money. Why did people decide to use the GMAAAC committee instead of setting up a new working group?
3. There have been a lot of projects funded through either GMAAAC or the leasing money. How were these different projects selected?
4. How were the projects managed? Was there any difference between the projects funded by GMAAAC or the leasing money? (only applicable to people on the GMAAAC Committee)
5. In what way has the CLC helped you with deciding on and managing projects?
6. How could the CLC do better in the future?

Questions for others, identified by CDU as people able to provide information about Nyirrpi:

11. Please describe what you see as the strengths of this community. Why is the community strong in this way? What do you think have been the influences or the people that have contributed to this?
12. What is hard for this community? What has contributed to these challenges or difficulties in the community?
13. Did you observe the community’s management of the community lease money? If so can you tell us what you observed about that process; both strengths and weaknesses?
14. What did you see CLC staff doing in that process? What did they bring to the situation? How do you think these ideas helped or hindered the community obtaining the outcomes and benefits that they wanted?
15. What else do you think is important to know and understand for people who are going to work with this community in the future?

Ntaria
The hypothesis for the positive outcomes in this community appears to focus on both existing strengths and good facilitation.

- This is a strong community building from previous experience.
- There is a good partnership with the local school which is both able to contribute to project implementation as well as work respectively with the working group
- the working group has actively used CLC in a positive way as a third-party in the negotiations with the school and other partners
- The high level of engagement and capacity of working group members has meant CLC staff have been able to facilitate more strategic discussions with a stronger focus on accountability
- The CLC has worked more comprehensively in Ntaria due to amount of lease money, proximity to Alice and the existence of partners who want to work collaboratively with the CLC.

Questions for the community:
7. Please tell us about this community. Why is it a good place to live?
8. You have now completed some projects. What has gone well and why? Where did you learn how to do this?
9. When CLC came to talk to you about the community leasing money how did you decide what to do with the money?
10. Who in the community helped with making these decisions??
11. What did CLC do to help you? What should they do in the future to be more helpful?

Questions for others, identified by CDU as people able to provide information about Ntaria:
16. Please describe what you see as the strengths of this community. Why is the community strong in this way? What do you think have been the influences or the people that have contributed to this?
17. What is hard for this community? What has contributed to these challenges or difficulties in the community?
18. Did you observe the community’s management of the community lease money? If so can you tell us what you observed about that process; both strengths and weaknesses?
19. What did you see CLC staff doing in that process? What did they bring to the situation? How do you think these ideas helped or hindered the community obtaining the outcomes and benefits that they wanted?
20. What else do you think is important to know and understand for people who are going to work with this community in the future?

Mutitjulu pool
Introduction
Previous baseline research undertaken for the pool identified that the main expectations for the community revolved around their ownership of the pool and an expectation that the pool would
provide a positive activity for the children. Major concerns related to safety, adequate supervision and good management of the pool.

Beyond providing an immediate activity for the children, the pool was expected to add value to community in four ways. Community members hoped that school attendance might increase, children would be taught to swim, there would be an increase in health and fitness, and that training and employment would be made available.

In terms of management of the pool, there was a view that there should be a strong local voice in the management, that it would provide an opportunity for local employment, and that there would be a focus on safety.

For the 2014 monitoring we need to explore whether these expectations remain and the degree to which they have been met. We also need to look at unexpected outcomes that is, what else happened that was not anticipated.

I propose that we undertake a random sample of community members, as well as a purposeful sample of representatives from the management group, the service provider responsible for pool management and other service providers. What we are trying to do is test community views and perceptions as well as check the experience of informed groups who should be in a position to provide us with factual information.

We should look to gather the following information.

*Use of the pool, disaggregated by age and gender.*

*This information is currently available from the pool management reports.*

*Community experience.*

This information should be collected by random interviews through the community. In line with previous baseline survey we should aim to interview approximately 20% of the adult population, (that is about 45 people I think), as far as possible evenly divided between men and women. (Note that it would be also useful to get the views of the children but without some specialised assistance I don’t think we can do that this time). The following questions are for those community members:

We want to know if the pool has been good for the community. Can you tell us:

a. What did you expect would be the benefits of the pool for people in this community?

b. What has changed since the pool opened? Both good and bad things.

c. Who decides how the pool should run?

d. Do you have any ideas about how to improve the pool?

*Pool management and pool management committee*

As far as possible these groups should be interviewed separately from each other and from the community. What we are seeking to understand is both what they see as the benefits and challenges of the pool, but also their more informed understanding of what it has taken to manage the pool to date.

We are interested in how well the pool has met the original expectations of the community, but also in understanding what challenges you have faced in trying to manage the pool in a way that brings the best outcomes. Can you tell us:
a. We know that many children are using the pool. What changes have you observed over time as a result of them coming to the pool?
b. Have there been in formal or informal programs to teach children to swim? To promote health and fitness around use of the pool? To link school attendance to use of the pool?
c. What training and employment opportunities have arisen in formally or informally as a result of the pool?
d. Are there other benefits or challenges that have emerged related to the pool in the community?
e. How do local people in the community have say in the management and decision making about the pool?
f. In what way is safety and supervision ensured at all times for the pool?
g. What future plans are there for further developments related to the pool?
h. Any other information?

Other service providers
We should be able to assume that if the pool is making a difference beyond providing an activity for the children other service providers should notice. It would be particularly useful to talk to the school principal, the senior person at the clinic and also to the police. However other service providers may also be useful respondents, particularly anyone working with children and young people in the community.

The pool has now been opened for more than a year. We would like to know if you’re observing any differences and benefits for the community as a result of the pool.

a. Has it made any difference to school attendance?
b. Have you observed any changes or improvements in health and/or fitness among the children or other community members?
c. Has the pool provided sufficient activity to make a difference to children’s behaviour in the community?
d. Are there any other changes in the community as a result of the pool that you have observed, either negative or positive?
e. Do you have any other suggestions for how the pool can be managed in a way that best serves Mutitjulu?

Schools program
There are two parts to this program that we could explore. There is the money to schools for support to individual students which I understand goes on a range of activities including providing funding for the students to attend activities and outings. There is also the funding for excursions and bush trips for Warlpiri students at the schools. I would suggest it’s worth looking at both areas since we have limited information about either. But I’m not entirely clear about how the money is divided up and whether both sets of monies go to the same schools or are directed in different ways. Therefore the following are two sets of questions are to go to school principals for the two programs, however there may be some merit in combining them for some schools.

Warlpiri Language and Culture Support Program
We receive regular reports from your school about the use of this funding. In this survey we would like to take the opportunity to look at the wider value of the program over the past five
years and gather some information to help us improve or further develop the program. Could you please tell us:

a. Approximately how often in the past five years your school has utilised this funding to organise specific activities, either within the school or externally?

b. Looking back over that time and observing the children who have participated, would you please outline what value you have seen in the program for the children? We are interested in your views on the overall value as well as any specific examples you may have of the difference it makes to particular children.

c. What ongoing challenges would you identify for the same children? Particularly as these challenges relate to their effective participation in school life.

d. What else could be done by WETT or the parents and communities to which these children belong, to support the children and their successful participation in school life?

Warlpiri Secondary School Support Program

We receive regular reports from your school about how this money has been used to support individual students including their opportunity to attend excursions. We would like to take this opportunity to look at the wider value of this program over time and understand how it can be further developed to more effectively support schools and students. Could you please tell us:

a. Over the past five years what have been the most common ways in which this money has been utilised? Do you have a particular policy that guides its use and to whom it is made available?

b. Approximately how many children have benefited from these funds over that time?

c. What would you identify as the major benefits for those children over time? (We are particularly interested here in any cumulative benefits rather than one off activities.)

d. How would you describe the major challenges for these students, particularly in regard to their successful participation in school life?

e. What else could be done through this program or other activities supported by WETT, that would support these children in their successful participation in school life?
Annex Two: Staff reflection and reporting for 2014

Staff reporting template

Purpose
The purpose of further developing the staff reporting template is to increase the focus on outcome information both at the level of the projects themselves and also moving to look at the locations. While it is useful to know what activities people have been involved in and you might still want to capture some of the information for your own internal purposes I think we also need to shift the activity information towards something that we can use for external audiences. Therefore I propose that we move to the following template which has much less space around activities and a lot more questions around the overall processes in which you are involved and the context in which these techniques are applied. They are designed to track information around your overall objectives.

Process
I think the following template would still be completed each three-month period but I would suggest it would be best done by teams rather than by individuals adding into the template so that there is some discussion in the teams prior to the information being entered. There is a suggestion in the three-month report to identify issues to be taken up to the senior CD team and learnings.

Explore methods to facilitate the team reflection process, for example the CD Manager facilitating so that there is consistency in approach across the 3 teams, plus so that senior CDOs can participate fully in reflection process.
CDU three-month team report

Qualitative reporting

I've divided this into both projects and location because each of the teams is at a different point and would need to apply the template to their work appropriately. The important thing is that this should be done collectively and the template filled out following a discussion among team members. Information in the template report should reflect the major outcomes of those discussions not all the detailed discussion unless there is a specific example that is important to include to illustrate an overall point. To trial team reflection facilitated an open ended manner on each theme.

Highlight any key learnings or issues that need to be addressed by the senior CD team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project specific</th>
<th>Community specific</th>
<th>Why is this happening?</th>
<th>Suggested actions – includes what’s working and we should do more of/ideas to address identified issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Governance processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What significant changes, both negative and positive, have you observed around governance processes over the past three months? This includes:

- The way decisions have been made,
- The level of participation in meetings and in other governance processes and
- The degree to which decision-making groups and meetings have been representative of all people in the community or those participating in the project.
2. **Benefits from CDU supported work**

What have been the benefits for people arising from CDU supported work in the past three months. This might include consideration of:

a) Long-term or short-term benefits
b) Benefits which are specific to a particular group in the community or have benefited most or all of the community
c) Benefits which are tangible and/or those which support the cultural and spiritual aspects of people’s lives
d) Benefits related to increasing employment, education or training for people in the community

3. **Contribution to process of community development**

To what extent has the work of your team contributed to an ongoing process of community development? This might include consideration of:

a) How people have been further empowered in the community
b) The increased control people have now over their lives or over how others operate in their community
c) Do people now have new plans for longer term activities that go beyond the immediate project plans?
d) What increased ability people have to solve problems and apply community development processes to other situations
e) If there are any signs of increased trust and cooperation between community members as a result of their experience in these projects
f) If people have increased ability to analyse and make sense of the situation in the way in which outsiders or opportunities are influencing the opportunities for development

g) If people are able to reflect on achievements and challenges and perhaps draw from feedback or information about outcomes in their future planning.
h) Other signs of community development

4. **Contextual influences**

It is important to understand how the context has enhanced or limited what can be achieved through the community development work in this location or project.
Over the past three months can you identify any significant influences or changes in the following:

a) The approach and attitude of other service providers
b) The willingness of other service providers and agents in the community to collaborate with each other and/or with CLC
c) Other ongoing challenges for people in this community
d) People in the community who are not involved in the projects or community development activity and how this influences the community development process
e) Other issues which have an impact

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. **Influence of CDU**

We are interested in the influence that CDU have on CLC and other people who work with aboriginal communities. It is important to go beyond numbers to look at outcomes. This might involve your observation of the following:

a) What use is being made of CDU material and ideas by others?
b) Are there are examples of situations where funding has increased because government or others are supportive of a community development approach?
c) Other changes that you have observed in the way others and CLC are operating as a result of their interest in community development?
d) What changes have you observed in the approach of others either at community level or regional and national level as a result of their exposure to a community development approach?
e) Any other changes observed?

6. **Other significant reflections**

Any other information or reporting that has been significant for this team over the past three months?
Annex Three: tools developed to facilitate project meetings

1. Getting Started
   Traditional owners/community members decide how much money to put aside for good projects that benefit the group.

2. Agree on Process
   Group and CLC talk about how to work well together and how Aboriginal people will make the decisions. Will there be a Working Group or will everyone be involved?

3. Choose Project
   The Aboriginal group talks about the main areas they want to work on to make life better now and for future generations. The group chooses the most important project/s to start working on.

4. Plan Project
   The group works with the CLC to make a project plan and shares it with everyone. The plan shows (1) how the project will help Aboriginal people, (2) which organisation will do the project and (3) how much it will cost.

5. Decide on Project
   After the project plan is finished, the group decides whether to allocate money to the project.

6. Enter Agreement
   The CLC checks that the right Aboriginal people were consulted and decisions were made in the right way. The CLC then signs a legal agreement with the organisation saying they will do the project as planned and budgeted.

7. How did it go?
   The group and CLC ask: How did the project benefit Aboriginal people? Was the money used the right way? How can we work better together next time?

PROJECT HAPPENS!

PLANNING FOR ACTION

CENTRAL LAND COUNCIL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
Editable Project Name
FUNERAL PROJECT APPLICATION PROCESS

Family to:
1. Complete the application form and get two signatories to sign.
2. Attach a funeral parlour quote.
3. Fax both to AAMC.

AAMC check signature on application form. If OK, purchase order sent to the funeral parlour for up to $3,000

Don’t forget: If the funeral is more than the $3,000 + ABA $1,600 for NT Aboriginal residents, family will need to chuck in the rest of the money before the funeral.

CLC Community Development Unit reports back to community/committee meetings about the funeral project.

Funeral
Annex Four: Public presentations related to community development work.

- **Conferences and Seminars**

 AIATSIS Conference presentation: *CLC’s Community Development Approach – Engaging Aboriginal people to direct their own development in Central Australia*. Danielle Campbell. Canberra, March 2014


 Native Title Conference: *Our projects, our way – Strong and flexible governance arrangements for community benefit programs from land use agreements*. David Howard and Noel Heenan (Yuelamu GMAAAAC Committee member). Coffs Harbour, June 2014


- **Workshop Presentations**

  NT Parks Joint Management forum presentation on the NT Parks Rent Money Project. Ian Sweeney. Alice Springs, May 2014

  Aurora Short Course Presentation: *Community Development work at the Central Land Council – Aboriginal people using their assets to drive their own development*. Danielle Campbell. Adelaide, July 2014

  GARMA presentation on WETT by Sharon Anderson and Valerie Patterson (WETT Advisory Committee Members). Gulkula, June 2014

  ACFID Indigenous Development Working Group, Janelle Trotman and Linda Anderson (Papunya CLM Project working group member). Sydney, November 2014

- **Presentations to the Commonwealth Government and other key stakeholders**

  Numerous presentations on 2014 Evaluation findings to the Federal Indigenous Affairs Minister, Indigenous Parliamentary Secretary, senior PM&C bureaucrats, senior Minerals Council of Australia staff and Newmont Asia Pacific.

  Presentation to Anindilyakwa Land Council executive and senior staff on CLC’s Community Development Program.
• **Publications and Reports**

Two 2014 editions of Community Development News

Roche and Ensor, 2014, Independent Evaluation of the Central Land Council’s Community Development and Governance Programs, La Trobe University and People and Planet Group, Alice Springs.