

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(251) Output 2.2: Translating and Interpreting Services**

Senator Ludwig asked;

NAATI

1. When was the need for the review of the administration tests identified?
2. How was it identified?
3. Could you provide the terms of reference of the review?
4. Which company is undertaking the review?
  - (a) How were they chosen?
  - (b) Was there a tender process? If so was it open or closed and
5. How are the consultations being provided?
6. Please provide a copy of the draft report.
7. Please provide a copy of the report, when it becomes available.

*Answer:*

NAATI has provided the following information in response to the questions:

1. In late 2003 NAATI concluded there was a need for an examination of test administration procedures. The NAATI Board, at its meeting in March 2004, formally agreed to the review.
2. During the period 2002 to 2004 a number of events brought to light issues related to NAATI test administration. These included Stages 1 and 2 of the Test Validation Project (Test Format Review, New Test Pilot Design and administration), the Examiner Workshops in June to August 2003, the NAATI National Managers Workshop in January 2004 and the Revision of the Examiners Manual in 2004.

In addition, NAATI implemented a new computer system in 2004 and opportunities were presented to make changes to some test administration procedures.

3. A Review of Administrative Processes Related to Testing, Including Quality Control Processes

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Purpose

- \* To evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and integrity of NAATI's administrative processes in relation to testing
- \* To evaluate the consistency of application of the processes
- \* To evaluate the transparency of the processes for test administration
- \* To ensure that there are effective quality control processes.

### Tasks of the review

- \* Review the processes involved in accreditation tests, including
  - a) Test program development
  - b) Test setting and approval
  - c) Risk management – including the testing processes in terms of test integrity and security.
- \* Test production and delivery
  - a) Test marking
  - b) Result processing
  - c) Viewing marked tests
  - d) Reviews and appeals
  - e) Candidate administration, including confirmation of candidate identity
  - f) Examiner and candidate feedback.
- \* Review NAATI's processes, including quality control processes, in relation to:
  - a) guidelines and standards for the operation of examiner panels
  - b) examiner panel, QAAC and ethics panel selection and appointment
  - c) processes for monitoring and auditing
  - d) examiner panel management and liaison.
- \* Compare NAATI test administration processes with examination processes of like bodies and institutions of higher education.
- \* Consult with major stakeholders including NAATI members or their representatives, NAATI staff in Central, State and Territory offices, examiners, candidates, relevant professional bodies and others that may be identified.
- \* Make recommendations for improvements.
- \* Recommend a strategy and costing for implementation.

4. Macquarie Research Ltd was selected by NAATI following a select tender process.

(a) and (b) Five organisations were invited to submit an Expression of Interest and four responded.

5. NAATI provided Macquarie Research Ltd with a list of more than 100

stakeholders located across all states and territories.

6. and 7. A copy of the final report will be publicly available when it is finalised.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

### BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

#### IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

#### (252) Output 2.3: Australian Citizenship

Senator Ludwig asked:

Wyong Citizenship Council

At citizenship ceremonies:

1. Who is entitled to present a new citizen their certificate of Australian citizenship?
2. For any citizenship ceremony, when is the programme prepared and by whom is it prepared?
3. What is the procedure in deciding who to invite as an official guest?
4. Is there a position of official delegate of the Minister for Citizenship or any other government delegate?
  - (a) If yes, what authority does that delegate have over the conduct of the ceremony?
  - (b) If yes, was Mr Ticehurst an official delegate?
5. Who conducted the presentation of the ceremony at the Wyong Shire Council Citizenship ceremony?
6. Did Ms Jill Hall present any certificates at that ceremony? If not, does the Department know why that is the case?
7. Does the Department issue guidelines as to the conduct of these ceremonies? If so, please provide.

*Answer:*

1. The combined effect of the provisions of the *Australian Citizenship Act 1948* (the Act), the *Australian Citizenship Regulations 1960*, and the Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code is that the person must be a person before whom the pledge of commitment must be made.
2. The program for a citizenship ceremony is usually prepared by the host organisation, at a time convenient to that organisation.
3. The Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code requires that, in addition to the candidates, the following official guests are to be invited to all citizenship ceremonies:
  - the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs - where the Minister is not able to attend, the Minister will nominate a representative;
  - the local Member or Members of the Commonwealth Parliament;
  - a Senator from a different political party to that of the local Federal Member/s;

- the local Member or Members of the State/Territory Parliament; and
- where ceremonies are arranged by community organisations, representation from Local Government.

4. Yes. The Act provides for the pledge of commitment to be made before “a person, or a person included in a class of persons approved in writing by the Minister ... being a person who is an Australian citizen...”.

(a) The role of the delegate, or presiding officer, is to read the preamble to the Act, be the person before whom the pledge of commitment is made, present the certificates of Australian citizenship to the new citizens and certify that the new citizens have made the pledge. Other aspects of the ceremony are a matter for those organising the ceremony.

(b) Mr Ticehurst has had a standing delegation, as the Member for Dobell, to preside at citizenship ceremonies since 2 August 2004.

5. During 2005, Mr Ticehurst MP has presided at citizenship ceremonies for the Wyong Shire Council on 26 January, 21 March and 17 May at the invitation of the Wyong Shire Council.

6. Wyong Shire Council has advised that:

- on 4 March 2005 Ms J Hall MP was invited to attend and assist with the formal proceedings at the citizenship ceremony to be held on 21 March 2005;
- Ms Hall was advised prior to the ceremony that she would not be able to preside at the ceremony because she did not have the appropriate delegation; and
- Ms Hall participated in the ceremony as a speaker.

7. A copy of the “Australian Citizenship Ceremonies Code” is attached.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(253) Output 2.3: Australian Citizenship**

Senator Ludwig asked:

1. In the years 00-01-02-03-04-05, how many persons have successfully appealed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal over an issue relating to...
  - (a) A grant of citizenship.
  - (b) Resumption of citizenship.
2. On how many occasions has the Department appealed the decision to a higher court? How far have these appeals gone?
3. How many of those have been successful?
4. How many Australians have had dual citizenship allowed under a ruling of the AAT?

*Answer:*

1. (a) According to our records for the years 00-01-02-03-04-05, 65 people successfully appealed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal over the grant of citizenship. This figure includes both Departmental losses and Departmental withdrawals  
  
(b) According to our records in the years 00-01-02-03-04-05, 8 people successfully appealed to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal over the resumption of citizenship. This figure includes both Departmental losses and Departmental withdrawals
2. According to our records in the period 00-05 the Department appealed to a higher court on 2 occasions. Both appeals went to the Federal Court only.
3. On both occasions the Department withdrew from litigation prior to hearing.
4. Our records indicate that for the period 00-05 no Australians have had dual citizenship allowed under a ruling of the AAT.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

### BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005

#### IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

#### (254) Output 2.3: Australian Citizenship

Senator Ludwig asked:

1. Do we have any estimates as to when the Bill will be introduced?
2. Has work begun on the Bill?
  - (a) When did work begin on the Bill?
  - (b) Is there an estimated date of completion?
  - (c) Will there be a draft bill released? If so, do we have a date when that may be released?

*Answer:*

1. Draft legislation is expected to be available for introduction in the Parliament this calendar year. The precise timing of the introduction of the legislation has not yet been determined but will, of course, need to take account of other Government priorities.
2. Yes.
  - (a) Work on the development of drafting instructions commenced in late June 2004.
  - (b) The draft legislation is expected to be available for introduction in the Parliament this year.
  - (c) Should time permit consideration will be given to releasing the draft legislation prior to its introduction in the Parliament.

## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(255) Output 2.4: Appreciation of Cultural Diversity**

Senator Ludwig (L&C 6) asked:

In relation to the access and equity annual reports and service providers, are any of those organisations reflected in the previous couple of studies, as case studies or as examples of how well they are performing?

*Answer:*

Third party service providers are reflected in the Access and Equity Annual Report through reporting by Australian Government departments and agencies under the 'Purchaser' role. 'Purchasers' are expected to ensure service providers observe the requirements of the *Charter of Public Service in a Culturally Diverse Society*.

For example, the following extract from the 2004 Access and Equity Annual Report was provided by the Department of Education, Science and Training.

*The Request for Tender for Brokers to deliver the pilot Tutorial Credit Initiative:*

- *was developed in consultation with Indigenous education areas of the department*
- *requires brokers (who will deliver the initiative) to be aware of the cultural and academic needs of the eligible children. This will be part of the brokers' contractual obligations*
- *requires brokers to ensure that eligible children in rural and remote areas can access the tuition*
- *provides differential administration payments for students in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas*
- *considers the needs of Indigenous children, and children already receiving help through Aboriginal Tutorial Assistance Scheme will still be eligible for the tutorial credit*
- *notes that brokers will need to provide access to an interpreter service for non-English speaking enquiries*
- *included state and territory Indigenous staff in the tender selection panel.*

Another example is the following extract from the 2003 Access and Equity Annual Report which was provided by the Department of Employment and Workplace Relations:



*Job Network members are bound by the Job Network Code of Conduct (the Code), which forms part of the Job Network member's contract with DEWR. The Code is designed to protect the interests of job seekers and to ensure they receive quality service. It also requires all Job Network members to establish their own internal complaints system. The Code is produced in accessible formats, is available electronically from the Job Network website and has been translated into 20 community languages. Available languages are Amharic, Arabic, Bosnian, Chinese, Croatian, English, Farsi, Filipino, Greek, Italian, Khmer, Macedonian, Pushto, Polish, Russian, Serbian, Singhalese, Somali, Spanish, Turkish and Vietnamese. The languages were chosen on the basis of Centrelink jobseeker data.*

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(256) Output 2.4: Appreciation of Cultural Diversity**

Senator Ludwig (L&C 6) asked:

Are there any case studies that you have done in respect of some of those service providers?

*Answer:*

See response to Question 255.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 26 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(257) Output 2.4: Appreciation of Cultural Diversity**

Senator Ludwig (L&C 6) asked:

Provide a copy of the terms of reference for the review of multicultural policy and programs.

*Answer:*

A copy of the approved terms of reference is attached.

# EVALUATION OF MULTICULTURAL POLICY AND PROGRAMS

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### MULTICULTURAL POLICY

#### Appropriateness

The evaluation will identify:

- the appropriateness of current multicultural policy and its programs in the context of current and emerging challenges and opportunities of Australia's cultural diversity;
- the continuing need to respond to these challenges and opportunities and the likely consequences of not doing so;
- alternative strategies available to address this need, and any implications for future multicultural policy or programs; and
- where relevant, alignment of and collaborations between federal and state programs and potential for improvement.

#### Effectiveness

The evaluation will assess:

- the achievements of the program elements to date;
- the extent to which the policy and its implementation have addressed the challenges and opportunities of Australia's cultural diversity;
- any unintended consequences (positive or negative);
- linkages between multicultural policy and other government policies and programs, and the scope for rationalisation or greater integration; and
- the adequacy of existing performance indicators and where these indicators need to be improved if similar programs are to continue.

#### Efficiency

The evaluation will provide evidence of the efficiency of the implementation of current multicultural policy, namely:

- the extent to which inputs have been minimised or outputs maximised, in achieving intended products and services;
- the impact on costs borne by the community, clients and other governments, including opportunity costs, facilitating appropriate utilisation of other services, and downstream savings;
- trends over time in the ratio of administrative to overall costs; and

- instances where there have been delays in implementation of the policy, overspends or underspends in recent years, and if this has been factored into estimates of future spending.

## **Recommendations**

The evaluation will make recommendations on:

- the concepts and emphasis of multicultural policy;
- whether the program elements should be continued, how long they should continue, and how they could be improved or modified to increase appropriateness, efficiency and effectiveness; and
- if program elements are continued, the timing and main issues to be addressed by the next evaluation.

## **LIVING IN HARMONY INITIATIVE**

### **Appropriateness**

The evaluation of the Living in Harmony initiative will identify:

- the extent to which the initiative has successfully engaged the Australian community in recognising and promoting community harmony;
- the extent to which the initiative has responded to elements of racism and intolerance in Australian society;
- the extent to which the initiative remains consistent with government priorities and able to meet the challenges of a dynamic and changing environment;
- the extent to which there is a continuing need to have in place a discrete program to promote community harmony and combat racism in Australia and the consequences of not doing so;
- whether other, similar programs exist, the extent to which they are promoting community harmony and combating racism, the degree of overlap with the initiative, existing linkages with the initiative, and the potential for integrating or aligning the initiative with them; and
- whether alternative strategies are available to promote community harmony and combat racism, and their implications for the initiative.

### **Effectiveness**

The evaluation will assess:

- the initiative's achievements in promoting community harmony and combating racism to date;
- the extent to which the initiative achieved its desired objectives;
- any unintended consequences, positive or negative, of the initiative; and
- the adequacy of existing performance indicators and whether they need to be improved.

### **Efficiency**

The evaluation will provide evidence of the efficiency of the initiative, namely

- the extent to which initiative inputs have been minimised, or outputs maximised, in achieving the initiative's outcomes;
- the impact of the initiative on costs borne by the community, clients and other governments, including opportunity costs, facilitating appropriate utilisation of other services, and downstream savings;
- trends over time in the ratio of administrative to overall costs; and

- whether there have been delays in implementing the initiative, overspends or underspends in recent years, and if this has been factored into estimates of future spending.

## **Recommendations**

The evaluation will make recommendations on:

- whether the initiative should continue, how long it should continue and the resource level;
- its core objectives;
- if it should continue, how it could be improved or modified to increase appropriateness, impact, efficiency and effectiveness; and
- if it should continue, when it should next be evaluated.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(258) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Crossin (L &C 13) asked:

Does the national healing day committee receive any funds from the federal government?

*Answer.*

At the hearing Mr Yates provided the following response, 'We have endeavoured to establish some information to assist in that regard. We understand that the Department of Health and Ageing provided some funds to assist the organisation with a number of its activities this year, including the launch of the National Day of Healing. Together, those amounts add to just over \$20,000.'

Please refer to Legal and Constitutional Hansard page 34.



**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(259) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 16) asked:

Does NIC funding come under 3.12, policy development and innovation, on page 90 of the PBS?

*Answer:*

NIC funding is part of the overall corporate resourcing within OIPC, which is shared across the various organisational units within OIPC. There is no specific line item with regard to corporate resourcing in OIPC.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

**IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO**

**(260) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 24) asked:

Can I get a breakdown of how the \$31,000 and the \$29,000 were spent? Can you get a disaggregation of the figures?

*Answer:*

<b>Expense</b>	<b>Meeting 1 (\$)</b>	<b>Meeting 2 (\$)</b>
Sitting Fees	\$8,064	\$8,064
Travel Allowance	\$2,778.15	\$2,652.28
Flights	\$12,130.67	\$10,290.98
Accommodation	\$3,818	\$3,009
Administration & incidentals	\$1702.50	\$648.07
Venue Hire & catering	\$2,548	\$2,917
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$31,041.32</b>	<b>\$27,581.33</b>

Note: For meeting 2 - due to changes of flight time costs varied accordingly

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(261) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 24) asked:

Can you provide an estimate of what it costs to service the National Indigenous Council?

*Answer:*

A team within the Secretariat and Policy Coordination Branch, which is headed by a Senior Executive Service Band 1 Officer, services the NIC as part of the Branch's broader role. Approximately one third of their time is spent supporting the work of the NIC and approximately 17% of the Branch Head's time.

The current team structure consists of an EL2, EL1, an Acting APS 5 and a Graduate.

Based on base rates of annual pay:

EL2: \$80 541	(one third = \$26 847)
EL1: \$69 853	(one third = \$23 284)
APS5: \$50 500	(one third = \$16 833)
Graduate: \$40 622	(one third = \$13 540)

Branch Head: \$110 000 (17% = \$18 700)

Total = \$99 204

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(262) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 24) asked:

Provide the dates on which the Secretary travelled to Tasmania on Indigenous business.

*Answer:*

For 2003-04:

26 March 2004.

For 2004-05:

27 July 2004

26 August 2004

10 March 2005

19 April 2005

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(263) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 24) asked:

Provide the dates on which the Minister visited the COAG trial area in Tasmania.

*Answer:*

Our records indicate that there has not been a visit by Senator Vanstone since the Trial commenced in its Tasmanian site in mid-2003. The former Minister, the Hon Philip Ruddock MP, did not visit either.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(264) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 25) asked:

Provide a list of the 52 shared responsibility agreements, including the amount of money involved with each of them and a list of the agencies involved with each of them. Also, where there are partnership arrangements, which of the agencies are actually providing that partnership arrangement.

*Answer:*

Attached is a list of the 52 Shared Responsibility Agreements (SRAs) including amounts and any partnership arrangements.

Please note that the total funding for these SRAs has increased by \$228,000 since they were announced on 27 May 2005. Variations are due to changes to the costs required to provide services and facilities or where additional resources are required. Where government investment has varied, this has been done in consultation with relevant communities (see notes in the attached document).

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(265) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 25) asked:

In relation to SRA funding, could you give me a breakdown of how that better part of \$100 million is to be spent?

*Answer:*

\$28.8m of administered funding will be spent on the Shared Responsibility Agreements Implementation Assistance Program (SRA IAP) in 2005-06.

The SRA IAP will assist communities negotiate SRAs with governments and provide start up resources for activities they have identified as important for their community. It also provides funding to access specialised skills and expertise through the panels of experts recently established by OIPC. Funding will support existing and new Communities in Crisis and continue previous assistance for Torres Strait Islanders on the mainland. Resources will also be available to facilitate and support community engagement with government through Regional Partnership Agreements (RPAs).

\$57.6m of departmental costs will support the ongoing operations of ICCs, including ICC staffing and infrastructure costs and national office costs associated with the SRA management, support and implementation of the Indigenous Women's Development Program, support costs for ICC operations, and progressing the Council of Australian Government (COAG) trials.

\$10.2m in other resources represents the estimate of revenues to be recovered from other agencies that utilise the ICCs under the common services arrangements.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(266) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 26) asked:

What are the costing arrangements for ICCs?

*Answer:*

Costs for operating ICCs (excluding salaries which are paid by the staff members' parent agency) are met by OIPC in the first instance. These costs are then recovered from participating agencies through a common services cost sharing arrangement.



**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(267) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 26) asked:

In terms of the expenses of the Tasmanian COAG trials, how much is spent on administration and how much is spent on other matters? Can I get a breakdown of that expenditure?

*Answer:*

Salary expenses for 2004-05 totalled \$106,285 while the administration and operational costs of the Tasmanian COAG trials in 2004-05 totalled a net amount of \$22,537 (after Tasmanian Government refunds of shared expenses).

Funding from the Flexible Funding Pool for the 2004-05 financial year totalled \$6,494, spent on employing short-term community liaison workers.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(268) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 31) asked:

The La Perouse SRA is an agreement looking at the repair of houses, isn't it?

*Answer:*

The SRA negotiated with the La Perouse community, which is still to be signed off by the community, focuses on the implementation of a housing maintenance strategy and the writing of the La Perouse history.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(269) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 31) asked:

In relation to native title land rights matters, how much of that \$57 million will go towards the evaluation of the representative bodies?

*Answer:*

The monitoring and evaluating of Native Title Representative Bodies is part of the ongoing work of OIPC, the costs being subsumed within the overall native title budget. In addition, the Office of Evaluation and Audit (Indigenous Programs) in the Department of Finance and Administration will conduct an evaluation and audit of Native Title Representative Bodies, and other bodies funded under the *Native Title Act*, in 2005-06.

## **QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(270) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 33) asked:

But did discussion occur recently with some rep bodies about the removal of certain clauses from the funding agreements on the basis that this was a requirement of the free trade agreement? If it is true – I clearly have been advised that it is true – I would like to know what was the rationale behind it.

*Answer:*

A workshop for Chief Finance Officers from Native Title Representative Bodies (NTRBs) was held in Alice Springs on 27 and 28 April on the 2005-06 Native Title program and changes to the 2005-06 Program Funding Agreement (PFA). During the course of the workshop a NTRB representative queried the removal from the 2005-06 PFA of the procurement conditions that encouraged NTRBs to provide opportunities for Indigenous organisations to participate in the tendering/quoting for contracts and for the provision of employment and training opportunities for Indigenous peoples.

An officer in responding to the query commented that he did not know whether the US Free Trade Agreement (USFTA) had any impact and this needed to be clarified. The response elicited a comment from another NTRB representative that this was not the case, as the USFTA made special provisions for Indigenous people. In light of this response the OIPC officer acknowledged that his reference to the USFTA was not correct and would not have been relevant to the revisions made to the PFA. The discussion at the workshop moved on to other changes to the 2005-06 PFA and the matter was not raised again.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(271) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 33) asked:

Is there any proposal to change the funding agreements as a result of alleged changes that result from the free trade agreement in regard to procurement?

*Answer.*

No; grants in the form of funding agreements are not subject to the Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines (which set out the requirements for Free Trade Agreement arrangements).

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(272) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 34) asked:

What is the status of the agreement that was reached in August 2003 between the Northern Territory Government, the land rights councils and the mining industry in regard to amendments to the Northern Territory Land Rights Act?

*Answer:*

The Government released an options paper on possible reforms to the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976* in April 2002. In response, the Northern Territory Government and the Northern Territory Land Councils released a joint submission in September 2003 proposing reforms to the Act. The Government is considering reforms to the Act and expects amendments to be introduced later in 2005.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(273) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Carr (L&C 34) asked:

Are there any proposals currently before OIPC to amend the Native Title Act?

*Answer:*

OIPC canvassed the need for amendments to the *Native Title Act 1993* in relation to the delivery of native title services in its submission to the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Native Title and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Fund Inquiry into the capacity of Native Title Representative Bodies to discharge their duties under the Act. OIPC will continue to monitor the effectiveness of the legislation as part of its ongoing work.

**QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

**(274) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Crossin (L&C 34) asked:

In relation to the National Day of Healing Committee, was it a condition of receiving the funding that the committee changed its name?

*Answer:*

No. The Department of Health and Ageing, which provides funds to the Committee, has indicated that there was no such condition attached to the funding. The Committee made its own decision on the name change (from 'National Sorry Day' to 'National Day of Healing').



## QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

**BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 27 May 2005**

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL AND INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO

### **(275) Output 3.1: Indigenous Policy**

Senator Crossin (L&C 36) asked:

Are there any existing Commonwealth programs that are directed at helping Indigenous women who exit prison?

Mr Yates, could you then take on notice whether there are any agencies responsible for programs of that kind? I am assuming you would not know if there was any funding that goes into those programs. You might take that on notice as well.

*Answer:*

OIPC does not have any programs directed at helping Indigenous women exiting prison.

OIPC approached the Attorney-General's Department and Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL) in the Family and Community Services (FACS) portfolio and received the following advice.

#### Attorney-General's Department

'The Attorney-General's Department, under the Prisoner Support sub-output of Prevention, Diversion, Rehabilitation & Restorative Justice Program, provides funding to a number of organisations around Australia to undertake the following:

- Pre and Post-release support
- Support while incarcerated
- Referrals to other relevant support services
- Advocacy and referrals for legal assistance.

The program is not specifically targeted at Indigenous women, but is for support to all Indigenous persons incarcerated. However, the Attorney-General's Department priorities for funding in 2005-06 included both women and juveniles.'

#### Family and Community Services (FACS) – Aboriginal Hostels Limited (AHL)

AHL is involved in a joint initiative with the South Australian government to provide short term temporary accommodation to enable Indigenous women exiting prison an opportunity to organise their affairs. The initiative is called 'Karinga'. It is a trial in its first year of operation.