

**Estimates Committee 2013**  
**Questions Taken On Notice**

( 18/06/2013 to 27/06/2013 )

Date: 26/06/2013

Output:

Sub Output:

Subject: Regional Governance Consultations

**From:**Ms Lynne Walker to Hon Alison Anderson  
Local Government

---

**9-13**

**Question:**

Minister, can you provide a list of the dates of all consultations which were held, the number of people present and where a community had its promised second consultation visit.

**Answer:**

Answered On: 09/07/2013

# Review of Regional Governance

## Draft Consultation Report – March to June 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose of Consultation .....	3
Consultation Overview.....	3
Community Consultation .....	4

Exclusions .....	4
Community Consultations.....	5
Community Consultation.....	5
Community Meetings .....	6
Methodology .....	6
Community Consultation Findings.....	6
A: Comments on Shire Councils .....	7
B: Comments on Local Authorities and Regional Councils.....	10
C: Comments on Regional Authorities .....	13
D: Comments on Boundaries .....	14
Written Submissions.....	15
Written Submissions Findings.....	15
Comments on Option 1 .....	17
Comments on Option 2.....	19
Option 3: CLC proposal - Regional authority/assembly.....	20

DRAFT

# Purpose of Consultation

At the 2012 Northern Territory election a large number of the residents of communities serviced by Shire Councils in remote parts of the Territory expressed their concern at the effectiveness of the governance and service arrangements established after the 2008 reform of local government.

The newly elected Northern Territory government committed to these remote residents that they would consult directly with them to better understand their issues and concerns and to examine the best means of improving the structures and operation of local government.

A critical issue raised during the election was the concern that people felt that they had lost control of their local government councils which were perceived to be unresponsive to community concerns. This was described as people having “lost their voice”.

For this reason a review was established to focus on the governance arrangements and how the Territory government could affect changes which re-enforce community control in the prioritising and addressing local initiatives and enhance residents’ confidence in their councils and administrations.

## Consultation Overview

In November 2012, the then Minister for Local Government (Hon. Adam Giles MLA) established the Regional Governance Working Group to develop an Options Paper to provide the basis for public consultation on future arrangements for regional governance. Regional governance in this context includes the current local government councils and the wider range of government service delivery and consultative mechanisms (or lack thereof) in regional and remote Northern Territory.

The discussion paper “Options for Regional Governance in the NT” was released in March 2013. Department of Local Government regional staff commenced consultations on the same day with a schedule requiring a minimum of two visits to over 70 towns and communities. In addition, written submissions were also invited through the department’s website.

The discussion paper presents two options for future regional governance.

The first option - the Regional Council Option - was considered by the majority of the Working Group as being capable of achieving quick changes to the current structure of shire councils to strengthen community input and decision making in shire, or regional, councils through a mandated Local Authority located in communities.

The second option - the Regional Authority Option - was considered by the majority of the Working Group as being a long term goal for strong regional governance that would include all three levels of government working closely with the local community in a regional partnership agreement or similar.

To be fully effective, the Local Authority proposed in both options presented in the discussion paper would need to be mandated by the Local Government Act. While the Regional Council would be the elected and accountable body, the Local Authority would have a prescribed role in Regional Council planning; prescribed two-way reporting requirements with the Council; and delegated functions.

Membership of the Local Authority would be determined by community processes (as is the case for shire council local boards) and members of the Local Authority would be eligible for sitting fees (unlike membership of current local boards where sitting fees are not permitted).

It has also become apparent through the community consultations that the options presented in the discussion paper are open to a range of interpretations, particularly in regard to the responsibilities of local government as opposed to other level of government, and the possible operational structures of future Regional Councils or Regional Authorities.

# Community Consultation

A critical consideration which has come to light during the Review of Regional Governance has been the widespread confusion as to which level of government is responsible, i.e. which makes the critical decisions, for the funding, the setting of program parameters and guidelines and the actual delivery of particular services. It was clear, even at Working Group meetings, that much criticism and negative sentiment expressed about the Shires, since the 2008 reform of local government, has largely arisen because they are the visible face of all levels of government in remote areas.

Much of the feedback received during the community consultations has concerned the delivery of contracted agency services, particularly housing maintenance, which are provided under the guidelines and approvals of the Territory and Australian governments. These government responsibilities, and the changes that have occurred in their funding and delivery, have in many cases, soured the relationship between community residents and their shire council staff. The historical reliance by community members on local decision making by council staff has been transformed to a remote power structure which allows little responsiveness at the local level.

As the submission from the Hon. Fred Chaney, Chair of Desert Knowledge Australia, states:

*“Longer term, the structures should aim to ensure clarity of mandate of all three levels of government, provide funding according to mandate, and ensure overall regional visions about what the people, Government and other stakeholders are trying to achieve overall”.*

## Exclusions

For this reason it is important that, if a comprehensive review of regional governance is to be undertaken, each level of government accepts responsibility for its own initiatives and outcomes and develops its own responses. As a result the summary of community consultations herein acknowledges but excludes from its discussions three key issues raised during the community meetings which fall beyond the jurisdiction of local government alone.

The three significant government strategic policy initiatives which have contributed to the Shires being unfairly criticised are:

- the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER or the “Intervention”);
- the establishment of remote Public Housing and its housing maintenance programs; and
- the ongoing changes to the Commonwealth Development and Employment Program (CDEP) and the perceived loss of local employment.

Each of these reforms has impacted strongly on the community’s sense of autonomy and all have had a profound effect on the level of service and responsiveness of the shire councils and so has reflected poorly on their performance.

### **Northern Territory Emergency Response**

One aspect of the changes arising in the delivery of community services since the NTER has been the apparent preference of the Australian government for the contracting of non-Indigenous NGOs for service delivery in remote communities in the Northern Territory. This has meant that services traditionally delivered through local governments, the former community councils, and employing a local workforce are now delivered by often non-resident organisations.

The proliferation of non-resident service providers has diminished the employment opportunities for local people who formerly ran local child care, aged care, women’s centres and recreation programs

themselves with limited council support. Many of these facilities are now managed by organisations administered from distant capital cities and communities have expressed a loss of voice in influencing their operations.

## **Public Housing**

Inadequate Public Housing maintenance and the excessive time taken for a response to maintenance and safety concerns was far and away the most common criticism of the shire councils raised during the consultations.

Perhaps the most profound change affecting local governments and the communities in which they operate has been the withdrawal of housing assets from local Aboriginal housing associations and councils and the creation of remote Public Housing, managed by the Department of Housing. This has meant that local government no longer has primary responsibility for housing asset management.

The shires, as managers of housing maintenance contracts, accept complaints from community members but these complaints are then conveyed to Territory Housing who either approves the request for immediate maintenance or refers the work to a “routine maintenance program”. The shires can do little to respond to residents if there is no approval from Territory Housing. A common complaint was that there were trained local Aboriginal people who could undertake much of this straightforward routine maintenance if they were given the chance.

The good news is that Territory Housing is developing a series of contracts aimed at enhancing local maintenance response times and employing local maintenance teams.

## **Commonwealth Development and Employment Projects (CDEP)**

Another issue of significant concern raised in many community meetings has been the perceived loss of local employment. The widely held perception is that this has largely been due to losses in the local government sector where, in reality, the number of Aboriginal people employed by local governments has actually increased over the last five years.

The constant changes to the Community Development and Employment Projects (CDEP) program which has in past years employed by far the highest number of staff in remote communities, have led to a significant loss of part-time employment in many communities. With the Australian government focus on getting people into the few full-time, “real” jobs available many communities have expressed their concern that there are fewer jobs and there are very limited opportunities for young people leaving the school system to enter gainful employment.

Between 2008 and 2012 the number of jobs in local government increased from 1657 to 2518, with the number of Aboriginal employees (1780) now greater than the total number of employees in 2008.

Again the Australian government is making significant adjustments to employment and training programs with the Remote Jobs in Communities Program due to commence in July 2013.

# **Community Consultations**

## **Community Consultation**

Initial visits were designed to introduce community residents to the NT Government’s Review of Regional Governance and the concepts contained in the ministerial Working Group’s discussion paper “Options for Regional Governance in the NT”. These visits were primarily intended to provide information rather than seek detailed comments or responses.

These visits typically consisted of a small community meeting followed up by one-on-one discussions with individuals and community stakeholders. Departmental staff have completed consultation summaries for each consultation and the information was “coded” into themes to assist an orderly analysis of the feedback.

A second round of visits, following up after communities had some time to discuss the reforms, were completed by the 14 June with the exception of Central Australia which was completed by 21 June.

## Community Meetings

### Statistical Information

Period:	11 March 2013 to 21 June 2013
No of community visits:	106
No of meetings held:	263
No of persons participating in consultation meetings:	3,045
No of one-on-one consultations:	48
No of consultations involving 2-10 people	102
No of consultations involving 11-20 people:	72
No of consultations involving 21-30 people:	26
No of consultations involving >30 people:	15

### Methodology

The consultation information gathering process was not standardised. Consultations were unstructured discussions where participants were encouraged to give their views and opinions freely on the governance options presented, and on any other local government issues of concern.

Accredited Aboriginal interpreters translated discussions where required, and all comment was recorded by Department of Local Government staff. Recorded consultation comment was then collated and analysed. Patterns emerged as comments reported by more than one participant were grouped and coded into consultation themes, that were further coded to positive, negative or neutral statements. Multiple researchers reviewed coded material to ensure consultation comment was analysed consistently.

## Community Consultation Findings

### Consultation Process and Timing

There were many comments made by participants on the consultation process, some positive but most negative. Community members who commented positively on the process said they liked that consultation was taking place in their communities, and that consultation was occurring before the governance reform began. There was positive comment about the widespread use of the Aboriginal Interpreter Service, especially as interpreters became more familiar with the subject matter.

There was obviously a widely differing understanding and interpretation of Option 1 and 2 from place to place. Some councillors and community members said they did not really understand what was being proposed in the options, “It’s hard for us to understand this straight away”. Some participants commented that the Consultation Paper was confusing and that they had difficulty in reading and understanding the options presented.

The greatest number of comments made on the review consultation process related to the limited time available for consultation. Frequently this was explained in terms of the importance of the proposed changes and the need to consider the options before making comment.

Other commonly raised concerns were; the makeup of the Regional Governance Working Group; the effectiveness of the communications material; and, the particular stakeholders targeted for consultation. There were repeated requests for more time to consider the options and for return visits by Departmental staff and a number of requests for a visit by the Minister for Local Government.

Other individual comment made on the review consultation process included:

- Consultation meetings were not well advertised.
- More individualised (“one to one”) consultation was needed
- Repeated change was destabilising local government.
- The review process was predetermined and that the government had already made its decision.

## **A: Comments on Shire Councils**

### **Core Services**

Much of the commentary on the performance of the shires related to core services, with a mix of positive and negative responses. Almost all of the core services comment received in consultation can be categorised under the following themes:

- Public Spaces and Cemeteries
- Roads
- Waste management
- Dog control

### **Public spaces and cemeteries**

This was the area of core services most frequently commented on. Many participants noted a general improvement in the maintenance of public spaces and other municipal areas after the Shires were established, as well as the creation of new parks, playgrounds and footpaths. Others believed that the maintenance of public spaces and cemeteries had generally declined since the formation of the shire councils.

Participants also reported differing levels of service across communities within the same shire council area. Improved performance was often attributed to having local work crews directed by good local leadership. There was frequent acknowledgement of the factors influencing service delivery including the historically degraded state of infrastructure, seasonal weather conditions, changes to the former CDEP program, and a lack of funding.

### **Roads**

The second most common issue raised was road maintenance, with comment almost entirely negative. Participants made strong statements such as “roads are like those in underdeveloped countries” and many roads were reported as unsafe. Most participants giving their views believed the condition of roads had significantly deteriorated since the shires were introduced. Shire councils were understood to have inherited responsibility for roads with minimal funding, resulting in deteriorating road conditions, and that shire councils were now unable to keep up with maintenance requirements.

It was said repeatedly that main community roads need major upgrades (bituminising) rather than just maintenance grading which was thought to be exacerbating degraded road conditions. There were a

significant number of comments regarding severe lack of plant and equipment such as graders and multiple references were made to large shire council areas with only a single piece of major equipment. Many participants focused on the poor condition of internal roads and the need for safety improvements such as speed humps and signs. The lack of associated road infrastructure, particularly kerbing and drains was also linked to damage to houses and house lots.

### **Waste management**

Comment on waste management mostly related to household rubbish collection and the operation of refuse dumps. Feedback on dumps was largely positive but comment on household rubbish collection was mixed. A number of respondents commented on the previous role of CDEP participants in local government and thought changes to CDEP had contributed to lower levels of waste management service and performance.

Waste management plant and equipment was frequently mentioned as being inappropriate or unavailable, and so limiting the development of a reliable service. Sewerage systems were also criticised as being in poor condition or inadequate and controlling stormwater run-off was raised as a significant issue for a number of communities.

### **Dog control**

Many participants emphasised the seriousness of dog management issues in remote communities, referring to dogs as a “massive problem” that was “out of control”. Most of the comment made in relation to shire performance on dog control was negative, and it was said that the shires have either not taken responsibility for managing dangerous and unhealthy dogs, or have not taken action.

While some participants complained that programs addressing dog control and dog health were more widely available under the former councils, others commented positively on animal welfare programs in their community. Consultation participants suggested measures such as such as bylaws, dog registration and fencing to manage dogs.

## ***Agency (non-Core) services***

### **Local Government Revenues:**

Due to the extremely low levels of own source revenue, that is rates and charges, of local governments in the Northern Territory services provided on behalf of other levels of government form a substantial percentage of the revenue base of the shire councils. In the case of the Commonwealth this contribution is over 70% of total revenue, and so this funding underpins a large part of the employment and service delivery capacity of the shires.

As discussed in the Exclusion section above, the services that are provided through contracts with the Northern Territory and Australian governments are provided under strict program guidelines and funding conditions. While these contracts make a major contribution to the budget and operation of local government, there are a number of criticisms of local government which result directly from changes in policy, program and provider of a number of programs.

### **Impact of Policy and Program changes:**

The examples, given earlier in this paper, of public housing maintenance, the provision of employment through CDEP and the change from a local government service provider to a non-Indigenous NGO has had serious implications for remote community residents' perception of the performance of the shires. Many see the changes as a lack of responsiveness of their shire council, or a decrease in employment opportunity because of local government reform.

## ***Assets and asset management***

### **Asset and asset management:**

Assets were another topic of considerable interest. Some participants were dissatisfied that assets belonging to former councils had been removed from communities, and centrally located for use across the shire. The sharing of assets across communities was said by others to be a good thing. Assets such as former council offices were considered by some as inaccessible to the public, and residents were unhappy with being charged for the use of assets which were previously free.

### **Recreational assets:**

Participants spoke of the need for specific recreational assets such as swimming pools and improvements to other recreational assets such as football ovals. There were a number of negative comments regarding the costs being charged by shires for the use of recreational assets, particularly swimming pools. Respondents commented on the need for specific recreational assets and the need to improve asset maintenance.

### **State of assets:**

Community concerns over the state of assets, some of which the existing shire councils are not responsible. There was a lack of funds to replace or upgrade assets. Some participants spoke of a lack of funds to replace or upgrade assets that are not fully functional, and this was said to have created undesirable workplace conditions for operators.

### **Asset ownership:**

Some comments about the existing shire council taking over all community assets. A number commented that previous councils used to be responsible for the majority of assets but the existing shire councils do not look after them now. There is some confusion in communities regarding responsibility for assets, exacerbated by assets being shared by service providers. There were a number of comments about Commonwealth funded assets which did not have clear asset ownership or coherent on-going maintenance plans.

## **B: Comments on Local Authorities and Regional Councils**

### ***Representation and Participation***

#### **Local Authority as single consultative body for the community:**

Respondents were very strongly supportive of having one consultative body, one voice (the Local Authority) that government agencies would use for community consultation and engagement.

Some respondents from larger communities commented that some existing community committees will still be required and should continue but stated that there should be a mechanism to ensure consistent information flow between these groups.

A number submitted that housing allocation and management needed careful, even-handed consideration and that the best people for a Local Authority might not be the same people trusted to provide advice on housing matters.

#### **Local Authority: membership; elected or not elected.**

In regard to membership of the Authority most were in favour of selection by community consensus rather than by appointment or election. A significant number of respondents commented that it was important to ensure that the Authority was not dominated by a minority group and others commented that the membership may need to be elected to be seen as fully legitimate.

Most comments in this area favoured the Local Authority consisting of clan representatives and in many cases these respondents supported male and female representation of each clan. A number of comments favoured inclusion of youth and, to a lesser extent, Traditional Owners, outstation residents and non-Indigenous members.

There appears to be a trend in the comments from residents in larger communities that the Local Authority needs to be sufficiently large to be inclusive of all important stakeholders. Some were concerned that a small Local Authority may be dominated by a small group of people that do not necessarily consider the full community viewpoint.

The relatively small number of pastoralists and business owners that commented on membership indicated that they felt excluded from current Local Boards and other shire council consultative processes. Some business operators commented that they would prefer to have a separate Local Authority from one established to consider community issues.

Some respondents commented that they were strongly opposed to any suggestion of any outside appointments to the Local Authority – “the community must decide”. Several respondents commented that it would be difficult to maintain a Local Authority given the fluid nature of residency but also commented that good people who would not necessarily stand for Council would most likely participate in a Local Authority if approached.

There should be a Local Authority for all communities.

#### **Composition of the Regional Council**

There appears to be a trend in the comments received from residents of smaller communities that the Regional Council should include a councillor from each community in the council.

#### **Possible conflict points between Local Authority and Regional Council**

Respondents generally favoured an increase for decision making at the local level. Others commented that increased decision making at local level may lead to conflicts with the parent Regional Council and stated that a process to manage such conflicts would be needed.

#### **Support for councillors and Local Authority members**

Respondents commented that it is vital to provide good training and support to councillors and members of Local Authorities. A number of respondents commented that it must be compulsory for councillors to attend Local Authority meetings.

## **Allowance for Local Authority members**

A relatively small number of respondents commented on the proposal to introduce an allowance for members of Local Authorities and these comments were in favour.

## ***Roles, Functions, Powers, Service Responsibilities***

### **Enhanced budget information**

There was high rate of positive comments in support of a requirement to have the Regional Council publish and report its planned and actual expenditure by Local Authority area. Some stated that it was important to have information presented in a simple and understandable format.

### **Enhanced decision making role at local level**

There was also a high rate of positive comment in support of a general increase in decision making capacity at the Local Authority level. However, many participants raised questions about the power of the Local Authority to make decisions, and it appeared that many others wanted more autonomy and decision-making power, including budget responsibly, than indicated in Option 1.

Participants frequently requested clarification of the roles and responsibilities of Local Authority members and others indicated that they had misunderstood or overestimated the amount of control and influence the Local Authority would have. Some participants commented that the roles and expectations of Local Authority members need to be defined if they are to be decision makers.

It was also said that increased responsibility needed to be supported with locally delivered capacity building, and professional assistance given with planning and budgeting activities.

### **Potential for conflict between Regional Council and Local Authorities**

There were many comments that increasing decision making powers at the Local Authority level could lead to conflicts between the Local Authority and the Regional Council. Concern was expressed that some Local Authority functions could be duplicating the role of councillors and potentially undermining councillors' accountability if unelected Authority members were making important decisions.

There were comments that conflict between outstation service providers and Regional Councils could also increase where Local Authorities include outstation residents. Another potential conflict arises with the sometimes stated desire to have an increased role for the Local Authority in management of council staff and directing managers of NT Agency services. Some respondents commented that it would be important to have the "rules" spelt out very clearly as to the respective roles of the Local Authority and the Regional Council to avoid these sorts of conflicts.

### **Community planning**

There was good support among respondents for tasking the Local Authority with producing and maintaining a community plan which would feed in the Regional Council plan. In some locations, respondents said they did not have a community plan and they were enthusiastic to produce one. In other areas, respondents stated that the Local Implementation planning process had been a worthwhile exercise and they supported the Local Authority being involved in this process.

### **Core and non-core functions**

There was a divergence of opinion on services that should be provided by the Regional Councils. Some commented that the Regional Council and Local Authority should get completely out of agency services and should concentrate on roads, rubbish and parks. Other envisaged a much wider role for the Regional Council saying that the council needed to increase its focus on aged care and youth services especially.

Other commented that it would be good for the Local Authority to provide personal services such as ID production, provision of (fee-for-service) morgues and assisting elderly people going hunting. Many comments were made regarding the need for local corporations to have the capacity to provide non-core local government services.

## **Community information sharing**

Improvement to community information sharing was raised by many respondents who stated that it was important for the Regional Council and the Local Authority to increase the community awareness of what these bodies were planning and the progress with current activities.

## **Employment, mentoring and training**

Many respondents stated they wanted councils and the Local Authority to deliver more local jobs especially jobs for young people.

There needs to be significant support for capacity building (mentoring/training/guidance) of local authority members or the model will not work. Members understanding of the local government system, their roles, governance, budgeting, project analysis and local planning is important. Interpreting services and numeracy and literacy will be needed.

There were concerns about the impact of supporting local authorities by council staff in communities and the additional workload that could be placed upon them including secretarial support.

## **Funding and Support**

There were a significant number of respondents who stated that increasing the role and functions of Local Authorities will cost additional money and may simply add another level of bureaucracy.

Residents raised many questions regarding the changes that will be made to existing shire councils rather than offering views including:

- Strong view - How will the changes be funded? Lack of funding now – let alone to fund additional reforms. Will funding be the same after the changes?
- What does the LA funding model look like?
- How will LA budgets be funded? Would removing areas from existing shires be cost effective?
- What services will Regional Councils deliver?
- Will service fees be re-introduced? (as paid for services provided by previous councils).
- Will LAs/RCs have authority or budget? Will a LA have financial control?
- Is the review addressing shire sustainability?
- Has the cost of changing shire names been assessed as money better spent?
- Who is going to support LAs (mentoring/training/close guidance)?
- How will we manage so many LA meetings per month in so many locations?

A significant number of respondents were existing shire staff who had a strong focus on costs of further reform, loss of revenue in forming new councils and sustainability of expenditure to support local authority changes.

## **Costs to councils and funding:**

A large number of questions raised regarding how the changes will be funded considering that existing shire councils do not have enough funds to do what needs to be done. Respondents strongly suggest that whatever is changed will need to be sustainable and additional funding into the councils will be required. If funding is not available then don't change the existing councils. Monthly local authority meetings will cost too much.

A number of comments were recorded including:

- Agency program revenue is used to pay for corporate and other support staff and breaking up a shire will cause loss of revenue and staff.
- Council costs are already increasing but funds are not keeping pace.
- Council funds for services should not go into reform costs.
- Changing council names is a waste of money.
- Each community needs a budget, especially for employment.
- Remove rate capping.
- Local government funding for each council will reduce as more councils are created.

## C: Comments on Regional Authorities

While there were mixed views on the desirability of the Regional Authority option, more participants in the community consultations commented positively on this option than negatively. However, the option was not well understood by many participants and there were frequent requests for further explanation and clarification, particularly in regard to the partnership arrangements of key stakeholders and the expanded role and service delivery functions of a Regional Authority.

Many of the positive comments on Regional Authorities were simple statements such as “We want one”. More detailed comments made on Option 2 ranged from issues of accountability to employment outcomes. But the bulk of comments received related to the following themes:

- the parties involved in a Regional Authority;
- how Regional Authority members would be elected or selected;
- the scope and complexity of the functions of a Regional Authority;
- establishing a Regional Authority and implementing service delivery; and
- effectiveness and accountability.

### **Parties involved:**

There were many positive comments on the coordination advantages and service delivery efficiencies of the Regional Authority option. Participants often saw this option as an opportunity to get key stakeholders in a region working together, a new arrangement where “everyone is talking to each other” and there is “no more us and them”.

There were repeated references to difficulties associated with having key stakeholders included as partners on the Regional Authority. Participants spoke of competing priorities of some stakeholders and partners in the Authority, and their past inability to work effectively under regional structures.

### **Representation by election and selection:**

Some consultation participations expressed concerns around the possibility of members of Regional Authority being appointed. Appointment and prescribed formal membership were interpreted by some participants as taking power from the communities and moving away from democratic election.

Many people consulted asked for more explanation and clarification on how government partners and key stakeholders in a region would be represented in a Regional Authority

### **Scope and complexity of functions:**

Negative comments were made by some participants on the expanded scope and increased complexity of the proposed Regional Authority functions. Participants spoke of the Regional Authority option as being “too big” or “too hard” and ‘very confusing’.

Others viewed the transferring of some functions of the NT and Australian Government as a positive that offered the flexibility and appropriate funding to tailor services to community needs. It was also believed by some participants that transferring functions would improve communication and negotiations with the Australian government.

### **Establishing a Regional Authority and implementing service delivery:**

Negative comments on the Regional Authority option mostly related to the current capacity of the Shires to successfully transition to a Regional Authority and expand on their present functions. Many participants also commented that a Regional Authority would not be suited to smaller communities and others said it would be difficult to administer.

Of the participants who commented positively on Option 2, many acknowledged that a Regional Authority could take a long time to establish and become operational, and it was repeatedly suggested that any changes to a Regional Authority should be staged or incremental. A Regional Authority was often endorsed as an aspirational goal - "something to aim for". It was suggested by some participants that a Regional Council option should be implemented first, and the Regional Authority Option introduced once capacity had been developed. However, others wanted a Regional Authority introduced in their region immediately.

### **Effectiveness and Accountability:**

There were participants who questioned whether the change to a Regional Authority would produce better service delivery outcomes, and were negative about introducing further changes when remote residents had only just accepted the newly created Shires. There were other consultation participants who believed a Regional Authority would be more accountable to 'local people' and would save money and improve financial sustainability.

## **D: Comments on Boundaries**

### ***Boundaries and communities of interest***

Comments expressed through the consultation process ranged from maintaining current boundaries to abolishing them totally and reforming at the community level. The scope and strength of opinion varied and in some cases this was observed even within individual consults. While there was opinion that the idea of a Local Authority would strengthen local voice there were varied and expressed views on the size of Local Authorities, their existence within a particular Regional Council and issues (both positive and negative) with shared membership with particular communities.

The range of responses reflects the complexity of the question. With the range of views in and between communities, it is not surprising that a clear and uniform opinion on Regional Council and Local Authority boundaries was not observed.

The factors of identity, voice, culture and language underpinned many opinions on the size of the Local Authority and to some extent, these factors advocate conflicting outcomes. Other opinions expressed that communities had distinct priorities from their neighbours. Nevertheless, where comments directly addressing Regional Councils were made, a range of views were expressed and a list of common themes can be seen, some of these include but are not limited to:

- communities identifying with services centres other than those within their existing shire;
- identity, needs and communities of interest should be considered;
- one model does not fit all;
- reduced size is seen to lead to more effective service delivery, increased co-operation and increased job opportunities in and between communities.

While individual views focused on reduced size of Regional Councils, equally prevalent were views on council boundaries remaining the same. As the views expressed were those of individuals these would need to be tested for their broad community or regional support through more detailed consultation and assessment of financial sustainability.

Given the complexity of this issue and that it was not raised as a key element of the Options Paper it would be appropriate that more detailed discussions are held with specific communities or regions which see a common purpose in boundary reform.

## Written Submissions

At 26 June 2013, a total of 36 written submissions (some individuals made multiple submissions) were received in response to the Options Paper. Of these detailed submissions were provided by: Desert Knowledge Australia; the Local Government Association of the Northern Territory (LGANT); the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA); the Australian Human Rights Commission; the Central Land Council (CLC); the Aboriginal Peak Organisations of the Northern Territory (APONT); Alyawarr Ingkerr-wenh Aboriginal Corporation; the NT Cattlemen's Association; the Anindilyakwa Land Council (ALC) and by five Shire Councils and three Municipal Councils. Submissions were also received from 12 individuals.

While many reflected similar issues to those raised in the community consultations a few raised significant issues or provided detailed insight into how the model of governance could evolve in the Northern Territory.

## Written Submissions Findings

### Financial Sustainability

A key issue raised in the submissions was the primary importance of financial sustainability for the councils established as a result of reform and that this has been the benchmark for reform in all parts of Australia. LGANT, APONT and FaHCSIA all stressed the importance of the local government sector in the Northern Territory and the reliance other levels of government have on a strong, financially stable, well resourced local government sector.

LGANT in particular wants assessments done on the financial sustainability of any new council so that they are not commencing from a parlous financial state. LGANT also stressed that they did not want to see the net benefits of the funds allocated in the 2013-14 Territory Budget lost in the creation of new regional councils which are not financially sustainable.

### Principles underpinning reform

A number of submissions proposed underlying principles which should govern the reform beyond the notion of financial sustainability.

The Australian Human Rights Commission noted that elements must be grounded in and promote the principles of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples:

- Self-determination
- Free, prior and informed consent
- Participation in decision-making
- Non-discrimination and equality

The 2012 Social Justice Report made two recommendations about governance in the Northern Territory. First, Governments invest in developing and strengthening governance structures and systems in Aboriginal communities to ensure they are culturally legitimate and aligned to community needs and priorities. And second, that any reforms to governance arrangements be done in genuine consultation, and where appropriate in partnership, with the Aboriginal communities affected. Consultations should be undertaken in accordance with the features of meaningful and effective consultation contained in the *Native Title Report 2010*.

LGANT suggested that there are some "minimum principles" of local government reform that should be considered in any structural reform agenda including:

- the optimum population size in a local government area
- adherence in a democratic society to election of a local government
- maintenance of the overall system of local government
- adherence to basic principles of democracy (adult franchise, choice of candidates and majority vote)

### **Relation to and responsibility of other levels of government**

Victoria Daly Shire Council reiterated the concern that negative views and opinions voiced about the Shires has often been made as a direct result of the policies, program guidelines and activities that were the responsibility of the Territory and Commonwealth Governments.

CLC recommended that any proposed reform should reflect “the consistent call from Aboriginal people for regional and local Aboriginal governance models that extend beyond the narrow purview of local government”. Further, they recommended that Aboriginal people and their organisations, the Territory and Australian Governments agree on a framework for negotiating a comprehensive Aboriginal governance arrangement, including allowing sufficient time and allocating sufficient resources for genuine Aboriginal governance development work.

### **Community communications**

Given the common confusion among community members as to the role of local government as against other levels of government a concerted plan and communications strategy needs to be designed and rolled out to help community members fully understand the role of Local Government in the NT today.

The notion of a complaints mechanism that provides a clear path for residents to seek redress of ongoing unresolved issues is important.

### **Service Standards**

The establishment of a consistent set of Local Government service standards for core Local Government activities which can be undertaken and measured by each Shire with input from community and assistance of government.

### **Cost of reform**

The potential costs of the likely reform were highlighted in a number of submissions and the possibility that funding for badly needed services would be diverted into “window dressing” of minimalist changes.

LGANT noted that the following items would require substantial additional dedicated funding:

- establishment costs (offices, personnel, information and communications technologies (ICT), equipment and other asset transfers and provision)
- ‘re-branding’ costs associated with changes of names
- process costs to do with ‘local authorities’
- land lease transfer costs for properties on Aboriginal land
- the election costs for new councils
- elected member costs (more members, more meetings, increased transport costs)
- costs associated with changing contracts, both commercial and industrial.

### **Boundaries**

While there was some discussion of possible boundary changes many respondents felt this matter should be the subject of later, more detailed consultations. LGANT suggested that the reform should

include the councils of Wagait, Belyuen and Coomalie and further consideration be given to the large unincorporated area surrounding these smaller shires.

The ALC believes that decisions relating to the towns of Groote Eylandt should be made on the island and not in Darwin and Nhulunbuy. The Warnindilyakwa people believe a Regional Authority should be established on Groote Eylandt.

### **Excision of the pastoral estate from local government**

The crisis in regional governance in the NT is a crisis of ineffective government policy and interventions in remote communities. The NTCA's firm view is that this is where the NT Government must start, with expansion of a model to the broader remote-based land mass and constituency if and when it can be empirically demonstrated that the model is:

- fit for purpose,
- financially sustainable
- capable of applying a rates and charges system that is equitable across the constituency and does not unfairly financially penalise any given group
- has the capacity, will and resources to deliver relevant services to all constituents

Until then, the pastoral estate must be excised from local government incorporated areas. Alternatively, a system of rate-payment exemptions must be applied to pastoralists in any new model that is implemented. Pastoralists have received no benefit from the existing Shire Council model, and have been forced to pay rates and charges for, literally, nothing in return. This critical issue has not been addressed in the review process or the proposed models. This is divisive and unacceptable.

## **Comments on Option 1**

There was generally strong support for the Local Authority/Regional Council model although some concern about how it would be funded. Many of the proposed functions of Local Authorities are reflected in best practice among the current Shire Councils. Some expressed scepticism that the Local Authorities would actually bring "real decision making control at the local level" and that Option 1 should not be implemented because it would bring little tangible gain and create further confusion..

### **Local Boards**

CLC conducted a survey of Local Boards in 2010 and found that while Shires had established local boards in all major communities and were supporting their development through training and resourcing of meetings, there are a number of structural and procedural issues (beyond the Shires control) that limit the effectiveness of the local boards as a mechanism for local decision making.

The research found that the selection process for membership on a local board was not well understood by community members with some suggesting that shire staff picked board members. The local boards were not seen as strong representatives or a legitimate body for the community. The lack of responsiveness of the shires to community issues or requests raised at local board meetings was found to be a significant factor leading to decreased interest and participation in meetings. This lack of response to community issues was due, in part, to the limited scope of local government functions.

There were widespread views expressed that conveyed fundamental concerns with the imposed structures and procedures of local boards. Participants raised the following concerns:

*"There used to be Anangu [Aboriginal people] and whitefellas working together. I was a councillor before. Anangu and whitefellas worked together, they were level in that council.*

*"Everyone in the council used to talk. Now there's lots of white people in the meeting. Make me shamed, feel no good. I don't feel like talking. I am a bit shy".*

Local boards were seen as less representative, had less authority, less decision making power and less capacity to resolve community issues than community councils and it was felt that there was a lack of relationships between shire staff and Aboriginal people .

### **Strengthening Local Boards, the Local Authority**

There was strong support for:

- strengthening Local Boards with a budget for the pursuit of stronger community consultation and expanded local action plans;
- Board minutes and action plans to be tabled at Council meetings;
- a stronger role in planning linking long-term community plans to the Shire Plan; and,
- better communication between the Council, the Board and the community.

There was also support for an expansion of current practice of providing a budget to Local Boards for their decision making on non-core expenditure such as for local activities, events, trophies, discos for youth or gardening equipment etc. It is proposed that Local Authorities would be allocated a specific local budget for allocation towards repairs and maintenance programs and personal services.

However, CLC stated, that without any indication as to the extent of budget allocation or mechanisms for expenditure it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which this will alleviate concerns regarding local control. It is not clear how the legislative provisions for Local Authorities will differ from those providing for local boards given it is already possible for Shires to delegate functions to local boards.

### **Single Consultative Group**

The proliferation of consultation bodies within communities was widely acknowledged to be problematic. The concept of a single entity that has the authority to speak on behalf of the community in respect of most NT and Commonwealth government consultation was generally supported.

However FaHCSIA noted that, if the Local Authority becomes the only consultative group at the community level, a further consideration is the broad and extensive range of issues a Local Authority will need to discuss and/or influence. It is worth considering if one advisory group will have the capacity to effectively represent community interests across all issues.

FaHCSIA noted that findings from reviews of local government in far west New South Wales suggest that a clear governance structure, which delineates between the role of Council and the local authority is integral to effective governance. The Regional Council option would be strengthened with the inclusion of a risk management strategy that examines how the option will meet service delivery requirements within the proposed structure.

CLC noted that “local communities will need to feel sufficient ownership of the Local Authority to support it to be the primary ‘community voice’. Certainly, local boards do not appear to have achieved this degree of legitimacy and it is not clear what governance development work will be done to ensure that the Local Authorities are seen to be legitimate, representative and effective”. While recognising the absurdity of the explosion of unpaid community consultative groups with no decision-making powers CLC’s experience with the Lajamanu governance project demonstrates that developing a truly legitimate governance arrangement takes time, resources and development expertise.

Local institutions of governance in Aboriginal towns now have little coherence, interconnectivity or practical collaboration owing to the plethora of informal advisory committees, task forces, working groups, reference groups and boards. Many have been created and run by government departments for the purpose of delivering outcomes on already-formulated government policy and service goals. For example, in Lajamanu there are over 30 such informal structures with over 60 Yapa men and women on these committees and reference groups (mostly receiving no sitting fees), primarily to give practical effect to government policies and service-delivery goals, but with no role in actually making the policies themselves. They remain highly skeptical as to whether their input is considered and/or valued by those who consult them.

The membership, terms of reference, structure and establishment of a Local Authority will require significant negotiation with all relevant stakeholders at the local level.

Victoria Daly Shire Council proposed that, with the formation of Local Authorities, the Shire Services Manager would become the Local Authority General Manager responsible to:

- prepare operational reports for the general meetings of the local authority
- liaise with the regional administration centre to prepare financial, asset, agency services, HR and capital works reports;
- facilitate the meetings of the local authority;
- report the decisions of the local authority to the regional council;
- provide necessary administrative support to the local authority.

Adequate resourcing will be required to support these activities.

CLCs view Option 1 was that it is:

- not significantly different to the current arrangements;
- unlikely to deliver significantly greater local control;
- unclear about how (nor what) economic development will be progressed;
- based on assertions, particularly of the potential legitimacy of the Local Authority model, without providing any detail about how this would be achieved; and
- not based on Aboriginal community governance principles or priorities.

The NTCA position is that proposed models presented in the Options Paper ignores what is a fundamentally flawed system and structure, and do not address the cause of the recurring crises in regional governance in the NT. They state that “simply rearranging regional governance structures, as the proposed models do, is dooming the NT to yet another model that will fail”.

## Comments on Option 2

While most respondents considered Option 1 as a critical first step in introducing reform Central Land Council (CLC), Desert Knowledge (DKA), the Anindilyakwa Land Council (ALC) and Alyawarr Ingkerr-Wenh (AIWAC) expressed support for the Regional Authority model. In the consideration of a phased approach, DKA believe the best approach to address the short term changes necessary sits with Option 2. The strength of this model is that local authorities have clearly defined tasks that can be controlled and managed locally that cascade up to a regional council.

DKA also considers that Option 2 also provides the best foundation upon which to build the structures necessary to address the deeper issues and tackle the longer term issues, address duplication, and that can establish shared purpose and focus for the region so enable stable regional, economic and community development. CLC asserted that a great deal more work, including extensive on-ground consultation, to address the many complex factors needed to develop a new governance arrangement.

CLC agreed with the proposition that Option 2 is a longer term goal but was strongly of the view that work needs to commence immediately on negotiating a framework for moving towards this longer term goal. However they do acknowledge this require bringing Northern Territory, Commonwealth, and key stakeholders together to support a common agenda, with each party having a clearly defined mandate, associated resourcing and clear accountabilities.

DKA proposes that a supervising entity, a Regional Board, emerges beyond the Regional Authority, is co-developed by the parties that negotiates these responsibilities and sits above the parties.

AIWAC proposes a regional model for Local Government services in all the Alyawarr language speaking communities and outstations in the Barkly area including Epenarra, Canteen Creek, Murray Downs, Ampilatwatja and Alpurrurulam. It also includes associated outstations and some of the Eastern outstations of Utopia.

The ALC views Groote Eylandt as being in a unique position to establish a Regional Authority and that it would be immensely beneficial to the region. The ALC wishes to work closely with DLG to ensure a suitably funded model is established to deliver core and non-core services on Groote and Bickerton islands. It is proposed that the responsibilities that the ALC has taken on under the Regional Partnership Agreement be implemented and resourced under a Regional Authority.

As noted by FaHCSIA the establishment of a Regional Authority would require continuing agreement from the Australian and Northern Territory governments and present significant challenges to the current funding arrangements of these governments, as well as cost challenges.

LGANT does not support the concept of a Regional Authority because it is not democratic and does not maintain the system of local government. LGANT does, however, support having a partnership agreement with the Northern Territory government.

### **Change management**

Victoria Daly Shire suggested that a technically resourced Transition Reference Group be established made up of members of the affected local governments, LGANT and public servants. It would develop, debate and produce the framework for the new local government policy position, including to:

- develop content for the regulation that establishes the new arrangements;
- establish a workforce subcommittee for the development of a 'workforce code of practice' ;
- determine the distribution of cash, liabilities, assets and employees (if required).

The committee would also review and highlight any opportunities to improve the policy position throughout the planning and change management phase.

## **Option 3: CLC proposal - Regional authority/assembly**

(An integrated approach with both short and longer term goals and actions)

We currently have an unworkable governance environment in Central Australia as a consequence of pendulum-swinging policy initiatives and poor implementation over many decades, combined with governments at all levels being unable to consider and make the necessary systemic adjustments.

These informal community institutions invariably operate as pipelines to silos, reporting back to their founding departmental or centralised agencies. Incorporated Aboriginal organisations in communities and regions are also part of this patchwork, and are routinely overloaded with program administration and financial compliance, at the same time as being underfunded to do their real jobs on the ground.

Local boards in communities are simply attached to another such silo within communities. As such they further undermine the potential for more cohesive community governance solutions to arise. Furthermore, *regionalisation* of local government has effectively been set up to fail as a result of severe underfunding from the NT Government, whilst at the same time being expected to assume greater responsibility for smaller Aboriginal communities and program initiatives funded by *both* the NT and Australian Governments.

Revision and reform to local government in the NT has been constant, with almost *annual* changes to

government policy, programs, departmental structures, Ministerial portfolio responsibility, and funding arrangements. At all levels of government there appears to be no single Minister or department responsible for taking an overall holistic view of the impact of such changes on Aboriginal people. Despite the rhetoric from successive NT Governments, Aboriginal people have been, and continue to be, left outside the policy-making process itself..

These 'governance-disempowering' initiatives by government include, for example, the Intervention; the undermining of the permit system; removal of homelands funding; removal of the CDEP scheme; removal of ICHOs and the wholesale transfer of community housing to Territory Housing; and statutory community councils being replaced by advisory local boards. Such initiatives, when combined with the dramatic increase in government-created informal committees in communities, have seriously eroded Aboriginal people's own governance authority, experience and confidence.

The CLC knows that fiddling around the edges of broken, impoverished government policy will not work. There is a clear need for a governance vision that goes beyond service provision, financial compliance regulation, and the implementation of interventionist government policies.

We need a governance vision that:

- includes innovative Aboriginal solutions, cultural preferences and decision-making;
- enables more integrated networked governance on the ground;
- will win the support of Aboriginal people as being legitimate; and,
- is committed to building practical and effective governance capacity and resilience over the long haul.

The CLC puts forward the following proposal as an alternative.

1. An 18 month Negotiation Phase:
  - negotiation of possible new Aboriginal governance arrangements for both community and regional governance open to the evidence and to innovative concepts
  - sustained and backed by a collaborative government mandate.
2. Development of Models and Options (for both community and regional levels):
  - models for more cohesive community and/or regional governance arrangements assessed
  - refined as a series of 'Innovative Aboriginal Governance Demonstration Projects'.
3. Negotiation Principles and Process:
  - agreed set of operating principles and processes relevant to the region.
  - acknowledgement that Aboriginal people have legally-enforceable land rights, holdings and resources; have existing cultural geographies and traditions of governance; and can pursue culturally-informed governance for their communities.
4. Fiscal Revamp:
  - Central Australia presently has an inadequate economic base to support the infrastructure and capital requirements needed for effective governance solutions.
  - fiscal federalism allows NTG to apply revenue assessed by the Grants Commission against the needs of communities to be allocated elsewhere. This loophole must be closed to ensure governance strategies are properly resourced.
5. Governance Rationalisation:
  - myriad of government-created informal governing structures would be rationalized
  - create a more streamlined, cohesive community governance environment
6. Local Government:
  - local government solutions part of a holistic package of bottom-up, Aboriginal governance solutions, not the cause of further fracturing and competition.
  - Local Boards given devolved decision-making role with respect to current local government services and funding priorities (under existing legislative provisions) and form part of a new *Community Governance Aboriginal Working Group*
  - the *Local Government Act (NT)* would need to be reviewed
7. Localism and Networked Regionalism:

- 'bottom-up' approach via *Community Governance Working Groups* is able to develop their *own* local solutions and put forward proposals for more regionally networked approaches; for example, via a set of culturally-aligned communities forming a network into a Regional Authority or Regional Assembly model based on a specific cultural geography.
8. CLC support:
- CLC prepared to assist by giving effect to a comprehensive communication and negotiation process in its region, so agreed models are based on informed support and have wide credibility and a greater chance of successful implementation.

The CLC looks forward to discussing Option 3 with all relevant parties.

DRAFT

# ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

## Questions Taken on Notice

2013

Date: 26 June 2013

Output Group: Local Government

Output: 8.0

Subject: Consultation for Local Government Reform

From: Ms Lynne Walker MLA  
Member for Nhulunbuy

To: Hon Alison Anderson MLA

Department of Local Government

---

**Number:** 9.13

**Question:** Consultation Process for the Local Government Reform:

List of dates for all consultations that were held (and actually proceeded) including:  
The people present at those meetings;  
When a particular community was promised a second consultation; and  
report of the main issues that were raised at these meetings

---

**Answer:**

A list of dates for the consultations is at Attachment A.

There were a broad range of stakeholders present at the meetings including community members, Shire Councillors, Shire staff, Traditional Owners, Government Engagement Coordinators and service providers.

An interim report on the main issues that were raised at these meetings, which was provided to the Regional Governance Working Group, is at Attachment B.

---

---

Community	Visit Date	Meeting Size	Visit Stage		Total Meetings
			Visit 1	Visit 2	
			No. Meetings	No. Meetings	
Alcoota	16/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	14/May	1 on 1		3	3
	14/May	6 to 10		1	1
Ali Curung	1/May	21 to 50	1		1
	2/May	1 on 1		1	1
	14/May	1 on 1		1	1
	5/Jun	6 to 10		1	1
Alice Springs	11/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	11/Jun	11 to 20	1		1
Alpurrurulam	21/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	22/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	6/May	11 to 20		1	1
Amanbidji	23/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	3/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
	3/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Amoonguna	21/Mar	11 to 20	1		1
	6/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Ampilatwatja	28/Mar	100 +	1		1
	20/May	1 on 1		2	2
	21/May	6 to 10		1	1
Angurugu	21/Mar	11 to 20	1		1
Areyonga	8/May	21 to 50	1		1
	30/May	2 to 5		1	1
Arlparra	25/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	11/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Barunga	16/Apr	2 to 5	2		2
	16/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
Beswick	15/May	6 to 10	2		2
	12/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Binjari	23/May	11 to 20		1	1
Borrooloola	13/Mar	1 on 1	2		2
	13/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	14/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	18/Apr	11 to 20	2		2
	30/May	11 to 20		1	1
Bulla	23/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	6/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Bulman	20/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	21/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	21/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	30/Apr	11 to 20	2		2
	22/May	11 to 20		1	1
Canteen Creek	19/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	24/Apr	2 to 5		1	1
	16/May	2 to 5		1	1
Corella Creek	17/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
Dockar River	23/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	23/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	13/Jun	6 to 10		1	1

Answer to QON 9.13 - Attachment A

Community	Visit Date	Meeting Size	Visit Stage		Total Meetings
			Visit 1	Visit 2	
			No. Meetings	No. Meetings	
Elliott	7/May	1 on 1		1	1
	8/May	1 on 1		1	1
	8/May	2 to 5		1	1
	4/Jun	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Emerald Springs</b>	30/May	1 on 1		1	1
<b>Emu Point</b>	17/May	1 on 1		1	1
Finke	20/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	11/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	9/May	21 to 50		1	1
	29/May	11 to 20		1	1
Galiwin'ku	26/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	23/May	6 to 10		1	1
	5/Jun	6 to 10		3	3
Gapuwiyak	23/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	13/Jun	21 to 50		1	1
Gunbalunya	2/May	11 to 20	1		1
	13/May	11 to 20	1		1
	13/Jun	21 to 50		1	1
Haasts Bluff	19/Mar	21 to 50	2		2
	29/May	6 to 10		1	1
Harts Range	17/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	15/May	11 to 20		1	1
	15/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Imangara</b>	2/May	11 to 20	1		1
Imanpa	26/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	26/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	12/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Jabiru	13/May	11 to 20	1		1
	14/May	1 on 1	1		1
	14/May	2 to 5	1		1
	11/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
<b>Jilkminggan</b>	4/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Kalkarindji	25/Mar	1 on 1	2		2
	25/Mar	2 to 5	2		2
	28/May	21 to 50		1	1
Katherine	19/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	15/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	15/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	30/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
Kintore	14/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	14/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	16/May	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Kybrook Farm</b>	29/May	2 to 5		1	1
Lajamanu	1/May	21 to 50	2		2
	5/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
	5/Jun	6 to 10		1	1
Laramba	17/Apr	2 to 5	2		2
	21/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Larrimah</b>	7/May	2 to 5	2		2

Answer to QON 9.13 - Attachment A

Community	Visit Date	Meeting Size	Visit Stage		Total Meetings
			Visit 1	Visit 2	
			No. Meetings	No. Meetings	
<b>Ltyentye Apurte</b>	26/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	26/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	4/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
<b>Maningrida</b>	8/May	1 on 1	4		4
	8/May	11 to 20	1		1
	22/May	6 to 10		1	1
	22/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Mary River Roadhouse</b>	23/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
<b>Mataranka</b>	7/May	11 to 20	2		2
	25/May	2 to 5		1	1
	4/Jun	1 on 1		1	1
	4/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
	6/Jun	1 on 1		1	1
<b>Milikapiti</b>	26/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	26/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	16/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	23/May	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Milingimbi</b>	17/May	11 to 20	1		1
	29/May	2 to 5		1	1
	29/May	6 to 10		1	1
	29/May	11 to 20		2	2
	30/May	2 to 5		2	2
<b>Milyakburra</b>	2/May	6 to 10	1		1
<b>Minjilang</b>	30/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
<b>Minyerri</b>	8/May	11 to 20	2		2
	5/Jun	51 to 100		1	1
<b>Molingi Busby</b>	3/May	1 on 1		1	1
<b>Mt Liebig</b>	12/Mar	11 to 20	1		1
	12/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	30/May	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Mungkarta</b>	13/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
<b>Mutitjulu</b>	18/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
<b>Naiyu</b>	24/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	25/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	26/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	26/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	1/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
<b>Nganmariyanga</b>	13/Mar	1 on 1	2		2
	13/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	8/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Ngukurr</b>	23/May	6 to 10	1		1
	23/May	11 to 20	2		2
	16/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
<b>North Barkly Homelands</b>	17/Apr	N/A	1		1
<b>Ntaria</b>	28/May	11 to 20	1		1
	12/Jun	1 on 1		1	1

Answer to QON 9.13 - Attachment A

Community	Visit Date	Meeting Size	Visit Stage		Total Meetings
			Visit 1	Visit 2	
			No. Meetings	No. Meetings	
<b>Numbulwar</b>	3/Jun	1 on 1		1	1
	4/Jun	11 to 20		2	2
	12/Jun	1 on 1		1	1
	12/Jun	2 to 5		3	3
	12/Jun	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Nyirripi</b>	22/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	29/May	11 to 20		1	1
<b>Papunya</b>	20/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	20/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	15/May	2 to 5		1	1
	29/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Peppimenarti</b>	11/Mar	2 to 5	3		3
	11/Mar	11 to 20	1		1
	7/May	11 to 20		1	1
<b>Pigeon Hole</b>	19/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	28/May	11 to 20		1	1
<b>Pine Creek</b>	21/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	21/Mar	11 to 20	1		1
	22/Mar	2 to 5	2		2
	23/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	29/May	2 to 5		1	1
<b>Pirlangimpi</b>	17/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	18/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	28/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Pmara Jutunta</b>	16/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	13/May	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Ramingining</b>	29/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	18/May	21 to 50	1		1
<b>Robinson River</b>	29/May	6 to 10		1	1
<b>Sabina</b>	2/May	2 to 5	1		1
<b>Tara</b>	12/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	12/Jun	N/A		1	1
<b>Tennant Creek</b>	20/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
	19/Apr	1 on 1	1		1
	9/May	6 to 10	1		1
	21/May	6 to 10		1	1
	14/Jun	6 to 10	1		1
<b>Ti Tree</b>	16/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	17/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	13/May	2 to 5		1	1
<b>Timber Creek</b>	24/Apr	2 to 5	1		1
	24/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	5/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
<b>Titjikala</b>	19/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	19/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	5/Jun	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Top Springs</b>	30/May	2 to 5		2	2
<b>Umbakumba</b>	2/May	11 to 20	1		1
	22/May	21 to 50		1	1
<b>Utopia Homelands</b>	25/Mar	6 to 10	1		1

Answer to QON 9.13 - Attachment A

Community	Visit Date	Meeting Size	Visit Stage		Total Meetings
			Visit 1	Visit 2	
			No. Meetings	No. Meetings	
Wadeye	12/Mar	1 on 1	3		3
	12/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	12/Mar	6 to 10	2		2
	12/Mar	21 to 50	1		1
	14/May	1 on 1		1	1
	15/May	11 to 20		1	1
	16/May	11 to 20		3	3
Wallace Rockhole	14/Mar	11 to 20	2		2
	12/Jun	1 on 1		1	1
	12/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
Warruwi	30/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	5/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
	17/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Willowra	24/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	23/May	6 to 10		1	1
Wilora	16/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	13/May	11 to 20		1	1
Wogyala	16/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
Woolianna	30/May	2 to 5		1	1
Wudicupidiya	30/Apr	1 on 1	1		1
	2/May	1 on 1	1		1
	2/May	2 to 5	1		1
	3/May	1 on 1	1		1
Wurrumiyanga	12/Apr	1 on 1	1		1
	23/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	30/Apr	2 to 5	1		1
	30/Apr	6 to 10	1		1
	1/May	2 to 5	1		1
	1/May	11 to 20	1		1
	10/May	2 to 5	1		1
	12/Jun	21 to 50		1	1
Wutunugurra	23/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	16/May	1 on 1		2	2
Yarralin	7/May	1 on 1	3		3
	7/May	2 to 5	1		1
	30/May	2 to 5		1	1
Yirrkala	22/Apr	21 to 50	1		1
	23/May	11 to 20		1	1
	12/Jun	2 to 5		1	1
	12/Jun	11 to 20		1	1
Yuelamu	17/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	30/May	21 to 50		1	1
Yuendumu	23/Apr	11 to 20	1		1
	22/May	21 to 50		1	1
Manyallaluk	19/Mar	1 on 1	1		1
	19/Mar	2 to 5	1		1
	19/Mar	6 to 10	1		1
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>164</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>282</b>