

Realising the Potential

A review of the
Army Aboriginal Community Assistance
Programme (AACAP)

A collaborative report researched and
prepared by
the Australian Government
Department of the Prime Minister and
Cabinet
and
the Australian Army

Written by

Bridadier Darren Naumann AM
and
Ms Katrina Jocumsen

Phone: 02 6271 5111

Fax: 02 6271 5414

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
PO Box 6500, Canberra, ACT, 2600, Australia

Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme, 2017 Review: Realising the Potential

© Commonwealth of Australia 2017

This work is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this material in unaltered form only (retaining this notice and imagery metadata) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your family or organisation.

This material cannot be used to imply an endorsement from or an association with the Department of Defence without the written permission of the Department of Defence (obtained through the Defence Web Manager). Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968 (for example, "fair dealing" for the purposes of reporting news under section 103B of the Copyright Act), all other rights are reserved.

Bona fide news media organisations only may republish and archive photographs and other material from the Defence web site for reporting news free of charge and without seeking further authorisation from the Commonwealth, subject to the following conditions:

Commonwealth copyright and Department of Defence origin must be appropriately acknowledged with status at least equal to other credits;

1. Users may not purport to license or assign copyright to other parties; and may not charge customers for its intellectual content; although they may charge for their production, research and retrieval, and distribution components of republishing;
2. Material must not be used in advertising, displays, other web sites, or in any public or mass media context other than reporting news, without specific written authorisation from the Department of Defence; and
3. The Commonwealth reserves all other rights.
4. To obtain a Commercial, Reproduce and Share video and imagery licence, please contact Defence Multimedia defence.multimedia@defence.gov.au. Provide links to the specific video and imagery and a detailed explanation of the intended use of the product.
5. Over any Caretaker period, the use of photos that contain military personnel should be avoided to ensure that there is no unintended "politicisation" of the Australian Defence Force.

Use of the Australian Army Rising Sun Emblem

For terms of use of the Army's Rising Sun Emblem contact the Army Brand Manager at: army.brandmanager@defence.gov.au

Attribution

This work should be attributed as follows, *Source: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Australian Army, Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme, 2017 Review: Realising the Potential.*

If you have adapted, modified or transformed this work in anyway, please use the following, *Source: based on Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Australian Army, Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme, 2017 Review: Realising the Potential.*

An appropriate reference for this publication is:

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Australian Army 2017, *Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme, 2017 Review: Realising the Potential*, Canberra.

Publication and media enquiries

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Media enquiries, phone: +61 2 6271 6039 or email: media@pmc.gov.au

Defence Media, phone +61 2 6127 1999 or email: media@defence.gov.au

The Australian Government:

- Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet; and
- Australian Army

31 October 2017

Lieutenant General Angus Campbell AO, DSC Chief of Army
Department of Defence Canberra
ACT 2601

Mr Andrew Tongue
Associate Secretary
Indigenous Affairs
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet PO
Box 6500
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Mr Tongue and Lieutenant General Campbell,

In accordance with the terms of reference at Appendix A to this report, dated September 2016, we have the pleasure in submitting to you the Final Report, the *Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme 2017 Review: Realising the Potential* for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Darren Naumann AM
Brigadier
Australian Army

AACAP Review, Co-Chair

Katrina Jocumsen
Senior Adviser
Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

AACAP Review, Co-Chair

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

Realising the Potential	1
1. TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	10
111. ABBREVIATIONS.....	11
1V. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	12
Background.....	12
Purpose of the Review	12
Methodology.....	13
Findings.....	13
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
Infrastructure enhancements	16
Sustainability Enhancements.....	16
Employment and Training Enhancements.....	17
Community Selection Enhancements.....	17
Cultural and Community Engagement Enhancements.....	18
Governance Enhancements	18
Maintain and communicate what is working well	19
CHAPTER 1: CONTEXT OF REVIEW	20
1.1 Context of Review	20
1.2 Background.....	20
1.2.1 History	20
1.2.2 Programme Overview and Methodology	22
1.3 Scope of the Review.....	23
1.4 Conduct of the Review.....	23
1.4.1 Desktop Review	24
1.4.3 Stakeholder Interviews	24
1.5 A guide to this report.....	24
CHAPTER 2: INFRASTRUCTURE.....	26
2.1 AACAP Objectives.....	26
2.2 AACAP Process.....	26
2.3 Key Observations.....	27
2.3.1 General	27
2.3.2 Housing.....	27
2.3.4 Health Clinics.....	28

2.3.5 Multi-Purpose Centres.....	28
2.3.6 Other Observations	28
2.4 Recommendations	29
CHAPTER 3: HEALTH	31
3.1 AACAP Objective.....	31
3.2 AACAP Process	31
3.2.1 Environmental Health Support	32
3.2.2 First Aid Training	32
3.2.3 Lessons on healthy living	32
3.2.4 Physical Training and Education Programmes	32
3.2.5 Dental Services.....	32
3.2.6 Veterinary Services.....	32
3.3 Key Observations.....	32
3.4 Recommendations.....	34
CHAPTER 4: TRAINING	36
4.1 AACAP Objective.....	36
4.2 AACAP Process	36
4.3 Key Observations.....	36
4.4 Recommendations	39
CHAPTER 5: EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	40
5.1 AACAP Objective.....	40
5.2 AACAP Process	40
5.3 Key Observations.....	40
5.3.1 Employment.....	40
5.3.2 Economic Development Opportunities	41
5.4 Recommendations	43
CHAPTER 6: COMMUNITY SELECTION.....	44
6.1 AACAP Process	44
6.2 Key Observations	45
6.3 Recommendations	46
CHAPTER 7: CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	47
7.1 AACAP Process	47
7.2 Cultural Preparedness	47
7.2.1 Army	47
7.2.2 Prime Minister and Cabinet.....	48
7.3 Key Observations.....	48
7.4 Recommendations	52
CHAPTER 8: PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE.....	53

8.1 Governance Framework.....	53
8.2 Performance Indicators.....	53
8.3 Structure	53
8.3.1 Steering Committee.....	53
8.3.2 Project Boards	54
8.3.3 Site Meetings	54
8.4 Documentation.....	54
8.4.1 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)	54
8.4.3 Reports.....	55
8.5 Funding	55
8.6 Public Relations.....	56
8.6.1 Media and Communications	56
8.7 Key Observations.....	56
8.7.1 Structure	56
8.7.2 Documentation.....	57
8.7.3 Efficiency.....	57
8.7.4 Public Relations	58
8.8 Recommendations.....	59
CHAPTER 9: SUMMARY and FINDINGS.....	60
9.1 Summary Findings.....	60
APPENDIX A: Terms of Reference	61
2017 Review of AACAP.....	61
Scope of the Review.....	61
APPENDIX B: List of Previous AACAP Locations	63
Year.....	63
Location	63
State.....	63
APPENDIX C: AACAP Review Reference Panel Terms of Reference	64
Background.....	64
Role of the Reference Panel.....	64
Timing.....	65
Appendix D: AACAP Review Reference Panel.....	66
Lieutenant Colonel Ron Baumgart.....	66
Mr Joseph Elu	66
Ms Jessica Spencer	66
APPENDIX E: Communities and Sites Visited	67
Table E1: Communities Visited	67
Western Australia.....	67

Northern Territory	67
South Australia	67
Queensland.....	67
Table E2: Sites Visited	67
APPENDIX F: Stakeholder Consultations.....	68
Table F1: Stakeholder Consultations.....	68
Australian Army.....	68
Department - Prime Minister & Cabinet	68
Other Stakeholders.....	68
APPENDIX G: Detailed Observations	69
Section 1: Infrastructure	69
G1.1 Housing	69
G1.2 Health Clinics	69
G1.3 Multi-Purpose Centres	69
G1.4 Service Provider Accommodation (SPA)	70
G1.5 Waste Water Treatment Systems & Waste Management Facilities.....	71
G1.6 Roads, Drainage and Footpaths.....	71
G1.7 Airstrips	71
G1.8 Repair and Maintenance	71
G1.9 Delivery of household and water efficiency education	72
Appendix G, Section 2: Health	74
G2.1 Dental Services	74
G2.2 Veterinary Services	74
G2.3 Physical and Education Training Services.....	74
G2.4 Enhanced Health Services	74
Appendix G, Section 3: Training.....	76
G3.1 Training Opportunities	76
G3.2 Employment Opportunities.....	76
Appendix G, Section 4: Employment and Economic Development.....	77
G4.1 Employment During Projects.....	77
G4.2 ADF Recruitment Activities.....	77
G4.3 Tourism	78
G4.4 Economic Development	79
G4.5 Caravan Parks	80
G4.6 Cultural/Arts Centres	80
G4.7 Cafes and Canteens.....	80
G4.8 Cultural Tours/Walking Trails/Cattle Drives	81
G4.9 Market Gardens.....	82
G4.10 Donkey Holding Yards	82
G4.11 Car Crushing.....	82

G4.12 Worm Farming.....	82
Appendix G, Section 5: Community Selection.....	84
G5.1 Use of Army’s knowledge to assist with identifying communities	84
Appendix G, Section 6: Community Engagement.....	85
G6.1 Temporary/Mobile Australian Army Cadets	85
Appendix G, Section 7: Governance	87
G7.1 Documentation.....	87
G7.2 Cost	87
Appendix G, Section 8: General Observations.....	89
REFERENCES.....	90
Final Community Comment.....	92

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: AACAP Review Terms of Reference

Appendix B: Map of AACAP locations

Appendix C: AACAP Review Reference Panel Terms of Reference

Appendix D: AACAP Review Reference Panel Biographies Appendix

E: Communities visited

Appendix F: Stakeholders consulted

Appendix G: Detailed Observations

11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report was commissioned by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C) and the Australian Army. The findings and recommendations do not constitute agreement or endorsement from the Australian Government.

The review team was led by Brigadier Darren Naumann (Army) and Ms Katrina Jocumsen (PM&C) and was assisted by Ms Reilley Hardy (PM&C) and Lieutenant Colonel Doug Mitchell (Army).

The review team worked with, and took advice from, a reference panel of senior Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community leaders who provided expert advice on opportunities to leverage AACAP to achieve better outcomes. The panel comprised:

- Ms Jessica Spencer;
- Mr Joseph Elu; and
- Lieutenant Colonel Ron Baumgart.

The review team would like to acknowledge and thank the reference panel members, community members, Army and PM&C personnel for their contributions.

Warning: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are advised this report may contain images or content referring to deceased persons. It may also contain words or descriptions that are culturally sensitive. The term Indigenous is occasionally used in this report to refer to Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

NOTE: A version of the Review that includes photographs can be obtained on request by emailing aacap@pmc.gov.au

111. ABBREVIATIONS

AACAP	Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme
ADF	Australian Defence Force
AIDP	Army Indigenous Development Programme
ANAO	Australian National Audit Office
ATSIC	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission
COAG	Council of Australian Governments
CDP	Community Development Programme
IAS	Indigenous Advancement Strategy MoU Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NORFORCE	North West Mobile Force
PM&C	Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
PMG	Project Management Guidelines
RFSU	Regional Force Surveillance Units
SPA	Service Provider Accommodation
SoW	Scope of Work
TDO	Training Development Officer
ToR	Terms of Reference
51 FNQR	51 Far North Queensland Regiment

IV. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme (AACAP) is a joint initiative between the Australian Army and PM&C. The Programme began in 1996 and is an ongoing commitment that reinforces the strong association between Army, PM&C and Australia's First Peoples.

The primary objective of AACAP is to achieve broad environmental health outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders by delivering an holistic package of assistance aimed at improving infrastructure, primary and environmental health and living conditions within remote Indigenous communities. For Army, the opportunity to exercise and test various operational capabilities through the planning and execution of AACAP projects presents a significant training benefit.

Since the Programme's inception, 43 AACAP projects have been delivered in 41 communities across Australia (refer to AACAP locations map at Appendix B). AACAP commenced with initial funding of \$11.7 million across 1997-2000 with a further \$107 million committed by the Australian Government from 2000-01 to 2017-18. Currently the Programme is funded from the Indigenous Advancement Strategy (IAS) through the Indigenous Affairs Group, PM&C at \$7 million each financial year, with Army providing in-kind support to each project to a notional similar value.

Under current arrangements, as provided in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which sets the strategic direction, working arrangements and funding processes for the AACAP, one AACAP project is undertaken in a remote community (or communities where location permits) each calendar year. Each project is tailored to meet the specific needs of the recipient community and consists of a construction, health and training component. When possible, Army also utilises its resources to undertake 'tasks of opportunity' that deliver additional benefits above and beyond the planned scope.

AACAP projects are managed through Army's 19th Chief Engineer Works and delivered by engineers from the 6th Engineer Support Regiment, with support drawn from across Army and occasionally the wider Australian Defence Force (ADF) and international partners.

The Programme is managed centrally by PM&C's National Office, which also co-chairs the Steering Committee with Army for each project. PM&C's Regional Network provides on-location support for each AACAP project.

Purpose of the Review

This review, sponsored jointly by Army and PM&C, is the fourth since the Programme's inception. In accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) at Appendix A, the review provides an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme and recommends potential improvements to leverage greater outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and to ensure Army's training objectives are realised. The findings highlighted in the report will inform the future delivery of the Programme.

Methodology

AACAP is one of a number of programmes aimed at delivering improved living conditions in remote communities and as with many such programmes, there is a lack of empirical data for a quantitative evaluation.

Accordingly, the conduct of the review has been a qualitative process, where an assessment of the effectiveness of the Programme has been measured through engagement with key stakeholders to capture their reflections of the Programme as a whole, or as it applied to their specific circumstances.

Acknowledging the limitations of such an approach, the review team determined the accuracy of any assessment of the Programme's effectiveness could be improved by increasing the size of the sample of communities visited and stakeholders engaged. The validity of themes was assessed by the extent to which they were supported by other data captured through the review process.

Given the Programme relies on funding from PM&C and in-kind support from Army, an assessment of its efficiency is subjective as it is difficult to fully identify or quantify all benefits and associated costs. Therefore, the review team has relied on assessments of past success and performance of the Programme and future assumptions to inform its considerations.

In undertaking its work, the review team conducted a desktop review of past projects, made site visits to 25 AACAP communities (61 per cent), and conducted interviews with key stakeholders.

The review team undertook extensive consultation with community members as part of the community site visits to inform the recommendations. The review team also worked with, and took advice from, a reference panel of senior Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community leaders established to provide expert advice on opportunities to leverage AACAP to achieve better outcomes.

Findings

Overall, the review team found the Programme has been a good example of Commonwealth Government agencies working collaboratively to improve primary and environmental health and living conditions for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, while providing valuable training outcomes for Army. In doing so, the Programme reinforces the strong association between Army and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

AACAP's objectives align with the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) 'Closing the Gap' targets in Indigenous disadvantage and with the Australian Government's IAS. AACAP was found to be an effective means for PM&C and Army to jointly achieve a number of positive outcomes for Indigenous communities.

In simple budget terms, AACAP has always been a small initiative within a larger overall Indigenous Affairs funding environment. Yet its impact in recipient communities is in excess of what might be expected from a similar investment through other initiatives. The health and training services provided by Army make AACAP more than a simple construction programme. These additional services, along with the behaviour consistently modelled by Army's personnel in

communities, have been described as delivering an unquantifiable, but highly valued, social benefit that is the key point of difference between AACAP and other programmes.

The review team found AACAP in its current form is widely regarded by communities as a successful programme that is very effective in meeting its intended objectives. The Programme positively contributes to practical reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians; with communities reporting an improved understanding of, and enhanced respect for Army; and Army reporting increased understanding and appreciation of Indigenous culture.

For Army, AACAP provides a valuable training opportunity to test and exercise its capability at the required readiness levels. This value extends beyond the Army engineers involved in the delivery of infrastructure and includes Army's health professionals, training staff, logistics and operations staff involved in the planning, mounting and sustaining of each project.

Except for a few isolated examples, infrastructure delivered under AACAP was observed to have been well designed, appropriate, and remaining structurally sound.

The provision of specialist facilities or infrastructure such as health clinics, multi-purpose facilities, or waste water treatment systems had significant, far-reaching positive impacts in communities; particularly where the assets were delivered with the support of other agencies, either for delivery or ongoing operation.

The review team found that while project scopes were valued highly, it was often the 'Tasks of Opportunity' delivered by Army that generated the most good will with communities, as they were considered an 'unexpected bonus'. Tasks of Opportunity are works of a minor nature conducted by Army personnel from residual capacity during deployment and may include minor repairs to existing infrastructure and/or the construction of simple non-technical items which can be completed within a short timeframe of one to two weeks and which do not incur an ongoing maintenance liability.

The delivery of health services was particularly well received by communities, with Army's health personnel considered professional and culturally sensitive in their engagement with community members. Dental services and the animal health services provided by Army veterinarians were particularly popular as were sports health programmes, such as AFL training, softball and planned sports days which tapped into the natural sports culture that exists in many Indigenous communities.

Army health staff report the delivery of health services to communities through AACAP offers good clinical skills training for Army's health professionals in a real environment, similar to that likely to be experienced on military operations.

In most cases observed, the training element of AACAP was found to have increased individual and community capability but it could potentially deliver more. When delivered well, and into a motivated, organised and well-governed community, the benefits derived from training can far exceed those of the infrastructure.

For a number of communities training was not always valued, as related employment outcomes appeared not to be readily available to community members. There were some indications of employment outcomes as a direct result of AACAP training, but these were limited to a minority of communities located close to obvious employment sources and direct linkages could not be confirmed.

There was good evidence to suggest broader handy-man type skills (e.g. construction, welding, small engine maintenance) continued to be valued with the skills used by Community Development Programme (CDP) participants and for other general activities. In these circumstances, a strong sense of achievement and pride about undertaking and using the training persisted.

A key indicator of the success of training programmes was the degree to which they aligned with and supported the needs of the community, the employment opportunities available, and the ongoing sustainment support available. Essential to ensuring full consideration of these factors into the design of training programmes is the early engagement of training development staff. The review team considers there is room for improvement in this area as personnel were often not engaged or fully committed to projects until late in the development process.

A number of communities expressed surprise at the absence of targeted ADF recruitment messaging delivered in conjunction with AACAP projects. Community members considered there would be benefit in Army engaging with youth and employment-aged people around military career opportunities. There was also significant support for further focused engagement with community youth during projects.

Community members appreciated the inclusion of International defence force personnel (e.g. Tonga, Papua New Guinea, East Timor) on projects and welcomed the opportunity to engage and share their culture with people from other cultures. Army reported the requirement to exercise and grow its cross-cultural communication skills in order to achieve project outcomes was of benefit.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The review team has identified seven key areas for potential improvement and considers the adoption of these recommendations will strengthen an already effective programme and enable its full potential to be realised into the future.

Infrastructure enhancements

Recommendation 1:

Support and promote the sustainability of infrastructure investment by giving consideration to:

- a. Ensuring infrastructure designs are robust, align with community and/or end-user capacity and capability and have minimal operational, repair and maintenance requirements (*Chapter 2*).
- b. Re-introducing 'basic home maintenance' training, particularly where houses are delivered as part of the infrastructure works package and for communities where employment opportunities are limited or non-existent, in order to enhance individual capability in general life skills (*Chapter 2*).
- c. Funding the fit-out of facilities such as multi-purpose centres to enable immediate occupancy and use (*Chapter 2*).

Sustainability Enhancements

Recommendation 2:

Enhance the sustainability of AACAP project outcomes by giving consideration to:

- a. Linking the design of AACAP training programmes with the CDP for job seekers in remote Australia in order to enhance employment opportunities (*Chapter 4*).
- b. Expanding the scope of AACAP to include the delivery of non-environmental health focused infrastructure where appropriate in order to create community employment opportunities (*Chapter 5*).
- c. Facilitating access to grant funding that supports the enhancement of economic development opportunities (*Chapter 5*).
- d. Inviting state/territory governments, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) specialising in particular fields, and other key stakeholders to collaborate in AACAP projects and work alongside Army and/or PM&C personnel, with the aim of:
 - increasing the range of health services provided (e.g. eye and ear health, physiotherapy, mental health) (*Chapter 3*),
 - increasing collaboration on, and investment in, locally identified priority areas (including training and capability development, education, employment, and safety) (*Chapters 4 and 5*),
 - sustaining services in communities post project (*Chapters 3 and 4*), and enhancing inter-agency cooperation (*Chapters 3, 4 and 5*).

Employment and Training Enhancements

Recommendation 3:

Utilise AACAP as an opportunity to develop sustained training and employment outcomes for Indigenous Australians by giving consideration to:

- a. Introducing community specific Training and Employment Plans for each project, developed in conjunction with PM&C and the community that consider and enhance employment opportunities within the community or proximate region (*Chapter 4*).
- b. Earlier assignment of Army's Training Development Officer to projects on a full time basis, ideally at least six months prior to project deployment, to facilitate better training programme design (*Chapter 4*).
- c. Formalising the sharing of lessons learned between project Training Development Officers, including considering the formal adoption of the draft Training Development Officer Handbook (*Chapter 4*).
- d. Investigating how Army might incorporate more opportunities for community members to work with Army on projects, including structured on-the-job experience or other direct employment opportunities (construction or otherwise), potentially through CDP (or similar) arrangements where appropriate (*Chapter 5*).
- e. Army proactively promoting ADF career pathways during projects with the aim of increasing Indigenous representation in the Army and the wider ADF (*Chapter 5*).

Community Selection Enhancements

Recommendation 4:

Strengthen the community selection process by giving consideration to:

- a. Identifying quantitative health indicators (such as environmental health status and social determinants of a community) to determine communities most in need and to guide evidence-based site selection (*Chapter 6*).
- b. Adopting a broader place-based approach to capitalise on local opportunities to better enable community led Indigenous advancement within a region (*Chapter 6*).
- c. Consulting with Army's Regional Force Surveillance Units and the wider Army Reserve community on suitable options in the early stages of community identification (*Chapter 6*).
- d. Working with the jurisdictions to ensure they better understand the nature of the Programme and the attributes of a suitable community in order to effect better nominations from them (*Chapter 6*).
- e. Introducing the opportunity for communities to nominate and demonstrate ownership, governance and leadership as a consideration in site selection (*Chapter 6*).

Cultural and Community Engagement Enhancements

Recommendation 5:

Further support and strengthen cultural engagement and exchange by giving consideration to:

- a. Enhancing the currently effective cultural awareness programme undertaken by Army with a formal community-specific cultural induction for Army personnel and contracted civilians upon arrival into recipient communities (*Chapter 7*).
- b. Employing local interpreters where relevant to address potential communication issues and enhance potential future employment opportunities (*Chapter 7*).
- c. Enhancing youth development outcomes by implementing youth specific engagement activities, such as a temporary cadet programme delivered as part of Army's AACAP project deployment. (*Chapter 7*).
- d. Installing commissioning plaques on major infrastructure builds, acknowledging the contribution of Army, PM&C, the community, and other key parties as appropriate (*Chapter 7*).

Governance Enhancements

Recommendation 6:

Strengthen AACAP governance framework by giving consideration to:

- a. The development of a project impact framework, managed by PM&C through the AACAP Steering Committee, in order to better assess the effectiveness of the Programme, including the social return on investment. (*Chapter 8*).
- b. The inclusion of state/territory government representatives on Project Boards (*Chapter 8*).
- c. Assigning a dedicated officer from the PM&C Regional Network for the duration of each AACAP project, to leverage the AACAP investment throughout the project lifecycle to maximise sustainable outcomes (*Chapter 8*).
- d. Reviewing and updating the MoU and the Project Management Guidelines (PMG) to ensure they reflect the current processes and incorporate any changes required as a result of adopting any of these Recommendations (*Chapter 8*).
- e. Options for telling the positive AACAP story to a wider Australian audience (*Chapter 8*).

Maintain and communicate what is working well

Recommendation 7:

Continue to maintain those elements of the Programme that are working well, including:

- a. Capitalising on the 'Tasks of Opportunity' that generate significant good will with communities (*Chapter 2*).
- b. The inclusion of wider ADF and international defence force participation in AACAP projects where appropriate (*Chapter 2*).
- c. Leveraging opportunities for joint celebrations such as:
 - Camp Birt open days;
 - visits from the Australian Army Band;
 - the involvement of the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF), particularly the ADF aircraft which community members saw in operation and were able to tour in person; and
 - visits from professional sporting teams in conjunction with health programmes (*Chapter 7*).
- d. Continuing to realise the value of the intangible social benefits that arise from Army living in communities for an extended period (*Chapter 7*).
- e. Maintaining the role of the PM&C Technical Adviser as a key partner in the management of the Programme (*Chapter 8*).
- f. The current approach of a four to six month AACAP deployment per year, which is sustainable within Army and provides the appropriate opportunities to exercise Army's operational capabilities (*Chapter 8*).
- g. Considering options for telling the positive AACAP story to a wider Australian audience (*Chapter 8*).

CHAPTER 1: CONTEXT OF REVIEW

Keep doing the programme because it was well appreciated and we learnt a lot”

- Community Member

1.1 Context of Review

The Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme (AACAP) is a joint initiative between the Australian Army and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C). The Programme began in 1996 and is an ongoing commitment that reinforces the strong association between Army, PM&C and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

The primary objective of AACAP is to achieve broad environmental health outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders by delivering a holistic package of assistance aimed at improving infrastructure, primary and environmental health and living conditions in remote Indigenous communities. For Army, the opportunity to exercise and test various operational capabilities through the planning and execution of AACAP projects presents a significant training benefit.

Delivery of the Programme is governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Army and PM&C and a supporting set of Project Management Guidelines (PMG). In accordance with the MoU, which requires a review of AACAP to be undertaken every four years, in September 2016 the Chief of Army, Lieutenant General Angus Campbell AO, DSC and the Associate Secretary Indigenous Affairs, PM&C, Mr Andrew Tongue, agreed to jointly sponsor this review to support the Programme’s continued effectiveness, sustainability and good governance.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this review are set out at [Appendix A](#).

In accordance with the ToR, this report provides the findings of the review and makes recommendations on opportunities to improve the future delivery of the Programme.

1.2 Background

1.2.1 History

AACAP’s history dates back 21 years, to 23 October 1996, when members of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation met with the then Prime Minister, the Hon John Howard MP, to raise concerns about the poor primary health of Indigenous Australians.

As a consequence, the then Ministers for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Defence and the then Department of Health and Family Services, agreed Army would assist with the provision of housing and infrastructure improvements in a number of remote communities identified by the former Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) for priority assistance. Senator John Herron, the former Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, announced the initiative known as the ATSIC Army Community Assistance Project (AACAP) on 14 November 1996. AACAP commenced with funding of \$11.7 million across 1997-2000, delivering into eight communities across Queensland, South Australia and the Northern Territory.

An evaluation of AACAP was undertaken in 1999 finding it *'represents value for money to all parties and is an efficient and effective means to achieve a number of outcomes over and above normal capital works provision'*.¹ As a result, the Australian Government announced the continuation of AACAP in 1999 with a \$40 million commitment over three years from 2001 to 2004.

A second evaluation finding AACAP continued to deliver benefits was completed in 2003². In recognition, the Government allocated \$20 million for another three years in 2005, funding the initiative until 2009.

Following the dismantling of ATSIC in 2004, the administration of AACAP transferred to the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

At this time AACAP became known as the Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme, retaining the same acronym. Within Army, it became known as Exercise SAUNDERS, named after Captain Reg Saunders, the first Indigenous Australian to become a commissioned officer in the Australian Army.

In April 2009, the Government agreed to continue AACAP for a further four years (from July 2009 until June 2013) with a budget of \$6 million per financial year. At this time, the Programme scope was broadened to include wider health and training initiatives, consistent with the COAG National Indigenous Reform Agreement.

In 2010 a performance audit undertaken by the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) found that while AACAP was a small Programme in terms of funding, and projects are small relative to overall Indigenous expenditure, the Programme represented a significant investment in small communities.³

In July 2012, the Government agreed to continue AACAP for a further four years (from July 2014 to 30 June 2018), with funding of \$21 million. Further Machinery of Government changes in December 2013 moved the administration of the Programme to PM&C.

In August 2015, the Government agreed to allocate funding for AACAP under the Indigenous Advancement Strategy (IAS) until 2021-22 with an increased budget of

¹ D Noble and P Hoskins. (2000), (*Evaluation Report of the AACAP*), Woods Bagot Pty Limited, Australia.

² Yaran Consulting. (2003), (*Round Two Evaluation of the AACAP Final Report*), Yaran Consulting Pty Ltd, Australia.

³ Australian National Audit Office. (2010), (*AACAP 2010 ANAO Report No. 19, 2010-11*), Commonwealth of Australia

\$7 million per year from 2017-18. Since its inception in 1996, AACAP has undertaken 43 projects in 41 communities across Australia (refer to AACAP locations map at Appendix B).

1.2.2 Programme Overview and Methodology

The primary aim of AACAP is to improve infrastructure, primary and environmental health and living conditions within remote Indigenous communities by delivering a holistic package of assistance.

The delivery of an AACAP project requires the generation, preparation, deployment and sustainment of a military contingent to remote locations in Australia for extended durations, and exercises the full range of the Defence supporting capabilities required. Through AACAP, Army aims to train and test selected capabilities against the themes of 'population support' and 'Indigenous capacity building'.

One AACAP project is delivered in a remote community (or communities where location permits) each calendar year and is tailored to meet the specific needs of the community. Each project consists of three components.

1. The **Construction** component generally includes the provision of environmental health related infrastructure (e.g. housing, waste water treatment systems, health clinics) as well as infrastructure aimed at improving access to primary health care facilities, such as new or upgraded transport and communication infrastructure (e.g. roads and airfields).
2. The **Health** component focuses on enhancing existing community medical, dental and veterinary services as well as providing accredited and non-accredited health training and physical training and education programmes.
3. The **Training** component provides accredited and non-accredited structured training programmes for community members in a range of areas (e.g. construction, welding, small engine maintenance, hospitality, business skills) to enhance job readiness and employment opportunities.

AACAP projects are undertaken only after close and culturally appropriate consultation with, and agreement from, communities.

The projects are managed by Army's 19th Chief Engineer Works and delivered by soldiers of the 6th Engineer Support Regiment, with support drawn from across Army and occasionally the wider ADF; such as RAAF tradespersons and RAAF and Navy transport and logistics assets. On occasion, international defence force personnel have also participated alongside ADF and community members.

PM&C's National Office provides Steering Committee support to the Programme and Project Board support to each project. PM&C's Regional Network provides ongoing on-location support for each project from within its existing resources.

This review follows three independent evaluations undertaken in 1999, 2003 and 2010.

³ Australian National Audit Office. (2010), (*AACAP 2010 ANAO Report No. 19, 2010-11*), Commonwealth of Australia

1.3 Scope of the Review

In accordance with the ToR, the review has examined AACAP with respect to the objectives of the Programme, including an assessment of the outcomes from AACAP projects in terms of what was planned and delivered and what has endured. The review has assessed the efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme and has made recommendations regarding potential improvements in site selection, planning, coordination and execution to ensure the intent of the Programme is achieved and sustained, including maximising enduring community benefits and ensuring Army's training objectives are achieved.

1.4 Conduct of the Review

In the spirit of the joint nature of the review, it was co-chaired by Brigadier Darren Naumann AM (Army) and Ms Katrina Jocusen (PM&C).

The review team worked with, and took advice from, a reference panel of senior Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leaders comprising Ms Jessica Spencer, Mr Joseph Elu and Lieutenant Colonel Ron Baumgart. The ToR for the Panel and their biographies are included at [Appendix C](#) and [Appendix D](#) respectively. The Panel guided the review team and provided expert advice on opportunities to leverage AACAP to achieve better outcomes in the areas of:

- Indigenous environmental health;
- community and business development;
- community engagement; and
- ADF recruitment.

The review team examined areas of improvement across the whole Programme including site selection, community engagement, governance as well as ways to leverage broader benefits such as greater training, employment and economic development opportunities.

AACAP is one of a number of programmes aimed at delivering improved living conditions in remote communities, and as with many such programmes, there is a lack of empirical data upon which a quantitative evaluation can be based.

Accordingly, the conduct of the review has been a qualitative process, where the effectiveness of the Programme has been assessed through engagement with key stakeholders to capture their reflections of the Programme as a whole, or as it applied to their specific circumstances.

Acknowledging the limitations of such an approach, the review team determined the accuracy of any assessment of the Programme's effectiveness could be improved by increasing the size of the sample of communities visited and stakeholders engaged. The validity of themes was assessed by the extent to which they were supported by other data captured through the review process.

Given the Programme relies on funding from PM&C and in-kind support from Army, an assessment of its efficiency is subjective as it is difficult to fully identify or quantify all benefits and associated costs. Therefore, the review team has relied on

assessments of past success and performance of the Programme and future assumptions to inform its considerations.

In undertaking its work, the review team conducted a desktop review of past projects, made site visits to selected AACAP communities, and conducted interviews with key stakeholders.

1.4.1 Desktop Review

The desktop review examined the documentation produced or held by Army, PM&C, and former agencies such as the Department of Health and Family Services, the Department of Health and Aged Care, and ATSIC.

The aim of the desktop review was to gain an understanding of how the scope and method of delivery of projects may have evolved over the life of the Programme and to identify communities for site visits.

1.4.2 Site Visits

The review team visited 25 communities across Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory, representing 60 per cent of all AACAP communities and approximately 50 per cent of each jurisdiction's projects.

Further details of communities and sites visited are at [Appendix E](#).

Broadly, the community sample provided an opportunity to examine projects that:

- were a variety of ages;
- were of different population sizes;
- were of different extremes of remoteness;
- contained both Army and contractor delivered infrastructure;
- were in-delivery;
- were both 'stand-alone' and 'multi-community'; and
- included communities that had benefitted twice in different years.

Site visits enabled the review team to:

- confirm the findings of the desktop review;
- assess the condition and current usage of infrastructure delivered;
- assess the outcomes of training and health programmes; and
- gather an understanding of community sentiment on all aspects of the Programme, including on ways to improve it.

1.4.3 Stakeholder Interviews

The review team interviewed (either face-to-face or via telephone) a range of key stakeholders including community members, PM&C Indigenous Affairs staff, Army personnel, state and territory government agency staff, and other stakeholders as relevant. The full list of consultations is at [Appendix F](#) to this report.

1.5 A guide to this report

This report consists of an executive summary, nine chapters and seven appendices. The review team has structured the chapters into three parts:

- Chapter 1 describes the background of the Programme and context of this review.

- Chapters 2 to 9 outline the AACAP objectives and the current framework for the three AACAP components of infrastructure, health and training as well as some additional key areas identified in the review's ToR for investigation. These chapters provide the review teams' observations of how these are faring against stated objectives.
- Appendices A to G provide supplementary information to the report.

CHAPTER 2: INFRASTRUCTURE

2.1 AACAP Objectives

- **AACAP housing infrastructure objective:** Supply safe, sustainable and adequate housing that will contribute to improved living standards for Indigenous people in remote communities and assist in "closing the gap".
- **AACAP essential services infrastructure objective:** Improve environmental health and living standards in Indigenous communities by providing, or upgrading, sustainable infrastructure and essential services, such as water, power supply, telecommunications, sewerage, roads, airfields and waste management.
- **AACAP sustainable facilities infrastructure objective:** Provide constructed (or upgraded) facilities that assist in closing the gap where appropriate and where co- contribution may be received from other Commonwealth and or State authorities, and or other entities agreed by the AACAP Steering Committee.

“The Army was very professional and very quick with work”

- Community Member

2.2 AACAP Process

The majority of funding committed under AACAP is directed to the delivery of environmental health infrastructure (e.g. housing, waste water treatment systems, waste management facilities, health clinics, multi-purpose facilities) as well as improved access to primary health care facilities by constructing or upgrading roads and airfields, with the overall effect of improving living standards.

The delivery of infrastructure under AACAP provides Army with the ability to maintain its engineering capability at the required readiness levels. In order to meet its training and readiness requirements, Army seeks opportunities for training in both vertical (e.g. houses, health clinics, community centres) and horizontal (e.g. roads, airfields, waste water treatment systems) construction activities. Opportunities to meet these training needs form a key consideration for Army when considering a community's suitability.

While Army seeks to undertake much of the design and construction work in order to meet its training needs, there are occasions when the project scope of works exceeds its capacity or technical capability. In these cases, works are delivered with support provided from other ADF or international defence force personnel or through civilian contracted arrangements, under Army's management.

A potential infrastructure Scope of works is identified during reconnaissance visits at the Inception stage. Once a Community has been selected for AACAP delivery, the Scope of works is refined during the Development stage through a detailed consultation process. Using its own organic design capability, and supplemented by specialist contracted design agencies where necessary,

Army identifies and engages with key stakeholders including community members, state/territory governments, regional authorities and other service providers to define

the community's need and design a tailor-made solution. A number of factors are considered, including:

- the community's infrastructure needs and priorities;
- availability of suitable end users;
- land tenure;
- technical and design requirements;
- sustainability, including ongoing operation and repair and maintenance requirements; and budget.

Upon Army's formal handover of completed infrastructure, the end-user takes on responsibility for its operation, repairs and maintenance. Army provides the relevant operation and maintenance manuals and any associated training and upon Practical Completion, manages a 12 month Defects Liability Period (DLP) during which it is responsible for the repair or rectification of any defects or omissions on the infrastructure.

2.3 Key Observations

2.3.1 General

In the main, infrastructure delivered under AACAP was observed to have been very well received by communities and:

- reflected the aspirations and individuality of communities;
- considered the physical environment and weather conditions;
- provided long lasting benefits; and
- remained structurally sound.

There were a few exceptions, which are explored further under detailed observations at [section 1, Appendix G](#) along with further discussion on the observations noted below.

Army's approach to defining each project's Scope of works in consultation with stakeholders and providing concept layouts and designs for acceptance and/or modification prior to work commencing, was positively received.

2.3.2 Housing

By and large, houses inspected were well-designed and appropriate for the community, well-constructed and appeared to remain structurally sound.

Both new housing and house refurbishments were very well regarded, exceeding community expectations both in terms of quality and outcomes (e.g. anecdotal evidence suggests new housing provided under AACAP has in some cases alleviated overcrowding). In a number of communities, the AACAP house design appears to have influenced the design of additional housing subsequently built by other providers.

“The quality of water has really improved – it tastes like rainwater.”

- Community Member

“ I am thankful to have a house like that...I consider myself very privileged.”

- Community Member

2.3.4 Health Clinics

Anecdotal evidence (from both community members and health professionals) suggests the delivery of health clinics in two communities visited had far-reaching impacts. The provision of well-designed and culturally appropriate clinics appears to have facilitated regular, ongoing visits from a wide range of health professionals.

2.3.5 Multi-Purpose Centres

Similarly, well-designed multi-purpose centres were popular with communities. They facilitated flexible usage for the delivery of various health, training, employment and social services and often generated income from that use. In many cases, these centres were the pride of the community and served as a focal point for community gatherings.

Final furnishing and fit-out of multi- purpose centres is not usually part of the work scope, with this responsibility falling to the ultimate end-user. Should this furnishing and fit-out not be completed in a timely manner there is a risk facilities may remain unoccupied and subject to misuse or damage, as was witnessed in one community visited. Consideration should be given to funding a minimum fit-out of facilities for future projects to facilitate immediate occupancy and use.

“Parents and kids love the Parents’ and Children’s Centre”

- Community Member

2.3.6 Other Observations

The provision of specialist facilities or infrastructure such as health clinics, multi-purpose facilities, airfields or waste water treatment systems was observed to have had significant, far-reaching positive impacts in communities, particularly where the assets were delivered with the support of other agencies, either for delivery or ongoing operation.

The review team found that while the defined scope of projects was always valued highly, it was often the ‘Tasks of Opportunity’ delivered by Army during projects that generated the most goodwill with communities, as they were considered to be an ‘unexpected bonus’. Tasks of Opportunity are works of a minor nature conducted by Army personnel from residual capacity during deployment and may include minor repairs to existing infrastructure and/or the construction of simple non-technical items which can be completed within a short timeframe of one to two weeks and

which do not incur an ongoing maintenance liability.

There is evidence that some communities need support beyond initial handover to ensure their capacity to operate, repair and maintain infrastructure well past the DLP. Some support already exists through the delivery of 'basic home maintenance' training; however this training is not delivered in all projects and does not address the full scope of support required. Clarity and certainty of asset responsibility arrangements post completion, will improve sustainability of infrastructure well into the future.

While communities appreciated delivery of infrastructure through the Programme, there was a clear preference for projects to be delivered by Army or other supporting ADF or international defence force elements over contracted delivery.

“The kids love the artificial turf – they call it ‘liar grass’.”

- Community Member

STORY BOX 2.1

NOTE: Story Boxes are found throughout the document. They provide additional information, stories and examples.

Type and Design of Infrastructure Must Match Community Capability

At the request of one community and its local health authority, AACAP delivered an automated fluoridation system into the community's drinking water supply. Upon inquiry, it was found the system was no longer in use as it had failed five years after installation and was now beyond repair and 'resting' in the back paddock.

Further investigation identified the system, while likely to be an appropriate solution in many communities in Australia, was simply too technically complex for the community to manage. In hindsight, the solution chosen has proven to be inappropriate for the circumstances, and a simpler solution may well have provided a better long term, sustainable outcome.

Although this appears to be an isolated, and a somewhat dated example, it serves as a reminder of the need to ensure designs give due consideration to community capabilities and provide 'minimum maintenance' solutions.

2.4 Recommendations

Support and promote the sustainability of infrastructure investment by giving consideration to:

- a. Ensuring infrastructure designs are robust, align with community and/or end-user capacity and capability and have minimal operational, repair and maintenance requirements.
- b. Re-introducing 'basic home maintenance' training, particularly where houses are delivered as part of the infrastructure works package and for communities where employment opportunities are limited or non-existent, in order to enhance individual capability in general life skills.
- c. Funding the fit-out of facilities such as multi-purpose centres to enable

immediate occupancy and use.

Continue to maintain those elements of the Programme that are working well, including:

- a. capitalising on the 'Tasks of Opportunity' that generate significant good will with communities.
- b. The inclusion of wider ADF and international defence force participation in AACAP projects where appropriate.

CHAPTER 3: HEALTH

3.1 AACAP Objective

- Utilise Army resources to provide primary health services, which may include dental care and general health check-ups, and veterinary care.

“With the dentist, it was good to see more clearly how everything works”

- Community Member

3.2 AACAP Process

The Health element of AACAP aims to improve the primary and environmental health and living conditions in communities, in parallel with the main infrastructure building effort. Army utilises its existing resource of doctors, dentists, veterinarians and other health professionals to provide health services that complement and link with existing community programmes. This approach seeks to avoid duplication of services and where possible and ensures their sustainability post project. The health service also supports the deployed Army contingent.

A Health Development Officer (HDO) is assigned to each project and commences planning for the delivery of health services in the Development stage. Planning involves close and early consultation with the community, state/territory governments and local health services.

Considering the short duration of projects, health services do not generally seek to provide long-term, enduring health programmes but rather, opportunistic short-term services. As such, no base line data is gathered prior to service delivery.

The design of health services for a specific project is tailored to each community and is dependent on:

- the identified needs of the community;
- the capacity of Army's health services;
- consideration of whether the services are sustainable over time; and
- sensitivities within the community and relating to the commercial and professional interests of local health and related care providers (e.g. where a health service is currently being provided, Army may decide not to provide that particular service).

Typically Army health personnel are able to provide:

- environmental health support and advice;
- first aid training (both accredited and non-accredited);
- lessons on healthy living;
- an evaluation of current community health procedures and equipment;
- physical training and education programmes; and
- dental and veterinary services.

3.2.1 Environmental Health Support

Environmental health support includes services such as:

- water quality testing in the community, at local outstations and water holes, and supervised water treatment;
- environmental health management assessments of waste management systems and advice on management processes; and
- field and home hygiene training programmes.

The health budget for each AACAP project is currently set at \$50K.

3.2.2 First Aid Training

Accredited First Aid training is frequently delivered along with basic (non-accredited) first aid training with particular groups, such as school children learning how to bandage a wound, through to rangers learning how to treat snake bite.

3.2.3 Lessons on healthy living

Lessons in healthy living typically include information about hand washing, general hygiene practices, food handling and healthy meal preparation.

3.2.4 Physical Training and Education Programmes

Army Physical Training Instructors (PTIs) lead community physical fitness programmes, primarily delivered via schools or with community sporting teams.

3.2.5 Dental Services

AACAP dental posts generally operate from the community school or other community-centric location. Treatments provided to community members include oral health education, basic dental hygiene, as well as typical services up to and including denture treatments.

3.2.6 Veterinary Services

Noting unhealthy dogs are a common source of disease in communities, veterinary services focus on de-sexing, worm, tick and flea treatment and the treatment of diseases. Animal (usually dogs) euthanising services are often provided, but only at the request of the community. Other animals treated have included cats, horses, donkeys, and kangaroos.

"The vets were good – my three dogs, they got no kids and they even worked on the donkey."

3.3 Key Observations

The Health element of an AACAP project presents a valuable opportunity for Army's health professionals to practice rural and remote medicine and to maintain their clinical skills at the levels needed to meet Army operational readiness requirements.

Army health services were universally well received by communities and considered to be professional and well-run. Unanimous feedback from communities described the strong rapport built between Army Health Personnel and community members, founded on a culturally appropriate approach to the design and delivery of health and related services.

AACAP dental services were found to be very well received with most community members otherwise reliant on infrequent visits from the mobile dental truck and/or travelling long distances to access services for their usual dental care. One community cited incidents of residents from nearby communities, familiar and comfortable with Army dental services due to their own previous AACAP project, travelling to the live project specifically for further treatments. People were genuinely appreciative of being able to view the dental surgery and talk through treatment procedures (a number of times if required) before committing to treatment.

Communities reported an ongoing confidence about dental treatments with many of the myths of pain associated with dentists dispelled. There also appeared to be an ongoing understanding of basic dental hygiene practises. However, some community members in receipt of new dentures reported they had been lost (misplaced) over time, leaving them with less oral capacity (and possibly at risk of compromised health (e.g. malnutrition)). Consideration should be given to social and environmental factors in the sustainability of denture treatments before undertaking such procedures in the future.

Veterinary programmes were also very well received once understood; in particular the de-sexing programme which was very successful (albeit only in the short-term) in controlling dog numbers. Sustainability of the programme however was limited by the usual ongoing animal management services available in each community. Most communities reported a number of (non de-sexed) 'stranger dogs' arriving post AACAP, that to varying degrees and over time, undermined results achieved.

Sports health programmes, such as AFL training, softball and planned sports days were very popular as they tapped into the natural sports culture that exists in many Indigenous communities. Community members were particularly proud to report on the several occasions when 'Community beat Army' or where community sporting teams went on to win local and regional competitions as a result of their increased skills and/or health and fitness levels.

Army health personnel reported they were keen to participate in AACAP as it provided excellent training and skills development in remote locations (i.e. away from suburban hospitals and health facilities) where practitioners are often required to develop innovative ways to treat patients with limited resources.

Health personnel also reported AACAP offered good clinical skills training in a real environment similar to that likely to be experienced on military operations. The collective benefits of deployment skills (including the packing up, transporting and setting up of health infrastructure facilities) and the experience of different sections working collaboratively together under pressure, allows personnel to be trained and tested to operate in conflict environments.

Army's ability to provide health professionals for AACAP deployments is constrained

by the demands of other ongoing activities such as military operations and major exercises. Consequently, the range of skills and number of health professionals available varies from project to project. While Army advised that it always endeavours to design a health support programme that meets community needs and is complementary to existing services, Army services are largely opportunistic and often may not fully address the identified needs of a community.

Without diminishing the undeniable success of the health services provided by Army under current arrangements, this limitation could be considered a missed opportunity to make significant change in the health of a community.

Noting that the health services provided by Army are delivered within the context of a wider community or regional healthcare environment, the long-term effectiveness of the Army effort could be enhanced where appropriate, by aligning the support of other health services providers, such as state/territory governments, non-government organisations, or local health professionals. These providers could be encouraged to work alongside Army in the conduct of appropriately targeted programmes, to complement the services provided by Army and potentially address such issues as:

- immunisation;
- eye and ear health;
- diabetes;
- mental health;
- physiotherapy; and
- physical fitness.

With sufficient planning, coordination and governance, the incorporation of civilian professionals and services into AACAP before, during, and/or after the deployment could increase health outcomes and facilitate longer-term, sustainable benefits.

STORY BOX 3.1

Leveraging Health Benefits

The health component of AACAP is designed, where possible, to deliver infrastructure that can provide a base for future health related activities. A good example of this was identified in the AACAP 1999 Project at Jumbun, North Queensland where a health clinic was delivered as part of the infrastructure Scope of works but funded by contributions from the Commonwealth and Queensland Departments of Health, separately from AACAP. Inspection of the clinic and interviews with the health services personnel revealed the building design was extremely functional and had attracted a wide range of services to the community that would not otherwise have been possible.

3.4 Recommendations

- a. Enhance the sustainability of AACAP project outcomes by giving consideration to inviting state/territory governments, non-government organisations specialising in particular fields and other key stakeholders to collaborate in AACAP projects and work alongside Army and/or PM&C personnel, with the aim of:

- increasing the range of health services (e.g. eye and ear health, physiotherapy, mental health);
- sustaining services in communities post project; and
- enhancing inter-agency cooperation.

CHAPTER 4: TRAINING

4.1 AACAP Objective

- Provide accredited and or non-accredited structured training programmes for the recipient community in a range of areas, including construction and facilities maintenance, to enhance employment opportunities.
- AACAP capitalises on Army's ability to holistically deliver a range of services to remote Indigenous communities that would not normally be available in a single project, including... the delivery of training activities and opportunities that may be considered independent of the AACAP Works.

“Army training was good”

- Community member, Pukatja 2017

4.2 AACAP Process

Due to the diversity of Indigenous communities and cultures across Australia, there is no single approach appropriate to the provision of training. Further, Army's operational constraints and the duration for which Army stays in the community, limits the nature of the training offered.

A Training Development Officer (TDO) is usually assigned during the Development stage of each project for a period of around 12 months (including the deployment period). The TDO undertakes a needs analysis and develops a tailored training plan in consultation with the community, PM&C network staff and local training providers that aims to:

- effect positive outcomes at both the individual and community level;
- deliver short-term accredited training to enhance life skills and job readiness skills to facilitate greater employment opportunities;
- complement and enhance existing training programmes and courses; and
- meet Army's own training objectives.

A number of factors are considered in designing the training plan including:

- community culture and values;
- community aspirations, needs, existing knowledge and capability;
- flexibility in design, content and delivery;
- the availability and quality of trainers (e.g. accredited, non- accredited);
- opportunities to leverage training to secure employment outcomes; and
- the available training budget.

The training budget for each project is nominally set at \$50K. This budget covers training support costs including:

- procurement of training materials and associated tools;
- purchase of specialist training support as necessary; and
- purchase of course design, testing and assessment services as required to support delivery of certified training courses.

4.3 Key Observations

There are indications training programmes delivered under AACAP are delivering real benefits to individuals and communities but it is not possible to quantify this from available data. On the whole, widespread appreciation was expressed by communities and other stakeholders for the training delivered by Army – both in terms of the variety of courses offered and the manner in which Army engaged with the community.

Generally the level of enthusiasm for, and participation in, training varied between communities based on:

- the type of training offered;
- the relevancy of training in terms of potential employment outcomes;
- individual capability and capacity to undertake structured learning; and
- the level of ‘training fatigue’ experienced by the community.

For a number of communities, training was not always fully valued as related employment outcomes appeared not to be readily available to community members. Further, in many cases there were no connections to ongoing training or job search support post AACAP projects, to leverage off the training delivered. Some communities appeared fatigued with ‘training for training sake’.

When delivered well, and into a motivated, organised and well-governed community, the benefits derived from the training element can far exceed those of the infrastructure (see AACAP 2014 Story Box 4.1 below).

STORY BOX 4.1

Leveraging Training Benefits

Canteen Creek, Northern Territory received very little infrastructure under the AACAP 2014 Project, as most was delivered in the neighbouring community of Wutunugurra. However, Canteen Creek did participate in health and training activities.

The welding training in particular attracted 18 participants, including one female, with three participants going on to receive a Certificate 1 in Basic Fabrication. A total of 84 double bed frames were produced for the two communities and other pieces of furniture were designed as part of the training. Today Canteen Creek continues to use the skills gained making items such as bedframes, sun shelters, park benches and chairs, both as a community service and for sale for private use. The community is now actively exploring opportunities to further leverage the training to achieve greater outcomes for both individuals and the community.

However, in the absence of this environment, no long term sustainable benefits arising directly from the AACAP training programme could be identified. The nature of AACAP’s ‘*backyard blitz*’ approach can limit the effectiveness of the training unless it is delivered within the context of a longer term, sustainable training and employment strategy supported by service providers other than Army.

The introduction of tailored training *and employment* plans for each AACAP project would formalise a commitment to target sustainable training and associated workforce development opportunities.

The plans could be developed by the PM&C Regional Office in consultation with the

TDO and other stakeholders relevant to the community and could include as appropriate:

- an analysis of community/individual job readiness;
- an analysis of training options against local employment opportunities;
- a strategy for working with local employers/industry to secure commitment to Indigenous employment opportunities;
- a focus on gender specific training as required;
- strategies for Army/ADF recruitment activities;
- a post project strategy to leverage jobs from AACAP training; and
- targets for sustainable employment outcomes.

For a number of (often smaller) communities, job readiness or job skills training is unlikely to lead to sustainable employment outcomes unless residents are willing and able to relocate to take up employment opportunities. In these communities, 'basic home maintenance' training could be offered to boost valuable life skills and increase individual capability to undertake basic community repair and maintenance tasks which could contribute to the sustainability of housing infrastructure (delivered by AACAP and other programmes). Other courses, which appeared to boost life skills and have particular enduring benefits, included 'small engine maintenance', and 'land management training', which could also support local ranger programmes.

Although the TDO is usually assigned to each project for a period of around 12 months (including deployment to the community), the demand for training staff across Army often constrains the ability of the TDO to focus on the design and development of AACAP training programmes during the Development Phase.

For the first six months of their AACAP assignment, the TDO is often required to undertake AACAP planning activities while concurrently performing the duties of their existing position. Accordingly, opportunities to place AACAP training activities within and leverage off existing programmes are not always identified or exploited to the maximum effect. Similarly, the linking of training programmes with sustainable employment outcomes is not always achieved.

The review team was made aware of a TDO guide developed by the Army's TDO assigned to AACAP 2015 at Titjikala. This document appears to be a useful article that could serve as a guide for TDOs assigned to future AACAP projects.

Supplementary observations for training are explored further under detailed observations at section 3, Appendix G.

4.4 Recommendations

Utilise AACAP as an opportunity to develop sustained training outcomes for Indigenous Australians by giving consideration to:

- a. Introducing community specific Training and Employment Plans for each project, developed in conjunction with PM&C and the community, which consider and enhance employment opportunities within the community or proximate region.
- b. Linking the design of AACAP training programmes with the CDP for job seekers in remote Australia in order to enhance employment opportunities.
- c. Inviting state/territory governments, NGOs specialising in particular fields and other key stakeholders to collaborate in AACAP projects and work alongside Army and/or PM&C personnel, with the aim of:
 - increasing collaboration on, and investment in, locally identified priority areas for training development;
 - sustaining training services in communities post project; and
 - enhancing inter-agency cooperation.
- d. Earlier assignment of Army's Training Development Officer to projects on a full time basis, ideally at least six months prior to project deployment, to facilitate better training programme design.
- e. Formalising the sharing of lessons learned between project Training Development Officers, including considering the formal adoption of the draft Training Development Officer Handbook.

CHAPTER 5: EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

5.1 AACAP Objective

AACAP capitalises on Army's ability to holistically deliver a range of services to remote Indigenous communities that would not normally be available in a single project, including... employment opportunities for community members that may be created through the delivery of infrastructure and essential services, or on-going maintenance associated with those facilities and services.

“Army makes people happy-happy memories”

- Community member, Pukatja 2017

5.2 AACAP Process

A key overarching objective of AACAP is to improve employment outcomes for Indigenous Australians consistent with the national agenda target for halving the gap in employment outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians by 2018⁴. However, there is no set target or performance measure for a quantitative assessment of employment outcomes under the Programme.

As noted in the Training section, historically AACAP training has been designed with the intent of improving the broad employability of individuals, rather than providing particular skills directed at securing specific jobs. A challenge has been the lack of obvious job opportunities in communities and the reluctance of many people to leave their community in order to secure employment.

Further, the delivery framework of AACAP has led Army and PM&C project teams to focus on services before and during project delivery with limited, if any, ongoing employment support services provided post project. Some recent attempts have been made to address this, including Army's identification of direct employment outcomes for AACAP 2016 and PM&C's implementation of a project-specific employment plan for AACAP 2017, where early results are positive with one full-time position already secured.

5.3 Key Observations

5.3.1 Employment

“We got a lot of training but no jobs.”

- Community member

The review team observed there was significant frustration across communities around the lack of employment opportunities, despite the efforts of AACAP and

⁴ Council of Australian Governments (2009) *National Indigenous reform agreement (closing the gap)*. Canberra: Council of Australian Governments.

other training programmes.

While communities saw value in training and working alongside soldiers during AACAP projects, there appears to have been limited direct employment generated.

Although Army has previously implemented strategies with respect to direct employment, such as on the 2003 Project where community members were engaged in support roles for the Army camp and there were opportunities for locals to bid for construction contracts, this does not appear to be standard practice. Considering the value placed on these opportunities by communities, Army might consider incorporating more opportunities for community members to work with Army on projects, including structured on-the-job experience or other direct employment opportunities (construction or otherwise), potentially through CDP (or similar) arrangements where appropriate.

Universally, communities acknowledged Army has not combined AACAP deployments with a focused ADF recruitment campaign. A high number of communities expressed a level of surprise at this approach and suggested Army should be more proactive in talking to people (particularly youth) during projects about military career opportunities (for both Reserve and Regular service).

The Review Team considers Reserve service in particular to be culturally appropriate as it provides a training and employment opportunity that enhances individual capability and capacity and allows smart and capable young people to remain in and contribute to their communities.

Supplementary observations for employment are explored further at section 4, Appendix G.

"Army should talk to community about joining – that would be great."

- Community member

5.3.2 Economic Development Opportunities

A significant number of people interviewed spoke of wanting to become income self-sufficient and not reliant on welfare or CDP, however the absence of economic opportunity was holding them back. While people were very appreciative of the infrastructure delivered under AACAP, there was a strong desire for infrastructure that could support economic development, generate revenue and create sustainable jobs.

The number and nature of business activities in remote communities limits opportunities for employment. Yet there appears to be significant will and enormous potential for Aboriginal people living in remote areas to generate revenue and create sustainable jobs in their communities. Many communities have given thought (significant in some cases) to identifying potential opportunities for economic development and subsequent employment creation.

Currently there is no provision within AACAP to directly support economic development opportunities for communities. However, the Review Team considers there could be value, in certain circumstances, in expanding the scope of

AACAP projects to include economic infrastructure. Such an approach would need to explore options on a case-by-case basis to assess the potential job creation and economic value generated, the impact on any existing commercial activities and to ensure such outcomes are for the economic benefit of the community rather than any one individual. Such enhancements should complement the environmental and primary health objectives of AACAP.

This potential enhancement to AACAP's scope is consistent with the COAG Closing the Gap target to halve the gap in employment by 2018.

As noted, several communities and associated stakeholders have either commenced implementation of economic development activities, or given significant thought to ideas that could be appropriate.

As one example, many remote communities are located in some of Australia's most breathtaking landscapes. They are attractive to tourists, particularly 'grey nomads' who generally have the time to linger, the interest to learn about the area and the means to sustain themselves and contribute to the local economy. The development of simple caravan parks and/or camping grounds could be economically viable, environmentally appropriate and simple to manage. They could generate jobs in cleaning, maintenance and business administration. Facilities could range from basic absolute blocks only, to sites with camp kitchens, laundries, ice machines and renewable energy powered sites (priced accordingly). AACAP could provide the infrastructure as well as training in the business and basic maintenance skills required for ongoing sustainable operation.

STORY BOX 6.1

The Imintji Aboriginal community

The Imintji Aboriginal community⁵ (on the western end of the Gibb River Road in the Kimberley, WA) runs the first campground under the Camping with Custodians initiative. The commercial campground was built and is operated by the community and features 20 campsites and visitor facilities.

Using the Imintji Aboriginal community as an example, a community with 20 camping sites at \$17 per person per night, if fully occupied for 20 weeks of the busy season, could generate up to \$95,200 in camping fees before expenses. Further, by adding two land-based fishing/cultural tours per week for six people at \$50 per person, an additional \$6,000 in revenue could be generated, along with increased sales at the community store and/or cultural/art centre.

The provision of simple low-cost infrastructure (i.e. camping facilities) has the potential to generate considerable revenue for communities, decrease financial dependence, create jobs and contribute to social and cultural (reconciliation) benefits.

A number of other ideas were raised by community members including:

- arts and cultural centres;
- cafes and canteens;
- market gardens;
- donkey holding yards;
- car crushing; and

⁵ Link destination: the *Imintji Campground and Art Centre Kimberley*: www.imintji.com.au (Accessed 12 May 2017).

- worm farming.

These ideas are explored in more detail at [section 4, Appendix G](#).

5.4 Recommendations

Utilise AACAP as an opportunity to develop sustained employment outcomes for Indigenous Australians by giving consideration to:

- a. Investigating how Army might incorporate more opportunities for community members to work with Army on projects, including structured on-the-job experience or other direct employment opportunities (construction or otherwise), potentially through CDP (or similar) arrangements where appropriate.
- b. Linking AACAP employment opportunities with the CDP for job seekers in remote Australia.
- c. Proactively promoting ADF career pathways during projects with the aim of increasing Indigenous representation in the Army and the wider ADF.
- d. Expanding the scope of AACAP where appropriate to include the delivery of non-environmental health focused infrastructure, in order to create community employment opportunities.
- e. Facilitating access to grant funding that supports the enhancement of economic development opportunities.
- f. Inviting state/territory governments, NGOs specialising in particular fields and other key stakeholders to collaborate in AACAP projects and work alongside Army and/or PM&C personnel, with the aim of:
 - increasing collaboration on, and investment in, locally identified priority areas for employment development;
 - sustaining employment services in communities post project; and
 - enhancing inter-agency cooperation.

CHAPTER 6: COMMUNITY SELECTION

“Army listened, were good role models and were always respectful”

- Community member

6.1 AACAP Process

Planning for community site selection for each AACAP Project begins approximately 24 months prior to delivery at the Inception stage to allow frequent community engagement throughout the Feasibility, Planning and Design stages.

In 2015, the site selection process was reviewed with an alternative methodology created to leverage greater commitment from jurisdictions.

Under current arrangements, the Minister for Indigenous Affairs writes to his portfolio counterparts in the state and territory governments, inviting them to bid for an AACAP project by nominating suitable communities in their jurisdictions and detailing the contribution they will make to the project. In parallel, PM&C uses its Regional Network, and other areas of the Department as appropriate, to identify additional communities in the jurisdiction with the best bid.

Community selection for AACAP is guided by giving priority consideration to communities with significant need and which warrant the use of Army resources.

Specifically, suitable recipient communities will usually need to meet the following criteria:

- be remote⁶;
- require works that align with COAG's *Closing the Gap* initiative;
- provide a sufficient training opportunity for Army;
- be supportive of AACAP;
- have suitable land-tenure arrangements for identified capital works;
- have limited policies and programmes that overlap with AACAP; and
- have not received AACAP previously.

PM&C recognises there are some communities located within inner or outer regional areas that may be considered remote that fall outside the definition of remote explained above. These may be communities that have limited access to government services or standards of infrastructure. Service delivery to these communities will be considered on their merits on a case-by case basis.

As part of the selection process, a shortlist of potential communities is presented to the Minister for Indigenous Affairs after considering areas in significant need,

⁶ PM&C applies the Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) to define remote areas. ARIA is widely accepted as Australia's most authoritative geographic measure of remoteness. ARIA measures the remoteness of a populated locality by its physical distances by road to the nearest urban centre.

PM&C recognises there are some communities located within inner and outer regional areas that may be considered remote that fall outside the definition of remote explained above. These may be communities that have limited access to government services or standards of infrastructures. Service delivery to these communities will be considered on their merits on a case-by-case basis.

jurisdictional bids and feedback from PM&Cs regional network.

The most favorable jurisdictional bid along with a list of other potential communities for further feasibility assessment are presented to the Minister for Indigenous Affairs for his agreement.

Once agreed, potential sites are identified for Army and PM&C personnel to conduct Feasibility Reconnaissance Visits during the Inception stage to assess their suitability and to identify potential scopes of work. These options are presented to the Minister of Indigenous Affairs as the decision maker with a final recommendation made as to the best community. In order to meet Army planning timeframes, a final decision is required from the Minister at least 14 months out from project delivery.

6.2 Key Observations

While the revised methodology for site selection is relatively new and has only been tested for the 2018 and 2019 Projects, early indications are positive with the South Australian Government committing funding towards new infrastructure over and above the planned Scope of works and budget for the 2018 project.

However, while early indications are that 'buy-in' from jurisdictions has worked, community nominations by jurisdictions have not been as successful for either 2018 or 2019, with limited and/or poor quality nominations received. To enhance the community nomination process, more work with the jurisdictions is desirable to ensure they understand the nature of the Programme and the attributes of a suitable community. This also presents opportunities to strengthen relationships with state and territory portfolio staff to effect informed, coordinated, and collaborative service delivery.

The review team noted that as part of the current site selection process, data on the environmental health status and social determinants of a community is not used to identify suitable site options. Adopting such an approach would provide additional rigour around selection criteria and should be considered to enhance the process.

The Review Team identified more consultation should occur between PM&C and Army during the initial identification of sites. Currently Army provides comments on the suitability of identified communities from a location and Scope of works perspective.

Given Army's Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs) and other regionally based Reserve units have intimate knowledge of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities within their area of operational responsibility, they could provide valuable insight into the community selection process. Further detail on the RFSUs is included at [section 5, Appendix G](#).

Past site selection considerations do not appear to have always considered future planned regional economic development initiatives in the assessment of suitability of communities. As a result, the opportunity for AACAP to supplement or leverage these activities and to work with other relevant bodies to enhance broader community or regional outcomes has not always been realized.

Given the significant investment the Programme brings in terms of funding, in-kind

support and broader social benefits to a single community, consideration should be given to how AACAP could be better aligned with longer-term Australian Government or other jurisdictional regional programmes to achieve wider outcomes. This might include the delivery of successive AACAPs in multiple communities in a single region or jurisdiction, or Army working as part of a wider team delivering a focused step-change outcome in a single community.

As a final observation, the review team notes there are currently no process for communities to self-nominate for AACAP. An opportunity exists to introduce a process for communities to nominate and demonstrate ownership, governance and leadership as a consideration in site selection. This process may encourage communities to invest effort in those areas. It also increases the risk of expectation, which would need careful management if this approach was adopted.

6.3 Recommendations

Strengthen the community selection process by giving consideration to:

- a. Identifying quantitative health indicators (such as environmental health status and social determinants of a community) to determine communities most in need and to guide evidence-based site selection.
- b. Adopting a broader place-based approach to capitalise on local opportunities to better enable community led Indigenous advancement within a region.
- c. Consulting with Army's Regional Force Surveillance Units and the wider Army Reserve community on suitable options in the early stages of community identification.
- d. Working with the jurisdictions to ensure they understand the nature of the Programme and the attributes of a suitable community in order to effect better nominations from them.
- e. Introducing opportunity for communities to nominate and demonstrate ownership, governance and leadership as a consideration in site selection.

CHAPTER 7: CULTURAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

“They did do consultations, the community was very well prepared”

- Community member

7.1 AACAP Process

Community engagement for an AACAP project occurs throughout each of the four stages of the project lifecycle (i.e. Inception, Development, Delivery and Closure).

The detailed process is outlined in the AACAP PMG that form part of the AACAP MoU. In summary, community consultation on a potential project begins during the **Inception** stage (14-26 months prior to construction) when Army and PM&C personnel conduct feasibility reconnaissance visits to short-listed communities to assess their suitability for the Programme. During these visits, the reconnaissance team engages with community representatives to explain the nature of the Programme and confirm the community's willingness to participate and to develop a possible infrastructure Scope of works.

Once a community is selected for AACAP by the Minister for Indigenous Affairs, further engagement occurs as Army undertakes a scoping reconnaissance, with the aim of confirming items identified during the feasibility reconnaissance, and further developing the Scope of works for Steering Committee and community endorsement.

Engagement continues during Development stage as Army and PM&C Network staff, supported by PM&C's contracted Technical Advisor (TA), consult further with community members and other appropriate stakeholders, to develop a tailored Scope of works package that incorporates all three elements of the Programme (i.e. infrastructure, health and training).

Once a project moves into the Delivery stage, Army's main deployment commences and a formal ongoing engagement process, including regular site meetings, commences and continues until completion of the project.

Following completion of the Army deployment and project construction works, engagement continues with at least two more community visits undertaken by Army during the 12 month DLP.

7.2 Cultural Preparedness

7.2.1 Army

Army's former Directorate of Indigenous Affairs developed a Defence Indigenous Handbook for commanders, managers and supervisors to support them when dealing with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Defence personnel and/or Indigenous communities. Consistent with the Handbook, it appears that on AACAP

projects all relevant stakeholders including PM&C's regional offices, land councils and the communities themselves, are consulted about local customs and protocols prior to Army's arrival.

Most Army personnel engaged in early consultation activities tend to have undertaken some form of prior cultural training, which provides a sound foundation for the conduct of culturally appropriate engagement.

Acknowledging the language challenges that may arise in some communities, Army uses translators to assist with the consultation process when required and includes female personnel on reconnaissance and project teams to enable consultation on women's cultural issues.

All AACAP Army personnel undertake Cultural Awareness and Appreciation Training prior to deployment for the Delivery stage. As a further measure, some communities choose to provide community-specific cultural training as part of a Welcome to Country activity once the main deployment body arrives in the community.

7.2.2 Prime Minister and Cabinet

PM&C relies on its Regional Network to guide community engagement and consultation throughout the project lifecycle.

The Network is staffed with experienced officers, often of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander descent, who undertake regular Cultural Appreciation Training. They have established relationships with communities and are well versed in local customs and protocols. Further, they have a sound understanding of each community's key stakeholders, the challenges faced and what infrastructure and services are needed.

7.3 Key Observations

In the main, AACAP's community engagement and consultation process appears to be robust with communities citing Army personnel as being respectful of and willing to learn about, customs and protocols. This can be attributed to a combination of the careful cultural preparations undertaken prior to deployments, and the very valuable cultural insight and understanding provided by PM&C Network staff

While the review team received no reports of cultural indiscretions by Army, there was some evidence to suggest civilian contracted workers employed on some projects may not have undertaken appropriate cultural training, exposing the Programme to an unnecessary reputational risk.

Community-specific cultural inductions are not a formal step in the community engagement process and occur only if requested by the project team or instigated by the community.

The review team considers a formal community-specific cultural induction delivered by community members could further assist Army personnel and any contracted civilians to gain a stronger understanding of local culture. Items covered could include:

- a Welcome to Country;
- local customs and protocols;

- specific cultural stories;
- advice on looking after Country; and
- issues faced by the community.

To a large extent, community members felt well-consulted on the scope and design of infrastructure as well as the range of training courses offered. In particular, people in receipt of new houses were very positive about their ability to 'alter' the base house design offered, to suit their individual needs and circumstances. It was evident that allowing the community to define its own needs and assist with design contributed to a sense of ownership and pride.

While this community consultation process is time consuming, it contributes significantly to the success of projects. The review team supports the importance placed on this process by both Army and PM&C.

Similarly, community engagement during projects is equally important. Numerous positive comments were received regarding the way Army and other ADF personnel engaged with community members during the projects, including through activities such as visits by the Army band, RAAF Hercules aircraft, and professional sporting teams. The 'open days' for organised visits of community members to Army's Camp Birt deployment campsite was also reported as a highlight of the projects.

Many elders noted the community social benefit of the AACAP deployments, expressing high regard for Army's leadership and work ethic, citing uniformed personnel as excellent role models for working-age people, particularly youth. Although the review team was not made aware of any formal youth development activities (other than sport-based), there was a high level of support for the engagement of soldiers with community youth when it did occur, whether that was through structured training programmes, sporting activities or simply on the occasional social engagement.

There was consistent messaging from communities around the need to create activities for youth to minimise issues arising from boredom. There were generally positive comments regarding the experiences of youth where they had the opportunity to engage with Army personnel, whether that was through structured training programmes, sporting activities or simply on the occasional social engagement.

Universally, community members considered Army personnel desirable role models for their youth. There appeared to be a keenness for a form of structured youth engagement during projects, potentially along the lines of the Australian Army Cadets youth development programme. The review team understands there has been some consideration within Army of the development of a mobile cadet capability (see 'Cadets in a box' – story box 6.1 at section 6, Appendix G for more detail) and considers AACAP would be an ideal platform to deliver such a function into those communities where this need has been identified.

“Army were good with the kids.”

- Community member

STORY BOX 7.1

Women's 'ladies day out' Activity

One community suggested there could be a mutual benefit achieved through conduct of a specific women's 'ladies day out' activity, where female community members would spend time with female soldiers; sharing experiences and cultures through camping, bush food, bush medicine and so on, in a two-way exchange of ideas and inspiration. A similar idea was suggested as also likely to be valuable for young men.

The feedback provided to the review team from communities and associated stakeholders has confirmed the value of AACAP for remote communities. As noted earlier in this report, Army also gains significant value from the Programme, both in developing and sustaining professional competencies and through the increased cultural awareness that develops through involvement on the Programme. A compelling example of this value is in Story Box 7.2 below.

STORY BOX 7.2

AACAP Learnings Applied on Operations⁷

Much commentary is provided on the suitability of AACAP projects as a training medium for Army to maintain its various skills and capabilities to required readiness standards. This applies equally to Army tradesmen and women who value the opportunity to practice their trades on real tasks in support of other Australians, but also to junior officers who are learning their profession in preparation for potential future operational deployments.

A case in point is that of a young Royal Australian Engineers officer who, newly graduated from the Royal Military College and the School of Military Engineering, found herself leading a troop of some 40 soldiers in an isolated Aboriginal community in remote north west WA.

The officer, who had yet to spend any time in her unit in barracks before arriving in the remote community, was tasked with leading a construction troop from the 21st Construction Squadron for a period of 3 months, remote from any of the Squadron's command element. The officer has since deployed twice with the Army to the Middle East and has gone on to command her own Engineer Support Squadron in barracks and on deployment to Papua New Guinea. As stated in the officer's own words, 'the problems were real' on AACAP.

AACAP placed her in a position where she 'felt real responsibility for the first time', not just for herself and her soldiers, but also for the members of the community who's lives could be affected by the officer's decision-making while in their community.

The officer notes that the lessons learned in leading soldiers in that environment were difficult at first but prepared her well for the challenges she would face later in her career. For example, English was often not the first language for many community members, 'there was no Bunnings down the street' if they had forgotten something, and troops had to feed and sustain themselves for an extended period of time,

For this officer, the first of those challenges arrived within 12 months of the AACAP deployment, when she was deployed to Afghanistan as part of the 1st Australian Reconstruction Task Force. The officer's role was very similar to that on AACAP. In simple terms, it was about building infrastructure in remote communities, but the officer reflects that it was much more than that.

The officer notes her time on AACAP allowed her to understand that in such environments, 'the benefit realised from a piece of infrastructure is more than just the provision of a new building; rather it is more about the wider effect and social outcomes that can be achieved for a community through the provision of that infrastructure'. The officer has carried this key lesson with her throughout her Army career and firmly attributes it to her time

The review team noted that commissioning/completion plaques have been placed on AACAP infrastructure in the past, but this has not consistently occurred across projects. It was noted that when plaques have been installed on major infrastructure builds they did not always acknowledge PM&C's (or other previous partner agencies') contribution. The review team considers this is a missed opportunity to acknowledge PM&C's involvement and strengthen its relationships with communities. Further, plaques did not always acknowledge the role of communities in projects, yet their input is a key contributor to project success. The review team considers the use of plaques to recognise the partnership nature of the Programme and the contribution of key parties is a practice that should be applied on future projects.

7.4 Recommendations

Further support and strengthen cultural engagement and exchange by giving consideration to:

- a. Enhancing the currently effective cultural awareness programme undertaken by Army with a formal community-specific cultural induction for Army personnel and contracted civilians upon arrival into recipient communities.
- b. Employing local interpreters where relevant to address potential communication issues and enhance potential future employment opportunities.
- c. Enhancing youth development outcomes by implementing youth specific engagement activities, such as a temporary cadet programme delivered as part of Army's AACAP project deployment.
- d. Installing completion/commissioning plaques on major infrastructure builds, acknowledging the contribution of Army, PM&C, the community, and other key parties as appropriate.

Continue to maintain those elements of the Programme that are working well, including:

- a. Leveraging opportunities for joint celebrations such as:
 - Camp Birt open days;
 - visits from the Australian Army Band;
 - the involvement of the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF), particularly the ADF aircraft which community members saw in operation and were able to tour in person; and
 - visits from professional sporting teams in conjunction with health programmes.
- b. Continuing to realise the value of the intangible social benefits that arise from Army living in communities for an extended period.

CHAPTER 8: PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE

“It was great having Army here... Army made people feel so good.”

– Community member

8.1 Governance Framework

There are a number of layers to AACAP's governance arrangements and management framework. The Programme is governed by a MoU between Army and PM&C and supported by the AACAP PMG, which provide the detailed processes for the management of each AACAP project (see below for more detail).

8.2 Performance Indicators

The MoU defines the performance indicators for AACAP as follows.

1. Army will deliver one AACAP project per calendar year.
2. Each AACAP project is delivered in accordance with Australian industry standards, including all legally mandated certification, and is appropriate to the community's location and identified needs.
3. Each AACAP project is delivered within the specified time frame and project budget approved by the AACAP Steering Committee.
4. Stakeholder consultation is undertaken throughout the process of each AACAP Project to ensure the community is satisfied at the end of the AACAP Project.

8.3 Structure

8.3.1 Steering Committee

As defined in the MoU, the AACAP Steering Committee provides strategic guidance and direction for the implementation of the Programme as well as individual projects.

The Assistant Secretary of PM&C's Remote Strategies Branch and Army's Force Engineer co-chair the Steering Committee. Additional members include representatives from Army (usually the Commanding Officer/Chief Engineer, 19th Chief Engineer Works) and PM&C (usually the AACAP Manager).

The Steering Committee makes executive decisions related to the selection and recommendation of recipient communities, approves project work scopes and approves the apportionment of individual project funding within the overall Programme budget. It may issue additional guidance as required from time to time, to govern how projects are to be developed and delivered.

The Steering Committee meets quarterly, usually in March, May, August and November (twice chaired by Army in Sydney and twice chaired by PM&C in Canberra). Secretariat support is provided by the agency hosting the meeting. Out-of-session meetings are convened by teleconference or email as required.

8.3.2 Project Boards

In accordance with the PMG, Project Boards are established for each project to coordinate engagement with the recipient community and other stakeholders in order to support project development and delivery.

Project Boards are chaired by PM&C National Office and include representatives from:

- PM&C's Regional Network;
- Army (Project Manager, Project Engineer, Contract Administrator and/or Works Supervisor); and
- the contracted Technical Adviser.

Projects Boards meet via teleconference and are conducted as a minimum as follows.

- Inception – monthly
- Development – fortnightly
- Delivery – fortnightly
- Closure – as required

Out-of-session meetings are convened by teleconference or email as required.

Since the commencement of the AACAP 2017 Project (i.e. Toomelah, NSW), PM&C has initiated Project Start-Up Meetings which bring all members of the Project Board (with the addition of PM&C Regional Managers) together for a one-off, initial face-to-face meeting.

This meeting is used to:

- establish rapport between all members;
- ensure all members are clear on roles and responsibilities;
- agree processes and communications;
- identify and discuss issues specific to the project; and
- provide a forum for PM&C regional staff to familiarise themselves with AACAP and the impacts a project will have on both their office and the community.

8.3.3 Site Meetings

Weekly Site Meetings chaired by Army's Project Manager are held with relevant construction agencies. These are conducted during the construction stage.

8.4 Documentation

8.4.1 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

A MoU between PM&C and Army sets the strategic direction, working arrangements and funding processes for AACAP. Further, it details the role of each agency and sets the broad terms and conditions under which AACAP will be delivered.

8.4.2 Project Management Guidelines (PMG)

The PMG form part of the MoU and are reviewed in parallel with the MoU. The PMG detail the roles and responsibilities of the various agencies involved in the

delivery of projects and the deliverables required in order to meet the

Programme's objectives, from the feasibility stage through to the defects liability period (DLP).

8.4.3 Reports

The PMG indicate that during the course of each project, Army will produce the following reports:

Feasibility Report:

- Provides an assessment of the viability and suitability of an AACAP project being delivered in the shortlisted communities and makes recommendations on a preferred recipient community.

Scoping Study:

- Develops a proposed Scope of works with the agreed recipient community for further development. The Scoping Study Report describes each proposed Scope of works item and outlines Army's intent for subsequent development and delivery. The report is submitted to the Steering Committee for approval and a works scope letter is subsequently issued to the community for its acceptance.

30 Per Cent Design Report (Concept Design Phase):

- Documents concept design solutions for the Scope of works to enable key stakeholder review and comment and community endorsement to guide and facilitate further development.

50 Per Cent Design Report (Schematic Design Phase):

- Stakeholder feedback is incorporated and further design solutions are developed for Steering Committee endorsement.

90 Per Cent Design Report (Final Design Phase):

- Includes confirmation of the final project budget allocation and exact works to be delivered including the delivery methodology for Steering Committee approval and notification of the works to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

Project Completion Report:

- The [Project Completion Report](#) is initially issued as the [Practical Completion Report](#) and later updated at the end of the DLP stage and reissued as the [Final Completion Report](#). The report includes:
 - a project summary including the project's aim, stakeholders and key appointments, Scope of works delivered and final costs and key project milestones;
 - a review of each project stage including a summary of activities undertaken, stakeholder management, lessons learnt or recommendations made; and
 - details of relevant statistics that can be used to promote the outcomes of the AACAP Project.

8.5 Funding

Under current arrangements PM&C allocates \$7 million per financial year for AACAP

from the IAS. Under current provisions, the Government has agreed to fund AACAP to 2021-22. Army contributes a similar value of in-kind support each year through the provision of personnel, equipment and resources.

Historically, AACAP has been a Commonwealth funded endeavour however there have been occasions where other agencies have contributed additional funding, often tied to delivery of a particular scope item (e.g. a state government health department contributing funding for the delivery of a health clinic). There was evidence this type of direct engagement increased outcomes for the community, provided greater certainty around ongoing end-user arrangements and increased 'buy-in' from the agency. Recent changes to the selection process encourage funding contributions from jurisdictions.

8.6 Public Relations

8.6.1 Media and Communications

Army and PM&C have agreed media and communication processes that include press releases, engagement with (usually) local media on each project and publication of stories on PM&C's website and/or www.indigenous.gov.au.

Army and PM&C have recently established and jointly administer a co-branded Facebook page which provides regular updates on live projects and provides a forum for the wider public to be informed and stay connected.

Army also produces a coffee-table style picture book after each project, which is used to 'market' the Programme to interested parties.

8.7 Key Observations

8.7.1 Structure

Overall, the structure of the AACAP governance framework appears sufficiently robust with minimal issues identified across the Programme's 21 years. Noting its unique nature, the review team considers the performance indicators for AACAP are an appropriate mechanism for measuring overall Programme performance, but they do not give any quantitative indication of the success of individual projects or Programme outcomes.

PM&C Regional Network staff have not always been assigned full-time to AACAP projects despite the relationship between senior on-site Army personnel and local Regional PM&C staff being critical to a project's success. In cases where staff have been assigned, the relationship appears to have been used to good effect to ensure issues are dealt with quickly as they arise, with escalation to the Project Board as necessary.

Going forward, noting the benefits arising from the current practice of regularly inviting the PM&C Regional officer to Site Meetings, there would be benefit in formalising this arrangement. Further, the current informal arrangement could be made more efficient and effective by PM&C assigning a PM&C Network officer for the full three-year duration of an AACAP project, to improve project knowledge retention within PM&C and ensure a relationship can be built within the wider project team. This option should be explored with consideration given to the workload this would

bring and what resources (financial or otherwise) might need to be made available to the Network to compensate for this commitment.

8.7.2 Documentation

Both the MoU and PMG are out of date and require updating to ensure they reflect current best practice and incorporate any changes arising out of this review. Further, the review team considers that to ensure the MoU and PMG remain current, it would be appropriate for PM&C and Army to conduct a review of the current MoU no later than four years after its initial commencement and thereafter every four years while it remains in use. The PMG should be reviewed regularly in conjunction with the MoU.

In undertaking the desktop review of project documentation, the review team found the design and completion reports did not provide consistent information from one AACAP year to another. In order to improve consistency of information and data collection, consideration could be given to reviewing project documentation requirements in line with the review of the PMG. Further detailed observations are at [section 7, Appendix G](#).

8.7.3 Efficiency

Due to the nature of this joint initiative relying on in-kind Army support, an assessment of the Programme's efficiency is subjective as it is difficult to fully identify or quantify all benefits and costs. Given this, the review team has relied on assessments of past success and performance of the Programme and future assumptions to determine programme efficiency.

Additionally, since AACAP's inception, the Programme has always been small in terms of overall Indigenous funding, however qualitative findings explored throughout the report and appendices suggest that AACAP consistently represents value in significant investments in remote Indigenous communities.

The review team notes the PMG provide a mechanism for ensuring value for money in procurement, requiring all activities undertaken in accordance with the Commonwealth Procurement Rules.

The PMG also defines a framework for review of project documentation to ensure value for money is achieved. A key component of the framework is the role of PM&C's appointed Technical Adviser, an industry expert engaged to provide PM&C with advice on how proposed infrastructure, health and training programme costs compare with market costs.

The effectiveness of the Programme could be better assessed through the development of a project impact framework to measure the social return on investment (SROI). Currently there is no principles-based method for measuring extra-financial value (i.e. environmental and social value) of an AACAP project relative to the resources invested. This could include a before and after snapshot of the three elements of AACAP through an outcome lens. Such a framework would allow PM&C and Army to effectively evaluate the impact of each AACAP project on stakeholders, identify ways to improve the Programme, and enhance overall Programme performance. Applying the SROI method would standardise and provide a consistent approach to evaluating each AACAP project and the

Programme as a whole. Once developed, the framework could be employed by PM&C's Network and oversighted by the AACAP Steering Committee.

In the absence of an objective measure, it is reasonable to conclude that since AACAP's inception, the Programme has been successful in delivering efficient and effective outcomes for both recipient Indigenous communities and Army.

Army personnel interviewed identified the deployments provided excellent training opportunities not only for Army's engineers, but also for its health professionals, training staff, planning staff, logisticians, and other support personnel. Further, inclusion of other ADF and international defence force personnel provide good opportunities for practicing working together in remote locations.

It was noted that AACAP does impose a demand on Army's resources, however the current rate of effort (one 4 to 6 month deployment per year) is understood to be sustainable within Army and provides the appropriate opportunities to exercise Army's operational capabilities.

Further detailed observations are at [section 7, Appendix G](#).

8.7.4 Public Relations

AACAP has a very positive reputation with communities and other stakeholders who have had close contact with the Programme, however there appears to be limited understanding in the general Australian community of the goodwill of the Programme. The review team considers there would be merit in actively engaging the media (and other communications mediums) to focus on the Programme as a positive model of change and commitment in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Positive stories about individual projects would provide crucial context for, and give credibility to the Programme.

Strong, strategic and ongoing public and media relations could prove an invaluable tool in raising general awareness of the Programme and increasing third party commitment to the Programme. Consideration could be given to using current media and communication practises to proactively engage with appropriate third parties with the view to securing additional commitment to the Programme.

Further, noting the Programme has been in operation for 21 years, it would be appropriate to consider some form of publicity to recognise and communicate to a wider audience the Programme's achievements over that time.

8.8 Recommendations

Further strengthen AACAP governance by giving consideration to:

- a. The development of a project impact framework, managed by PM&C through the AACAP Steering Committee, in order to better assess the effectiveness of the Programme, including the social return on investment.
- b. The inclusion of state/territory government representatives on Project Boards.
- c. Assigning a dedicated officer from the PM&C Regional Network for the duration of each AACAP project, to leverage the AACAP investment throughout the project lifecycle to maximise sustainable outcomes.
- d. Reviewing and updating the MoU and the PMG to ensure they reflect the current processes and incorporate any changes required as a result of adopting any of these recommendations.

Continue to maintain those elements of the Programme that are working well, including:

- a. Maintaining the role of the PM&C Technical Adviser as a key partner in the management of the Programme.
- b. The current approach of one 4 to 6 month AACAP deployment per year, which is sustainable within Army and provides the appropriate opportunities to exercise Army's operational capabilities.
- c. Options for telling the positive AACAP story to a wider Australian audience.

CHAPTER 9: SUMMARY and FINDINGS

“We were the celebrity community – people were coming in to see the Army”

- Community member

9.1 Summary Findings

In addition to detailed observations and findings identified earlier in this report, overall the review team found the Programme has been a good example of Commonwealth Government agencies working collaboratively to improve primary and environmental health and living conditions for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, while providing valuable training outcomes for Army. In doing so, the Programme reinforces the strong association between Army and the Indigenous people of Australia.

AACAP was found to be an effective means to achieve a number of positive outcomes for both Indigenous communities and Army. AACAP’s objectives align well with the COAG ‘Closing the Gap’ targets in Indigenous disadvantage and with the Australian Government’s IAS.

In simple budget terms, AACAP has always been a small initiative within a much larger overall Indigenous Affairs funding environment, yet its impact in recipient communities has been found to be in excess of what might be expected from a similar investment through other initiatives. The health and training services provided by Army make AACAP more than a simple construction programme. These additional services, along with the role model behaviour demonstrated consistently by Army’s personnel in communities, have been described as delivering an unquantifiable, but highly valued, social benefit that is the key point of difference between AACAP and other programmes.

The review team found AACAP in its current form is widely regarded by communities as a successful programme that is very effective in meeting its intended objectives. The Programme is contributing positively to practical reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians; with communities reporting an improved understanding of, and enhanced respect for Army; and Army reporting increased understanding and appreciation of Indigenous culture.

For Army, the review team found AACAP provides a valuable training opportunity to test and exercise its capability at the required readiness levels. This value extends beyond the Army engineers involved in the delivery of infrastructure and includes Army’s health professionals, training staff, logistics and operations staff involved in the planning, mounting and sustaining of each project.

APPENDIX A: Terms of Reference

2017 Review of AACAP

Since 1996 Army, in cooperation with relevant Commonwealth Departments (currently the Department of the Prime Minister & Cabinet (PM&C)), has conducted the Army Aboriginal Community Assistance Programme (AACAP) to deliver a range of infrastructure, services and other benefits to selected remote Indigenous communities. A review of the Programme to support its continued effectiveness, sustainability and good governance is timely.

Scope of the Review

1. The review will examine AACAP with respect to the objectives of the Programme, including an assessment of the outcomes from AACAP projects in terms of what was planned and delivered and what has endured. The review will assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme and make recommendations regarding potential improvements in site selection, planning, coordination and execution to ensure the intent of the Programme is achieved and sustained, including maximising enduring community benefits and ensuring Army's training objectives are achieved.
2. The review will specifically consider:
 - whether the Programme objectives need to be adjusted in order to pursue wider benefits in line with the broader policy context including:
 - opportunities to leverage broader benefits from the Programme and improve longer-term sustainable outcomes, including through cross agency, wider ADF, state/territory government, business, community-sector and other partnerships; and
 - opportunities to achieve greater training, employment and business outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including through ADF recruitment and links to the CDP.
 - arrangements for site selection;
 - opportunities to improve the engagement of Indigenous communities in Programme decisions and activities;
 - the adequacy of relevant ADF and PM&C policy or guidance and planning documentation;
 - the arrangements for coordination between PM&C, Army, Forces Command (FORCOMD), technical advisers, state and territory agencies, and communities;
 - project outcomes achieved compared with the original intent, along with an assessment of results that have endured and why/why not (focusing on more recent locations and sampling older sites);
 - the funding, cost attribution, personnel and materiel arrangements;
 - any relevant reports and evaluations, including the 2010 ANAO audit of the Programme; and
 - opportunities to improve communication about the Programme's outcomes.
3. The review will be conducted jointly by Army and PM&C which will work closely with, and take advice from, a reference panel of Aboriginal and

Torres Strait Islander leaders.

- The review will also engage with relevant Commonwealth, state and territory experts and community stakeholders.
 - The review team will report to an oversight committee, comprising representatives of Army and PM&C, providing project updates at key intervals.
4. The review will commence in September 2016 with a mid-project report to the Chief of Army and the Associate Secretary, Indigenous Affairs Group, PM&C, in December 2016.

APPENDIX B: List of Previous AACAP Locations

Year	Location	State
1997	Bulla	NT
1998	Docker River	NT
1998	Oak Valley	SA
1998	Bickerton Island	NT
1998	Elcho Island	NT
1999	Jumbun	QLD
2000	Melville Island	NT
2000	Bathurst Island	NT
2001	Amanbidji	NT
2001	Yarralin, Lingara	NT
2002	Beagle Bay, Red Soil, Djarindjin, Bobieding, Banana Wells, Lombadina	WA
2002	Pandanus Park	WA
2003	Palm Island	QLD
2004	Bamaga, Seisa, Injinoo, Umagico, New Mapoon	QLD
2005	Fitzroy Crossing, Yiyili, Yakanarra, Milijitti, Kadjina	WA
2006	Borrooloola	NT
2007	Doomadgee	QLD
2008	Kalumburu	WA
2009	Mapoon	QLD
2010	Pukatja	SA
2011	Joy Springs, Bayulu	WA
2012	Fitzroy Crossing, Ardyaloon, Djarindjin, Lombadina	WA
2013	Fregon	SA
2014	Wutunugurra, Canteen Creek	NT
2015	Titjikala	NT
2016	Laura	QLD
2017	Toomelah	NSW
2018	Yalata	SA
2019	Jigalong	WA

APPENDIX C: AACAP Review Reference Panel

Terms of Reference

Background

The PM&C and the Australian Army are undertaking a review of the AACAP. The review will examine the objectives and outcomes of AACAP with a view to broadening the benefits of the Programme. The review is expected to take six months from October 2016 – June 2017.

Since 1997, AACAP has delivered a range of housing, infrastructure, essential services (power, water and sewerage) and other benefits to selected remote Indigenous communities to improve the primary and environmental health and living conditions of Aboriginal people.

Over the past 20 years, AACAP has been delivered to 41 communities.

The objective of the review is to examine the appropriateness, efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme by considering elements such as:

- the arrangements for site selection;
- project outcomes achieved compared with the original intent;
- the engagement of Indigenous communities in the Programme's decisions and activities;
- funding, cost attribution, personnel and material arrangements; and
- the adequacy of relevant Defence and PM&C policy or guidance and planning documentation.

The review will also specifically consider whether the Programme objectives need to be adjusted to pursue wider benefits including:

- opportunities to leverage broader benefits from the Programme and improve longer-term sustainable outcomes, including through cross agency, wider ADF, state/territory government, business, community sector and other partnerships; and
- opportunities to achieve greater training, employment and business outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, including ADF recruitment and links to the CDP.

The review team will be led by Brigadier Darren Naumann (Army) and Ms Katrina Jocusen (PM&C), and will be assisted by Lieutenant Colonel Doug Mitchell (Army), Ms Lori Richardson (PM&C) and Ms Annette Godden (PM&C).

The review team will conduct desktop reviews of all 43 AACAP projects as well as travel to a select number of communities, to assess the infrastructure delivered and survey community members and other stakeholders in order to inform recommendations for programme improvement.

Role of the Reference Panel

The Reference Panel will provide expert advice on opportunities to leverage AACAP to achieve better outcomes in the areas of:

- Indigenous environmental health;
- community and business development;
- community engagement; and
- ADF recruitment.

Specifically, the Panel will provide advice on:

- the proposed review methodology; and
- the report under draft, particularly in relation to ways the Programme can be improved.

Timing

It is anticipated the Panel will meet with the review team three times; upon formation (i.e. November 2016), at the mid-point (i.e. December 2016/January 2017) and once the findings have been drafted (i.e. March/April 2017).

Meetings may be conducted by teleconference and/or face-to-face with supporting email communications. Commitment is not expected to exceed 15 hours (excluding travel time if required).

APPENDIX D: AACAP Review Reference Panel

Appendix D: AACAP Review Reference Panel

Lieutenant Colonel Ron Baumgart

Lieutenant Colonel (LTCOL) Ron Baumgart is from Pine Creek, NT with some 42 years of service in the Australian Army. He joined the Army in 1975, and on completion of recruit training at Singleton was allocated to the Royal Australian Infantry Corps. In his early days of soldiering, LTCOL Baumgart achieved the rank of corporal before he was selected for officer training at the Officer Cadet School Portsea, Victoria.

LTCOL Baumgart graduated from the Officer Cadet School in December 1981 having been awarded the Sword of Honour. He has served in numerous Infantry regimental, training and staff positions including command of a rifle company in the 2nd/4th Battalion in Townsville. Further appointments include Deputy Head Australian Defence Staff Port Moresby, Defence Advisor South West Pacific (including Solomon Islands and Vanuatu), and Defence Cooperation Program Team Leader in Timor Leste. In each of these appointments he was responsible for the design and delivery of the Australian Defence Cooperation Programme.

Mr Joseph Elu

Mr Joseph Elu is the Torres Strait Regional Authority (TSRA) Member for Seisia and has been elected for the sixth time to the TSRA Board. During the previous term of the TSRA Board, from 2012 - 2016, Mr Elu was elected as the TSRA Chairperson. Mr Elu is the Portfolio Member for Economic Development on the current TSRA Board.

During his career, Mr Elu has been an influential leader in Torres Strait Islander and Aboriginal Affairs and Indigenous economic development. He has been instrumental in assisting Indigenous people throughout Australia develop sustainable economic enterprises. Mr Elu advocates for and encourages Torres Strait and Northern Peninsula Area communities to generate sustainable enterprises to enable a generation of income that is their own.

Mr Elu also continues as the Chairperson of the Seisia Enterprises Pty Limited and Seisia Community Torres Strait Islander Corporation.

Ms Jessica Spencer

Ms Jessica Spencer is a proud Wiradjuri woman from Central West New South Wales. As a graduate of the NSW Health Aboriginal Environmental Health Officer Training Programme, Ms Spencer has achieved a Bachelor of Applied Science (Environmental Health) from the University of Western Sydney. She has also obtained a Masters of Applied Epidemiology from the Australian National University.

Ms Spencer has been in the role of Regional Aboriginal Environmental Health Project Officer for the NSW Health Aboriginal Environmental Health Unit for the past year. In this role, she is responsible for delivering environmental health initiatives at the grass roots level while feeding outcomes of these initiatives and other observations from the field into evidence based policy at the state level.

APPENDIX E: Communities and Sites Visited

Table E1: Communities Visited			
Western Australia	Northern Territory	South Australia	Queensland
Ardyaloon 2012	Canteen Creek 2014	Fregon 2013	Bamaga 2004
Banana Wells 2002	Milikapiti 2000	Pukatja 2010	Injunoo 2004
Bayulu 2011	Wurankuwu 2000		Jumbun 1999
Beagle Bay 2002	Wutunugurra 2014		Laura 2016
Bobieding 2002			New Mapoon 2004
Budgarjook 2002			Seisa 2004
Djarindjin 2012			Umagico 2004
Joy Springs 2011			
Lombadina 2002, 2012			
Pandanus Park 2002			
Yakanarra 2005			
Yiyili 2005			

Table E2: Sites Visited
Army Headquarters, Russell Offices, Canberra
Headquarters Forces Command, Victoria Barracks, Sydney
Headquarters 51st Far North Queensland Regiment, Cairns
17th Construction Squadron (AACAP), Laura QLD
Army Indigenous Development Program, Batchelor, Northern Territory
PM&C regional offices in Broome, Derby, Alice Springs and Adelaide

APPENDIX F: Stakeholder Consultations

Table F1: Stakeholder Consultations		
Australian Army	Department - Prime Minister & Cabinet	Other Stakeholders
Chief of Staff, HQ Forces Command	Alice Springs Regional Office	Kullarri Regional Communities
Force Engineer, HQ Forces Command	Broome Regional Office	Northern Peninsula Area Regional Council
G3 (Operations), HQ Forces Command	Eastern NSW Regional Office	Trility Pty Ltd
Command Health Officer, HQ Forces	Cairns Regional Office	Nyul Nyul Rangers, Beagle Bay
Staff Officer Grade 1 Education, HQ Forces Command	Townsville Regional Office	Tiwi Islands Regional Council
Senior Health Officer, HQ 6 Brigade	Top End & Tiwi Islands Regional Office	Western Australia Department of Housing
Director Workforce Strategy - Army	National Office, Canberra	Nirrumbuk Aboriginal Corporation, Broome
Commander, Australian Army Cadets		NPA Health services
Commanding Officer and Regimental Sergeant Major,		Ardyaloon Community Council
Commanding Officer, 51 Far North		APY Trade Training Centre
Staff Officer Grade 3 Training Systems, Royal Military College		Save the Children, Djarindjin
		Fregon (Kaltjiti) Community Council
		Yurmulun Aboriginal Corporation, Pandanus
		Laura State School
		My Pathways
		Ernabella Arts Centre

APPENDIX G: Detailed Observations

Section 1: Infrastructure

G1.1 Housing

By and large, houses inspected were well-designed and appropriate for the community, well-constructed and appeared to remain structurally sound. Both new housing and house refurbishments were very well regarded by community members, exceeding community expectations both in terms of quality and outcomes (e.g. anecdotal evidence suggests new housing provided under AACAP has in some cases alleviated overcrowding). In a number of communities, the AACAP house design appears to have influenced the design of additional housing subsequently built by other providers.

Consultation on house design in particular was very well regarded, as future residents of new house builds were given the opportunity to amend the basic design offered to suit their individual situations. This fostered a sense of pride, ownership and good will towards Army.

There were some minor detailing issues noted, however these were generally the exception rather than the rule. For example, house designs in one community did not account fully for overland water flows, resulting in some minor flooding into houses. Had the houses been built on slightly elevated building pads rather than excavated for slab construction, the issue could have been avoided. Mostly, these design issues were simple over-sights or errors with minimal impact on the sustainability of the built solution.

G1.2 Health Clinics

Anecdotal evidence (from both community members and health professionals) suggests the delivery of health clinics in two communities visited had far-reaching impacts. The provision of well-designed and culturally appropriate clinics appears to have facilitated regular, ongoing visits from a wide range of health professionals.

This benefit was magnified significantly in one particularly isolated community, where the health clinic was complemented by the construction of an airstrip for use by the Royal Flying Doctor Service (RFDS). The inclusion of a 'staff apartment' in the clinic, serving as a rest area for flight crew, is an excellent example of a well thought-out design that further enhanced the facility's utility.

G1.3 Multi-Purpose Centres

Similarly, well-designed multi-purpose centres were popular with communities. They facilitated flexible usage for the delivery of various health, training, employment and social services and often generated income from that use. In many cases, these centres were the pride of the community and served as a focal point for community gatherings.

Final furnishing and fit-out of multi-purpose centres is not usually part of the work scope, with this responsibility falling to the ultimate end-user. In one facility inspected, the end-user had not undertaken fit-out and occupancy of the building in a timely manner, reportedly due to budget constraints. This resulted in sufficient

damage from vandalism (broken windows and doors) to render the building unusable until repaired. As the end-user now needs to carry out costly repairs ahead of occupancy, the building has remained empty since completion in 2014.

It is noted AACAP Technical Advisers have since been tasked with identifying end-users and working with them to ensure they have the capacity and capability to take on infrastructure to minimise further instances like this occurring. Consideration could be given to funding a minimum furnishing and fit-out (e.g. \$10K) of facilities for future projects to facilitate immediate occupancy and use, but more could be done both in terms of design and governance.

With regard to design, security screen protection was provided to all operating sash or panel components of windows and doors in the multi-purpose facility referenced above, but not to the fixed non-operable glass components. As a result, many of the fixed glass elements were broken, yet all protected components remained intact. Including security screen protection over all glass would have minimised the damage and likely preserved the useability of the building.

In the absence of a clear design reason, it appears the limited security protection may have been a budget-driven decision, which although creating a capital cost saving at the time, has resulted in a higher cost of ownership for the community. This example presents a good case where a more sustainable outcome may have been achieved with a slight increase in capital expenditure up front.

In terms of governance, there appeared to be no ongoing post project support provided to the end-user. Such support from PM&C Network staff could help minimise recurrence of such incidents and ensure programme outcomes are realised.

G1.4 Service Provider Accommodation (SPA)

The provision of SPA in those projects investigated by the review team yielded mixed results. In one case, the SPA now provides a source of income and employment for the community as visitors rent accommodation rooms at approximately \$50 per night and locals are employed to clean the facility.

In another, the SPA was not being used to its full income-generating potential as it was competing for business with the pre-existing Australian Government accommodation facility, preferred by visitors given its lower/no cost. While this is a matter for the community to address with the management of the Government facility, the situation does reflect on the Programme and could be prevented in the future with sufficient post-project support from PM&C.

A third example saw the SPA no longer used at all given occupational health and safety concerns arising from the poor condition of the building. It is noted this facility failed after the defects liability period and was a trial, prefabricated option that Army has subsequently determined should no longer be used.

G1.5 Waste Water Treatment Systems & Waste Management Facilities

In the main, waste water treatment systems were well designed and soundly constructed, significantly improving living conditions in communities along with the safety and wellbeing of residents.

Similarly, waste management facilities were relatively well designed and used, although it is noted the provision of 'recycling' spaces often tended to be ineffective given remoteness and the length and expense of the supply chain to transport collected items to recycling facilities.

G1.6 Roads, Drainage and Footpaths

Of the items inspected, works were well designed, structurally sound and in good use. Reports indicate they had improved access, reduced noise and dust and provided safer passage. Substantial stormwater drainage works observed in one community appeared to have been successful in design and sufficiently robust in construction to continue to be operating effectively many years later.

G1.7 Airstrips

Airstrips inspected were found to be serviceable, well maintained and in good use. In two instances, confirmation as to their quality was verified on the spot with pilots. While their overall benefits are hard to capture, there is some evidence to indicate they have facilitated the provision of better health services in particularly remote communities (see Health Clinics).

G1.8 Repair and Maintenance

Some issues with ongoing maintenance and repair of infrastructure were identified. Although there was no direct evidence that Army's (Operations and Maintenance) O&M training, O&M documentation or DLP management was deficient, there were numerous examples where the ongoing operation and maintenance of infrastructure was not being undertaken as it should.

In some instances, this was the result of insufficient ongoing funding, uncertainty regarding the ownership of assets, or the absence of an identifiable body willing and able to take on responsibility. It is noted this is not an AACAP specific issue, and current AACAP planning processes seek to better address this now than in the past. In terms of general repairs and maintenance, infrastructure design should consider the capacity and capability of end-users to manage their assets.

In two communal facilities (a SPA and a multi-purpose facility), ease of maintenance did not appear to be considered fully in the design, with higher than standard ceilings presenting issues for routine maintenance tasks such as changing lightbulbs, cleaning fans and maintaining smoke detectors. Communities were faced with additional costs to purchase high work platforms and invest in staff training in order to undertake the tasks themselves, or engage contractors to complete the work. The designs were considered in the desktop review but no apparent reason for the high ceilings could be identified. It is noted this appears to be a project specific issue that was not seen in other communities visited. Future projects should give consideration

to robust designs that align with community and/or end-user capacity and capability and have minimal operational, repair and maintenance requirements.

It is clear some communities need support beyond initial handover to ensure their capacity to operate, repair and maintain infrastructure well past the DLP. Some support already exists through the delivery of 'basic home maintenance' training however this training is not delivered in all projects and does not address the full scope of support required. Clarity and certainty of asset responsibility arrangements post completion, will improve sustainability of infrastructure well into the future.

G1.9 Delivery of household and water efficiency education

While not an AACAP issue *per se*, it was evident communities are in need of energy and water efficiency education. The review team encountered many broken/running taps, water pipes and bores, lights and air conditioners on in unused/buildings and/or air-conditioners running with windows and doors open.

A basic household education and energy/water efficiency programme included as part of AACAP could reinforce messaging from other programmes/sources and assist in boosting individual and community capability to manage critical issues like water supply and sustainability. Such a programme could offer practical ways for households to:

- reduce energy and water consumption;
- reduce household running costs; and
- improve comfort within the home.

Story Box 1.9.1

Education and Behaviour Change

Community engagement and education around energy efficiency was a key component of the Manymak Energy Efficiency Project⁷ which trialled energy efficiency approaches in Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory.

While the approach taken targeted the needs of remote Yolngu communities, the following recommendations may be useful for other education and behaviour change programmes.

- Energy efficiency education could be delivered in local language, by trained local people.
- Recognise that energy is an enabler for livelihood, health, social wellbeing, safety, comfort and entertainment – the focus should be on improving energy productivity rather than energy reduction.
- Understand the hierarchy of needs and where energy efficiency will sit within people's priorities.
- Energy efficiency educational resources could:
 - Engage early with the intended audience to help target and scope them appropriately;
 - Provide an appropriate amount – but not too much information or too many educational materials – to convey the energy message;
 - Use multimedia to engage the audience; and
 - Be judicious with what resources are used in a project – more is not necessarily better.
- Provide a full explanation of the motivators and drivers for the initiative.
- Link energy education to key motivators for change, including health and safety co-benefits, environmental co-benefits and environmental sustainability.
- Design education materials and the approach to start from and build on existing knowledge and beliefs.
- End-user training is as important as any technology retrofits themselves – community engagement needs to happen earlier in order to achieve best practice outcomes.
- Provide tailored approaches to engage all sectors of the community – both genders and all ages (e.g. presentations to children in schools are helpful for engaging children).
- Combine energy and water efficiency training with other community education programmes (e.g. month management) to improve economies of school and build capacity in communities.
- Focus on addressing the social and cultural norms and barriers around appliance use, including establishing responsibility and motivation for turning appliances off.

⁷ Indigenous Essential Services Pty Ltd, on behalf of Manymak Energy Efficiency Project consortium. (2016), (*Final Report: Manymak Energy Efficiency Project*), Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

Appendix G, Section 2: Health

G2.1 Dental Services

Dental services were very well received with most community members otherwise reliant on infrequent visits from the mobile dental truck and/or travelling long distances to access services for their usual dental care. One community cited residents from nearby communities, familiar and comfortable with Army dental services due to their own previous AACAP project experience, travelled to the live project specifically for further treatments. People were genuinely appreciative of being able to view the dental surgery and talk through treatment procedures (a number of times if required) before committing to treatment.

Communities reported an ongoing confidence about dental treatments with many of the myths of pain associated with dentists dispelled. There also appeared to be an ongoing understanding of basic dental hygiene practises. However some community members in receipt of new dentures reported they had been lost (misplaced) over time, leaving them with less oral capacity (and possibly at risk of compromised health (e.g. malnutrition)). Consideration should be given to social and environmental factors in the sustainability of denture treatments before undertaking such procedures in the future.

G2.2 Veterinary Services

Veterinary programmes were also very well received once understood; in particular the desexing programme which was very successful (albeit in the short-term) in controlling dog numbers. Sustainability of the Programme however was limited by the usual ongoing animal management services available in each community. Most communities reported a number of (non desexed) 'stranger dogs' arriving post AACAP, that to varying degrees and over time, undermined results achieved.

G2.3 Physical and Education Training Services

Sports health programmes, such as AFL training, softball and planned sports days were very popular as they tapped into the natural sports culture that exists in many Indigenous communities. Community members were particularly proud to report on the several occasions when 'Community beat Army' or where community sport teams went on to win local and regional competitions as a result of their increased skills and/or health and fitness levels.

G2.4 Enhanced Health Services

Noting the limitations on the range and availability of Army health personnel who can be deployed to support AACAP projects, and the over-riding intent to ensure services delivered complement existing services, there may be scope to enhance services under AACAP through support from external sources.

In the spirit of enhanced inter-agency cooperation on health services, other health services providers (e.g. state/territory governments, non-government organisations, local health professionals) could be encouraged to work alongside Army in the conduct of appropriately targeted programmes, potentially addressing such issues as:

- immunisation;
- eye and ear health;
- diabetes;
- mental health;
- physiotherapy; and
- physical fitness.

With sufficient planning, coordination and governance, the incorporation of civilian professionals and services into AACAP could increase health outcomes and facilitate longer-term, sustainable benefits.

Fact Box 2.1

Health Outcomes

The provision of housing and associated infrastructure is essential to improve the health of Indigenous people and will facilitate healthy living practices, which plays a key role in health outcomes⁸

⁸ Australian Indigenous Health *InfoNet*. (2008), *Review of the impact of housing and health- related infrastructure on Indigenous health*, Australian Indigenous Health *InfoNet*

Appendix G, Section 3: Training

G3.1 Training Opportunities

Training opportunities were generally open to both genders but female participation was sometimes dependent on the availability of 'traditionally female' training with only a few examples noted of women undertaking 'traditionally male' training such as welding or construction. There was general agreement from communities that more 'female friendly' training would be welcomed, particularly programmes focussing on business administration and hospitality/catering.

It was noted that while it had been a regular training course in early AACAP projects, 'basic home maintenance' training had not been provided in recent years. Consideration could be given to the permanent re-introduction of 'basic home maintenance' training, particularly for communities where employment opportunities are very limited or non-existent, in order to boost life skills and/or where houses are delivered as part of the infrastructure works package.

G3.2 Employment Opportunities

Employment outcomes also varied. Some community members thought a number of employment outcomes were a direct result of AACAP training, but this was limited to a minority of communities located close to obvious employment sources, and a direct link could not be confirmed. There was however, good evidence to suggest broader handy-man type skills (e.g. construction, welding, small engine maintenance) continued to be valued, with the skills used by CDP participants and for other general activities. In these circumstances, a strong sense of achievement and pride about undertaking and using the training persisted.

Fact Box 3.1

AACAP Training Completion Rates

Programme documentation identified a number of positive factors influencing higher completion rates. These include but are not limited to:

- short course training models;
- positive view towards Army;
- engagement of community members during the training development stage; and
- inclusion of an Indigenous mentoring course undertaken by Army trainers before they delivered training in the community.

Appendix G, Section 4: Employment and Economic Development

G4.1 Employment During Projects

In addition to the possible creation of direct employment opportunities during project delivery, Army can also utilise its contracts to influence civilian contractors engaged on the projects to meet Indigenous employment targets. This approach would be in accordance with the requirements of the Commonwealth Procurement Rules (including Exemption 17⁹) and the Commonwealth Indigenous Procurement Policy, which both seek to increase opportunities for Indigenous engagement on projects funded by the Commonwealth.

G4.2 ADF Recruitment Activities

Employment opportunities for people living in remote communities are limited. Given the apparent value community members (particularly elders) place on military service, AACAP presents an opportunity 'to start a conversation' with interested people about defence service, jobs and careers.

Noting the desire for many communities to see this dialogue increased, this 'conversation' could be expanded to include one or more of the following, tailored for each community as appropriate.

- Regular visits from Army's RFSU (i.e. NORFORCE, Pilbara Regiment and 51 FNQR) to complement and leverage off the engagement of the AACAP contingent.
- Informal talks with appropriately aged youth and working-age adults, potentially on multiple occasions across several days to enable full engagement.
- More formal ADF recruitment presentations, including coverage of Air Force and Navy career opportunities.
- Information on, and access to, alternate ADF entry pathways, including Reserves and regular service options (see Army Indigenous Development Programme (AIDP) information below at story box 4.1).
- Noting the value of youth development outcomes achieved via the Australian Army Cadet organisation, establishing a 'temporary Army Cadet Unit' (see 'Cadets in a Box') in those communities that have expressed a desire for the duration of the AACAP deployment could also serve as part of the 'recruitment conversation'.

⁹ Exemption No. 17 (included in Appendix A) of the Commonwealth Procurement Rules (CPRs) allows a Commonwealth agency to approach a small or medium Indigenous business (at least 50 per cent Indigenous owned) directly (via limited tender) for a quote for the provision of goods or services.

Story Box 4.1

Army Indigenous Development Programme (AIDP)

The AIDP (Northern Territory) or AIDP-NT is an award-winning collaboration between the Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education and the Australian Army that is successfully increasing the representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the ADF.

The five month course supports student recruits to develop key literacy and numeracy skills (to Year 10 equivalent) and teaches basic military skills within a culturally appropriate learning environment.

The AIDP-NT offers a safe middle-ground to trainees, allowing young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to learn and adjust to the demands of full time employment in the Army, before being sent to Kapooka for recruit training to progress their careers.

In addition to standard training, recruits are often sent out to lend a hand in a wide range of community projects, such as the Barunga festival and environmental management programmes. These activities instill a sense of pride and allow individuals to act as role models within the community.

The Commanding Officer (CO) NORFORCE has a team of eight officers/soldiers (as part of the NORFORCE Unit) working the AIDP-NT.

'It is one of the things that I am most proud of. Our collaboration with Batchelor and the work that is done to enable opportunities for young Indigenous men and women is just phenomenal'.

Last year's graduates brought the number of Indigenous people in the ADF to more than 500 for the first time since World War II. This year's intake of 33 trainees, will build on that success, as will the four programmes planned for 2018. By next years end, around 180 young Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander lives will have been significantly changed for the better with most expected to go onto full-time military careers.¹⁰

G4.3 Tourism

Australia has a diverse and iconic landscape which is attractive to domestic and international visitors. By their very presence in that landscape, many remote communities are very well positioned to capitalise on tourism opportunities. Site selection for AACAP projects could consider such opportunities.

¹⁰ Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education. 2017. *Indigenous Recruits Start Army Training*. [ONLINE] Available at: <https://www.batchelor.edu.au/portfolio/new-indigenous-recruits-start-army-training/>. [Accessed 28 June 2017].

Story Box 4.2

Cape Leveque Road

In 2016 the then Premier for Western Australia announced funding in 2017 to seal the Cape Leveque Road from Broome, through the length of the Dampier Peninsula, to Cape Leveque.

The road will provide training and employment, generating around 80 jobs during the four-year construction period and open up tourism and business opportunities for the estimated 1400 people living in the 52 permanent Aboriginal communities on the Dampier Peninsula¹¹.

Fact Box 4.3

Indigenous Employment Rates According to Locality²

Indigenous employment rates across Australia are affected by remoteness of location with the general limited availability of mainstream jobs being one of the main reasons for higher unemployment rates in remote communities.

In 2012-13, 50 per cent of Indigenous working age people living in *Major cities* were employed; but the proportion dropped to 42 per cent for those living in *very remote* areas.

Between 2002 and 2012-13, the proportion of Indigenous 18-24 year olds whose main source of personal income was government pensions and allowances (or - remote areas).

The proportion of 18-64 year olds whose main source of personal income is government pensions and allowances (or CDEP payments), is far greater in the Indigenous population than in the non-Indigenous population.

Fact Box 4.4

Indigenous Employment

Closing the Gap Target: Halve the gap in employment by 2018.

Progress: In 2014-15, the Indigenous employment rate was 48.4 per cent, compared with 72.6 per cent for non-Indigenous Australians (a gap of 24.2 percentage points up from 21.2 percentage points in 2008).¹³ This indicates a need to create employment opportunities, particularly in remote communities.

G4.4 Economic Development

¹¹ Government of Western Australia. 2016. *Funding for Broome to Cape Leveque Road*. [ONLINE] Available at: <https://www.mediastatements.wa.gov.au/Pages/Barnett/2016/12/Funding-for-Broome-to-Cape-Leveque-Road.aspx>. [Accessed 26 June 2017].

¹² Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Australian Government 2017. *Diversity and Disadvantage in Australia*. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.aihw.gov.au/australias-welfare/2015/diversity-and-disadvantage/>. [Accessed 14 June 2017].

¹³ Link destination: the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet website, 2017. Document sourced is the *Closing the Gap Prime Ministers Report*, the ninth annual report to Parliament on progress in Closing the Gap. Available at: www.pmc.gov.au [Accessed 28 June 2017]

During interviews, several communities and stakeholders identified potential economic development opportunities that may be appropriate for remote Indigenous communities. These are described in the following paragraphs. The review team is well aware that the sustained success of such opportunities is directly related to the level of continued active management and support, and is by no means guaranteed. However, for the purpose of provoking discussion and potentially influencing development of other ideas, the opportunities are listed below.

G4.5 Caravan Parks

Many remote communities are located in some of Australia's most breathtaking landscapes. They are attractive to tourists, particularly 'grey nomads' who generally have the time to linger, the interest to learn about the area, and the means to sustain themselves and contribute to the local economy. The development of simple caravan parks and/or camping grounds would be economically viable, environmentally appropriate and simple to manage. They could generate jobs in cleaning, maintenance and business administration. Facilities could range from basic absolute blocks only, to sites with camp kitchens, laundries, ice machines and renewable energy powered sites (priced accordingly). AACAP could provide the infrastructure as well as training in the business and basic maintenance skills required for ongoing sustainable operation.

G4.6 Cultural/Arts Centres

Cultural/arts centres provide a focal point for visitors to communities, offering opportunities to learn about local history and customs and to purchase arts, crafts and other goods. They could generate jobs in cleaning, maintenance, sales and business administration as well as provide an outlet for local artists to sell their products. Facilities need only be simple, low cost, low maintenance structures, easily within Army's construction capabilities. In addition, Army could provide training in basic business skills and maintenance to support ongoing sustainable operations.

G4.7 Cafes and Canteens

To support sporting facilities, caravan parks, camping grounds and cultural/arts centres etc., cafes and canteens could be delivered under AACAP to generate revenue for the community and create jobs in cleaning, maintenance, sales and business administration. Facilities would not need to be complex in design and Army's basic maintenance, business skills and hospitality/catering training could be used as a base upon which other service providers could build to support ongoing sustainable operation.

Fact Box 4.5

Grey Nomads Tourism, Australia

In May 2017, Tourism Research Australia, estimated that visitor numbers for stopover accommodation (caravan or camping (commercial or non)) in Australia for grey nomads from the ages of 55+ was 20,267 total nights over a three year average period from 2014 to 2016¹⁴. Using this baseline data and assuming conservative future growth of 5 per cent per annum, the number of independent travellers is project to grow to more than 26,000 by 2022.

In the Queensland Government's response to the Economic Development Committee's Issue Paper No. 3: Grey Nomad Tourism, it was noted that economic potential of mature age tourism in remote Indigenous communities warrants further consideration.

Data from 1999, suggests that 24 per cent of international visitors to Queensland visited an Aboriginal community/site; and in 2001, 14 per cent of interstate visitors to Queensland visited an Aboriginal community/site.

Comparative numbers experienced Aboriginal art/culture or cultural displays¹⁵. The Northern Territory's demographic profile attributes 24 per cent of Indigenous culture visitors to people aged 55 years and over. Western Australia's demographic profile data from 2007 suggests that 40 per cent of the visitors were 55 years and over¹⁶.

The Queensland Government's response recommended steps necessary to develop mature age tourism in remote communities including: infrastructure development; marketing to local and international audience; and local community skill development to manage tourist activities and accommodation.

Story Box 4.6

Whale Song Campground and Café

Overlooking Pender Bay on the West Kimberley coast, Whale Song Campground and Café¹⁷ offers simple fresh food daily during the dry season and authentic bush camping in a secluded location with cliff-top views of Humpback Whale nursery and resting grounds. Its owners have established the business from the ground up, employing local Aboriginal people during the tourist season. They cite basic barista, food health and safety, computer and marketing/advertising training as valuable skills for community members seeking employment.

G4.8 Cultural Tours/Walking Trails/Cattle Drives

¹⁴ Tourism Research Australia, 2017 (unpublished data).

¹⁵ Link destination: Tourism Queensland website: Document source is an updated research paper titled *Indigenous Tourism* that provides information on Indigenous Tourism opportunities in Queensland. www.tq.com.au/research

¹⁶ Tourism Western Australia and Tourism Research Australia (2007). *Understanding the Caravan Park Industry in WA*, Tourism Western Australia, Perth.

¹⁷ Link destination: Whale Song Campground and Café. (2017), Website provides information about the campground, café and other tourist facilities. whalesong.com.au (Accessed: 26 June 2017)

Cultural tours, walking trails and cattle drives are all ideas offered by communities as ways to share their history, culture and lands with visitors. In most instances, simple signage, fencing and pathways are all that is required in terms of infrastructure. Supplemented with specialist horticultural, animal management and online marketing training from programme partners and Army's business skills training, these present low cost opportunities to tap into a growing domestic tourism market to generate revenue and jobs.

G4.9 Market Gardens

Establishing market gardens within communities could increase health and wellbeing, generate revenue and create jobs. Infrastructure costs would be relatively low, even if incorporating watering systems, and well within Army's capability with specialist horticultural training provided by programme partners.

G4.10 Donkey Holding Yards

Indigenous Rangers advise donkeys are a valuable resource for protecting cattle from dingos. Providing donkey holding yards under AACAP could allow communities to process and sell feral donkeys to local cattle stations, generating revenue and jobs. Infrastructure would be low cost and simple enough to deliver as a CDP activity or as part of construction pathways training. Basic business skills could complement the initiative.

G4.11 Car Crushing

Albeit a short-term initiative, mobile car crushing units (either purchased or leased) would allow communities to gather car bodies to process as scrap metal for sale, all the while cleaning the surrounding environment and making it safer. Revenue earned from recycling the metal could fund workers and pay for costs. Safe operation training could supplement Army's small engines training and be provided under AACAP

G4.12 Worm Farming

Commercial worm farms could serve as an environmentally friendly option to process organic waste (gathered from cafes, canteens, kitchens, schools and businesses etc.) to produce valuable liquid and solid fertiliser for sale locally or further afield and/or to support market gardens. While requiring specialist infrastructure (from programme partners or through direct procurement), operational requirements are simple and the initiative could be supported by basic business skills training and training in marketing.

Story Box 4.7

Worm Farming Assessment of Costs and Considerations

Costs for composting vary greatly, depending on the type of materials processed, annual throughput, the type of technology employed and the kind of products generated. Generally they range between \$25 and \$130 per tonne.

For each 500g of food waste produced each week, at least 30 cm² (1 ft²) of composting bin space is required. As a benchmark for every 2-3 people worth of food waste, composting bins should measure 60 x 60 x 30 cm and be stocked with 1 kg of worms. Roughly, 1 kg of worms (3000 to 5000 individuals) needs 3 to 4 kg of food per week or 1kg of scraps every 2-3 days. End products include liquid and bio-organic solid fertiliser, worm tea, worm faeces (vermicast - worm castings) and mature worms.

WORM HABITATS - Suitable for medium to large scale composting for schools, cafes and larger assignments. Worm habitat costs for processing approx. 20 litres waste per day + 2kg worms- \$2,400 +GST to \$4,400 + GST.

Story Box 4.8

Regional Vermiculture Australia (RVA) (now Australian Vermiculture)¹⁸

RVA was initially formed in Broken Hill in 1997 as a research project that provided an opportunity to address the ongoing problems of youth unemployment and Indigenous community self-sufficiency. To do this, the business set up "Land Fill as a Resource" and initiated a partnership with the Broken Hill City Council to turn green waste and all organic material into a viable and saleable resource, using composting and vermiculture (commercial worm farming) techniques. This created employment, a sustainable business producing varying grades of organic fertiliser and mulch and eradicated much of the problem of waste as landfill and its associated costs.

The business has had a major social impact with increased participation in youth employment and training programmes and in 'selling' Broken Hill as progressive and environmentally responsible in waste management.

The RVA model has been set up to be easily adaptable and transportable to other parts of the Country.

¹⁸ Australian Vermiculture. 2013. *Australian Vermiculture*. [ONLINE] Available at: <https://www.australianvermiculture.com.au/our-story>. [Accessed 17 May 2017].

Appendix G, Section 5: Community Selection

G5.1 Use of Army's knowledge to assist with identifying communities

Tapping into the wealth of information held by Army's RFSUs as part of the community selection process, could contribute to quality nominations.

Story Box 5.1

Regional Force Surveillance Units

The RFSUs employ a large number of Indigenous soldiers, many of whom are employed from local communities on a part-time (Reserve) basis or through the Regional Force Surveillance List.

While NORFORCE is well known for its engagement with Indigenous communities, 51 Far North Queensland Regiment (51 FNQR) and the Pilbara Regiment are also closely involved with communities within their area of operation and employ local Indigenous people.

NORFORCE is based at Larrakeyah Barracks in Darwin. Its area of operations covers 1.8 million square kilometres and encompasses the Northern Territory and the Kimberley region of Western Australia - the largest area of any military unit in the world today. The primary role of NORFORCE is reconnaissance, observation and the collection of military intelligence.

Australian Aboriginal soldiers form 60 per cent of NORFORCE personnel and are predominantly drawn from the areas they patrol, in order to draw on local knowledge. This has resulted in a great trust for the Regiment among Aboriginal communities.

51 FNQR plays an important role in the security of Australia by conducting surveillance patrols in the sparsely populated and remote regions of Far North Queensland. 51 FNQR is made up of full-time and part-time members with battalion headquarters and a surveillance company located in Cairns. Surveillance companies are headquartered throughout Far North Queensland at Weipa, Thursday Island and Mount Isa.

Approximately 30 per cent of 51 FNQR personnel are Indigenous Torres Strait Islanders and mainland Aboriginal peoples. 51 FNQR is tasked with reconnaissance and surveillance of some 640,000 square kilometres from Cardwell (north Queensland) to the Torres Strait (inclusive of Cape York and the Gulf Country) and west to the Northern Territory border.

Pilbara Regiment has a mission to provide the Australian Army with information by conducting surveillance operations to contribute to an effective ADF surveillance network in the North West of Australia (Pilbara Region). It is responsible for an area of 1.3 million square kilometres from Port Hedland to Carnarvon in Western Australia, and from the coast to the border with the Northern Territory - approximately one-sixth of the total Australia land mass. A detailed knowledge of its area of operations is maintained by conducting reconnaissance patrols by foot, vehicle and watercraft, surveillance from static observation posts and by systematic communication and liaison with police, customs, other regional authorities and local landowners.

²¹ Australian Army. 2017. *Army Indigenous Initiatives*. [ONLINE] Available at: <https://www.army.gov.au/our-people/army-indigenous-community/army-indigenous-initiatives>. [Accessed 26 June 2017].

Appendix G, Section 6: Community Engagement

G6.1 Temporary/Mobile Australian Army Cadets

The Australian Army Cadet Programme is developing a concept for a limited exposure cadet experience which is deployable to remote communities, building interest long after the Programme moves on. This concept requires the prepositioning of a 'Cadets in a Box' pack into a community followed by support from suitably qualified personnel. Such an activity, if conducted in a community during an AACAP project could enhance the community youth engagement outcomes achieved.

Story Box 6.1

Cadets in a Box

The Australian Army Cadet Programme seeks to address youth development by providing Australia's youth with an activity programme set in a military like environment. Using a disciplined, hierarchical structure and teaching military skills, the programme seeks to develop leadership potential where participants build confidence, resilience and values.

One concept being developed under the Programme is the idea of a limited exposure cadet experience which is deployable to remote communities, building interest long after the Programme moves on. This concept requires the prepositioning of a 'Cadets in a Box' pack into a community followed by support from suitably qualified personnel.

The 'Cadets in a Box' experience would primarily be used to address the key objectives of organisational identity (in this case community), respect for hierarchy, discipline in participation and the value of the team over self. This is achieved by deploying a known set of equipment for use by instructors in a program which could run for about two weeks. The key equipment would include the following:

- Inflatable Obstacle Course
- Radio equipment
- An erectable climbing/abseiling wall
- Pre-prepared initiative activities
- Simple fitness equipment
- A set of logs, ropes, pulleys, sandbags and anchors as a field engineering kit
- A mobile Q Store with selected field equipment and expendable clothing
- First aid instructional equipment and expendables
- Mobile WTSS equipment
- Select night vision devices
- Drones and robots
- Command post with flagpole

Deployed early in an AACAP project, Cadets in a Box would initially be supported by the Australian Army Cadets Programme and could potentially be continued in the community with the support of the deployed AACAP unit, or the local RFSU or Army Reserve unit.

Story Box 6.2

*The Junior Canadian Ranger Program as a Model for Re-engaging Indigenous Australian Youth in Remote Areas*¹⁹

In 2006 the Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research released a discussion paper called, *Kids, Skidoos and Caribou: The Junior Canadian Ranger Program (JCRP) as a Model for Re-engaging Indigenous Australian Youth in Remote Areas*.

In a dynamic and learning partnership, the Junior Canadian Rangers Program strives to strengthen remote and isolated Canadian communities through an altruistic, responsible and practical youth program that embraces culture and tradition, promotes healthy living and positive self-image, and reflects the proud military legacy of the Canadian Rangers²⁰.

The JCRP grew out of the realisation that traditional cadet programs could not easily accommodate the cultural differences and extreme isolation of remote communities. JCRP has a focus on deep engagement of communities in design, content and delivery, which has contributed to its overwhelming success.

Although somewhat dated, the paper can still be regarded as relevant and draws on the ADF's established tradition of involvement with Indigenous communities; suggesting there is value in adopting a similar model (or some components of it) in remote areas of Australia. This could be linked into the activities of Army's regional Reserve units and RFSUs.

¹⁹ Schwab, R.G. 2006, *Kids, Skidoos and Caribou: The Junior Canadian Ranger Program as a Model for Re-engaging Indigenous Australian Youth in Remote Areas*, Discussion Paper No. 281/2006, Centre for Aboriginal Policy Research, Australian National University.

²⁰ Government of Canada. 2014. *Junior Canadian Rangers*. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.jcr-jrc.ca/en/about-jcr.page>. [Accessed 26 June 2017].

Appendix G, Section 7: Governance

G7.1 Documentation

The current MoU is out of date in that it:

- details key personnel by name and not organisational position;
- does not refer to the IAS;
- refers to Army producing a 25 per cent Design Report in lieu of its standard practice (and industry standard) of producing a 30 per cent Design Report;
- does not reflect the changes to site selection endorsed by the Minister for Indigenous Affairs in 2015.

The PMG is out of date in that it does not reflect the changes to site selection endorsed by the Minister for Indigenous Affairs in 2015.

Consideration should be given to updating both the MoU and the PMG to address issues raised here and to incorporate, where appropriate, any recommendations taken up from this review.

With regard to project documentation, it is noted format and content of reports has changed with time, with varying levels of completeness observed. For a period, Completion Reports captured a series of lessons learned from individual projects but these have not been included in recent reports.

In a number of instances, the reports did not fully articulate changes of scope (e.g. when scope changed, reason) across projects. It is acknowledged such decisions are routinely undertaken by the Steering Committee however, capturing relevant information around changes across the reports would ensure completeness of records and preserve possible lessons learnt for future projects.

G7.2 Cost

The Programme appears well funded at \$7 million per financial year and when combined with Army's in-kind contribution is generally sufficient to deliver appropriate infrastructure works and health and training outcomes.

The new site selection process has successfully attracted additional funding from the South Australian Government for the AACAP 2018 Project, enabling a more focused service provision that is better aligned with existing on-going programmes in the Yalata community. Noting these extended community benefits, such contributions should be encouraged for future projects.

There also appears to be interest from non-government agencies in making contributions to, or working collaboratively on, projects in order to address specific issues (e.g. often health-related, in-kind support). These are considered to be worthy of follow-up.

In order to manage funding contributions from other parties, consideration should be given to an appropriate financial management framework that is transparent and provides surety to contributors.

Given the joint arrangements (i.e. Commonwealth funding and Army in-kind support), the question of best 'value for money' is subjective as it is difficult to fully identify or quantify all benefits and costs associated with the Programme and/or individual projects.

It is evident the infrastructure delivered under AACAP has been important to the health and well-being of communities. Without the Programme, many communities may have had to wait much longer to receive vital infrastructure such as waste water treatment systems and enabling infrastructure such as health clinics. In some cases, such infrastructure may not have been received at all.

Further, there is strong evidence to suggest the Programme provides significant social benefits to communities. Army's extended presence in a community facilitates reconciliation, increases positive social interaction and reinforces messaging around school attendance, employment, service to community, personal health, safety and well-being etc. Arguably, no other current Indigenous infrastructure programmes are able to achieve the same extended social outcomes.

For Army, AACAP provides a valuable training opportunity to test and exercise its capability at the required readiness levels. This value extends beyond the Army engineers involved in the delivery of infrastructure and includes Army's health professionals, training staff, logistics and operations staff involved in the planning, mounting and sustaining of each project.

Appendix G, Section 8: General Observations

The following general observations were noted by the review team.

- The RAAF involvement in the Programme was an important opportunity to expose aspects of the wider ADF to communities. (Everyone remembered the visit of the RAAF Hercules aircraft in support of the project).
- The participation of international soldiers from Tonga, PNG, and East Timor was successful from all accounts.
- There is a significant 'reconciliation' impact from AACAP, as community members viewed the experience as 'very positive for the community'. Further, some community members continue to maintain contact with Army personnel via Facebook and reported at least two instances of 'an Army man coming back to community during his holidays to do volunteer work'.
- Contractor-only infrastructure delivery (albeit in a minority of projects) waters down the 'Army' effect, unless there is also a training and/or health component provided.
- The inclusion of visits by professional sporting team representatives to communities (such as the NRL Indigenous Ambassador's visit to Laura, the AFL's Adelaide Crows to Fregon, and Queensland state cricketers to the Tiwi Islands), often in conjunction with NAIDOC Week activities, adds a particular value to the work being undertaken by Army.
- The review team received universal comments that Army was well behaved and respected community culture during their time in communities.
- Community visits to the construction squadron's Camp Birt were always remembered well.
- The 'all or nothing' approach to the majority of more recent AACAP projects, where only one community benefits, could cause issues locally that might be addressed through inclusion of outreach programmes to nearby communities where possible.
- There was a clear messaging that what differentiates AACAP from other programmes is the 'social stuff' that comes with it; that an AACAP project is much more than simply an infrastructure project.
- Many communities commented on the value of the Army band visits.

REFERENCES

- Australian Army. (2017), (*Army Indigenous Initiatives*), Available: <https://www.army.gov.au/our-people/army-indigenous-community/army-indigenous-initiatives> (Accessed: 26 June 2017).
- Australian Indigenous Health/InfoNet. (2008), *Review of the impact of housing and health-related infrastructure on Indigenous health*, Australian Indigenous Health/InfoNet.
- Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Australian Government. (2017), (*Diversity and Disadvantage in Australia*), Available: <http://www.aihw.gov.au/australias-welfare/2015/diversity-and-disadvantage/> (Accessed: 14 June 2017).
- Australian National Audit Office. (2010), (*AACAP 2010 ANAO Report No. 19, 2010-11*), Commonwealth of Australia.
- Australian Vermiculture. (2013), (*Australian Vermiculture*), Available: <https://www.australianvermiculture.com.au/our-story> (Accessed: 17 May 2017).
- Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education. (2017), (*Indigenous Recruits Start Army Training*), Available: <https://www.batchelor.edu.au/portfolio/new-indigenous-recruits-start-army-training/> (Accessed: 28 June 2017).
- Council of Australian Governments. (2009) *National Indigenous reform agreement (closing the gap)*. Council of Australian Governments, Canberra.
- Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation. (2017), (Queensland Government response to the Economic Development Committee's Issues Paper No. 3: Grey Nomad Tourism), 1st ed, Queensland Government, Australia.
- Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. (2017), (*Closing the Gap Prime Ministers Report*), Available: www.pmc.gov.au (Accessed: 28 June 2017).
- D Noble and P Hoskins. (2000), (*Evaluation Report of the AACAP*), Woods Bagot Pty Limited, Australia.
- Government of Canada. (2014), (*Junior Canadian Rangers*), Available: rjc.ca/en/about-jcr.page (Accessed: 26 June 2017).

Government of Western Australia. (2016), (*Funding for Broome to Cape Leveque Road*), Available: <https://www.mediastatements.wa.gov.au/Pages/Barnett/2016/12/Funding-for-Broome-to-Cape-Leveque-Road.aspx> (Accessed: 26 June 2017).

Imintji Aboriginal Corporation. (2016), (*Imintji Campground and Art Centre Kimberley*), Available: www.imintji.com.au (Accessed: 12 May 2017).

Indigenous Essential Services Pty Ltd, on behalf of Manymak Energy Efficiency Project consortium. (2016), (*Final Report: Manymak Energy Efficiency Project*), Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.

Regional Vermiculture Australia. (2005), (*Regional Vermiculture Australia*), Available: http://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0ahUK Ewjz5uqexdzUAhVCm5QKHR6PBzYQFggiMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.aph.gov.au%2Fparliamentary_business%2Fcommittees%2Fhouse_of_representatives_committees%3Furl%3D%2Fatsia%2Findigenousemployment%2Fsubs%2Fsub078.pdf&u sg=AFQjCNGvIZsR9n2En9N_LkUsSYetCy8fDw (Accessed: 17 May 2017).

Schwab, R.G. (2006), (*Kids, Skidoos and Caribou: The Junior Canadian Ranger Program as a Model for Re-engaging Indigenous Australian Youth in Remote Areas*), Discussion Paper No. 281/2006, Centre for Aboriginal Policy Research, Australian National University.

Tourism Queensland, (paper undated), (*Indigenous Tourism*), Available: www.tq.com.au (Accessed: 27 June 2017).

Tourism Research Australia. (2017), (unpublished data).

Tourism Western Australia and Tourism Research Australia. (2007). (*Understanding the Caravan Park Industry in WA*), Available: <http://www.tourism.wa.gov.au/Publications%20Library/Industry%20Support%20and%20Opportunities/Understanding%20the%20Caravan%20Park%20Industry%20in%20WA.pdf> (Accessed: 26 June 2017).

Whale Song Campground and Café. (2017), (*Whale Song Campground and Café*), Available: whalesongcafe.com.au (Accessed: 26 June 2017).

Yaran Consulting. (2003), (*Round Two Evaluation of the AACAP Final Report*), Yaran Consulting Pty Ltd, Australia.

Final Community Comment

We got together at the shed to say goodbye. The Kids had been preparing a song for weeks to sing. They all stood up. They had no shame, and they sang "We are Australian"... All the Army people had tears in their eyes.

- Community Member