

Careless, Crude and Unnecessary: The launch of NITV over the body of ICTV

For general release: Thursday July 12 2007

An open letter:

To Senator the Hon Helen Coonan
Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts
Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

ICTV represents the most significant advance for remote Indigenous communities in the past 20 years in terms of its potential to contribute to the maintenance of languages and cultures, boosting self-esteem and making a significant contribution to reinforcing a sense of identity amongst its diverse audiences. It has already begun to achieve this, according to the audience feedback we have included in our study.¹

Dear Senator Coonan,

THE TERMINATION OF ICTV

On July 13, with the launch of the new National Indigenous Television network (NITV), ICTV will be switched off so that NITV can be given sole access to Imparja's Channel 31 carrier.

This will effectively scrap the much loved and irreplaceable ICTV broadcast - a proven remote community television network *that is already working*; and Australia's *FIRST* community conceived and built national Indigenous television service.

While the NITV launch is celebrated in Sydney, in the bush the remote media organizations that have worked so hard to build ICTV from the ground up, and the 147-plus communities who have enjoyed its fruits, will be mourning; with ICTV's termination, communities that felt they were going forward with their own community television network, face the tragic prospect of going backwards - 10 years!

The proposal to install a one-size-fits-all, single National Indigenous Television service at the expense of ICTV, is looming as the biggest policy failure in

¹ Michael Meadows, Susan Forde, Jacqui Ewart, Kerrie Foxwell, Community Media matters, An audience study of the Australian community broadcasting sector, Griffiths University, March 2007

Indigenous media since the *invention* of Aboriginal television over 20 years ago. It is a clumsy shotgun wedding between disparate Indigenous media interests that is both doomed to fail remote communities, and endanger the new NITV initiative.

People in remote communities speak *'with passion and pride about the importance of seeing images of local, identifiable Indigenous people on TV... 'Our voices'; 'our images'; 'the Anangu way'; 'black voices, black issues'*.² What they see on this *'really deadly'* ICTV service makes them feel proud and inspires them to make their own contributions. They are adamant that they want ICTV to stay. This has been said time and again in forums and submissions during the development of NITV, but it seems, this advice has been determinedly ignored. When they learn that the goal posts have been moved, and that ICTV is being terminated, *'it takes the wind right out of their sails'*³.

I do not argue here that the NITV vision does not have a place, but rather, that its implementation is imprudent and destructive. NITV will not, can not, replace the crucial function of ICTV. The proposed NITV model is designed to serve different ends and will effectively usurp ICTV without discharging ICTV's most important functions.

This error can be corrected by amending policy to allow for these two services to coexist in a complimentary manner, each serving its own inimitable purpose. This would not be expensive or have any implications on the overall allocations for Indigenous media that could not be easily accommodated.

Such a policy adjustment would recognise the distinctive virtues and achievements of ICTV, give ICTV the respect and recognition it deserves, avert a scenario of winners and losers, and support remote Indigenous media practitioners in carrying forward the remarkable and hard-won gains they have made.

The Minister, then, should heed the call of remote Indigenous media practitioners for:

- **THE REINSTATEMENT OF A SATELLITE CARRIER FOR ICTV;**

and

- The settlement of a fair agreement between ICTV and NITV that feeds selected remote community programming to NITV;
- Financial support for ICTV at a realistic level, either through a guaranteed allocation of NITV funds, or separately;

² Meadows, et al. 2007

³ Utjutja Featherstone, Media Manager, Ngaanyatjarra Media, June 2007

- The provision of funds to ICTV and the Indigenous Remote Communications Association (IRCA), adequate to their peak-body/resource-agency functions and responsibilities.
- Policy clarification within DCITA about how Remote Indigenous Media Organizations will be supported to maintain their distinctive cultural and communications functions.

IN THE CURRENT CONTEXT

The magnitude of this policy error is underscored by the lessons about community development highlighted in the *Little Children Are Sacred*⁴ report. This report stresses that: locally based action, local resourcing, and local control are needed to really make changes; resources must be developed to empower Indigenous communities to lead themselves out of the malaise; the most successful programs are community-owned, adapted to the specific needs and cultural dynamics of individual Aboriginal communities, and cannot be imposed from without. The report says that there cannot be a “*shrink to fit*” or one-size-fits-all approach to reform in Aboriginal communities.

Further, this report declares that that relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people are profoundly affected by the failure of successive governments to ‘*communicate effectively with Aboriginal people in any sustained and focused way*’. Submissions to the inquiry explained that ‘*that concepts need to be explained in the local Aboriginal language*’. An improvement in program outcomes will only be achieved, the report states, by addressing these chronic communication failures and by ***bolstering communication strategies and capabilities*** in remote communities.

By eliminating *the most significant advance for remote Indigenous communities in the past 20 years*, by ignoring local concerns and successes, current policy impacting on ICTV flies in the face of common sense. Now as much as ever, it is critical to maintain the functionality of communication systems in remote communities and to reward their successes. It is not a time to be dismantling such an essential, grass-roots service as ICTV:

We feel that the media and communications in those remote communities are a survival mechanism and that these tools can literally save lives. We consider media and communications to be an essential service that helps to address life and death issues, which could include suicide, child abuse and domestic violence. Each community is unique and only each community truly understands what its priority issues are and how they should be addressed using media. Outsiders cannot do this

⁴ Ampe Akelyernemane Meke Mekarle, “Little Children are Sacred”, Report of the Northern Territory Board of Inquiry into the Protection of Aboriginal Children from Sexual Abuse, 2007

*as we can do this ourselves, as you've seen, there are people here with 23 years experience.*⁵

LEST HISTORY BE RE-WRITTEN

The minister's statement, in the Second Reading of the Broadcasting Legislation Amendment Bill 2007, that the government provision of \$48.5 million over 4 years to establish NITV would, *for the first time*, give indigenous communities a dedicated indigenous television service, was mistaken.

The honour of creating the first dedicated indigenous television service in Australia clearly belongs to ICTV who have been free-to-air broadcasting - courtesy of Imparja's channel 31 carrier - a regular schedule of Indigenous programming to remote Indigenous communities *since 2001*.

A SHORT HISTORY OF ICTV

The first trials of remote Indigenous community broadcast on Imparja Channel 31 were initiated in 1998, with Imparja's invaluable technical assistance, through the team effort of the remote media hubs: Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Media, Warlpiri Media and PAKAM.

By 2001 PY Media were regularly transmitting live broadcasts of the Central Australian Football Competition from Alice Springs back to 18 communities in the Anangu-Pitjantjatjara-Yankunytjatjara Lands. After the football compilations of remote Indigenous programming from the PY Media, Ngaanyatjarra, Warlpiri and PAKAM catchments were broadcast. These broadcasts were known as "Feeding The Beam". By 2003 a regular *collective* daily schedule of programming was being broadcast, and this was formalised under the network identification *ICTV* in 2004.

ICTV has maintained a steady growth in the reach, sophistication and volume of its play-out schedule, which broadcasts up to 300 hours of original, community-initiated, community-produced television each year.

Year by year, through their entrepreneurial effort, and with an enormous amount of passion and commitment from community elders, television workers and media managers (often working through their representative body IRCA), the remote media organizations have built a genuine COMMUNITY TELEVISION SERVICE that today boasts a widely recognized 'brand' that is cherished by the loyal remote producers *and* viewers that sustain its operation. (The "*ICTV, Showing Our Way*" motto greets crews throughout the Centre and the North).

⁵ Ella Geia, Presentation To NITV & DCITA at the ICTV/IRCA Summit, Alice Springs, March 21 2007

Today ICTV is watched more than any other TV channel in remote communities. It is the pride of remote communities. They are watching real life, local culture and issues communicated by their own people in their own language and this local control of remote community TV is essential.⁶

It is important to note that before the innovation of ICTV, Imparja 31 had played no role in broadcasting Indigenous programming. It was the enormous success of the ICTV initiative that put Imparja Channel 31 on the map as an Indigenous broadcaster. Essentially, Imparja Channel 31 **was** ICTV.

Indeed, the ultimate success of the lobby for the \$48.5 NITV funding allocation, was in large part due to the heavily cited, extraordinary example of ICTV, which was recommended as a foundation for a future NITV service, and which, to this day, maintains by far the largest volume of programming on Channel 31.

There is no question, then, that ICTV was the pioneer of networked Indigenous broadcasting in Australia, and the progenitor of a regular service that showed the way for others.

A GENUINE COMMUNITY INITIATIVE

The genesis of ICTV is an admirable illustration of the earlier cited principles that urge for Indigenous community programs to be built on local initiative and participation, and adapted to their specific needs and cultural dynamics. It also turns on its head the lament of taxpayer dollars being thrown at Indigenous problems for no outcome.

ICTV and IRCA's remarkable achievement has been, not only the creation of the first Aboriginal Community broadcasting network in Australian history, but the accomplishment of this ***with no dedicated funding whatsoever***. ICTV was not formed in response to a ministerial direction, a consultant's report or a government program, but through community partnerships, the ingenuity and energy drawn from remote communities themselves.

The irony is, that now, with the most generous Indigenous media budget in history, the remote communities that got the ball rolling, will be penalized.

ORIGINAL INTENTS & PURPOSES OF REMOTE INDIGENOUS MEDIA

The BRACS/RIBS analogue TV transmitter network that serves remote communities Australia-wide, and through which ICTV/Channel 31 is rebroadcast today, was

⁶ Annie Lui, Presentation To NITV & DCITA at the ICTV/IRCA Summit, Alice Springs, March 21 2007

conceived and initiated in the mid-1980s to service *the distinctive needs of REMOTE Indigenous communities*.

Cities and large urban centres have not figured in the way ICTV or the remote transmitter network has developed, or in the content it produces and screens.

The further development and expansion of this network of television transmitters and satellite decoders was given a boost in 2005 with the Minister's announcement of \$2m for the roll out of up to 80 additional television transmitters at Remote Indigenous Broadcasting Services (RIBS) sites across remote Australia.

This doubling of the size of the network would not have occurred without the determined lobbying of the remote television sector represented by IRCA, the ICTV membership and RIMO managers - who pressed for the roll out *with the specific purpose of extending the reach of ICTV*.

This also appeared to be the Minister's intention. On making your announcement, you noted the steady increase of culturally relevant content transmitted from ICTV, and remarked that the expansion of the network would give RIBS services the opportunity to broadcast their own community programming to a wider audience.⁷

It is disturbing to see, in recent communications, a revisionism that seeks to erase ICTV's place in this history, and replace it with NITV. See a recent DCITA announcement⁸ stating that Indigenous communities received support under the RIBS TV Transmitter Roll out Project *to receive NITV!*

20 years ago, at the beginning of this journey into self-representation (the BRACS era), clear distinctions were made between the needs, modes and strategies for promoting *urban-based* Indigenous media on the one hand, and *remote* media practice on the other. Now in a regressive stroke, this lesson has been ignored and NITV has been installed as a one-stop-shop through which all networked Indigenous media will be filtered.

Plans to terminate ICTV undercuts the Minister's declared intentions for the transmitter roll out, and shows careless policy execution that will in fact subvert the ability of RIBS services to broadcast the videos they produce.

⁷ Senator the Hon Helen Coonan, Media Release, "TV Transmitter roll out for remote communities", Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, 5 April 2005

⁸ Jennifer Levy, Manager, Community Broadcasting Section, Australian Government Department of Communication, Information Technology and the Arts, July 2007

THE MINISTER'S CAUTION

Inconsistencies arise again in the failure of NITV to follow the sensible guidelines outlined by the Minister and expressed in a letter to AICA on August 14 2006.⁹ In this letter the Minister directed that the new service be based on Option 3 of the Indigenous Television Review report¹⁰. This Report states that the new NITV service should: *“Build on the Indigenous Community Television narrowcasting service [ICTV] transmitted by Imparja Television...”*. This has clearly not happened.

Option 3 also states that: *“Under this option, ICTV would be funded to commission or produce additional Indigenous content to strengthen its schedule.”* This cannot happen since the ICTV schedule will be terminated.

Further, the Minister stated that: *“one of the pillars of Option 3 is the programming developed by remote communities and currently provided on Imparja’s narrowcast service Channel 31, the Government intends that the ITV [now NITV] service would continue to carry substantial programming intended for remote area audiences and made in remote communities. ... the business plan should articulate the proposed accommodation of the existing ICTV programming within NITV.”* [My emphasis]

In fact, **existing ICTV programming** will be simply cut off at the NITV launch, and NITV has not put in place any provisions that indicate that the Minister’s directions regarding the substantial participation of remote television (ICTV) in NITV, will be met.

This should not come as a surprise, since, contrary to assurances from DCITA and NITV that remote community programming will be accommodated, it is clear that NITV, by its organizational design, cannot fulfil the community television function that ICTV has been purpose-built to perform.

It would be prudent for the Minister to examine the misguided trail of policy advice that has led to this disarray.

TWO DIFFERENT CONCEPTS

The NITV concept with its corporate, top-down, professional structure, and aspiration to eventually reach large urban centres with programming that is deemed appropriate for a national NITV audience, is necessarily and fundamentally different to ICTV or the ‘remote community television’ concept.

⁹ Senator The Hon Helen Coonan, to Mr. Ken Reys, Chair, Australian Indigenous Communications Association, 14 August 2005

¹⁰ Indigenous Television Review Report, Report of the review into the viability of establishing an Indigenous television service and the regulatory arrangements that should apply to the digital transmission of such a service using spectrum in the broadcasting services bands, DCITA, August 2005

In order to satisfy its charter and notions of target audience, NITV has set in place a raft of ‘professional’, exclusive prescriptions and guidelines (see their website) that delimit the kind of programming it will accept for broadcast in terms of length, technical quality, aesthetic values, legibility to English speakers, and so on.

20 pages of NITV Commissioning and Acquisition guidelines tell media makers how they may approach NITV for commissions through various stages, *“to get an opinion about the inherent interest of the proposed program to NITV and therefore whether it is worth developing a full proposal”*. They describe mechanisms and criteria of assessment including: proposal ‘relevance’, the skills level of proponents, their ability to deliver to NITV’s priorities and to engage with NITV viewers. Applicants must satisfy NITV standards in regard to production values, chain of title and clearances, and are required to abide by stipulations for sub-titles or re-narration in English.

NITV CEO, Pat Turner, has said that NITV is keen to purchase programming from the bush, as long as it is **‘broadcast quality’** and has all the rights cleared. *“Whatever we do has to be **professional**”*, she said, *“and at a standard that we do not put Imparja’s license at risk”*¹¹.

Any film producer who has worked in this mainstream/professional paradigm understands the considerable administrative resources required to negotiate the taxing and officious processes of winning commissions from, and delivering programs to, the mainstream broadcasters.

Imposing such a regime on the community television model that ICTV has developed, which is based on principles of open access and responsiveness to community initiative, is a death sentence. While the major remote media organizations have some facility to manage matters to do with rights, clearances, production values, technical conformity and so on, they do not have even a fraction of the resources required to apply such management across the broad slate of productions coming out of the dozens of communities in their orbits.

It was precisely to break through such **gate keeping** structures that community media networks evolved, giving non-professionals the opportunity to access media tools and to say the things they wanted and needed to say to their own communities without the mediation of prescriptive, ‘professional’ oversight, or the intervention of external authority and experts.

¹¹ Pat Turner, Radio Interview, CAAMA Radio, June 21 2007

ICTV - FROM THE ROOTS UP

ICTV has managed brilliantly without such misplaced regulation, indeed, its success in producing community television for targeted, niche audiences, has come precisely from the *flexibility* it commands in relation to production processes. Video programs are produced in direct response to directions from elders, cultural imperatives, information needs, personal motivations and interests, and so on, in *each* RIBS community, with whatever personnel and means are available, and *without the permission of an outside authority or commissioning editor*.

This flexibility, local responsiveness and accessibility are cultivated within a close, collaborative relationship between ICTV and the RIMOs, where all parties are equal. ICTV is not a controlling authority but a facilitating agency; decisions regarding what will be broadcast on ICTV are not centralized, but rather, made by each contributing RIMO so that local autonomy of production, programming and content ownership is preserved. Access to ICTV for motivated Indigenous videographers is assured since all the programming submitted to ICTV is broadcast, with exceptions made only in deference to cultural sensitivities attending the deceased.

Such an inclusive and non-discriminatory approach is anathema to conventional, 'professional' television organizations such as NITV, and something they could never hope to match. It is true to form, then, that NITV have rejected out of hand the possibility of ICTV maintaining its own programming blocks on NITV.

CUSTOM FIT

ICTV was not poured out of packet like instant soup, but is the fruit of a 20 year incremental, adaptive process, shaped according to on-ground realities and direction given by remote community leaders and media makers; it was forged with the specific aim of serving and responding to the remote audiences at the end of the BRACS/RIBS transmitters.

The aesthetic values of remote media makers and audiences are not equivalent to those of a national/general audience. Community-based media makers dealing with their own local community issues and cultural materials, have a different sense of what is more or less important for the community audience they serve, than would a professional filmmaker with a brief to make something for national broadcast.

In the bush a one or two hour '*inma*' in language without explanation or subtitles is welcomed as much as a first-time effort by school children, or a 'professional' AFC-funded drama for that matter. Cultural programs about country, 'the creation', or bush tucker are not edited with a general audience in mind, but for a remote community audience who want all the relevant detail and nuance.

By working sympathetically with the RIMOs, ICTV has been able to embrace local sensibilities to deliver effective and culturally appropriate programming,

which promotes community well being and economic development *within local/regional contexts and in local languages.*

Another special attribute of ICTV is the communications web it provides between remote communities: *'it's creating a huge network, like someone in Warlpiri community or Yuendumu or wherever is watching something from Ernabella...'*¹² This encourages dialogue between remote communities, brings people together, shares their ideas and promotes respect between them.¹³

Perhaps the most urgent motivation that sustains ICTV is to provide children with an education through media - both traditional and contemporary. *'The media we started for Anangu children. We can't give it to anybody.'*¹⁴ The loss of the Channel 31 satellite carrier that delivers remote community programming to the audiences that value it so much, defeats this dream.

So vital has media become to education and cultural maintenance, that it has become part of the fabric of traditional cultural production. Recording ceremony and narratives in language has become a routine of their performance:

The filming of inma and song and all of that is really important for future generations. Every time someone dies here we lose a library. We lose an enormous amount of information and under the pressures of the outside world that's increasingly at risk... If you can't record that and protect that and give it status within the community well then there is a great risk that these people will lose what makes them strong.¹⁵

In summary, the qualities that distinguish ICTV are:

- open access to the distribution platform - free of overdetermination or prescription from programmers or commissioning agents
- authentic community self-representation through ownership and control of the production process
- **direct** responsiveness to Indigenous cultural protocols
- community determination of production values or 'quality'
- a programme duration and flow that is not chopped up to fit into mainstream notions of programming
- community determination of programs of interest
- decentralized consortium-style institutional structure and governance
- predominantly traditional and remote/regional audience or constituency

¹² Focus Group, CAAMA, 2006, in Meadows, et al. 2007

¹³ Yuendumu Interview, 2006, in Meadows, et al. 2007

¹⁴ Interview, Umuwa, 2006, in Meadows, et al. 2007

¹⁵ Interview, Umuwa, 2006, in Meadows, et al. 2007

CAREER PATHS FOR WHOM?

In promoting NITV, Paul Remati, the NITV Director of Television, stated that, as the first 'professional' Indigenous television service in Australia, NITV, unlike community TV, would be able to offer professional career paths for Indigenous filmmakers, careers in which they get a full-time wage for a full-time job. He said that part of the advantage of NITV is that for the first time cash will be put into production.¹⁶

He perceptively observes that there's not a lot of money floating around in the Remote Indigenous Broadcasting Service scene; that there isn't enough money in community television to make a professional career; that community media makers have to do other jobs or subsist on CDEP payments; that It's very hard to live, thrive and survive full-time without actually getting paid.

Remote media workers who participated in planning sessions for NITV, and who have worked their hearts out for the last decade, who have built ICTV without dedicated funding, understand this acutely.

Remote communities are screaming for resources that might allow them to develop innovative, properly remunerated employment and training options for Aboriginal media workers. In fact they had hoped that with the provision of \$48.5m dollars for Indigenous media, their work would finally be rewarded appropriately for the first time, and that they would be given access to resources that could make their service even better. Their legitimate hopes were misplaced. NITV has no intention of ***building on the Indigenous Community Television narrowcasting service*** as the Minister directed. In fact NITV guidelines will rule out the vast majority of their kind of community television, or strangle it with red tape.

The termination of ICTV, then, far from enhancing skills levels of remote Indigenous media makers and increasing their participation in media production, will put barriers in the way of the vast majority of remote media makers, take their channel away, reduce their incentive to practice their skills or participate in media production.

IMPASSES

ICTV and IRCA have consistently declared their willingness to share what they have learned in building ICTV, and to work with other indigenous media organizations to create an inclusive NITV Service. This good will has been betrayed. The intention that NITV would 'grow up' from ICTV and that NITV would accommodate *the existing ICTV programming within NITV*, has come to nothing.

¹⁶ Paul Remati, Radio Interview, CAAMA Radio, June 21 2007

More recently, NITV has dragged the chain on negotiations regarding a role for ICTV as an aggregator of remote television content for NITV, so that on the eve of the NITV launch, there is no content supply arrangement in sight. The reality is, that if an agreement is ever concluded, NITV is unlikely to take but a fraction of the programming currently scheduled on ICTV.

DCITA has proposed to patch-up the anomaly of this inequity by the application of a quota that would oblige NITV to broadcast content from remote communities - 10%, increasing to 20%. Such miserable tokenism cannot hope to do anything to change the fundamentals that discriminate against the bush and the incomparable community television model it developed.

If the better established RIMOs decide to seek commissions or sell content in accordance with NITV's published guidelines - if indeed NITV are paying a better-than-break-even price for programming and such transaction is at all viable - then these RIMOs will be faced with the unenviable decision of whether they direct resources to the production of a higher cost, smaller volume of more 'professional' content for NITV, or to a larger volume of content shaped to the specific needs and desires of their own media makers and audiences.

The current scenario promises a dog-eat-dog, every-media-organization-for-itself scenario in which the bigger and better established media organizations and urban-based (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) production companies take the lion's share of the cake, leaving the bush operators outside the gate. This is a long way from the collective, community television approach that ICTV made so successful.

A FAIR AND RATIONAL OUTCOME

It is a testament to ICTV that it has won such deep-rooted and broadly based support throughout the lands it broadcasts to. ICTV does not deserve to be punished for its success. It does not deserve to be terminated and then cannibalized. It does not deserve to have its unique nodal, collective, consortium style of operation broken.

The Minister should pause now and gather better-informed advice so that the current farrago can be worked out. A fresh approach that demonstrates understanding for the crucial and distinctive role that ICTV plays would reconsider the failed 'one organization' position that is at the root of the current crisis.

The Minister should reward remote communities for their vitally important and historic achievement by **reinstating a satellite carrier for ICTV.**

Running in parallel, ICTV and NITV, on their own carriers, might achieve something great for Indigenous broadcasting. ICTV *can* work alongside NITV in a mutually beneficial, cross-fertilizing, synergy if it is allowed to maintain its own unique service and honour its responsibilities. There is no reason why these two services cannot exchange material as it suits them, with a view to serving their quite

different audiences in the best possible way. In fact there is no reason why ICTV could not carry NITV programming alongside its own, to the BRACS/RIBS transmitters.

Any settlement of this issue must also address the skewed DCITA funding formula that has allocated \$12m per year to NITV, and a combined total of \$195,000 to ICTV and IRCA - bodies that represent hundreds of remote Indigenous media practitioners and dozens of RIBS and RIMOs. (IRCA @ \$120,000 and ICTV @ \$75,000 for 2007-08). This is less than the salary of ONE NITV executive salary package. This funding anomaly reveals DCITA's failure to understand the crucial function IRCA and ICTV must play, and the resources they need to effectively undertake their major facilitating and coordinating role.

Whatever the outcome, ICTV will persist because of the simple fact that ICTV is a product of, and can do media better for, the bush, because it provides an essential service that cannot be fulfilled by NITV, and because those who carry the vision for remote community media and understand how much it means to people in the bush, can not walk away from their responsibilities.

The Minister, DCITA and NITV must now decide whether they will become true partners with the bush.

*We're looking ahead you know, we don't want to stop in the middle; we just want to go on, continue on. Yes. That's really important and we need you fellas to listen.*¹⁷

Frank Rijavec

rijavec@iinet.net.au

Documentary Producer, Director, Writer

Former Manager Indigenous Remote Communications Association

Former Acting Manager ICTV

Former Media Production & Training Manager, Juluwarlu Aboriginal Corporation

PhD Candidate, Communications Studies, Murdoch University

Abbreviations:

ICTV	Indigenous Community Television
NITV	National Indigenous Television
DCITA	Department of Communication, Information, Technology & The Arts
BRACS	Broadcasting for Remote Aboriginal Communities Scheme
RIBS	Remote Indigenous Broadcasting Services

¹⁷ Owen Burton, Presentation To NITV & DCITA at the ICTV/IRCA Summit, Alice Springs, March 21 2007

RIMO Remote Indigenous Media Organization
IRCA Indigenous Remote Communications Association
NIRS National Indigenous Radio Service
AICA Australian Indigenous Communications Association
AFC Australian Film Commission

The Remote Indigenous Media Organization (RIMO) members of the Indigenous Remote Communications Association (IRCA) are:

WMA Warlpiri Media Association; aka PAW Media & Communications (Pintubi, Anmatjere and Warlpiri) - www.warlpiri.com.au
NMA Ngaanyatjarra Media Association - <http://waru.org/organizations/ngmedia/>
PY Media Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Media Association Aboriginal Corporation - www.waru.org/organizations/pymedia/
PAKAM Pilbara and Kimberley Aboriginal Media - www.pakam.com.au
TEABA Top End Aboriginal Broadcasting Association - www.teabba.com.au/
QRIMA Queensland Remote Indigenous Media Association
RICA Remote Ilan Communications Association
CAAMA Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association - www.caama.com.au/caama/