

REPORT

Kalgoorlie Working in Partnership Workshop, 25 to 26 March 2003

Prepared for

Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources

Ground Floor
20 Allara Street
Canberra City ACT 2601

9 April 2003

A10235.0

URS

Sustainable
Development

Prepared By Lynda S Harding
Senior Social Scientist

URS Australia Pty Ltd
Level 3, The Hyatt Centre
20 Terrace Road
East Perth, WA 6004 Australia
Tel: 61 8 9221 1630
Fax: 61 8 9221 1639

Reviewed By Dr John Cook
Principal Anthropologist

Authorised By Dr John Cook
Principal Anthropologist

Date: **9 April 2003**
Reference: A10235.0
Status: FINAL

1	Introduction-----	1-1
1.1	About this Report	1-1
1.2	Workshop Overview	1-1
1.2.1	Workshop Development	1-2
1.2.2	Aims	1-2
1.2.3	Participants	1-3
1.2.4	Workshop Venue	1-3
1.2.5	Social Event	1-3
2	The Kalgoorlie Workshop -----	2-1
2.1	Issues	2-1
2.2	Workshop Structure	2-1
2.2.1	Day 1 of the Workshop	2-2
2.2.2	Day 2 of the Workshop	2-2
3	Workshop Outcomes -----	3-1
3.1	Outcomes	3-1
4	Limitations -----	4-1
	Appendix A - Invited Participants -----	5-1
	Appendix B - Workshop Program -----	6-1
	Appendix C - Day 1 Information -----	7-1
	Appendix D - Day 2 Information -----	8-1

It is with pleasure that URS provides this report on the “Working in Partnerships”, Kalgoorlie Workshop, held at the Maku Stadium on Tuesday, 25th and Wednesday, 26th March 2003.

The URS Facilitation Team jointly discussed and developed the Kalgoorlie Workshop (the Workshop) approach, program and methodologies, and this Report. The URS Facilitation Team comprised:

- Mr Grant Sarra, Lead Facilitator (Grant Sarra Consultancy Services);
- Ms Lynda Harding, Senior Social Scientist (URS);
- Dr Catherine Macdonald, Principal Community Relations Specialist(URS); and
- Dr John Cook, Principal Anthropologist (URS).

1.1 About this Report

Section 1 introduces the Report and provides an overview of the Workshop.

Section 2 discusses the Workshop structure and activities.

Section 3 details the Workshop outcomes.

The **Appendices** provide a list of Workshop invitees, Workshop program and the information generated over the course of the two-day Workshop.

1.2 Workshop Overview

The concept for the Kalgoorlie Workshop was based on two fundamental premises:

1. that mining and Indigenous communities can achieve more by “working in partnership” than separately;
2. that a regional focus (i.e., the Goldfields Region) is necessary to identify specific local requirements.

These fundamental premises stem from recognition by the Working in Partnership program that the mining industry is uniquely placed to provide opportunities for indigenous communities, and while accepting the legacy of strained relations, that significant opportunities for mutual benefit remain.

Under the Working in Partnership Program, a range of work has already been undertaken in promoting existing cases where the mining industry and indigenous communities are working together in partnership. Some 17 case-studies in the program publication specifically highlight instances of good practice in the industry working with indigenous communities. The publication also goes to some length in identifying relevant government programs for assisting relationships between the two parties.

Furthermore, the first regional workshop held in Alice Springs (June 2002) demonstrated the benefit of bringing stakeholders together at a regional level to discuss local issues.

Extensive work had already been carried out on improving indigenous community and mining industry interaction by such projects as the MMSD Workshop on Indigenous Peoples and Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development (4-6 February 2002), and Agreements between Mining Companies and Indigenous Communities, December 2001 (a report to Ameer as part of the MMSD project by Indigenous Support Services and ACIL Consulting). This work had already discussed, reviewed and strategised issues such as:

- The different features and characteristics of agreements between companies and Indigenous communities.
- Creating high-level key principles and future practices.
- Developments in agreement making.

1.2.1 Workshop Development

From the outset, the URS Facilitation Team (URS) designed the workshop to be a participatory program. URS wanted the participants to identify their own priorities, analyse their current situation and decide what actions to take to improve the status of partnerships between Aboriginal communities and the minerals sector. There were two major reasons for this emphasis on participatory analysis and planning:

1. If people in the Goldfields Region decided upon their own issues for discussion and proposed their own solutions to any problems identified, then the results were likely to be firmly grounded in the local situation and relevant to the people of the Region; and
2. Neither the URS team nor the project sponsors (Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources), would be staying long-term in the Goldfields Region. Therefore, any initiatives would need to be undertaken by people in the Goldfields Region, with relevant support from Government Departments and Agencies. URS viewed it as essential that participants be encouraged to 'own' the Workshop outcomes by being intimately involved in the development processes.

For these reasons, the agenda for the Workshop was kept broad and non-prescriptive.

1.2.2 Aims

The aims of the Workshop were simple:

- Focus on the Goldfields Region; and

-
- Identify practical actions and steps for mining and indigenous communities to take for successful partnership.

Based on interaction at the Workshop and feedback during and after the Workshop, these Workshop Aims were comprehensively achieved.

1.2.3 Participants

As the Workshop was aimed at a 'hands-on' level, URS considered it appropriate to invite people actively engaged in the minerals sector, and who would therefore have practical experience to draw from during Workshop discussions. We decided against attracting higher-level people who perhaps set the policy agenda, because we felt that there had already been a good deal of work done on broad principles. This previous work had already defined principles and protocols for partnership in a generic sense. We wanted to focus on the 'grass roots' level and strive for some practical initiatives.

URS were successful in identifying a list of people with practical experience in the minerals sector and in interesting them in participating. The response was very enthusiastic, and resulted in participation levels which varied between 30 and 50 over the two days of the Workshop, a very satisfactory indication of interest in the program.

1.2.4 Workshop Venue

URS selected the Maku Stadium, an indoor basketball stadium with conference facilities, which is run by the Eastern Goldfields Aboriginal Advancement Council, and is therefore an Indigenous business itself. It was a good choice, as Aboriginal participants seemed to feel quite comfortable being there and this lent itself to a good atmosphere for the Workshop. The Maku Stadium also had all the amenities needed to facilitate good discussions. The basketball arena provided plenty of space for small group work and the meeting room was useful for plenary sessions.

1.2.5 Social Event

An outdoor barbecue afforded a relaxed form of social gathering on the evening of the first day. URS selected the WA School of Mines garden as the best venue, as it is attractive and centrally-located, in Kalgoorlie. Other venues considered were either too far out of town or too formal. The barbecue was well attended and URS understands that attendees found the event enjoyable. It provided a good opportunity for a more relaxed acquaintance to develop between participants previously unknown to each other and for others to catch up on news from colleagues they do not get to see as often as they would like to.

2.1 Issues

As part of the Workshop preparation, prospective participants were asked about current issues faced (within the context of partnership) in the Goldfields Region. These issues included:

- The need for business management capacity building for Indigenous business people – especially contract/tender management.
- Understanding of Aboriginal cultural elements by mineral companies, which may constrain workplace participation
- The necessity of deeper understanding by Aboriginal workers of business / workplace culture.
- Broader educational needs for the general Aboriginal community, in order to expand the pool of potential employees.

After much analysis by participants, these issues were confirmed as some of the most important. It might be suggested and be the view of some of the participants, that since the major issues had already been identified, the Workshop could have proceeded directly to discussion of solutions for the issues. Undertaking the Workshop on this basis would have saved time. However, it is the view of URS that it was the *process of discussion* when working towards identifying problem areas that formed the basis for the eventual consensus suggestions which arose from the Workshop.

During the process of identifying and analysing the issues, a lot of grievances were aired. People were able to vent frustrations and speak about events and incidents they had experienced in the past. The Workshop presented an opportunity for people, particularly Aboriginal people to have their grievances heard. This was helpful in generating an atmosphere of commitment to the resolution of issues.

Please refer to Appendix A for a list of invited Workshop participants.

2.2 Workshop Structure

The Workshop program was not designed or structured by URS to include presentations of case studies or talks by outside speakers. Instead, it was a participatory and interactive program in which the case studies and knowledge came from the participants. That is why URS were so purposeful in seeking participation from practitioners, rather than policy makers. The accumulated knowledge of the participants far exceeded the wisdom that could be imparted by outside ‘experts’

The Workshop program featured a lot of small group work, with those groups reporting back to the larger meeting in order to exchange and synthesise information. In our experience, participants feel most comfortable in contributing their experiences in smaller groups until they know each other better. The use of small group work is also an effective means of ensuring broad-based participation, rather than the larger group work being dominated by confident speakers.

Please refer to Appendix B for the Workshop Program.

2.2.1 Day 1 of the Workshop

On Day 1 of the Workshop, small group sessions involved people from similar backgrounds working together. URS broadly categorised participants into the following groups:

- Indigenous Community (including Indigenous Business);
- Mining Community; and
- Government/Service Providers.

While URS drew up the initial group lists, it was emphasised that people should feel free to sit with whichever group they preferred, and some participants did change groups. The small group sessions were productive and revealed extensive data about people's experiences and requirements.

Large group sessions were also held and designed to encourage people to analyse and critically evaluate the information generated during the small group sessions. This analysis of small group data helped to move the larger group toward understanding and consensus of the broad range of issues. At all times, URS worked toward keeping discussion focussed on practical outcomes, although there was a lot of humour and levity injected into the discussions, too, to keep the mood light.

During Day 1 of the Workshop, the following activities were undertaken:

- Discussion about what constitutes *partnership* and how it might be defined (large group).
- Identification of core wants and needs for *partnership* (small group then large group feedback).
- Identification of issues and barriers for *partnership* (small group then large group feedback).
- Discussion and identification of the current initiatives in place within the Goldfields Region (large group).

Please refer to Appendix C to see the information generated during the Workshop Day 1 activities.

2.2.2 Day 2 of the Workshop

On Day 2 of the Workshop, small group work continued with the analysis and review of the information created on Day 1. Within the small groups, participants were asked to sort the core needs and wants, and barriers and issues, into the draft headings that were brainstormed by the large group as the first activity on Day 2.

During the large group session, it emerged that some participants felt that the pace of discussion being set by some of the other groups was too fast and that they were being left behind. As the underpinning philosophy of the Workshop was participatory and that the outcomes needed to be supported by all

participant groups (that is Indigenous, Mining & Government), rather than efficiently following the program, time was taken to backtrack and go over the analysis work in the small work groups. This ensured that a common level of understanding and an equal opportunity for putting forward viewpoints was afforded to all participants.

The final sessions in the afternoon were devoted to working in a large group, with care being taken to ensure that all participants had an opportunity to speak. Given that none of the initiatives or outcomes from the Workshop would be sustainable without the input and support of all people present, URS considered it critical to make sure that broad participation continued.

The slowing of the pace frustrated some of the more outcome-focussed participants, however it was critical that all participants were actively involved in the analysis of the information and the subsequent outcomes. Consensus of the larger group was that the Workshop participants needed to arrive at the decisions and outcomes together, even if that meant that fewer outcomes and initiatives were discussed in detail.

Please refer to Appendix D to see the information generated during the Workshop Day 2 activities.

3.1 Outcomes

As a result of the consensual discussions, some practical and cooperative outcomes were achieved. Firstly the group identified the following five issues as priority areas for action in improving relations between the mining industry and indigenous communities in the Goldfields region, and in essence supporting a Goldfields Regional Partnership.

- Education & Skills
- Communication
- Business
- Capital resources
- Understanding of Culture

The group was also able to identify specific initiatives to address some of these priority issues. These initiatives are specifically discussed below. In addition a number of new relationships were established and existing relationships were nurtured through group discussion and the social aspects of the workshop. This is an important outcome for the workshop as a face to face relationship can often form the basis for a future partnership.

At the conclusion of the workshop it was agreed that the Department of Industry, Tourism & Resources (ITR) would work in conjunction with the Goldfields Esperance Development Commission (GEDC) to ensure that the above priority areas continued to be progressed at a regional level. In concrete terms, the following specific initiatives are the first examples of positive action, but these will be built on through the work of ITR and the GEDC over the coming year.

Tendering and Contractual Requirements of Mining Companies

The Indigenous Employment Forum (IEF) to work on providing better information about tendering and contractual requirements of mining companies. This will require increased input to the IEF from the mining sector, from the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies (AMEC) as well as mineral company representatives. Active Indigenous participation will also be essential in achieving this outcome. The Indigenous Peoples in Mining (IpiM) program of the Goldfields Esperance Development Commission (GEDC) said it could offer tendering courses only with a guaranteed minimum participation level of 10 people, so endorsement from the North Eastern Independent Body (NEIB), the Maduwongga People, and other Aboriginal people will be needed to for this initiative to succeed.

Indigenous People in Mining Program (IPiM)

The Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources will work with the IPiM and the Office of Aboriginal Economic Development and the North Eastern Independent Body (NEIB), Maduwongga People and other Aboriginal community people, to rejuvenate the IpiM program. The intent of the IPiM previously was to be an active resource for Aboriginal people to use to enhance their access to the minerals sector. This project needs to be rejuvenated.

Support for Fledgling Programs

The Aboriginal Education Council will work with the Department of Education Officer and other members of the Indigenous Employment Forum to support fledgling programs for high school vocational training and mentoring programs.

URS Australia Pty Ltd (URS) has prepared this report for the use of the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources, in accordance with the usual care and thoroughness of the consulting profession. It is based on generally accepted practices and standards at the time it was prepared. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report. It is prepared in accordance with the scope of work and for the purpose outlined in the Proposal dated 13th December, 2002.

The methodology adopted and sources of information used by URS are outlined in this report. URS has made no independent verification of this information beyond the agreed scope of works and URS assumes no responsibility for any inaccuracies or omissions. No indications were found during our investigations that information contained in this report as provided to URS was false.

This report was prepared between 28th March 2003 and 7th April 2003 and is based on the information derived and gathered at the time of preparation. URS disclaims responsibility for any changes that may have occurred after this time.

This report should be read in full. No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose or by third parties. This report does not purport to give legal advice. Legal advice can only be given by qualified legal practitioners.

Appendix A - Invited Participants

<u>Title</u>	<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
Ms	Christine	Boase	Goldfields Esperance Development Commission, IPiM Project
Mr	James	Bowie	Chamber of Minerals and Energy of WA
Mr	Tony	Bullen	Department of Industry and Resources
Ms	Kathy	Burns	Goldfields Land and Sea Council
Ms	Sadie	Canning	SMC Vending Operations
Ms	Christine	Coyne	Eurest
Mr	Ray	Ciantar	Goldfields Esperance Development Commission, IPiM Project
Mr	Bob	Dalton	WMC
Mr	Nigel	Dann	Dann Contracting
Ms	Julie	de Jong	Office of Aboriginal Economic Development
Mr	Richard	Gordine	Sons of Gwalia
Mr	Brian	Champion, Jnr	ATSIC
Mr	James	Gorham	Goldfields District Education Office
Mr	Stephen	Grech	Indigenous Employment Programs, DEWR
Ms	Rebecca	Harkin	Bidarn P/L
Ms	Maisie	Harkin	Spinifex Support Services
Mr	Ron	Harrington-Smith	Yunguntjara Star P/L
Mr	Adrian	Brahim	ATSIC
Mr	Richard	Houlihan	WMC
Ms	Sharon	Hume	Kirkhume Cleaning Services
Mr	David	Kirk	Indigenous Employment Centre
Ms	Vicki	Kirk	Kirkhume Cleaning Services
Mr	Alan	Layton	Association of Mining & Exploration Companies (AMEC)
Mr	Brad	Maher	Department of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR)
Mr	Phil	McEvoy	Placer Granny Smith
Ms	Trish	McGinley	Westrain
Mr	John	Miliken	AngloGold

Appendix A - Invited Participants

Mr	Matthew	Payne	Goldfields Esperance Area Consultative Committee
Mr	Neil	Rankine	KCGM Strategic Mine Development Team
Ms	Gail	Reynolds-Adamson	Newmont Australia
Ms	Marjorie	Strickland	Maduwongga People
Mr	Leo	Thomas	Goldfields Land and Sea Council
Mr	Lawrence	Thomas	Waljin Aboriginal Corporation
Mr	Daniel	Tucker	Carey Mining
Mr	Quinton	Tucker	Burnna Yurral Aboriginal Corporation
Mr	Les	Tucker	Kurruwang Contractors
Mr	Fabian	Tucker	North East Independent Body
Ms	Danielle	van Kampen	KCGM Strategic Mine Development Team
Ms	Shaneen	Weldon	BP Laverton
Mr	Peter	Winter	Portman Limited
Mr	Chub	Witham	Curtin University
Mr	Brian	Wyatt	Goldfields Land and Sea Council
Mr	Dave	Wyborn	Anaconda Operations, Murrin Murrin Minesite
Ms	Shauna	Zani	Curtin University

Appendix B - Workshop Program

Approximate Timing	Session	Content
Tuesday, DAY 1		
8.30am		Registration, Informal Meet and Greet
9am	<i>Startup Session</i>	Commencement of first day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of Country • Introduction of facilitators. • Housekeeping. • DITR presentation. • Objectives and expected outcomes /aims/ overview
9.30am-9.50am	<i>Session 1</i>	Setting the Scene - Defining partnership: Overview and discussion of what constitutes partnership.
9.50am-10.15am	<i>Session 2</i>	Successful partnerships: What are the problems /issues / barriers that may stop a successful partnership being developed in the Goldfields?
10.15am-10.30am		Morning Tea
10.30am-12.30pm	<i>Session 3</i>	Core Wants and Needs Core wants and needs required by each party to have an effective partnership between the mining industry and the indigenous community. Each group to think about what it needs and then to try to imagine what the needs of the others are.
12.30pm-1.15pm		Lunch Break
1.15pm-2.30pm	<i>Session 4</i>	Barriers and Inhibitors What are the barriers and inhibitors to the parties achieving wants and needs? Having identified what each group wants, what stops them from getting it?

Appendix B - Workshop Program

Approximate Timing	Session	Content
2.30pm-4.00pm	Session 5 <i>Afternoon Tea Available</i>	Current Initiatives / Practice What is happening in the Region that is good? Of these, what needs further development? This is where participants will be encouraged to contribute their own case studies. Afternoon Tea Available from 3pm and to be taken during Session 5.
4.00pm-4.30pm		Summation and brief for Day 2
6.30pm		Wrap up BBQ workshop dinner away from Maku Stadium at WASM Garden

Appendix B - Workshop Program

Timing	Session	Content
		Wednesday, DAY 2
9.00am-9.15am		Objectives of Day 2 / Brief summary and overview of Day 1.
9.15am-10.30am	Session 6	Analysing the Barriers and Issues Review of data from Session 3 and Session 4.
10.30am-10.45am		Morning Tea
10.45am-11.30am	Session 7	Creating a Goldfields Partnership What principles, values and commitments should / would underpin a successful, culturally appropriate, community-sensitive and business minded Goldfields Partnership?
11.30am – 1pm	Session 8	Turning Problems into Opportunities How are we going to manage / resolve these issues to turn them into opportunities?
1pm-1.45pm		Lunch Break
1.45pm-2.30pm	Session 9	Feedback and discussion from Session 8.
2.30pm	Session 10	Steps for building Goldfields Partnership What next –Where to from here? What are the structures / vehicles and support structures available for suggested future steps? Information from Session 5.
4.30-5pm	Close	Wrap up and close

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

The following information was generated in a large group session at the commencement of Day 1. It is a compilation of comments generated in relation to the question generally combined as “What are the characteristics of partnership and what are the barriers to getting partnership?”

Defining Partnerships:

Characteristics:

trust; honesty; respect; identification of expectations; understanding; sharing; two-way communication; cultural understanding (indigenous and business); recognition of skill levels; basis for talking (native title or other?); common goals; win/win; flexibility; listening equality; learning-how-to-partner; time definitions; cooperation and good faith; timeframe for partnership; similar goals; consistent benchmarking; appreciation of difference; produces something partnership expectations (realistic and applicable, and relevant to all parties).

Barriers:

Changing personnel / people; racism; gender bias; drivers needed; relationship based on native title only; lack of access to decision makers; capital\$\$; perceptions of each other; political influence; not using local indigenous people or businesses; agreements not followed through; skills of people mean we access legal advice; stage business is at (servicing new or existing projects); negative views (based on history / experience).

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

Information created in small group work Day 1

The following information is a compilation of comments that were generated during small group discussion activities on 'core wants and needs' and 'barriers and issues' during Day 1.

Indigenous

Cultural awareness:

Need to have a clear understanding of Aboriginal history & culture - from middle management to board members & those who are employed to liaise and promote business needs with Aboriginal people.

Mutual respect: use of terminology; language; jargon; Use words that Aboriginal people understand.

Education programmes: develop realistic career paths (management positions etc.).

Training: design training packages to meet Aboriginal people's needs.

Role Models:

Identify positive role models within the industry & community to promote mentors to support & encourage employee's on the job.

Agreements:

Be more accountable.

Need to adhere to agreements.

HONOUR AGREEMENTS.

Contract Opportunities:

Business development for Aboriginal people within the industry - they need economic empowerment.

Aboriginal people need to have opportunity in their own right to tender and not necessarily be steam rolled in Joint Ventures.

Pastoral leases:

Mining companies need to take into consideration Aboriginal people when purchasing pastoral leases. It would be to their advantage because mining companies are not in the business of grazing sheep and cattle.

Construction:

Aboriginal Business Development Trust - similar to financial institution. Aboriginal people can purchase heavy machinery to be competitive.

Environment Issues:

Go the whole 9 yards.

Recognition:

Accredited Aboriginal training agencies.

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

ACTION and ATTITUDE (had enough talk).

Being Aboriginal is a barrier.

Discriminated against because you are Aboriginal.

Native Title rights.

Divide and conquer mentality of mining companies.

ATSIC processes - setup to fail.

Lack of knowledge of Aboriginal culture.

Lack of respect for custodian ownership.

Lack of education.

Not adhering to agreements - what's on paper.

Mining coy decision makers not sent.

Perceptions of how non-Indigenous perceive Indigenous people (by the Indigenous person).

Too many experts:

Layers, anthropologist.

Lack of resources to tender,

No machinery no money.

Stereotyping Aboriginal people.

Equality is needed.

Minot police record e.g. no licence or non-payment of fines (can't work for mining coy).

Allow Aboriginal people to heal - come together as a group in workplace.

Attitudes towards Aboriginal people.

Mining

Cooperation from the Indigenous Community.

Active involvement from the Indigenous Community.

Enduring, long-term relationships with the Indigenous Community.

Opportunities to explore relationships, issues and share information.

Productive outcomes from meetings with Indigenous Community.

Local knowledge from the Indigenous Community.

Good communication with the Indigenous Community.

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

- Transparency with and from the Indigenous Community.
- The Indigenous Community to have realistic expectations.
- Cooperation from the Indigenous Community.
- Government to provide a stable environment to operate in.
- Determination of Native Title (legal and consent) by Government.
- Better dissemination of information from Government.
- Better cooperation between State and Federal Government.
- Involvement in Local and Regional Government planning.
- School trainee-ships.
- Curriculum Development (teen programmes).
- “Get into bed with each other” (closer liaison).
- Multiple competing Native Title claims.
- Regional locations (travel distances can be a problem).
- Government protection of information (State and Federal).
- Cost of implementation of traineeships / training.
- Lack of suitable candidates (for training / employment etc).
- Cultural issues:
 - Mining culture / shifts.
 - Ethnic boundaries.
- Inability (for Indigenous people) to meet minimum standards for business.
- Expectations of Native Title Applicant / Holder.
- Inability (of Indigenous people) to meet minimum entry requirements:
 - Drugs, Driver’s Licence, Fitness for Work.
- Intransigence:
 - Not prepared to be flexible.

Mining 2

- Understanding of business processes & requirements by Indigenous Community (e.g. Safety, tendering).
- Strategic business partnerships with the Indigenous Community.
- Support from the Indigenous Community.
- True cross cultural awareness - (Indigenous and industry).

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

K I S S (simple processes from Government).

Informed and adequate resourcing from Government.

Government should focus on quality not quantity.

Strategic business partnerships with Government.

Indigenous Community competence and reliability.

Government competence and reliability.

Identified Indigenous Community contacts.

Indigenous Business to be competitive.

Understanding of timeframes from the Indigenous Community.

Appreciation of constraints and limitations by Indigenous Community.

Level of education.

Level of business skills and/or experience, track records.

Ongoing intra-indigenous group disputes.

Unrealistic expectations / aspirations - (mining and Indigenous).

Government lack of understanding of the issues.

Lack of transparency and trust on both sides.

Lack of cultural awareness (both ways).

Communication.

Lack of audited accountability (Indigenous and Mining).

“Cheque book” agreements legacy.

Short term production focus (especially ‘gold’).

Shortage of qualified Indigenous People.

Government

Mining companies to be good corporate citizens in their local community.

Mining companies to be satisfied (with the land agreement process & fulfill their land use obligations).

Greater cooperation from mining companies towards mutual outcomes.

Government expects miners to act with respect to Traditional rights.

Mining companies should have better transition and sustainable policies for Indigenous Communities.

Government should support full-time and part-time employment options.

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

Better cooperation between levels of Government. and private sector for delivering services - (to Indigenous community).

Effective communication with Indigenous Communities.

More Indigenous Small Business in the mining sector.

Positive outcomes (economic development; employment growth).

Interaction with levels that can make decisions and agreements.

Active participation in any Joint Venture or Partnerships by Indigenous Community.

Personal responsibility in relation to finance by the Indigenous Community.

Realistic understanding of small business requirements by Indigenous Community.

Start articulating what policies are suitable (for Indigenous people).

Lack of forward planning in exploration and approvals process.

'Cargo cult' mentality by Government to mining companies.

Unrealistic expectations - mining companies not 'bottomless pit of money'.

Mining companies exclusive process - rigid selection criteria.

Failure of Education Department.

Conflicts over duration, I.e. accountability.

Less incentives for smaller companies to do business / be in business.

Polar cultural differences.

Pre-employment requisites.

Lack of understanding of work culture.

Lack of work experience.

Lack of capital, assets and skills base.

Ignorance of full legal ramifications of Native Title process. Uncertainty of mine life.

Little knowledge of development approvals process.

Unrealistic expectations.

Little pro-active Government on-ground support.

CDEP Mentality - does not lead to anything; lack of incentive.

Government 2

Layers of Government (too many).

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

Changing priorities (effect on budgets) by Government Departments.

Lack of communication between Government Department Head and Regional Offices.

Under resourcing in Govt Departments. Leading to lack of direct involvement in Regions.

Power-less-ness as industry / communities decide their own fate.

Knowing which Indigenous groups / people to deal with.

Understanding Government programmes.

Lack of understanding of Aboriginal culture.

Companies lack resources (\$) to engage with Indigenous Communities.

Organisations' communication channels – getting the message to the mine site and vice versa.

Accessing locally experienced Aboriginal workers.

Low literacy levels of Aboriginal people.

Lack of business skills amongst Indigenous people.

Health issues.

Mining company work practices; workplace culture (e.g. 12 hour shifts).

Lack of information.

Lack of access to tender processes.

Problem with changing personnel / people.

Layers of Government (too many).

Changing priorities (effect on budgets) by Government Departments.

Lack of communication between Government Department Head and Regional Offices.

Under resourcing in Govt Departments. Leading to lack of direct involvement in Regions.

Power-less-ness as industry / communities decide their own fate.

Knowing which Indigenous groups / people to deal with.

Understanding Government programmes.

Lack of understanding of Aboriginal culture.

Companies lack resources (\$) to engage with Indigenous Communities.

Organisations communication channels – getting the message to the mine site and vice versa.

Accessing locally experienced Aboriginal workers.

Low literacy levels of Aboriginal people.

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

Lack of business skills amongst Indigenous people.

Health issues.

Mining company work practices; workplace culture (e.g. 12-hour shifts).

Lack of information.

Lack of access to tender processes.

Problem with changing personnel / people.

Current training often not appropriate – need for flexible, tailored training.

No access to financial backing – capital.

Making sense of range of Government Programmes.

Appendix C - Day 1 Information

Current Initiatives in the Goldfields Region

Indigenous People in Mining (IpiM).

Indigenous Employment Forum (IEF);

Partnerships for Success (Polly Farmer Foundation).

Goldfields Football Academy.

Goldfields Native Title Liaison Council.

Freefall Theatre.

Tools for Change.

Department of Education & Curtin University – traineeships & school programmes.

Aboriginal Group Holdings.

Aboriginal Economic Development (fledging initiative through GEDC).

WMC Training Centre (at Leinster).

Murrin Murrin Training School.

Indigenous Employment Centre.

Newmont Training Programme.

Laverton-Leonora Cross-cultural Association.

Office of Training – Work Readiness Programme.

Appendix D - Day 2 Information

Draft Headings:

The following headings for discussion were drafted in the first part of Day 2. The information generated in Day 1 was sorted by small groups (into the headings) as a first attempt at analysis. The small groups also reviewed the headings during this process to determine if they were correct or if they needed amendment.

The headings are not listed in any priority order.

- Education and training.
- Communication / information sharing.
- Business training.
- Determination of Native Title.
- Access to capital.
- Understanding of Cultures.
- Mentoring.
- Partnerships.

Revised Headings

There was some discussion around the headings and amendments were made and are listed here: The headings are not listed in any priority order.

- Business (includes contracts, tendering, incubation, corporate governance; partnership, joint ventures.
- Culture (Indigenous, Government, Business)
- Education, Training, Employment & Mentoring.
- Capital and Resources.
- Communication and Information Sharing.

Appendix D - Day 2 Information

Final Headings

During the previous session, it was found that not all Aboriginal people had had an opportunity to consider the revised headings. Consequently, time was spent reviewing and revising the headings and listing them in the following order of priority:

1. Education and skills.
2. Communication.
3. Business.
4. Capital Resources.
5. Understanding of Culture.