



***“TALKING STRAIGHT
& LEVELLING THINGS UP”:***

**Report on the Cultural and Social Impact
of the
Operation of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park on
the
Aboriginal Traditional Owners**

Office for Joint Management
Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park

August 1998

Report prepared by Dr Annie Holden, ImpaxSIA Consulting, Brisbane
Email: impaxsia@ibm.net
Phone: (07) 3369 6857

Artwork by Pamela Taylor, Walkatjara Art Centre, Uluru.



“TALKING STRAIGHT AND LEVELLING THINGS UP”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
Methodology	2
Monitoring	6
Acknowledgements	6
2. Summary	8
3. Recommendations	13
Funding	13
Joint Management	13
PAN employment and training	14
Tourism	15
Cultural maintenance	17
4. Description of the site and people	19
Brief history of tourism in the region	20
Population	22
5. Joint Management	23
Operationalising Joint Management	23
Reporting structures	25
Policies and procedures manual	26
Involvement at other levels	27
Joint Management: Anangu concerns and aspirations	27
6. The Anangu perspective on caring for the Park	30



7. <i>Anangu employment in Park management</i>	33
8. <i>Further employment opportunities in Park management</i>	39
9. <i>Impacts of tourism</i>	43
10. <i>Tourism: Anangu concerns and aspirations</i>	47
<i>2000 Olympics</i>	48
11. <i>Opportunities for Anangu employment in tourism</i>	50
<i>Barriers to Anangu employment in tourism</i>	51
<i>Possible solutions to barriers to Anangu employment in tourism</i>	52
12. <i>Anangu control over visitor management and impacts</i>	55
<i>Tourists</i>	55
<i>Visitor Impacts: Other</i>	56
<i>Tourism industry priorities</i>	57
13. <i>Community development</i>	58
14. <i>Cultural and intellectual property</i>	61
15. <i>Cultural maintenance</i>	63
<i>Culture under threat</i>	63
<i>Professionalisation of Park work</i>	64
<i>Recognition of non-resident Traditional Owners</i>	65
16. <i>Youth</i>	68
17. <i>Monitoring</i>	70
<i>'State of the Culture' Report</i>	71
<i>'State of the Community' Report</i>	73
<i>'State of the Economy' Report</i>	74
18. <i>Conclusion</i>	75



<i>19. Bibliography</i>	<i>76</i>
<hr/>	
<i>20. Appendix One</i>	<i>78</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Terms of reference</i>	<i>78</i>
<hr/>	
<i>21. Appendix Two</i>	<i>83</i>
<hr/>	
<i>Statistical profiles</i>	<i>83</i>
<hr/>	



ACRONYMS

CSIA	Cultural and Social Impact Assessment
PAN	Parks Australia North
OJM	Office for Joint Management
VMS	Visitor Management Strategy
CLC	Central Land Council
DEETYA	Dept of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs
SOCOG	Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games
CDEP	Community Development Employment Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

TRANSLATIONS

Tjukurpa	Law
Pirinpa	Europeans
Minga	Tourists (literally 'ants' but used by Anangu to refer to tourists because they look like ants as they climb the path up the Rock).
Tjunga	Together
Malpa	Companion or friend
Minkiri	Mice
Munta	Earth
Wiltja	Shelter



1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of an assessment of the significant social and cultural impacts that the operation of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has on the Aboriginal Traditional Owners of the Park. It is entitled 'Talking Straight and Levelling Things Up' because this is what Anangu want – for people to 'talk straight' and for things to be 'levelled up'.

The project was commissioned in July 1997 by the Office for Joint Management (OJM) at Mutitjulu. (Mutitjulu is the community located within the Park boundaries, close to Uluru itself, where many Traditional Owners and PAN staff live). One of its intended uses will be to provide input into a new draft Plan of Management 1998-2004 currently being prepared by Parks Australia North (PAN). The recommendations of the Cultural and Social Impact Assessment (CSIA) are intended to inform the new Plan by providing suitable strategies to minimise negative impacts on the Aboriginal Traditional Owners and to optimise potential benefits to them of operation of the Park. It will also contribute to the provision of a base line for future monitoring. (See Terms of Reference, Appendix One).

The scope of work of the CSIA includes the consequences from the Plan of Management consultation program itself, the current operational and visitor management regimes and projected uses and visitation to the Park. The approach taken to the work has been to use a participatory planning methodology, described below.

A number of other studies and consultative activities were already underway or had just been completed at Uluru-Kata Tjuta when the CSIA commenced, and which it is designed to complement. These include:

- A series of Anangu workshops conducted as part of a comprehensive consultation exercise for the preparation of the new Plan (Office for Joint Management and Central Land Council). These workshops identified Anangu aspirations and concerns relating to joint management and care of the Park. The findings of the workshops have been drawn upon in this report.
- A Visitor Management Strategy (Tourism Resource Consultants – project suspended and then terminated). Some issues that might have been considered by the CSIA, e.g. Anangu attitudes to tourists climbing Uluru and options for different gate entry fee arrangements and site management, were to be considered within the context of the VMS. These issues remain outstanding and need to be taken up again in the future.
- Community Development Strategic Plan for Mutitjulu Community (undertaken by Wynter Hill Consultants). The Plan is presented as four separate plans, the 'Gold Plan' – Business and Enterprise; the 'Blue Plan' –



Town Planning and Housing; the 'Red Plan' – Training and Employment; and the 'Black Plan' – Community Development. The plans provide a range of recommendations, few of which have yet been implemented due to lack of funding and other support. This issue is discussed below. The CSIA report makes the point that a well community, and that therefore community development, are absolutely critical to the ability of Anangu to cope with and benefit from tourism and the declaration of Uluru-Kata Tjuta as world heritage listed and as a national park.

- Review of the Cultural Centre (Wynter Hill Consultants). The issue of the Cultural Centre was raised on a number of occasions during the CSIA consultations. The main concerns raised were that it had failed to deliver any significant economic benefits to Anangu and that a business plan was desperately needed. As discussed below, non-resident Traditional Owners also expressed dissatisfaction that their interests had not been protected in the design and operation of the Cultural Centre.
- An economic impact study of the Yulara township being prepared as part of a native title application (Central Land Council). It is anticipated that the findings of the economic study will augment the findings included within the chapter in this report dealing with social justice for Anangu. It was because of the CLC study being undertaken that the CSIA study did not incorporate an economic impact study as part of the impact assessment. Outstanding in particular is the need to give close consideration to issues relating to Anangu participation as owners and operators of tourism-related ventures in the Park and in adjacent tourist areas.
- A Natural Resources Research Workshop conducted in August 1997 aimed to offer a strategy for natural resource management which would feed into the Plan of Management. The Workshop also considered cultural maintenance matters as an aspect of natural resource management and identified loss of traditional environmental knowledge as being of 'utmost importance and requiring urgent attention' (1997:xiv).

The Cultural and Social Impact Assessment did not duplicate the work that was undertaken by these other consultants and agencies, however it does refer to their research and findings where these are available.

Methodology

Consultation is the key methodology of contemporary social impact assessment. However, one of the difficulties for the CSIA Consultant in this instance was that the client group, Anangu, have been subjected to extensive consultation over a host of issues during the past few years and are experiencing distress and tiredness at having to repeat themselves to new consultants again and again.



This 'over-consultation' is aggravated by the fact that some Anangu feel that they have made clear statements on a number of occasions about a range of matters that concern them but their requests and suggestions seem to them to be ignored or not acted upon. This issue is addressed in the report. It relates largely to funding, but also to organisational inertia within stakeholder agencies.

Most recently Anangu have participated in a comprehensive series of consultative workshops organised co-jointly by the Office for Joint Management, Mutitjulu and by the Central Land Council. The outcomes of these workshops are intended to inform the new Plan of Management. A number of Anangu feel that much of what they have to say about tourism and Park management has been said very clearly and documented during the course of these workshops.

Accordingly, the CSIA Consultant, in consultation with the Office for Joint Management, sought to develop a methodological approach that restricted consultations with Anangu to an absolute minimum. Previous consultations had not focussed greatly on developing solutions to problems identified, nor on concrete strategies for ensuring that the Anangu perspective was recognised and incorporated into joint management practices. So although further consultations would be required, care was taken to ensure that the CSIA workshops did not go over old ground but took the issues a step forward.

The CSIA consultations were also restricted by a limited budget. There were not funds available for the Consultant to travel to other communities besides Mutitjulu and the Consultant relied upon minutes from consultations with non-resident Traditional Owners conducted by the CLC to identify issues of concern.

In addition to identifying issues and developing a strategic response to dealing with these, some form of participatory 'sign off' process was essential that would provide Anangu with the opportunity to endorse the final Plan provisions. It was recognised that it would be possible to arrange some sign off and undertake the CSIA work as part of the same exercise.

Another strategy to reduce the demands of consultation was to organise special interest working groups with only those Anangu with a particular interest in an issue and other stakeholders involved. To ensure that the participants of these working groups were recognised as legitimate spokespersons, a public meeting was called where the Mutitjulu community and visiting members of the Traditional Owner group were invited to appoint people to the working groups.

The working groups focussed on strategies and solutions to issues already identified and were able to explore these in depth without placing too much strain on the community as a whole. Furthermore, the people nominated were authorised by the larger community to advise the CSIA Consultant on appropriate material to include in her report and to include in the Plan of Management.

The four working groups were



- Anangu Business and Enterprise Development – Opportunities and Partnerships
- Partnerships – Tjungu - Jointly Managing the Park
- Education, Employment and Training
- Park Uses (e.g. site planning and nominating areas where visitors can access)

In addition to the nominated Anangu, relevant stakeholders and Malpas to Anangu were invited to attend the workshops. It was made clear, though, that non-Anangu were there only in a support role and the workshops were to provide a forum for Anangu to articulate *their* views on barriers. Strategies and solutions would be developed jointly.

A number of one day, structured, strictly focussed workshops were conducted with each of the workshop groups, excluding that dealing with Park uses. This group was to work with OJM and the consultants developing the Visitor Management Strategy (VMS) in an extensive site planning exercise.

The workshops were very successful. The feedback from Anangu who participated was that they were very excited to be working together in the way that the workshops had been conducted. They felt very optimistic that the solution-based approach to the issues was positive. They also indicated that this process of working jointly with private tourism operators and with PAN was a process in which they wanted very much to be involved in an ongoing way. This then raised the issue of permanent ongoing structures, processes and mechanisms for joint management and partnerships with tourism operators.

One of the issues that emerged repeatedly were concerns about Anangu youth not learning basic skills, not being able to take up employment opportunities, substance abuse, their seeming disaffection with the Park and almost with life itself. There is a clear need to undertake further work focussing on direct consultation with youth. A number of ideas have been generated and are included in the chapter below on youth, however these were not generated by youth themselves and have not been canvassed with them. Such consultations should involve not only youth at Mutitjulu but should also include young members of the non-resident Traditional Owner group.

In contemporary social impact assessment methodology, a key focus of research is the structures, mechanisms and processes by which the client group is enabled to assume some control and influence themselves over the management of existing and future impacts that arise with change. This approach represents a shift away from a more classical approach of social impact assessment methodology which conceives of the client group as somehow passive and as a



group to whom things simply happen, in ways which can be objectively observed, measured and described.

At Uluru-Kata Tjuta the key structures where decisions are made include the joint management arrangements between Anangu and PAN, and decision-making structures within PAN and within the regional private tourism industry. During the period of the CSIA, the VMS consultancy, which ran parallel with the CSIA, made a number of recommendations about consultative structures and processes and decision-making between PAN and the regional tourism industry. These also became a focus for the CSIA.

Significantly, the creation of structures, mechanisms and processes which empower local indigenous people in relation to other stakeholders now present in the region (e.g. PAN, the tourism industry), have the potential to undermine the indigenous group's own internal power relations that were in place prior to engagement, depending upon the manner in which the new systems of consultation and decision-making articulate with the traditional systems.

This and related issues concerning cultural maintenance are given consideration in the report below. While a full exploration of these issues was beyond the resources and the expertise of this particular project, a number of questions have been raised which remain important and unanswered. An appropriately qualified anthropologist might be engaged to explore these further.

Another key focus in contemporary social impact assessment methodology is to identify not only the past, existing or future negative impacts but to consider also any potential benefits of change for the client group. Rarely is any change event without some opportunities, irrespective of whether the change is wanted or if overall it is not beneficial. Sometimes, however, to take advantage of any opportunities, a client group may require (and be entitled to) some assistance in order to derive potential benefits that might arise. Government and those who otherwise benefit from the change have a special responsibility to ensure that those most likely to be negatively impacted are assisted to benefit where they can.

The approach of social impact assessment methodology therefore is to work with affected people to identify any opportunities that are or may be created for them and are consistent with their overall life aspirations and to assist them to develop a range of strategies for taking advantage of these opportunities.

At Uluru-Kata Tjuta obvious major potential benefits which Anangu identified arising from the declaration of the region as a world heritage area and from tourism, relate to the business and employment opportunities that could be created for them and by them, both in natural resource management and in tourism. Given this, strategies intended to maximise these opportunities, both in the public sector with PAN and in the private tourism industry, became a key consideration of the working groups.



Similarly, attention is given to the issue of social and economic equity for Anangu in comparison with other groups in the region. The report reviews available demographic and socio-economic data and reports on a range of social justice and equity issues in the Park.

The research commenced in July 1997 and was conducted over a twelve month period, concluding in August 1998.

Monitoring

Another important aspect of impact assessment is monitoring. To date the issue of monitoring has not been adequately addressed (at Uluru-Kata Tjuta and rarely elsewhere). A systematic approach to monitoring is required which establishes base line data and where appropriate indicators are developed. In particular, a monitoring system needs to be developed which involves Anangu themselves (through OJM) in identifying relevant indicators, analysing data that are collected and recommending actions based on the monitoring results. Contained in the report below is a discussion of these and related issues together with suggestions for monitoring.

Acknowledgements

This project was initiated and managed by the Office for Joint Management (OJM) at Mutitjulu. There was an expectation at the outset of the project by some other stakeholders that the CSIA Consultant would arrive, 'study' the impacts on Anangu and then leave and write a report s47F and s47F of OJM understood and supported the approach taken and worked tirelessly to facilitate the process and involve and inform Anangu and other stakeholders throughout. Where possible they have already moved to implement some of the recommendations of this report.

The CSIA Consultant is also grateful to the Chair of the Board, Ms Jo Willmot, for her interest and support, and for her involvement and contribution. Other Board members also contributed significantly to workshops and at meetings,

s47F

and s47F, as did members of the wider Anangu community including

s47F

Aboriginal Community Police), s47F

The staff of PAN made concerted efforts to address the issues raised by the CSIA. In particular the Consultant would like to acknowledge the interest and



commitment of s22 [redacted] Acting Park Manager, s22 [redacted] Education, Interpretations and Public Relations Manager, s22 [redacted] Training Officer, the former Park Manager, s22 [redacted], the new Park Manager, s22 [redacted] and other PAN staff who attended workshops and provided interpreting services.

Staff of the Central Land Council also provided professional collaboration and support which was greatly appreciated. This report also draws on some of their consultations. s47F [redacted] assisted with interpreting services. The contributions of s47F [redacted]

[redacted] are also gratefully acknowledged.

Peer review was provided by Dr Richie Howitt of Macquarie University and Dr Helen Ross of the Australian National University.

Some of the material incorporated into this report is reproduced from a paper presented at a conference organised by UNESCO in Thailand in January 1998, "Involving Local Communities in Management of World Heritage Areas" by Annie Holden and Paul Josif.



2. Summary

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park leads the world in its involvement of the local indigenous people in managing a National Park and World Heritage area. By national and international standards the joint management approach taken here offers a high degree of deference to the Anangu perspective. In 1995 Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park was awarded the prestigious Picasso Gold medal, UNESCO's highest honour, in recognition of the way in which Anangu expertise, knowledge and understanding is incorporated into the management practices of the property.

However, for many Anangu the operation of joint management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta falls short of what they imagined it would be. For them 'joint management' means '50-50' in all aspects of decision-making and management and at all levels of management and operation, (not only at Board level), and '50-50' in sharing the benefits. They say they want things between themselves and the relevant agency, Parks Australia North (PAN), to be '*levelled up*'.

Employment

Anangu say they resent the presence at Uluru-Kata Tjuta of so many comparatively well-paid non-indigenous PAN employees in contrast to the high number of unemployed Anangu youth. At the same time, PAN staff at Uluru-Kata Tjuta would welcome greater numbers of Anangu employed. The training and employment programs that have been in place over the past years have not succeeded in creating any significant employment outcomes for Anangu in terms of moving them up the PAN hierarchy and assuming positions of influence within the bureaucracy and Park management. It is increasingly recognised that this is because trying to mold Anangu to the white ways of the PAN bureaucracy is not the solution.

However, Anangu currently receive almost 40% of the wages and salary budget generated by PAN. In addition, recent initiatives in alternative employment programs have been very successful and well received. The 'Traditional Consultancy' program and, if implemented, the proposed 'Malpa' program, (described below), are creative and appropriate ways to deliver greater employment to Anangu. There is still some distance to go to develop these programs and to fund them adequately, but they are an important step.

It is in the area of land management that Anangu are most interested in working. Lack of funding is the most significant barrier to employing Anangu in these areas and with the tightening of budgets in recent years, land management programs have been one of the areas to suffer most.

While there is wide scope for increasing the employment of Anangu with PAN, both by improving their access to existing positions and by increasing expenditure in employment areas of relevance to them, it is important for



Anangu to recognise that PAN can never generate enough employment to meet the employment and income needs of the Mutitjulu community. Other ways of developing employment opportunities, most obviously in the area of tourism-related services and products, should be a focus for Anangu interested in generating greater employment and income opportunities.

Resources and decision-making

Anangu seek more understanding and involvement in decision-making relating to financial expenditure in the Park. They want to 'follow the money-line'. They want more financial information about Park operations, gate money and other sources of income into the Park and how this money is spent. Importantly they also want to be involved in PAN budget formulation.

Anangu also indicated they believe they are entitled to a greater share of gate money. The inequities in the standard of living of Anangu residing at Mutitjulu compared with PAN employees residing at nearby 'Rangerville' is stark. By comparison Mutitjulu is overcrowded, (263 people living in 20 houses), in disrepair and not properly serviced. Between forty and sixty Anangu, including the elderly and very young, live in make-shift shelters with no power, running water or ablution facilities. Amongst many elderly Anangu living in shelters is actually the preferred lifestyle but for others, living in sub-standard housing is a major impediment to their health, welfare and employment prospects.

Most Anangu living at Mutitjulu live a sedentary lifestyle, are bored and some younger members have recently begun to experiment with petrol sniffing. Anangu living conditions, and their inability to share in the wealth their country and sacred sites generates, is not inevitable and should be addressed. During the twelve month period that the CSIA project was underway, two Mutitjulu Community Co-ordinators left and replacement has been difficult each time. It is obvious also that unless community development issues are addressed the poor living conditions of Anangu will continue to frustrate PAN and private sector tourism-related employment initiatives.

Unemployed youth say that for them the biggest barrier to employment is not having anywhere to sleep, being disturbed at night by drinking parties and not being able to eat well. Alcohol consumption at Mutitjulu has been consistent over recent years, but there is now also petrol sniffing and marijuana use amongst youth. Clearly one outcome of joint management has not been economic equity and social justice for Anangu.

By '*levelling up*' Anangu refer also to the balance of resources dedicated to caring for Minga (tourists) compared with resources given over to caring for the cultural and natural resources of the Park. Some Anangu express the view that too much money is spent on caring for tourists, compared with the amount of money spent on caring for country and Anangu who live at the Park. The natural resource management work of the Park is considered both by Anangu and amongst PAN staff at Uluru to be underfunded. A number of land care programs, which created



Anangu employment and financed important natural resource management work, are now finished or suspended.

It is not difficult to justify Anangu receiving a greater share of gate money (or of having access to funds raised through an increase in the gate fee or by other means such as licenses or royalties), in particular if this provides them with more opportunity to undertake the 'work', as they see it, of caring for the Park.

Different perspectives

Anangu have a different perspective to PAN on what constitutes 'the work' of caring for Uluru-Kata Tjuta. For Anangu, caring for the Park relies on people practicing ceremony and to do this people must be well and teaching between generations must occur. People need to visit country and one another in order to keep the country alive. Hence caring for people (old people, young people, men, women) is as important for Anangu as any other activity is in caring for the Park. In contrast, a European perspective on caring for people is that this is not 'work' for which we are paid but is part of our private, domestic responsibilities.

This different attitude in the relationship of people to country is reflected also in a different view about the value or otherwise of the presence of people in the Park. For some PAN staff, the view is that the Park (the environment) is better off without people. It is human beings that damage it and compromise its integrity. For Anangu, the country will die without people; human beings and their actions, providing these are right actions, are fundamental to the well-being of the natural resources of the Park.

Cultural maintenance

Anangu also raised a number of issues during the period of the consultancy which might be loosely grouped together as 'cultural maintenance'. Anangu repeatedly expressed concerns about young people not learning their responsibilities under Tjukurpa (Aboriginal law. Anangu talked of being tired and receiving no support in undertaking their teaching and ceremonial responsibilities. The perennial problem of access to vehicles in order to visit country and to visit relatives and so maintain the social relations and traditions that are critical to cultural practice, was no less evident at Uluru-Kata Tjuta than elsewhere in Aboriginal Australia. Clearly the enforced sedentary lifestyle of Anangu is a serious concern for cultural maintenance.

People repeatedly reaffirmed that the stories are still strong in their heads and that they are not 'letting go' of their culture and responsibilities, but they still feel they are losing contact with the land and are receiving little support to carry out their responsibilities under Tjukurpa. A trust fund for financing cultural maintenance activities and community development is recommended. The fund might be financed through a levy on the gate entry fee, through licensing arrangements of cultural and intellectual property, or by other means of raising revenue.



Articulation of two cultures

It is not difficult for anyone to see that the presence of a large bureaucracy with a significant stake in the Park, and the presence of a growing number of tourists, have the potential to create significant and possibly disastrous impacts for Anangu and the maintenance of their cultural traditions. However, it is also entirely possible that articulation can provide opportunities to strengthen cultural maintenance. The extent to which impacts create pressures and poor outcomes for Anangu depends upon the manner in which the Anangu and external systems articulate. It also depends upon the extent to which Anangu have opportunity to influence the management of those impacts.

Anangu knowledge about land management practices is gradually being recorded and incorporated into PAN land management practices, while Anangu stories are being recorded and presented to tourists by tour operators and through interpretive materials. Some argue that Anangu are gradually making themselves redundant. It is ironic that it is precisely this sharing of information with Pirinpa that won Uluru-Kata Tjuta the Picasso medal.

In relation to tourism itself, Anangu have remained largely marginal to the industry and few benefits have trickled through. There should be opportunities for Anangu, both those resident at Mutitjulu and Traditional Owners not resident within the Park, to establish an independent economic base from tourism. However, this has not materialised and needs still to be developed and facilitated.

Partnerships

To satisfy the employment and income needs of Anangu, it will be necessary to generate employment and income through other means such as tourism-related services, royalties and licensing. This aspect of potential employment and income generation for Anangu is seriously under-developed.

The CSIA broached the question of partnerships between Anangu and private tour operators. The workshops with private tour operators were very successful and demonstrated a genuine commitment on the part of private tour operators to have greater involvement with Anangu as well as a willingness to be flexible in their approaches to making this happen. It was interesting that the goals and aspirations which Anangu identified in relation to tourism corresponded closely with those of private tour operators.

However, lost opportunities abound. The six million-dollar plus Cultural Centre has no business plan and the PAN position of Cultural Centre Coordinator is unfilled. Private tour operators and regional and community art enterprises point out that lack of money to properly manage and plan for opportunities at the Cultural Centre has cost Anangu (and the private sector tourism industry) dearly. Ways of using the Cultural Centre to generate revenue for Anangu are largely unexplored. PAN has not made any concrete contribution to the facilitation of Anangu participation in the private tourism industry. Rather PAN is widely criticised by both Anangu-owned businesses and by other private sector tour



operators as more often presenting barriers to commercial development than facilitating its appropriate and sustainable development.

Opportunities for Anangu to exert control over the way in which the Park and Anangu are promoted in tourism marketing materials nationally and internationally are lacking. Other arrangements for Anangu to have influence or control over and to benefit from cultural tourism-related products and operations also need to be put in place. Issues relating to protection of intellectual and cultural property were also raised and are discussed in the report.

Solutions

Having the money to plan, allocate, employ and invest is fundamental to almost every strategy contained in this report. The objectives of these strategies include greater involvement of Anangu in joint management decision-making, greater equity for Anangu in housing and access to services at Mutitjulu and greater access to business opportunities and other benefits of tourism.

The resounding response by PAN to every proposal by Anangu during the period of the CSIA has been 'no money'. The argument is consistently that the government already subsidises the Park (i.e. operational costs are greater than gate takings), so it is unreasonable to expect that even more be provided to Anangu.

Yet the equation ignores the substantial multiplier effects to the billion-dollar travel and tourism industry that hangs off Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and Anangu. It also ignores the fact that the Northern Territory Government does not fund Mutitjulu on the basis that 'gate money' should provide crucial local government and housing funding to Mutitjulu.

Uluru-Kata Tjuta is World Heritage listed as a cultural landscape and surely this creates some obligation on us to preserve the conditions which enabled such a listing to have been made. There are signs that Anangu culture is under threat, not the least being lack of inter-generational cultural transmission. By some means, unless greater funding is provided for Anangu cultural maintenance and community development, the listing of Uluru-Kata Tjuta as a cultural landscape will eventually be called into question.

The evidence also suggests that because their decision-making power and ability to set priorities within joint management is less than it should be, Anangu are unable to effect a significant objectives of theirs - to create more youth employment and to create a supportive environment for cultural maintenance.

Clearly the failure of Anangu to derive any significant benefits from tourism points to a need for some assessment of improved mechanisms and arrangements for their greater participation in sharing the benefits of the commercial exploitation of their culture and country. The Plan of Management should address this issue.



3. Recommendations

Funding

- (F1) A review of options for provision of additional funding to Anangu for community development, business planning and investment and cultural maintenance activities (ceremony, visiting country and relatives, teaching youth), be undertaken as a priority.
- (F2) The options reviewed to include a greater share of gate money to Anangu, raising the gate entry fee, a levy on tourists to be placed into a 'cultural maintenance and community development trust fund', a fully accounted 'users pays' policy applied to the gate entrance fee which acknowledges the true costs of cultural maintenance and community development, increased government funding for housing and essential services, licensing provisions (including for the use of traditional knowledge in land practice), increased lease payments and other arrangements that might be negotiated.
- (F3) The recommendations of this CSIA report and of the Community Development Plan strategies be fully costed and negotiations take place with all relevant funding agencies to provide adequate resourcing for comprehensive implementation.

Joint Management

- (JM1) PAN to involve Anangu through OJM in the formulation of PAN annual budgets and setting of work priorities.
- (JM2) PAN to develop an 'Anangu-friendly' financial reporting system which makes transparent expenditure on items of relevance to Anangu (e.g. proportional expenditure on Anangu wages and salaries).
- (JM3) A Policy and Procedures Manual be developed by PAN and OJM for the effective implementation of policies, practices and procedures at all levels of management which ensure effective joint management.
- (JM4) The Joint Management Policies and Procedures Manual to incorporate strategies for ensuring that non-resident Traditional Owners are consulted on relevant matters.
- (JM5) A set of policies and procedures be developed jointly by PAN and OJM for how each of visitor groups (other than tourists) be dealt with and which agency should take responsibility for dealing with each group and their requests.



- (JM6) An agreed protocol between Anangu and PAN for site planning and infrastructure development be negotiated and documented by OJM and PAN.
- (JM7) A Malpa [mentoring] program be established at senior management level in PAN.
- (JM8) Handover of local government functions at Mutitjulu to Mutitjulu Community Incorporated.
- (JM9) A system to monitor ongoing economic, social and cultural impacts of joint management and tourism on Anangu be developed and implemented.
- (JM10) Cross-cultural awareness training be provided for all PAN and community staff, including temporary appointees.

PAN employment and training

- (PE1) A target of one half PAN salaries and wages to be earned by Anangu be adopted (in lieu of number of employees being used as the performance measure).
- (PE2) A ten year target of majority of PAN salaries and wages to be earned by Anangu be adopted.
- (PE3) The organisational structure of PAN at Uluru-Kata Tjuta be reviewed to create career paths for Anangu which recognise Anangu seniority and knowledge and do not rely upon Anangu having to acquire formal qualifications.
- (PE4) Training of Anangu supervisors to become a PAN priority.
- (PE5) Encourage older Anangu to take more responsibility for motivating younger people and encouraging them to take up employment and training opportunities.
- (PE6) Establish a CDEP or comparable employment program at Mutitjulu. Mutitjulu to receive first preference in awarding of PAN contracts.
- (PE7) PAN to allocate funds from within its own salaries, wages and training budget to train and employ Anangu youth. This is in addition to external training funding that might be procured.



- (PE8) Review PAN's work culture and ensure it is 'Anangu-friendly' as well as 'Pirinpa-friendly'.
- (PE9) Negotiate an independent funding stream for employment of Anangu youth on land care programs where conditions of funding are flexible.
- (PE10) PAN positions be held open for a maximum of twelve months after which time staff either return to Uluru-Kata Tjuta or move onto the 'excess officers' list.
- (PE11) Cross-cultural training and orientation be provided to temporary PAN staff as well as appointed staff.
- (PE12) Anangu be provided with the opportunity to visit or work in other National Parks.

Tourism

- (T1) The ownership, management and utilisation of the Cultural Centre be reviewed and a Business Plan prepared, costed and implemented.
- (T2) Options for a regional presence (i.e. non-resident Traditional Owners) in the activities at the Cultural Centre be explored.
- (T3) A strategic plan for the greater participation of Anangu as owners, operators and small and big business participants in the regional tourism industry be developed. In particular opportunities for PAN to support Anangu participation be identified and commitments negotiated and included in the Plan of Management.
- (T4) A study of the impacts and opportunities for Anangu to benefit economically from the 2000 Olympics be undertaken.
- (T5) A review of the Tour Operators' Licensing System be undertaken including assessment of Anangu opportunities for raising revenue, Anangu control over access to the Park and different sections of the Park, control over how the Park is used and conditions on use.
- (T6) A review be undertaken of ways in which Anangu might assume control over imagery and messages used in marketing the Park.
- (T7) A system of compulsory accreditation of tour operators be introduced which involves Anangu in providing accreditation courses and accrediting tour operators. This to include ongoing monitoring and quality assurance of tour operator activities in relation to those issues of interest to Anangu.



- (T8) Through an Anangu-controlled 'Tour Operators' Licensing System, require tour operators to negotiate targets for employment and training of Anangu, subject to the successful implementation of recommendations designed to support tour operators employing Anangu.
- (T9) OJM to coordinate the development and introduction of a system of licensing and trademarking of cultural and intellectual property.
- (T10) PAN to hand over the current system of issuing permits for commercial film and photography to OJM. Such a system to be administered using the principle of 'user pays'. The issuing of permits to require film crews to employ Anangu to the extent possible.
- (T11) Establish a permanent forum for ongoing cooperation and communication (partnerships) between Anangu and private sector tour operators.
- (T12) Review the function and staffing of the OJM and Mutitjulu Council Coordinator in terms of their capacity to take on a greater role in providing support, liaison and coordination of Anangu involvement and participation in the private sector tourism industry. Position of an 'Anangu Business Development Manager' be created.
- (T13) Provide training for Anangu and their Malpas (e.g. staff of OJM, PAN, the Mutitjulu Community Coordinator, Pirinpa staff of Anangu-owned enterprises) in how the tourism industry operates, on expectations of tourists, on how to capitalise on a local tourist trade and principles and practices of effective marketing.
- (T14) Appoint a full-time training and employment officer, based at Yulara and funded on a 'user-pays' basis, offering training and employment support to the private sector (Anangu, Pirinpa and combined).
- (T15) A strategy to be developed for the creation of work experience opportunities for Anangu in the private tourism industry.
- (T16) Introduce a Malpa program to the private sector.
- (T17) OJM to approach the Central Land Council and urge them to quickly resolve the matter of an agreement with the Traditional Owners for access to country by tourism operators outside the Park.
- (T18) Investigate funding options, both from public sector and private sector sources, for strengthening of the Homelands Movement including upgrading of water supply, planning of shelters suitable for tourists, upgrading of roads, planning of tourist interpretative walks. (Also benefits cultural maintenance).



- (T19) OJM to encourage Anangu to network with the private sector tourism industry more.
- (T20) Cultural awareness courses be offered to senior management of private tour operators and tourism corporations particularly when senior management are not resident in the region.
- (T21) OJM to organise a forum for funding bodies to meet with Anangu and private tour operators to make them aware of funding available for training and employment support.
- (T22) OJM to organise an annual facilitated workshop between private tour operators and Anangu to review these strategies and assess progress to date.
- (T23) OJM to prepare an annual report for Anangu summarising estimated revenue and expenditure of the private sector tourism industry (preferably on a sector by sector basis), including estimates of income and earnings by Anangu and Anangu owned operations.
- (T24) Visitor management strategies be designed in ways which do not undermine the achievement of Anangu goals, which address Anangu concerns and which are consistent with Anangu values.
- (T25) Consultation be undertaken with Anangu to determine the reasons for their desire to see the Climb closed and the strength of their feeling about this.
- (T26) Depending upon the outcome of T25, PAN to liaise with the TCC to develop a strategy for eventual closure of the Climb.
- (T27) Conflicting messages to tourists about the Climb and offence to Anangu be resolved.

Cultural maintenance

- (CM1) Undertake a comprehensive archaeological and anthropological base line survey of the Park.
- (CM2) Archaeological and anthropological work done to remain confidential and the property of the Traditional Owner group.
- (CM3) Review PAN recruitment policies and working conditions to identify conflicts with Anangu ceremonial responsibilities and family responsibilities. Negotiate more flexible recruitment and working



conditions to accommodate Anangu cultural differences and conflicting demands on time.

- (CM4) The Anangu perspective of what constitutes the work of caring for Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (telling stories, revisiting country, teaching youth, etc.) be given official recognition by PAN and other stakeholders.
- (CM5) Involve Anangu in the development, establishment and operation of an ongoing system for the monitoring and reporting of economic, social and cultural impacts (including non-resident Traditional Owners).
- (CM6) Camping facilities (including ablution block) to be constructed at Mutitjulu for use by visiting non-resident Traditional Owners.
- (CM7) An interim strategy for recognition and management of Anangu cultural and intellectual property rights, (pending the outcome of the national review), be devised.
- (CM8) Further consultations be undertaken with youth to identify strategies for ensuring younger people are supported in taking up their responsibilities under Tjukurpa.
- (CM9) An anthropologist should be engaged to work with Anangu to describe and document Anangu social relations to ensure that consultation processes and decision-making structures are compatible with Anangu systems and do not undermine these.



4. Description of the site and people

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park is located within the southwestern corner of the Northern Territory of Australia covering an area of approximately thirteen hundred square kilometres. It lies within the geo-cultural region known as the Western Desert and consists largely of low sandhills and sandplains. Within the Park is Uluru, which is an immense monolith, and the rock domes located west of Uluru, called Kata Tjuta.

Uluru and Kata Tjuta form part of a landscape which is interwoven with the traditional belief system of the traditional inhabitants, the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people. Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people refer to themselves as 'Anangu' and are members of a functioning hunter-gatherer society.

Uluru-Kata Tjuta was World Heritage listed for its natural values in 1987 and subsequently for its cultural values in 1994. The nomination document for cultural values states that

A unique cultural adaptation to the desert environment enabled Anangu and related groups in the Western Desert to develop social groups that were based on semi-permanent water sources but held reciprocal rights of access to temporary water sources and plant and animal resources in the intervening years. This adaptation is of outstanding universal value. (Department of the Environment, Sports and Territories 1994:22).

Australia has enacted legislation, the *World Heritage Properties Conservation Act* (1983), to carry out its responsibilities under the UNESCO World Heritage Convention.

Uluru and Kata Tjuta include a number of places of great spiritual importance and as such, are focal points for 'Tjukurpa', or Anangu religious, creation and law stories and manifestations, across the entire Western desert region. 'Tjukurpa' is the Pitjantjatjara term for 'Law' and is an all-encompassing series of laws that bind people, the landscape, the animals and plants into one interconnected world. 'Tjukurpa' regulates all aspects of life.

Although the park has been listed as a cultural landscape and there has been some anthropological and archaeological work done in the area (see list reference), there is still a need to undertake comprehensive archaeological and anthropological survey work. It is recommended that this be done and that any records produced remain confidential and the property of the Traditional Owners.



Brief history of tourism in the region

Archaeological evidence suggests that Anangu have occupied the central desert areas of Australia for at least 30,000 years. After colonisation, and while assimilation was official government policy elsewhere in Australia, the Uluru-Kata Tjuta region was left as part of an extensive series of reserves created by governments for the protection of Aboriginal people. It was not until the 1940s that a road was put through to Uluru-Kata Tjuta and Anangu began to have some contact with tourists. According to Layton (1986), their dealings with tourists provided a source of cash which enabled them to avoid government settlements and continue to live a hunter gatherer lifestyle relatively unaffected by European intrusion.

In 1958 Uluru-Kata Tjuta was excised from the South West Reserve and set aside for the purpose of a national park. Tourist accommodation was built near Uluru soon after. The continuing presence of Anangu in the Park was not encouraged by the Northern Territory Reserves Board, which had control of the Park. (Dept Environment, Sport and Territories 1994:16).

1973 marked a shift in government attitude to the presence of Anangu when a federal parliamentary enquiry recommended the relocation of tourist facilities to outside the Park boundaries, and the protection of Anangu sacred sites and training for Anangu rangers. In 1977 Uluru-Kata Tjuta was declared a National Park under the provisions of the *National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act* (1975) and came under the control of the Conservation Commission of the Northern Territory Government. In 1979 Anangu Traditional Owners successfully make a land claim to the vacant Crown land surrounding the Park but 'their claim to Uluru and Kata Tjuta failed on legal technicalities' (Dept Environment, Sport and Territories 1994:17).

In 1985 the land was declared Aboriginal inalienable freehold and title was vested in the Uluru-Kata Tjuta Aboriginal Land Trust which represents the Anangu Traditional Owners. On the same day that Aboriginal ownership was recognised, the Park was leased back to the Director of PAN for 99 years, to be managed as a National Park. With the exception of Yulara, (see below), all land surrounding the Park is Aboriginal freehold under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act (NT)*, (1976).

The Northern Territory Tourist Commission estimates that there were 167,000 visitors to Uluru-Kata Tjuta in 1985-86, increasing to 270,000 in 1988-89 (Ditton 1989:423). In 1983 a major resort town was constructed by the Northern Territory Government twenty kilometres outside the boundary of the Park. Yulara is the base for the Ayers Rock Resort and is essentially a 'closed town'. This means that land at Yulara is not for sale and housing and accommodation there is only available to Resort staff, government employees and some contractors. There is effectively only one employer at Yulara, the Ayers Rock Resort Management (which is the management corporation for the owners General Property Trust).



Since the construction of the resort town and with the opening of the Connellan Airport, visitor numbers have trebled (TRC 1977:75). Today it is estimated that approximately 400,000 visitors per annum come to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and it is anticipated that these numbers will continue to increase in the years ahead. In particular, proposals to make Uluru the Australian landing point for the Olympic Torch will raise the international profile of the destination and can be expected to lead to further dramatic increases in visitor numbers in the future.

While the number of visitors has steadily increased over the years, the average length of stay has actually declined. In 1990 the average length of stay was 1.8 nights. Since then it has declined to 1.6 nights (TRC 1977:75). Visitors (other than the friends and relatives of Mutitjulu residents) cannot stay overnight in the Park. They must stay at Yulara where there is a range of accommodation options from camping and backpacker hostels to a luxury resort. In this sense the fragility of the desert ecology has served the interests of Anangu. Tourists are strictly restricted in their access to the Park because of the very real potential for damage to the physical environment of a desert ecology. The terrain at Uluru-Kata Tjuta repairs very slowly and visitors are managed carefully with a range of enforced restrictions on where they can walk and drive.

The Northern Territory Tourist Commission estimates that there were 167,000 visitors to Uluru-Kata Tjuta in 1985-86, increasing to 270,000 in 1988-89 (Ditton 1989:423). In 1983 a major resort town was constructed by the Northern Territory Government twenty kilometres outside the boundary of the Park. Yulara is the base for the Ayers Rock Resort and is a 'closed town'. This means that land at Yulara is not for sale and housing and accommodation there is only available to Resort staff and government employees. There is only one employer at Yulara – the Ayers Rock Resort Corporation.

Since the construction of the resort town and with the opening of the Connellan Airport, visitor numbers have trebled (TRC 1977:75). Today it is estimated that approximately 400,000 visitors per annum come to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and it is anticipated that these numbers will continue to increase in the years ahead. In particular, proposals to make Uluru the Australian landing point for the Olympic Torch in the year 2000 Olympic celebrations will raise the international profile of the destination and can be expected to lead to further dramatic increases in visitor numbers in the future.

Anangu privacy has also improved dramatically with the creation of Yulara. Previously tourists camped in a camping ground nearby the Mutitjulu community and were free to visit the community and make purchases from the store. Now Mutitjulu is strictly off limits to tourists. This has increased the privacy of community members and reduced pressure on them from tourists. However, it has also had the effect of making some Anangu feel that they are now cut off from tourists. Some Anangu report feeling disappointed that tourists no longer ask them questions. Other Anangu made comments during the CSIA consultations, which suggest that the 'professionalisation' of the tourism industry



and some aspects of land management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta have marginalised them. Anangu described how in earlier days they used to be involved in rescues on the Climb, in caring for waterholes and burning, and in providing ad hoc guiding services. They reported how they did these things well and enjoyed the responsibility attaching to them. These services and responsibilities have now been taken over by PAN and private tour operators.

As Rose writes, 'unlike the reaction to tourism indicated in most of the literature (which suggests a passive and somewhat uniform reaction from the host culture) Anangu have reacted in complex and diverse ways to tourism' (1995:74). As will become clear throughout this report, many Anangu (particularly older Anangu) seek to engage with tourism. The point is reiterated that the key issues for Anangu must be control and benefits. Both these aspects are explored below.

Population

There are no figures available of the actual numbers of people within the Traditional Owner group. However, estimates range from 500 to 1000 people, of whom approximately 300 live at Muṯitjulu. Others live in surrounding communities including Imampa, Docker River in the Northern Territory, Ernabella, Amata and Kalka/Piptyatjara in South Australia, and Wingellina and Warburton in Western Australia.

1996 ABS census data record a total population of 2,092 people in the Muṯitjulu/Yulara region. Of these 206 identified as indigenous, 1,452 as non-indigenous and an unusually high number of respondents did not indicate their ethnicity (n=434).

Amongst the indigenous population at Muṯitjulu/Yulara there is a ratio of 11 females to every 9.6 males. It is not clear why there are more females than males at Muṯitjulu except that access to services may be better here than in outlying communities. It should be noted that the data set is small and the greater number of females may not be significant.

Conversely, amongst the non-indigenous population there are 7.34 males for each 7.18 females. This is consistent with a resort town demographic profile where young single males are more mobile and more likely to take up employment opportunities in a remote place.

According to the census data, 40% of indigenous respondents speak English well or very well. The remainder do not speak English well or at all. While these figures may accurately reflect the percentage of Anangu who understand English, it is not the case that 40% of Anangu at Muṯitjulu or even close to that number speak English well.



5. Joint Management

'Joint Management' or 'working together' is a fundamental aspect of the management of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. Joint management is required by the lease arrangements between PAN and the Anangu Traditional Owners, and is an objective of the jointly produced Plan of Management. The management of the Park is intended to be driven by policies decided in the Board of Management, a ten member body consisting of an Anangu majority

The Park Vision Statement (reproduced below) describes Tjukurpa as the guiding set of principles and knowledge which Anangu and PAN jointly strive to implement. However, as the workshops revealed, incorporating indigenous values into the management of the Park is not always easy. This is particularly the case when indigenous values conflict with non-indigenous values which emanate from and are imposed from outside the immediate Park joint management framework.

Operationalising Joint Management

'We give our ideas again and again and still nothing happens.' (s47F [REDACTED], Board member).

The Office for Joint Management (OJM) is a key mechanism by which joint management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta is implemented. The primary role of OJM is to ensure Anangu are fully informed about all activities being conducted or proposed by PAN and other users of the Park, and that Anangu are appropriately involved and represented in all fora and activities relating to the management of the cultural and natural resources. This includes involvement in visitor management issues, and other proposals or issues relating to Anangu, or the local community of Mutitjulu. OJM also provides secretariat and other support to the Board of Management, and particularly to Anangu Board members.

While OJM provides a key role in operationalising joint management through the facilitation of consultation with Anangu and negotiation with PAN, it has no decision-making power in its own right in relation to decisions affecting Park management. It can ensure that PAN is aware of Anangu views but it cannot force these on PAN.

A view held in many quarters is, given that Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has an Anangu-dominated Board of Management, this must mean that Anangu wishes prevail. However, at different times throughout the period of the CSIA consultancy, different Anangu Board members expressed to the CSIA Consultant frequent frustration in not seeing their aspirations realised and little action taken



Vision Statement
Uluru-Kata Tjuta Board of Management

The Uluru-Kata Tjuta landscape is and will always be a significant place of knowledge and learning. All the plants, animals, rocks and water holes contain important information about life and living here, now and for all time.

Anangu grandparents and grandchildren will always gain their knowledge from this landscape. They will live in it in a proper way. This is Tjukurpa.

The special natural and cultural features of this area, which have placed it on the World Heritage list, will be protected. Its importance as a sacred place, and a national symbol will be reflected in a high standard of management.

This will be achieved through the joint management of Uluru - Kata Tjuta National Park where Anangu and Pirinpa will work together as equals, exchanging knowledge about our different cultural values, processes and their application.

Together we will apply relevant Anangu Tjukurpa and practice, and Pirinpa knowledge to:

- keep Tjukurpa strong;
- support a healthy Anangu culture and society;
- look after country and protect a national symbol;
- protect World Heritage natural and cultural environments of the Park in harmony with Australian social and economic aspirations.

We would like all visitors and people with an interest in this place to learn about this land from those who have its knowledge. We would like you to respect this knowledge, behave in a proper way, enjoy your visit and return safely to your homes and families to share the knowledge you have gained.



on matters which were of a high priority to them. This related in particular to access to financial information, youth employment, the proposed Malpa program and PAN employment which offers them the opportunity to visit country.

Anangu Board members do not appear to see their position as offering them the opportunity to force changes they think should be made. This situation is partly a reflection of only limited training being provided to Board members in the recent past and is a direct consequence of language being a barrier to effective participation and decision-making in Board proceedings. Obviously with the amount of written material that passes before a Board of Management of a multi-million dollar operation, not having literacy skills and not having a great deal of conceptual knowledge of the dominant culture, severely limits Anangu Board members in their ability to deal with a wide range of substantive matters and to make informed decisions, the use of interpreters notwithstanding.

Board members (and OJM) suggest that too often they are not offered the opportunity to develop or choose from options in their decision-making but are frequently presented with what is a *fait accompli* on important issues for Anangu. Anangu are supported by OJM but it would be incorrect to suggest that Anangu Board members exercise as much control over the policies and direction of the operation of the Park as might be the case in a more usual Board arrangement.

Reporting structures

“If whitefella come from Alice Springs, they should speak to these people. These are the people who should talk about this kind of business. s47F at Cave Hill, myself, s47F, s47F. Make a council of these people.” s47F, Ernabella.

“We’re in a different area. How is it we’re left out even though we’re Traditional Owners? That makes me very sad. We’re bringing up kids who are Traditional Owners but have been left out.” s47F, Imanpa.

OJM is funded by PAN but it reports to the Mutitjulu Community Incorporated Governing Committee. One of the weaknesses of OJM reporting to this body is that this has the effect of compounding the common confusion between the identity of the Traditional Owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta and the identity of the members of the Mutitjulu community. It is the case that not all members of the Traditional Owner group are resident at Mutitjulu and not all Aboriginal people who reside at Mutitjulu (and therefore potentially the members of the Governing Committee) are members of the Traditional Owner group.

In the strictest sense OJM should be reporting to a trust of Traditional Owners of sites at Uluru and Kata Tjuta and other sites located within the boundaries of the



Park or adjacent areas likely to be affected by decisions taken by the Board of Management or by PAN. Clearly there are practical reasons why this is not the case, however, the point is made in order to draw attention to the need to provide greater opportunity for non-resident Traditional Owners to influence decisions about Park management and Park uses.

Policies and procedures manual

The OJM fulfills its responsibilities towards involving Anangu in management of the Park through:

- acting as an initial contact point for outsiders and for PAN and referring matters to Anangu where required;
- implementing Anangu instructions for dealing with matters;
- advocating Anangu interests to PAN, government and outside agencies and individuals;
- ensuring that visitors and users of the Park understand and respect the Anangu perspective and Tjukurpa;
- ensuring that uses of the Park are consistent with Anangu ideals;
- facilitating recruitment of Anangu in the work of managing the Park, undertaking performance reviews in conjunction with PAN and the community and dealing with Anangu personnel issues (usually cross cultural problems);
- facilitate the participation of Anangu on selection panels for PAN staff (including Park Manager's position);
- undertake and/or facilitate consultation about key aspects of Park management and Park uses (including the Plan of Management);
- arrange for the involvement of Anangu in planning and decision-making about Park management, conservation and uses, including site-planning work;
- arrange for the participation of Anangu in all public education and discussion forums;
- advise PAN on Anangu-related matters;
- coordinate training programs for Anangu and for PAN staff with respect to joint management and cross-cultural training;
- implement instructions from the Board of Management or Mutitjulu Council on matters relating to Park management or Park uses;
- liaise with external agencies and individuals on matters relating to Park management and Park uses;
- implement actions included under the Plan of Management; and
- monitor the implementation of Anangu aspirations.

The OJM consists of one Co-ordinator and one Assistant Co-ordinator. The principles and practices, which have been established in relation to joint management structures generally in the Park, have been developed over a number of years and are not documented. They are therefore subject to change and are



implemented with various levels of commitment, depending upon the awareness of past practices and level of commitment of the Park Manager and OJM Co-ordinator at the time. It is recommended that a policy and procedures manual be developed for use by PAN and OJM staff for the effective implementation of practices and procedures at all levels of management which ensure effective joint management.

Involvement at other levels

At other levels of operation, Anangu become less present and are even less involved in decision-making. Repeatedly, Anangu have expressed an interest in developing a greater understanding and having a more hands-on involvement in the day-to-day decision-making and management of the Park.

“We don’t understand about the Money Line. We want to learn about the budget and money business about the Park and be involved in deciding how it is spent.”

S47F

For this to occur there is a need to make PAN more ‘Anangu-friendly’. Some of the ways in which this might happen have been explored through the Plan of Management process and were touched on in some of the CSIA workshops. However, there is a need to develop more comprehensive measures and to document these in a manual.

For example some policies, practices and procedures that might be developed and included in a manual include:

- Use of interpreters for all meetings at which Anangu are present.
- Training for Anangu in accounting and financial management (‘Money Line’).
- Budget formulation process to involve Anangu.
- Budget documents to be prepared in a suitable format (e.g. using the CLC ‘Money Line’ Workshop methodology.)
- Work programs to be discussed with and approved by Anangu.
- 50-50 Anangu representation at key decision-making meetings.
- An interpreter on staff a minimum of two days a week. PAN and OJM to schedule meetings and consultations for those two days.
- Traditional Owners not resident at Mutitjulu be included in key discussions.
- Anangu be included on selection panels for PAN positions including temporary positions (which often become permanent).
- Anangu involvement in and direction of site planning and infrastructure development.

Joint Management: Anangu concerns and aspirations

During the period of the CSIA consultancy, Anangu expressed a range of very specific aspirations and concerns about the operation of joint management at



Uluru-Kata Tjuta. It should be noted that no attempt has been made to gauge how widely these views are held. The following may be the views of some individual Anangu but do not necessarily reflect the view of all Anangu¹:

- *We want to be able to properly check the Plan of Management's progress and its implementation. We have given our ideas many times over and over and still they are not put into place.* s47F [redacted] Board member).
- *There is no togetherness. Still working separately. Anangu women want to get involved and work with the Park. There is no joint management happening. Pirinpa women need to get together with Anangu women.*
- *We want more control over Park management and in decision-making over Park management and visitor management. We want higher levels of involvement in running the Park.*
- *Watching the money line – we want to know what happens to the gate money and other income into the Park. Where does it go?* s47F [redacted] Board member).
- *We want to increase the number of sites we care for. There are also some women's sites we want to be able to care for. [Note: These sites are located outside of the boundaries of the Park.]* (s47F [redacted] former Board member).
- *We older people are tired. We want to rest. Grandparents need to be supported in teaching Tjukurpa to young people.* (Barbara Tjikudu, former Board member).
- *We want younger people to be more involved in actively caring for Tjukurpa. We want them to have jobs and to have better education about Tjukurpa.*
- *We want more Anangu working in this Park. Lots of rangers come and go and still we don't see Anangu rangers. There's only a handful of Anangu working. Still we haven't young people up learning about Tjukurpa.*
- *We want to working together on the land with rangers. There is no joint management. We don't work together on the land.*

While the idea of a local indigenous community and a government department of the dominant culture jointly managing a National Park may seem appealing,

¹ The following quotations were taken from a meeting between the Visitor Management Strategy Consultants and a large group of Anangu and PAN staff. The quotations were documented from the tape of the meeting that included the interpreter's translations. The words above are those of the interpreter's. Not all of the names of the individuals who contributed the remarks were available on the recording.



turning the idea into a reality is not an easy task. It requires creativity, tolerance and the ability for each party to step out of its own cultural blind and attempt to develop a better appreciation of how the world looks from others' eyes. Joint management also requires tremendous patience and cultural tolerance from all sides. All exchanges need to be interpreted since few Anangu speak English and few PAN staff speak Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara. PAN provide Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara work-based language classes and expect staff to acquire language skills, while English orality and literacy are recognised by Anangu educators as a learning priority.

One of the difficulties experienced is that at any one time up to one third of PAN staff are temporary. Temporary staff receive no formal cross-cultural awareness training or orientation. Orientation is provided for appointed staff but not for temporary staff. It has been suggested that Uluru-Kata Tjuta is a special situation and that Commonwealth conditions of employment which allow an officer to take extended leave for up to three years without needing to surrender his or her position creates special problems here. It is proposed that at Uluru-Kata Tjuta positions should be held open for only twelve months after which time staff should either return to Uluru-Kata Tjuta or move onto the 'excess officers' list. It is also recommended that all Pirinpa Officers, including temporary staff, receive cross-cultural training.



6. The Anangu perspective on caring for the Park

A starting point for the workshops between Anangu and PAN was to invite Anangu to articulate what they see the work of properly managing Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park should actually involve.

Anangu state that to care properly for the National Park, Tjukurpa must be 'number one'. Their description of what this means in practice is:

- passing on knowledge to young men and women
- learning to find water and bush food
- travelling around the country
- learning about, collecting, and using bush medicines
- visiting sacred sites
- visiting family in other communities
- watching the country and making sure Tjukurpa is observed
- remembering the past
- thinking about the future
- keeping visitors safe - keeping women away from men's sites and keeping men away from women's sites
- teaching visitors how to observe and respect Tjukurpa
- teaching Park's staff and other Pirinpa² how to observe Tjukurpa
- bringing up children strong and caring for children
- growing the country by doing the right things (e.g. hunting at the right time of the year and not at wrong times or in the wrong way)
- keeping Anangu women safe
- keeping Anangu men safe
- making the country alive (e.g. through stories, ceremony and song)
- keeping the Mutitjulu community private and safe
- putting the roads and Park facilities in proper places so that sacred places are safeguarded
- rock waterhole cleaning/protection inside the Park and outside the Park
- collecting bush foods and seeds
- old men teaching stories -young boys and men learning stories
- old women teaching stories -young girls and women learning stories
- looking after country (e.g. burning work)
- hunting food to feed young children
- hunting food to feed old people

Anangu say that if all of these things are not done, the requirements of Tjukurpa are not fulfilled and the country will die.



PAN sees things somewhat differently to Anangu. For them the work of caring for a World Heritage National Park involves activities such as visitor management, natural and cultural resource management, interpretation of the Park and Anangu culture and administration. Within these broad categories are a multitude of tasks aimed at managing and providing visitor safety, amenities, interpretation and information; or aimed at mitigating and monitoring the negative impacts of tourism on the natural resources of the Park.

The following list was compiled in the workshop and describes the PAN perspective of what constitutes the work of managing a World Heritage area:

- licensing permitted uses
- Ranger patrols
- law enforcement
- rescues
- training in emergency procedures and rescues
- weed control
- feral animal control
- infrastructure maintenance and development (e.g. roads, power, water, walking tracks)
- natural and cultural resource research and monitoring programs (e.g. fauna survey)
- fire management
- erosion control
- feral animal control
- interpretations and visitor/tourist relations (e.g. guided walks, signage)
- tour operator education and training
- site planning and mapping
- community liaison
- art site management
- corporate services (e.g. ticketing, communications, capital works planning, budgets)
- staff administration

A point to note about the work that PAN undertakes is that most of the work, as they see it, involves managing visitors to the Park and working to minimise the impact of tourists and other human Park users on the natural values of the Park.

As can be seen, there is a good deal of overlap between the PAN perspective and that of Anangu about what constitutes the work of caring for a National Park. However, there are also some fundamental differences between the two perspectives. One of the major differences is the view on what rightly counts as 'work'. For Anangu the over-riding priority in caring for the Park is that Tjukurpa must be observed. Anangu see caring for family and caring for country as bound up together and inextricably linked through Tjukurpa. Since Anangu themselves must be well and healthy if they are to care for the country and keep it



alive and well, for them there is no separation between caring for themselves and caring for the Park.

This Anangu belief is distinct from a European perspective that sees caring for family as a private activity and a private responsibility, while caring for a National Park is an activity conducted in the public domain and a public responsibility.

A second difference between the Parks' perspective and that of Anangu relates to the role of people in caring for a National Park. For PAN staff much of their work is created by the presence of people and the need to manage visitors and manage the impacts of people. Understandably there is view (not only at Uluru-Kata Tjuta, but elsewhere) that National Parks would be better off without people. People are part of the problem.

This conflicts with the Anangu perspective on the role of people in a National Park. For Anangu, it is people keep the country alive (through ceremony, song, right practice and right knowledge.) The Anangu perspective is that the country will die without the people who have the responsibilities and knowledge under Tjukurpa, which relate to the maintenance and care of the country. The presence of (the right) people is as essential to maintaining the integrity of the natural values of the Park as it is to maintaining its cultural values.

The significance of the divergence in views is manifested in the Park management budget (discussed below). Slowly, increasing monies are being allocated to Anangu Traditional Consultancy Program (described below) but there is still little allocation of funds, for example, for Anangu to visit country and perform ceremony or to undertake other aspects of what they see as the work of caring for the Park, but which the dominant culture does not agree legitimately counts as work.

Other problems have developed in recent years with a tightening of budgets. For example, while previously PAN was able to accommodate men and young men needing to be absent from work to attend ceremony or funerals, tighter budgets have meant that PAN has now restricted such leave to a maximum of ten days every two years, down from ten days per annum. This is experienced as a serious restriction of activities that Anangu see as part of caring for Uluru-Kata Tjuta.



7. Anangu employment in Park management

“Young people tell me that to be able to come and work in the Park they need a good house, furniture and a good bed to sleep on.” s22 [redacted] Training Officer, PAN

Under the provisions of the Lease agreement, PAN is required to:

1. Take all practical steps to promote Aboriginal administration, management and control of the Park;
2. Engage as many relevant Aboriginals as is practicable to provide services in and in relation to the Park;
3. Take all reasonable steps to adjust working hours and conditions to the needs and culture of Aboriginals employed in the Park;
4. Utilise the traditional skills of Aboriginal individuals and groups in the management of the Park;
5. Encourage Aboriginal business and commercial initiatives and enterprises within the Park.

Performance on each of these has been varied. In relation to 1) above, the two key achievements in this area are the Board composition, which has an Anangu majority, and the establishment and operation of the Office for Joint Management and the Traditional Consultancy program. These are significant achievements, but otherwise, there is still some distance to go in promoting or permitting Anangu to become involved in administration, management and control of the Park.

As demonstrated by the number of Anangu employed in middle or senior management in the Park (nil), in terms of appointing Anangu to administrative and management positions, this has not occurred at all. The basic argument put by PAN in the workshops is that until Anangu have ‘whitefella qualifications’ they cannot expect to take up positions in the PAN bureaucracy.

However, Anangu argue that to make joint management strong, they should be working side by side with PAN management. They say that PAN management ‘listen one side’ and do not have access to the Anangu perspective in the day to day running of the Park. They propose a ‘Malpa’ or mentoring program:



"We need this [mentoring] system at manager level. Once that is in place everything else will fall into place. Everyone else will start working together. They will bring in young people – supervise them. In that way joint management will be much stronger." (s47F [redacted]).

The proposal is to create a Malpa program which amounts to the creation of joint management functions within the five senior management positions in the Park – Park Manager, Manager Education and Interpretation and Public Relations, Manager Training, Manager Resources and Manager Operations. The proposed role of the Anangu joint manager (Malpa) includes:

- ensure that Tjukurpa is observed
- teach the Pirinpa manager about the application of Tjukurpa in his or her work area
- learn about park management and develop English literacy
- make joint decisions about the allocation of resources and setting of priorities
- ensure Anangu know about employment opportunities
- supervise young Anangu working under that manager
- encourage other Anangu to work and to train under that manager
- liaise with the Anangu community – informing them and consulting with them
- liaise with OJM

At the workshops PAN staff said that their organisation's view would be that the proposed Malpa/mentoring system is expensive and that there is no money to pay for it. They also expressed the view that some Pirinpa staff would resist the scheme on the basis that they want things to be done quickly and Pirinpa way. If a mentoring system is to be introduced, cross-cultural awareness training for Pirinpa staff will be essential. Some Anangu feel very strongly that PAN should be making greater efforts to create opportunities for Anangu other than at the manual labour and interpretation level.

"Where are Pirinpa staff transferring their skills to Anangu? They should be doing that so much that eventually they have no job." s47F [redacted] Board member.)

A second proposed initiative is that career paths and the organisational structure of PAN at Uluru-Kata Tjuta be reviewed to create career paths for Anangu, which recognise the value of traditional knowledge and seniority and do not rely upon having 'whitefella qualifications'.

PAN's performance on the second of its obligations, 2) above, has also been variable. Under the current Plan of Management PAN is committed to ensuring



that one third of PAN staff be Anangu. However, while one third of PAN staff are Aboriginal, not all are Anangu. It was suggested in one of the workshops that PAN recruit Aboriginal people from elsewhere because their requirements are so stringent that local Anangu cannot meet these. PAN is recruiting from outside the Traditional Owner group in order to meet their obligations under the Lease agreement.

However, the fact is that, as a proportion of the PAN wages and salaries budget, Anangu employees earn almost 40% of the PAN wages and salaries budget (including monies set aside for the Traditional Consultancy budget). By any standard, PAN's performance in relation to employment is excellent.

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Budget 1996/97:

Salaries/ wages income, Anangu:

Anangu Rangers	279,000
Traditional consultancy budget	<u>144,000</u>
Total	<u>\$423,000</u>

Salaries/ wages income, non-Anangu:

Non-Anangu Rangers	529,000
Entry Station	100,000
Admin/Management	455,000
OJM	<u>105,000</u>
Total	<u>\$1,189,000</u>

% of PAN salaries and wages budget earned by Anangu: 35.6%
(not including payment to Anangu Board members)

PAN also has in place a number of initiatives to increase these numbers and is clearly committed to doing so.

While PAN aspires to a majority Anangu employee workforce as its long term goal (John Hicks, Assistant Secretary, PAN, TCC Workshop Yulara, 11-12 June 1998), this is not a suitable performance measure. Rather PAN should aspire to Anangu eventually earning more than 50% of the income earned in salaries and wages in Park management. Given that part-time, seasonal and casual work is



more compatible with the Anangu lifestyle, 50% staff numbers is not a suitable measure.

It is also the case that wages and salaries paid to Anangu are not all funded out of the PAN salaries and wages budget but often only provided when additional funds from agencies such as DEETYA can be procured. There is a view, held within PAN, OJM and amongst Anangu, that PAN should have a substantial employment and training allocation within its own budget. Other funds should still be sought, but only as an addition to a PAN allocation.

The reality is – which it is important to note and which it is not currently recognised amongst Anangu – is that PAN cannot and will never generate enough employment to satisfy the income needs of Mutitjulu residents and other members of the non-resident Traditional Owner group. For example, even if PAN were to allocate its entire salaries and wages budget to Anangu employees, this would still generate less than \$5,000 per capita per annum. Anangu must look to other employment and income employment opportunities to meet their income needs. Furthermore, the population at Mutitjulu is growing much faster than is the salaries and wages budget at PAN. As time progresses the adequacy of the PAN employment budget and Mutitjulu's income needs will grow apart even further.

One of the major difficulties in achieving employment objectives is, according to PAN staff, that many Anangu youth do not want to work for PAN and that PAN therefore has difficulties recruiting Anangu youth. These same difficulties apply in the private sector and relate largely to the community development needs of Mutitjulu, discussed below.

In addition to the barriers to employment identified above, Anangu also complain that when they do work with Pirinpa they are not allowed to drive the vehicles and that Pirinpa staff always drive. They say also that Anangu should be supervised by Anangu and that this is another reason why they are not always happy working at PAN. In addition they are not supported in getting to work. They say that they often wait in the community to be picked up to go to work but no one picks them up.

However, Anangu believe that the solution to Anangu under-employment is to employ Anangu and Anangu youth in employment programs that are more appropriate than those opportunities currently made available. There is no shortage of Anangu-proposed work programs, including teaching youth about hunting and protection of sacred areas, but PAN's response to these suggestions is that there is 'no money' for them. This is very frustrating to Anangu.

"There are lots of jobs that can be done – building fences, driving trucks, repairing things, checking on tourists, going to the cultural centre, working with the resource people, firework, cleaning water holes, minkiri work, helping Rupert



with his tour – if only we can get the money to help people get into the jobs.”
s47F (former Board member).

However, even when money is made available for these sorts of tasks it quickly runs out. It is frustrating to Anangu that there is no committed ongoing funding stream for these kinds of work. Money is granted and runs out or is cut out. Future funding is never secure. This is partly because Anangu employment is not funded out of PAN's core funding. Rather PAN applies for special grants and through special schemes for funding to employ Anangu. One participant expressed the view that PAN employ Anangu as a 'luxury' or 'add on' and not as an essential part of Park management expenditure. However, this again is a partly a reflection of Anangu and others not having an accurate picture of PAN's Anangu employment and training performance.

“Write it in the Plan – money for employing young people.” s47F
(former Board member).

PAN's performance on 3) is variable also. At the local level there is some degree of flexibility and accommodation of the competing demands of the Anangu lifestyle. But PAN operates according to conditions and rules that are set in Canberra. As one example, the payment cycle of PAN does not make sense to many Anangu. They work and are not paid, or they do not work and they are paid. It is not always clear to them on what basis they are paid or why they are not paid when they have worked.

For example, one Anangu ranger took unpaid leave to attend ceremony. He received full pay for the three weeks he was away on ceremony. When he returned he worked for one month and was not paid. It is hard for people to make sense of this and is a source of tension and conflict in the workplace.

It is on 4) that PAN can be said to best perform. Anangu knowledge has been extensively explored and documented in the areas of resource management and interpretation. Other issues arise in relation to Anangu traditional knowledge and are discussed in more detail below.

PAN's performance on 5) above has been virtually non-existent to date. There are currently no policies or strategies in place to assist or foster Anangu-owned enterprises other than at the Cultural Centre. PANs need to develop a strategic response to supporting Anangu businesses in the Park and to commit some resources to this. For instance, it was proposed at a Tourism Consultative Committee workshop in June 1998 that PAN should adopt policies similar to those at Kakadu where preference is given to tourism operators with a successful track record in employing Anangu. Obviously such a requirement would also



place some obligation on PAN to assist tour operators with advice or direction on how they might achieve PAN-defined preferred status.

PAN's vision statement for the Cultural Centre includes the words 'to encourage successful Anangu-owned and controlled enterprises which provide Mutitjulu community with training, employment and substantial financial benefits.' At present up to \$3,000 per week is generated in earnings for Anangu from the sale of art at the Centre, while tour guides with Anangu Tours earn up to \$2,500 per week from conducting guided tours through the Centre. (Anangu Tours report they currently have 73 Anangu on their books.) However, the position of Cultural Centre Coordinator is currently vacant and the Centre has no business plan.

At the tour operator workshops many ideas were forthcoming for how the Centre could be used to generate revenue for Anangu. However, there are outstanding questions about ownership, management, whether or not a user pays policy should be introduced and whether the Cultural Centre should continue to be free to visitors, or, alternatively, if stopping at the Cultural Centre should be obligatory on visitors to the Park.

PAN recognises the need to review the ownership and operation of the Cultural Centre and to undertake business planning but there are no funds available to do so. There are also conflicting values about use, and the roles and access of private tour operators (Anangu owned or otherwise) to the Cultural Centre.

Given that it is only in the private sector tourism industry that there is any scope to achieve Anangu aspirations in relation to employment and income, this area needs to become a much higher priority. PAN has not yet begun to meet its responsibilities under the Lease agreement in relation to supporting Anangu business development and should address this area of neglect.



8. Further employment opportunities in Park management

“We need Community Rangers like in South Australia. More rangers taking young people out bush. Young learning from old people. Keep cultural business on high ground, as priority on top.” s47F

Against this background, the opportunities for further involving Anangu in employment in the Park were explored. PAN and OJM operate, or are in the early stages of initiating a number of innovative employment and training schemes. These include:

- Traditional Consultancy Program (administered by the OJM to facilitate the involvement of elders in aspects of decision-making and management of the Park)
- community contracts (local community contracts with PAN to provide building, maintenance or other services in the Park)
- casual day labour (flexible employment arrangements for Park maintenance tasks)
- Anangu rangers (regular full or part-time employment with PAN)
- Junior rangers (school-based program to increase Anangu skills and knowledge about PAN work in the Park)

There is also the proposed Malpa program, discussed above, which it is not at this stage intended to implement.

The following table identifies the potential employment areas of PAN, those areas and the schemes under which Anangu are currently employed and those areas where greater opportunities exist and the schemes which best lend themselves to greater Anangu involvement.



Employment opportunities in Park Management	Anangu employed currently or employed in the past	Greater scope for Anangu in the future
Safety for Minga	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes
Site planning	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes
Seed collection	Yes - Traditional Consultancy & Anangu rangers	Yes
Fire management inside the Park	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes - Traditional Consultancy; younger people casual day labour
Fire management outside the Park	Yes - one off contract	Yes - Traditional Consultancy
Sunset Patrols Sunrise Patrols Rock Art Patrols Kata Tjuta Patrols	Yes - Anangu rangers	Yes - Malpa program; work experience; casual work; trainee rangers
Administration/paperwork/telephone	No	Yes - small business traineeships; Malpa program
Dog control	No	Yes - community project work
Feral animal control - rabbits, camels, fox, cat trapping	Yes - Traditional Consultancy; Anangu rangers	Yes - Malpa program, junior ranger, possibly contracts
Endangered species captive breeding program	No	Yes - Traditional Consultancy, Anangu ranger
Minkiri work (fauna survey)	Yes - senior ranger; casual day labour; Traditional Consultancy; royalties from fauna account	Yes - old men teach young boys; old women teach young girls; old and young work together
Looking after munta (i.e. erosion control)	Yes - day labour	Yes
Firewood collection	No	Yes - community contract; Traditional Consultancy
Tourism/infrastructure development planning	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes



Employment opportunities in Park Management	Anangu employed currently or employed in the past	Greater scope for Anangu in the future
Film and photography	Yes - Traditional Consultancy as performers	Community owned agency for film & photography (revenue opportunities)
Weed control	Yes - Traditional Consultancy; Anangu rangers	Yes - community contract; CDEP
Enforcement	Yes - rangers	Yes - education through Cultural Centre
Interpretation	Yes - straight employment	Yes - various
Operators accreditation, training and approvals	Yes	See previous workshop between private tour operators and Anangu
Firewood plantation	No	Yes - community project
Art site management	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes
Camel project - as a private enterprise project for youth	No	Yes - community project
Construction & maintenance	Yes - day labour	Yes - flexible work contracts
Research programs c.g. reintroduction of species	Yes - Traditional Consultancy; Anangu rangers	Yes
Paid teachers and trainers	Yes - Traditional Consultancy	Yes



One of the factors limiting PAN's ability to offer employment contract opportunities to Anangu relate to Mutitjulu's underdevelopment. The Community Development Plan prepared by Wynter Hill Consultants has been criticised because it relied upon additional funding being provided to the community. Its recommended actions have not been able to be implemented. However, the message that should be read is that without further funding to the community, its development is stymied. There is no further development which can occur without additional funding being provided to Mutitjulu.

The case of PAN work contracts is only one example. PAN offered Mutitjulu the opportunity to construct wiltjas (sheds) for tourists around the base of the Rock. Mutitjulu Community Incorporated was unable to take up this opportunity because it has no work vehicle, no work supervisor and no equipment to do the work. Instead, Mutitjulu was only able to take up the contract to collect spinifex for the sheds.

Although the Community Development Plan identified the urgent need to establish a CDEP (Community Development Employment Program) at Mutitjulu, CDEP numbers are presently capped and there is reportedly a three year waiting list for Aboriginal communities to come onto CDEP. In the meantime the community is not able to gear itself to take up opportunities that might be offered by PAN by way of community contracts.

During one of the workshops, a number of Anangu also expressed interest in going to work in other National Parks. They pointed out that often Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people from other parks come to Uluru-Kata Tjuta but that Anangu do not have the opportunity to visit or work in their parks.



9. Impacts of tourism

The 1991 report *Sharing the Park: Anangu Initiatives in Ayers Rock Tourism*, ANPWS identified three main areas of concern amongst Anangu in relation to tourists. These were concerns about photography, visitor safety on the Climb and restrictions on access by tourists to sacred places. Since that time consultation with Anangu has provided greatly improved sacred site protection by placement of restrictions on access to some sites, installation of appropriate signage, restrictions on photography of sacred sites and re-routing of access roads and tracks. Controls on photography have also been increased and there are proposals in train to further improve management of photography and imagery.

In relation to safety on the Climb, stricter controls on access to the Climb have been put in place (restricting access on hot or windy days), and the Tourism Consultative Committee has noted Anangu desire to eventually see the Climb closed.

However, according to the VMS Consultants,

International and national promotion centres on the Rock as the key attraction. Climbing the Rock has also been an integral part of the tour program for many years, offered as a 'soft' adventure option ... Some markets ... focus strongly on the Climb as being the major attraction. (1997:63).

There is no clear commitment on the part of PAN at this point that the issue of closure of the Climb be explored in terms of how it might be accomplished. The issue has not been adequately canvassed with Traditional Owners. For instance, it is not clear the extent to which Anangu want the Climb closed for spiritual reasons, (Uluru is sacred and reportedly traditionally only climbed by certain people for ritual purposes), or the extent to which they wish to see it closed to protect visitor safety. There has been no discussion at this point of a strategy to achieve eventual closure of the Climb, nor even any clear commitment to do so.

The VMS Interim Report identified a clear contradiction which exists at the moment where

Many tour operators carefully and conscientiously explain the Anangu 'We do not climb' message, but continue to offer the Climb in the itinerary and allow visitors to make up their own mind. A clear danger of this is that visitors get the impression that Anangu sensibilities count for little. ... The mixed messages confuse the visitors, most of whom do not wish to offend Traditional Owners but have arrived expecting the Climb to be a highlight of their visit. (My emphasis). (1997:63).



Clearly there is a need to determine the reasons for Anangu desire to close the Climb and the extent to which they feel strongly about this. If it is established that Anangu wish the Climb closed because it is offensive to them culturally, and that they feel strongly about this, PAN should liaise with the Tourism Consultative Committee to develop a strategy for eventual closure of the Climb.

In the interim, consideration should be given to a 'user pays' approach to the Climb whereby those who Climb pay an additional fee to the gate entry fee, sufficient to cover the costs of patrolling the Climb and undertaking rescues and to a marketing/issues management approach to limiting demand.

It is essential that the issue of presenting the Climb as an option, going against Anangu sensibilities, be immediately addressed. The VMS Consultants recommend

Encourage all visitors to fully understand the Anangu perspective on the Climb and adjust the presentation of the messages to include the notion that a positive compromise has been made by Anangu for those who come strongly wishing to climb and who are capable of doing so safely. (1997:63).

Another important strategy to address Anangu concerns about the Climb is to develop products which do not involve the Climb and so distract tourist attention away from it. One of the activities planned under the VMS consultancy was a site planning exercise to work with Anangu to identify alternative visitor sites other than the Climb. This has not been proceeded with the result that an opportunity to create further commercial opportunities in the Park, in consultation with Anangu, as well as to take attention away from the Climb, has been lost. The planned site-planning project should proceed.

Anangu take their responsibilities towards tourists very seriously. They feel that as Traditional Owners of the Park and as hosts they have a strong obligation to protect and educate tourists. While there were some concerns about the numbers of tourists in relation to the carrying capacity of the Park (which is a management issue rather than a policy issue), in general Anangu appear to remain positively disposed towards tourists and tourism. The only other concern, (besides issues relating to the Climb), raised in any of the forums organised or attended by the CSIA Consultant was a view that some Anangu would like to see more Australian tourists visit Uluru-Kata Tjuta rather than more overseas visitors. This reflects an Anangu sense of responsibility to educate other Australians on the value of their shared heritage.

In relation to the impact of tourism on Anangu at Uluru-Kata Tjuta, two key issues were identified. These are Anangu control over the management of tourists and their impacts and Anangu being able to share in the benefits of tourism to the region. Almost all the aspirations and concerns identified by Anangu in the workshops can be linked to these two key issues.



Other stakeholders clearly have interests and values in the Park that might conflict with the interests and values of Anangu. Most obviously, tourism as a value and the 'science' of natural resource management as a value, are examples where there may be potential for conflict with Anangu values. However, the potential for conflict in values really only becomes a concern when a competing set of values is allowed to dominate over Anangu values. 'Joint management' means mutual respect for different but hopefully in the main complementary values and perspectives. It does not mean the dominance of one set over the other. Given this, it is not any conflict of any specific value between Anangu and other stakeholders in the Park that is of issue here. Rather it is the issue of control for Anangu that is more fundamental.

Access to information is one key aspect of control and Anangu repeatedly asked for more information in relation to tourism but also in relation to most other aspects of activities at the Park (discussed above).

Potential benefits for Anangu relate mainly to using tourism as:

- a means to providing another purpose for remembering and telling stories and maintaining material cultural practice;
- a platform for promoting protection of intellectual and cultural property rights;
- a means for developing an economic base (employment, business ownership, licensing);
- a resource to enable greater access to country and better facilities on country; and
- a means to promote and interpret Anangu culture and increase respect for Anangu culture.

At the present time, Anangu's ability to take up the potential benefits from tourism is severely limited. As evidenced by the income data presented in the next chapter, Anangu have yet to share significantly in the economic benefits of tourism at Uluru-Kata Tjuta.

Similarly, while substantial opportunities exist for Anangu to participate in the provision of direct services to tourists and to produce artefacts and other products for sale to tourists, their participation in the industry is profoundly underdeveloped. It is in the area of recognition of rights and respect for Anangu culture that most progress has been achieved, however, there are still further opportunities yet to be realised. In particular, there are opportunities lost in the



area of licensing and royalties which should be identified and ways to exploit these be developed.

The partnership workshops between Anangu and private tour operators and tourism corporations were very successful, in particular as it became quickly apparent (somewhat surprisingly to some of us involved) that Anangu goals and aspirations in relation to tourism are virtually identical to those of private tourism operators. There was evidenced at the workshops a clear willingness to cooperate in achieving these common goals. There was also evidenced a high degree of mutual respect and recognition on the part of private tour operators towards Anangu as Traditional Owners for the area. (Although some of those representing the larger companies said that their bosses higher up in their organisations were not as aware as they were. It was proposed that cultural awareness courses should be offered to senior management of private tour operators and tourism corporations particularly when senior management are not resident in the region.)



10. Tourism: Anangu concerns and aspirations

In the workshops, Anangu identified the following concerns and aspirations relating to visitor impacts:

- More jobs for Anangu youth
- Tourism as a way of offering greater access to country for Anangu
- Opportunity to share Anangu culture with tourists in overnight camps
- Opportunity to share Anangu culture with Pirinpa youth
- Greater ability to care for women's sites by tourism offering more opportunity to visit sites
- Anangu wish to be better informed about money-line (details on revenue generated in the local tourism industry and how spent and distributed)
- Tourism as a way of creating greater opportunity to care for places and visit places outside of the Park boundaries
- We are worried about visitor levels. We feel that the visitor numbers are at a maximum and those visitors are not reading information and so putting their safety at risk.
- More direct interaction with tourists.
- A role in and greater ability to care for tourists (e.g. safety)
- Greater educational and training opportunities for Anangu and especially Anangu youth
- Owning and providing visitor accommodation adjacent to the Park
- More diversity for Anangu in the range of job opportunities
- Tourism as a way of providing incentives for younger Anangu taking on responsibilities from older people
- Concern about visitor numbers. That they are at their maximum already. [These concerns were referred to the VMS Consultants to be dealt with in that report.]
- Question: where is the extra money since there are so many more tourists?



- Greater cooperation and information sharing between private tourism operators and Anangu
- Greater opportunity to control the messages about Uluru and Anangu being given out through marketing materials and greater control over imagery
- Greater control over intellectual and cultural property. Private persons/businesses trademarking Anangu intellectual and cultural property.³
- Increased control over film and photography including images of Uluru and Anangu
- More control over marketing Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and Anangu in a way that encourages the kind of tourism that Anangu want (more Australian tourists than overseas tourists, not encouraging tourists to climb Uluru⁴.)
- Desire for greater understanding of how the tourism industry operates, of tourists' expectation and of how marketing works

It is generally recognised that visitor management strategies need to be designed in ways which do not undermine the achievement of Anangu goals, which address Anangu concerns and which are consistent with Anangu values. However, in almost all respects the aspirations and concerns of Anangu coincide with those elicited from tourism operators and reproduced in the VMS report. It is also the case that numerous studies confirm that visitors wish very much to meet with Anangu and share in and learn about Anangu culture – and that this demand is largely unmet. The task of delivering such services, and in a way which fits with the manner in which Anangu wish to share their time and their culture, is still significantly underexplored. The joint workshops confirmed that this was a key interest of both groups and sought to explore ways in which Anangu might provide more direct services to tourists in a way that is both enjoyable and profitable to Anangu.

2000 Olympics

Anangu have been consulted by the Sydney Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (SOCOG) to seek their agreement for the Olympic Torch being

³ For example, Bachmann has trademarked the following terms 'Uluru', 'Inside Uluru', 'Uluru on-line', 'The Uluru Club', 'Friend of Uluru', 'The Uluru Shop', as well as created 'The Uluru Homepage'. OJM advise that Bachmann has no connection with Uluru or Uluru Traditional Owners and has not sought permission to trademark the terms or establish the homepage.

⁴For example, aerial photography of Kata Tjuta is still available which is offensive to Traditional Owners, photographs of deceased persons still appear on postcards for sale, tour operators brochures still promote the climb.



brought to Australia as the first point of arrival. Festivities are planned to welcome and celebrate the arrival of the Olympic Torch

Although this event is, at the time of writing, little more than eighteen months away, no planning has taken place to evaluate opportunities that this might create for Anangu to capitalise on this key event.

(Neither has there been any consideration given to upgrading housing, services and facilities in the Mutitjulu Community in preparation for this event.)

This is only one example of planning facilities at Uluru-Kata Tjuta to identify opportunities and to plan strategically to take advantage of these. While private tour operators at Yulara are already putting in place plans to optimise opportunities created by this signal event, no thought has yet been given to exploiting these opportunities at Mutitjulu.

The following section provides some insights into why these opportunities are not taken up. The reasons relate principally to lack of co-ordination, lack of resources, lack of training and lack of expertise in planning for and providing tourism-related services.



11. Opportunities for Anangu employment in tourism

The workshop was attended by a number of private tour operators and other Malpas who lent support to Anangu to identify employment opportunities. The following table was compiled at the workshop⁵.

Employment Opportunities in the Private Sector	Anangu currently employed	Greater scope for Anangu employment	Training required?
Bus drivers	No	Yes	Yes
Guides	Yes	Yes	Yes
Information personnel	Yes	Yes	Yes
Interpreters	Yes	Yes	Yes
Retail sales	No	Yes	Yes
Craft demonstrators	Yes	Yes	No
Shop assistants	No	Yes	Yes
Tourism/infrastructure development planning	Yes	Yes	Yes
Employment in Anangu-owned accommodation adjacent to the Park	No	Yes	Yes
Resort hotel positions	No	Yes	Yes
Performance dancing	No	Yes	Yes
Overnight Guides outside the Park	No	Yes	Yes
Designing and printing workshops	Yes	Yes	Yes
Marketing/admin/product planning	No	Yes	Yes

⁵ These opportunities do not include those available to the Anangu at the Cultural Centre which should be considered within the context of the proposed business plan for the Cultural Centre.



As with employment by PAN, it was agreed by all those who attended the workshops that the creation of a CDEP at Mutitjulu or similar employment scheme, would greatly facilitate the recruitment of casual, temporary and permanent Anangu employees in the private tourism sector.

Barriers to Anangu employment in tourism

Anangu and their Malpas identified the following barriers to Anangu being able to take up potential employment opportunities in the private tourism industry. These barriers include:

- Lack of training and education is regarded as the major obstacle to Anangu being able to take up employment opportunities.
- Lack of co-ordinated approach by all the relevant players, including Anangu training and education professionals, private operators, industry bodies, Anangu Malpas etc.
- Lack of understanding by Anangu and their Malpas of how the tourism industry operates and what are the expectations of tourists.
- Not enough working together.
- No strategic planning to identify and take up opportunities.
- Inappropriate and inflexible training methods.
- Lack of follow up and resourcing to do all of the work needed to support Anangu in training and employment.
- Lack of funds for training.
- Lack of knowledge about what is available in terms of funding support.
- Cultural barriers: 'We say that we'd love Anangu to come and work for us but we say they have to be just like us. We are expecting Anangu to stop being Anangu that is not what tourists want anyway.'
- Identifying potential employees and trainees – recruitment.
- Poor English and Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara literacy and orally, poor numeracy.
- Lack of work experience, need to undertake mentoring.



- Social obligations compete with work demands on Anangu.
- European approaches to work differ from Anangu approaches to work.
- Requirements of the nature of the tourism industry don't sit well with Anangu lifestyles.
- Lack of support structures for individual Anangu already in employment.
- Expectations of some tourists in relation to Anangu personal presentation and grooming.
- Difficulties in identifying who is available for work – recruitment.
- Political differences between sectors of the tourism industry, and between some Anangu organisations.
- Lack of understanding by employers about what motives Anangu trainees and employees.
- Lack of support for the Homelands Movement and the need to upgrade water supply and infrastructure on outstations.
- Need to plan and construct/modify building on outstations to make them suitable for tourists.
- Lack of adequate roads and lack of interpretive walks in outstation areas.
- Inability to reach agreement with CLC and Traditional Owners on access to sites outside the Park.

Possible solutions to barriers to Anangu employment in tourism

Time was not available to consider in depth every barrier that was identified. However, a wide range of strategies were developed and commitment made by all parties to continue to meet in an ongoing way and so develop further strategies:

- Establish a permanent forum for ongoing cooperation and communication (partnerships) between Anangu and private sector tour operators. To be convened by OJM.
- Review the function and staffing of the OJM and Mutitjulu Council Coordinator in terms of their capacity to take on a greater role in providing support, liaison and coordination between Anangu and the private sector local tourism industry.



- Develop a strategic plan for promoting Anangu interests in the private sector local and regional tourism industry.
- Appoint a full-time training and employment officer, based at Yulara, offering training and employment support to the private sector (Anangu, Pirinpa and combined). OJM and the Co-ordinator Mutitjulu Council to jointly investigate recruitment.
- Create more work experience opportunities to be provided for Anangu.
- Make training of Anangu supervisors a priority.
- Extend the proposed Malpa program to the private sector.
- Look at successful employment and training programs elsewhere and use these as models for developing employment and training programs at Uluru-Kata Tjuta.
- Where possible develop work conditions that suit Anangu instead of trying to fit Anangu to the mold.
- Review Pirinpa work cultures and ensure that they are 'Anangu-friendly' as well as 'Pirinpa-friendly'.
- Be realistic about the time frames needed to achieve successful outcomes and develop both short and long term strategies.
- Encourage older Anangu to take more responsibility for motivating younger people and encouraging them to take up employment and training opportunities.
- OJM to approach CLC and urge them to quickly resolve the matter of an agreement with the Traditional Owners for access to country outside the Park.
- Investigate funding options, both from public sector and private sector sources, for strengthening of the Homelands Movement including upgrading of water supply, planning of shelters suitable for tourists, upgrading of roads, planning of tourist interpretative walks.
- Encourage Anangu to network with the industry more.
- Organise a forum for funding bodies to meet with Anangu and private tour operators to make them aware of funding available for training and employment support.



- Hold an annual facilitated workshop to review these strategies and assess progress to date.
- Prepare an annual report for Anangu that summarises estimated revenue and expenditure of the private sector tourism industry (preferable on a sector by sector basis), including estimates of income and earnings of Anangu.

In particular the following training needs were identified at the workshop:

- Cross-cultural training for Anangu and Pirinpa.
- Cross-cultural training for senior tourism industry managers/leaders as well as middle managers.
- Train-the-Trainer for all Pirinpa who work with Anangu.
- Train-the-Trainer for Anangu who work with Pirinpa.
- Language and literacy skills training.
- Money line training for Anangu.



12. Anangu control over visitor management and impacts

Tourists

Anangu expressed a number of concerns and aspirations in relation to exercising greater control over a wide range of aspects of visitor management and visitor impacts. A number of strategies were proposed during the workshop intended to enhance Anangu control:

- Provide training for Anangu and their Malpas (e.g. staff of Office for Joint Management, PAN and Mutitjulu Community Coordinator, Pirinpa staff of Anangu-owned enterprises) in how the tourism industry operates, on expectations of tourists, in how to capitalise on a local tourist trade and how marketing works.
- Encourage greater cooperation between private tourism operators and Anangu through the proposed forum and annual facilitated workshop.
- OJM and PAN to project manage a review of the Tour Operators' Licensing System. Such a review to include the issues of control and management by Anangu of the imagery used in marketing the Park, compulsory accreditation of Park tour operators, Anangu opportunities for raising revenue, control over access to the Park and different sections of the Park, and control over how the Park is used and conditions on use.
- Through an Anangu-controlled Tour Operators' Licensing System, require Tour Operators to set targets for employment and training of Anangu subject to the successful implementation of other recommendations discussed above.
- OJM to coordinate the development and introduction of a system of licensing and trademarking of cultural and intellectual property.
- PAN to hand over the current system of issuing permits for commercial film and photography to Mutitjulu Community Incorporated. Such a system to be administered using the principle of 'user pays'. The issuing of permits to require crews to employ Anangu to the extent possible.
- Position of Business Development Manager, based at Mutitjulu, to be created.



Visitor Impacts: Other

In addition to tourists who travel independently or with tour operators, OJM have identified nine distinct categories of visitors, each of which create demands and have separate management issues attaching to them.

The high profile of the Park makes it a very desirable destination. Uluru-Kata Tjuta is particularly vulnerable to 'development tourism' where delegates interested more in sightseeing and relaxing than in working find a purpose to visit. Observing joint management in practice at Uluru-Kata Tjuta is the excuse to visit, not the real reason.

The categories of visitors are:

- education groups, secondary and tertiary
- scientific researchers – natural scientists e.g. university groups wishing to study marsupial moles
- scientific researchers - social scientists e.g. post graduate anthropologists
- spiritual groups that want to meet with Anangu for joint religious experiences or to perform rituals relating to the rock
- public figures (wanting to make public visits to the Park)
- senior public servants, ministers and foreign public servants (e.g. wanting to observe Australian world heritage management)
- indigenous groups – from Australia and overseas interested in joint management
- commercial film groups
- commercial photography groups
- commercial artists

Apart from the diversity of the groups and the demands they make on resources, there is also the issue of lead time that these groups provide. There seems to be a belief amongst outsiders that Anangu have no other commitments or social obligations. It is a frequent experience for OJM that visitors of the above groups expect instant responses to their requests without due regard to the myriad of other demands already on the OJM.

There is an identified need to establish and document an agreed process for dealing with each of these groups. This should be approved by the Board and would provide a joint framework for agreement between PAN and OJM for how each of these groups will be dealt with and which agency should take responsibility for dealing with each group and their requests. As a standard good management practice, the advantage of developing a policies and procedures manual for dealing with each of these requests ensures that they are each dealt with equally, that the process is transparent (necessary especially where requests to visit or use the Park in certain ways are rejected), and to ensure that 'corporate memory' for how certain groups are dealt with is not lost and the wheel does not



have to be reinvented. This is particularly important because of the high staff turnover at Mutitjulu of PAN staff, OJM staff and Mutitjulu Community Incorporated employees.

At the present time PAN is dealing with some requests and there is concern that Anangu are not advised or involved in decisions to allow or refuse requests to visit or use the Park. A policy manual which Anangu are involved in developing and which is signed off at Board level may reassure some Anangu that PAN management are managing visitor uses in an agreed way.

Tourism industry priorities

The tourism industry has identified four key areas of concern where it believes its concerns and interests coincide with those of Anangu. These areas are:

1. The private tourism industry's relationship with PAN, described as 'not constructive';
2. Site planning – in particular development of visitation sites which take the focus away from the Climb;
3. The operation of the Entry station and loss of substantial revenue (discussed below);
4. The need for a Business Plan and improved management of the Cultural Centre.



13. Community development

The Yulara Resort, as a privately owned corporation with infrastructure provided initially by the Northern Territory Government, provides an international standard of accommodation and services to guests and staff that include police, education, health, recreation and emergency service. Parks Australia provides to its staff within the Park a high standard of urban-equivalent accommodation, appropriate recreation facilities and suburban-standard power, water and sewerage.

Mutitjulu is expected to provide, from its own resources, a range of local government services and, of the three communities in the area (that is, Yulara, Park staff and Mutitjulu), has the lowest level of access to recreation facilities, has poor roads, poor housing and generally demonstrates all the aspects of a Fourth World community. (Phillpot et al 1998:27)

A community-based housing survey was conducted at Mutitjulu in July 1998, with the following findings:

There are twenty houses at Mutitjulu with 263 people living in them. There are an additional 40-60 people living in make-shift shelters with no ablution facilities or running water. Both elderly people and children live in the shelters.

The question of economic and social equity is an important one for Anangu (as it is for most people.) Although there is a stark contrast in the relative affluence of the residences and facilities at nearby Yulara, the resort town constructed by the Northern Territory Government, and those enjoyed by Anangu residents at Mutitjulu and surrounding Aboriginal communities, this does not appear to concern Anangu. For them it is the comparative affluence of the PAN staff resident at Rangerville, adjacent to Mutitjulu, which most distresses them.

Obviously the closer proximity of Rangerville to Mutitjulu is one reason for PAN staff drawing the attention of Anangu in this respect. However, it appears also that some Anangu feel that if they were treated equally in relation to employment opportunities provided by the Park, they would have greater access to the housing and vehicles that Park's staff currently occupy and access. This is in fact not the case. As discussed above, there is not the capacity within PAN to deliver substantial economic benefits to Mutitjulu.

As Anangu stress, for Tjukurpa to be observed it is necessary that people are cared for. It is people whose actions keep the country alive and ensure the survival of species. It is Anangu knowledge of Tjukurpa and its practice that is



the very essence of good Park management. A well community, and therefore community development, is absolutely critical to the ability of Anangu to care for Uluru-Kata Tjuta, and to their ability to cope with and benefit from tourism.

But a more cynical, and equally true perspective, is that the care of Anangu is also critical to the future well-being of the tourism industry that hangs off Uluru-Kata Tjuta. Private tourism operators in the region have little difficulty in recognising that the welfare of Anangu is intimately tied to the welfare of their own industry. There is privately held concern amongst some private tour operators that the time bomb that is Mutitjulu will one day explode to publicly reveal Anangu poverty. There is concern that this could cause severe embarrassment to the industry and so damage its national and international reputation. The impending use of Uluru-Kata Tjuta as the launch site for the Olympic Torch Relay and the anticipated influx of a massive media entourage surely must raise some concern amongst stakeholders. While this might be said about any cultural tourism site in Australia, it is particularly relevant where the World Heritage listing of the people themselves, (which, in effect, is what listing Uluru-Kata Tjuta as a cultural site means), could make any such embarrassment doubly so.

The Community Development Strategic Plan for Mutitjulu Community, prepared by Wynter Hill Consultants is presented as four separate plans, the 'Gold Plan' - Business and Enterprise; the 'Blue Plan' - Town Planning and Housing; the 'Red Plan' - Training and Employment; and the 'Black Plan' - Community Development. The plans provided for a range of recommendations, few of which have been implemented due to lack of funding

At the present time the Mutitjulu community still has seriously inadequate housing, is under-serviced, has no facilities for visiting Traditional Owners, no training officer, few recreational facilities and has no CDEP or similar employment program. It is the responsibility government, in the absence of there being any other income base, to provide these things. It is to the benefit of governments that Anangu feel great shame about their situation and so do not seek to publicise the serious impoverishment of their community conditions.

At the commencement of the CSIA, in July 1997, community members were proud to point out that, although there is some incidence of alcohol abuse, there is at least no petrol sniffing at Mutitjulu. By the time of the completion of the CSIA research period, twelve months later, a group of petrol sniffers had moved into the community and the practice is now being taken up more widely.

This is cause for great shame amongst Anangu and is not discussed here at length except to draw the attention of government to the need to provide urgent funding for community development at Mutitjulu.

In 1996/97, \$4.2 million was received in Park entry fees. This money is then placed in a National Parks and Wildlife Fund from which it is distributed as follows:



25% of Park entrance fees are paid to the Central Land Council in trust for the Traditional Owners as well as rent of \$150,000 per annum indexed from May 1990. In 1997 these amounts totaled in excess of \$1,000,000 and were distributed to Anangu Traditional Owners resident at Mutitjulu and throughout the region. Amounts are distributed to senior Traditional Owners whose responsibility it is to then re-distribute these amongst their families. Thus members of the Traditional Owner group each received an estimated \$1,000 to \$2,000 per annum in royalties and gate money. People use their royalties and gate money to purchase second hand clothes and toys for their children, washing machines where they have access to running water, fridge's and televisions where they have access to electricity and, importantly, many pool their money to purchase second hand vehicles.

In addition, 20% of this 25% is provided to Mutitjulu Community Inc for community development projects. In 1997 this amounted to \$210,000.

75% of the gate money is provided to PAN for expenditure on salaries, works, water, essential services and Park operation. This amount is reluctantly subsidised by the Commonwealth. It is used to provide some infrastructure development and services to Mutitjulu.

One of the findings of the VMS report is that between 40,000 and 60,000 people per annum avoid paying the gate entry fee to Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. This translates into an estimated revenue loss of between \$600,000 and \$900,000 per annum. While the VMS recommended a range of alternative strategies, (and there are others not considered by the VMS consultants), PAN has not yet moved to address this problem and given no indication that it intends to do so.

The issue of the gate entry fee is a vexing and emotional one not only for Anangu but also for the private tour industry which is very critical of what it sees as PAN mismanagement and lack of commercial entrepreneurial sensitivity. The matter has been raised in a number of forum since the draft report of the VMS was released but without any resolution.



14. Cultural and intellectual property

“We don’t have much money. We’re talking about big sacred stories. We don’t get much money yet we’re giving a lot of effort, time and energy with these stories.” s47F

“Some of us parents cannot work out how to ensure a strong financial future for our children. At present our kids have got nothing. No money. No blankets. They are thin. We want a bank account with heritage money for our kids which will be a strong financial investment for the future of children. An investment built on culture. To us the old women’s knowledge is an investment. This could be transformed into money and put in the bank and invested for the future - just like our old knowledge has been invested in us and has come down to us ... Mutitjulu is empty.” s47F

Since 1985 Anangu have made an enormous contribution to Park interpretation (eg the Liru Walk and Tjukurpa Tunnel), scientific research (eg rare and endangered fauna, flora and invertebrates), land management (eg ecosystem delineation and maintenance), visitor management and infrastructure planning. The joint management approach taken at Uluru-Kata Tjuta offers a high degree of deference to the Anangu perspective on these issues. Indeed, the UNESCO Picasso Gold medal was awarded in 1995 specifically in recognition of the way in which Anangu expertise, knowledge and understanding is incorporated into the management practices of the property.

A question which remains unanswered at Uluru-Kata Tjuta, however, is whether Anangu should be compensated for the use of their knowledge about land management practices and knowledge of flora and fauna, for their stories that are used in interpretation and for other uses of their cultural and intellectual property⁶. Clearly, many Anangu feel they should be.

⁶ Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property may include:

- Literary, performing and artistic works (including songs, music, dances, stories, ceremonies, symbols, languages and designs)
- Scientific, agricultural, technical and ecological knowledge (including cultigens, medicines and the phenotypes of flora and fauna)
- All items of movable cultural property
- Immovable cultural property (including sacred and historically significant sites and burial grounds)
- Documentation of Indigenous peoples’ heritage in archives, film, photographs, videotape or audiotape and all forms of media. (Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 1997:7).



That such traditional cultural knowledge is in fact privileged information, (it is only imparted to the right people and at the right times), suggests there may be a case for the Traditional Owners of such knowledge to assume some sort of benefit from its wider distribution and use.

The question of recognition, protection and compensation for use of Anangu cultural and intellectual property is an important one that is unresolved at Uluru-Kata Tjuta. For instance, knowledge about land management practices is gradually being recorded and incorporated into PAN land management practices, while Anangu stories are being recorded and presented to tourists by tour operators and interpretive materials. One outcome, some argue, is that Anangu are gradually making themselves redundant.

PAN staff and others working with Anangu talk about the need to document Anangu knowledge before it is lost. This raises an important question – is it ethical to invest significant resources in recording valuable ethnobotanic and other Anangu-held information? Surely such resources should be expended in protecting the people and the culture which holds this knowledge, rather than seek to quickly extract it.

At the present time Australian indigenous cultural and intellectual property laws are being reviewed by ATSIC. Liaison should occur between OJM and the law firm acting as consultants to the federal government to ensure that all issues relevant to Uluru-Kata Tjuta are brought to the attention of the review, and to ensure that OJM is able to access the most recent advice on handling of these issues.

An interim strategy for recognition and management of Anangu cultural and intellectual property rights at Uluru-Kata Tjuta needs to be devised. In particular, the proposed Business Development Manager might explore opportunities for licensing and royalty agreements to be put in place.



15. Cultural maintenance

Culture under threat

The nomination of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park as a cultural landscape is based upon

- the use of traditional Anangu methods of land management, which are governed by Tjukurpa, in particular the traditional regime of controlled burning and husbanding of temporary water sources;
- the continuing spiritual relationship of Anangu with the land and the way in which it directs both everyday life and all ceremonial and religious activity; and,
- the associations that Anangu make between nature and culture and the way in which Anangu culture is 'embedded' in the natural setting. (Department Environment, Sport and Territories 1994:22).

There is evidence to suggest that Anangu culture is a 'living culture under threat'. There is increasing evidence of extensive substance abuse within Mutitjulu, particularly amongst young people, with petrol sniffing recently being introduced into the community. Anangu say that young people not learning their responsibilities under Tjukurpa and express grave concerns about this. Old people say they are tired and not receiving the support they need to carry out their ceremonial responsibilities under Tjukurpa.

Anangu say they are very sad. They feel that people are literally dying away and that things are dying around them. This issue is complex and is not made easy to monitor, either, by the fact that much of Tjukurpa is 'invisible'. White people can't see the stories because Anangu have them strong in their heads.

'Culture' is also not something distinct that one can point to. It is embedded in social and economic relations. This means that we outsiders must rely largely upon Anangu self-reporting as a key source of information about the relative intact state of Anangu culture.

However, the Natural Resources Research Workshop, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, conducted in August 1997, did identify the loss of traditional environmental knowledge about rare species and fire management by Anangu, both within the Park and elsewhere in the region, as being 'of utmost importance and requiring urgent attention' (1997:xiv).



Another issue, identified by the workshop as 'critical', is the cultural pressure on Anangu experienced through loss of species. The workshop also identified the lack of availability of resources for Anangu to undertake land management (ie vehicles, jobs, funding programs) as being a 'significant limiting factor in cultural activities in general, and with respect to land management in particular' (1997:xv). This corresponds with statements made by Anangu in many of the workshops conducted as part of the CSIA Consultancy.

People repeatedly reaffirmed that the stories are still strong in their heads and that they are not 'letting go' of their culture and responsibilities, but they still feel they are losing contact with the land and are receiving little support to carry out their responsibilities under Tjukurpa. The perennial problem of access to vehicles in order to visit country and to visit relatives and so maintain the social relations that are critical to cultural maintenance is a constant issue at Mutitjulu and amongst the Traditional Owner group elsewhere:

"We want that 50-50 gate money to pay for young people to work and to learn about culture. We want holiday pay entitlements and we want travelling money for business."

s47F

"Land management at Uluru-Kata Tjuta (ie Parks) should provide Toyotas so people, and women and children, can look after land, keeping dead camels out of rockholes, etc. Might need a Toyota to look after our land at Uluru. Right around the lands, Katitit Land Trust, there are sites that might not be looked after. Not just in the Park. We have to look after the surrounding country. I'm asking for a Toyota straight away to look after that. Not for private use but for work. It's not good enough that ranger Toyotas can be used for that. Anangu need their own Toyota. It should be the same as Uluru-Kata Tjuta on the Northern Territory side. We also need radios to communicate with Mutitjulu. We're on radio. Let us know and we'll come up and do the work."

s47F Ernabella.

Professionalisation of Park work

Another complaint from some of the older Traditional Owners is that increasingly they are being excluded from undertaking work in the Park which used to be left for them to do. People spoke of being previously employed as casual guides and of having more informal contact with tourists. Some of the older men spoke of being employed in some of the important work caring for tourists, which is now the domain of trained Park staff:

"A long time ago, Reggie [Uluru] and I did all that waxu burning work. I was dropped on top of the rock to rescue a person. This went on from early days. Then others came and it got messed up [he illustrated this in the sand]. A lot of different people came in



but that's no good. Those whose fathers' country it is should do it. Not others. It should be the people whose mothers and mothers' country it is." s47F [redacted] Amata.

Recognition of non-resident Traditional Owners

Amongst the recorded views of non-resident Traditional Owners, collected by the Central Land Council in July 1997, were frequent comments about their exclusion from decision-making and lack of consultation about Park management and uses. The recognition of the legitimate rights of non-resident Traditional Owners to have influence over decisions which affect country and sites within the Park boundaries is a significant issue.

"It's up to everyone who's responsible for the land to have a say and put down their ideas. It's important for all people involved in that land. Sometimes people sitting down elsewhere are left out of management. It's your country, you should have a say. It's also important for the children as they grow up to be involved. It's up to people to think about that land and how their ancestors looked after that land. Now it's different, those people have moved into other communities but they're still Traditional Owners and it's important that things are done straight up front, not round the back. Kuniya Tjukurpa [an important dreaming track] goes straight through this country, and it's now being held in the Cultural Centre. How is it that we've been left out even though we're Traditional Owners? It makes me very sad." s47F [redacted], Imanpa.

"If the government comes, the Mutitjulu mob has got to call them [non resident Traditional Owners] over. Let them know properly." s47F [redacted], Mutitjulu.

"Kurpanyi came to Uluru from the west. It means it's our place and we have to look after it." s47F [redacted], Ernabella.

"It's important for the government to understand that it is not just one place (Mutitjulu) that speaks for Uluru- Kata Tjuta - lots of other communities have strong connections and must be involved in discussions and decisions about that place." s47F [redacted]
Docker River.

There is a tendency amongst non-Anangu users of the Park to confuse the identity of the Mutitjulu Aboriginal community with the identity of the Anangu Traditional Owners. (See for example *Mutitjulu: A Unique Community*, Ditton et al 1989.) Although many Traditional Owners do reside at Mutitjulu, and they assume special responsibilities in relation to caring for sites in the vicinity, it is not correct that all residents of Mutitjulu are Traditional Owners or that all Traditional Owners (with the attendant rights to consultation) are resident at Mutitjulu. The Central Land Council has taken this on board by arranging for non-resident Traditional Owners to be involved in workshops providing input



into the Plan of Management. However, within the PAN budget there is no provision for the cost of transporting non-resident Traditional Owners to Mutitjulu for key meetings. Arrangements for their inclusion in consultative processes are not adequate.

The tendency to confuse the identity of the Mutitjulu community with that of Traditional Owners of Uluru-Kata Tjuta is also reflected in the fact that the OJM, as discussed above, itself reports to the Mutitjulu Community Incorporated Governing Committee. This is despite the fact that, in theory, members of this governing committee could be Aboriginal but not necessarily members of the Traditional Owner group of Uluru-Kata Tjuta or even Anangu.

On the other hand, OJM has no reporting relationship to the Land Trust, which is comprised of members of the Traditional Owner group, and nor does the Land Trust have any role in decision-making about management or uses of the Park. Other than through the CLC, the Land Trust has no link to any decision-making structures in the Park. Yet it is the Land Trust which is the 'landlord' and the body which does incorporate the Traditional Owner group. It is the representative group to which PAN owes its responsibilities under the lease – not to the Mutitjulu community or to Mutitjulu Community Incorporated Governing Committee.

There are two key consequences arising from this confusion. One is that Traditional Owners outside of the Park area are not immediately recognised as being 'bosses' for OJM or as having a key right to consultation in decision-making. The second consequence is that Mutitjulu residents are afforded an elevated role in decision-making by virtue of their recognition and their accessibility.

The impact of this on traditional forms of social relations is that the risk is run of facilitating breakdown of traditional forms of authority and decision-making. In interacting with European systems of power relations and decision-making, an alternative power base is created which has the potential to conflict with or undermine traditional power bases. The reduced mobility of people within the Park and of non-resident Traditional Owners compounds this problem.

A second and related point concerns the Park creation of the 'generic' Traditional Owner. Social relations amongst Anangu are structured and determined by their relationships to sites and to country. These are site specific. Park responsibilities are divided, on the other hand, along functional lines. While PAN seem to have taken on board that responsibilities, social relations and authority to speak are often gender specific, there does not appear to be a corresponding recognition that different family groups have different responsibilities for different sites within the Park boundaries and extending beyond these – hence the 'generic' Traditional Owner.

This is not a problem when it comes to making decisions across the Park which affect the operation of the Park but are not relevant to any specific site within the



Park. However, where individual sites are affected (or interpreted or protected etc) the agreement of the relevant senior Traditional Owners needs to be specifically sought. It devalues the richness and complexity of Anangu social organisation to not recognise this. It is also a reflection of the difficulties of making such richness and complexity intelligible to non-Anangu. The difficulty for the CSIA Consultant (and for others) is that these matters are unintelligible to non-Anangu. It is simply not possible at this point to determine if traditional power relations and social relations have been under-mined through engaging with the PAN bureaucracy, except to say that this is possible and should be investigated. An anthropologist should be engaged to work with Anangu to describe and document Anangu social relations in such a way that their richness and complexity can be made intelligible to PAN and OJM and to ensure that consultation processes and decision-making structures are compatible with Anangu systems and do not undermine these.

Another reason why it is important to properly understand traditional forms of decision-making and power relations is that if Mutitjulu begins to prosper in the way that Anangu, PAN and OJM all hope that it will, there may be created a 'reverse brain drain' or 'honey pot' effect. This is a situation where Mutitjulu can become a desirable place to live (offering employment opportunities, housing and access to services) but with the consequence being that it has the potential for better educated, bi-cultural 'outsiders' to move into the area and begin to compete with longer term Mutitjulu residents for opportunities created and resources provided. This is a common experience in Aboriginal communities which begin to develop and would need to be managed carefully. It is an issue which should be monitored and strategies (eg appropriate employment and housing policies) developed to ensure that such a trend does not create conflict within Mutitjulu.



16. Youth

Youth at Mutitjulu demonstrate the classic signs of alienation, role confusion and marginalisation. Incidences of vandalism of Park fences, signs and other PAN property by youth have been reported. Substance abuse including alcohol, drugs and petrol sniffing are on the increase. In workshops Anangu consistently raised concerns about youth not learning about and taking on their responsibilities under Tjukurpa. They described youth as having had things 'too easy' with store bought food and sit down money and that now they had lost their knowledge and ability to survive in the bush.

Specific strategies need to be developed which will foster the assumption of responsibilities for Tjukurpa by youth and, accordingly, resources need to be devoted in the Park budget for the funding of these. Unfortunately, there were not the resources as part of this consultancy to conduct youth workshops or to spend enough time with youth to develop strategies. The following are therefore suggestions only and will need to be canvassed with youth and other stakeholders:

- An annual youth forum to be convened where Anangu youth discuss their needs, interests and concerns in relation to the assumption of Tjukurpa responsibilities.
- A Youth Council to be established. The Youth Council to be consulted on all major decisions affecting youth or where youth wish to have input into decision-making.
- A formal position on the Board of Management be created for a youth representative.
- Annual visits to other Parks and cities for youth to be planned - to understand where tourists are coming from and to better assist them to develop an interest in and plan services for tourists.
- A youth leadership program to be commenced.
- Uluru youth to host visits and camps by other school children and young leaders.
- The school curriculum for all grades be reviewed to ensure that young Anangu receive appropriate training in Park management and administration, assumption of Tjukurpa responsibilities, visitor management and liaison.



One question that needs to be explored with youth is whether they see themselves as willing inheritors of the lease agreement. The lease was negotiated by these young people's grandparents without consultation with them and without them necessarily understanding what was agreed to and what has been negotiated. Now perhaps it is time for PAN to write a lease with young Anangu.

It is not suggested that a new legal document be developed, but that an agreement be negotiated which begins by asking Anangu youth what it is that they want in return for leasing their inheritance to PAN. Perhaps it would be possible for PAN through OJM to consult and negotiate with Anangu youth about an appropriate supplementary lease agreement. This may produce greater commitment of Anangu youth to joint management as being something meaningful to them.



17. Monitoring

While it is readily acknowledged that Anangu culture may be vulnerable to the impacts of tourism and the establishment of Uluru-Kata Tjuta as a national park, little attention has been given to how such impacts might be monitored. This Cultural and Social Impact Assessment project and report is itself a start but more work (and resources) are required to establish a comprehensive and ongoing system for monitoring social and cultural impacts at Uluru-Kata Tjuta.

Requirements for the monitoring and reporting of properties on the World Heritage List were added to the UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention in February 1995. The Guidelines make a distinction between systematic monitoring and reactive monitoring. Systematic monitoring involves the continuous observation of the conditions of the world heritage site with periodic reporting on its state of conservation. Reactive monitoring is used to assess the state of conservation where the site is seen as being under threat.

UNESCO is itself still considering the best ways to monitor cultural sites (pers comm, Richard Engelhardt, Regional Advisor for Culture in Asia, UNESCO, January 1998). Monitoring is recognised by the Australian Federal Department of Environment, World Heritage Unit, as a neglected area of world heritage management in Australia. The Unit acknowledges that there is still a need to adequately identify suitable indicators and establish appropriate and effective monitoring systems for cultural sites (pers comm, s22 [redacted], Director, World Heritage Unit, Environment Australia, Thailand, January 1998).

It is the responsibility of the States Parties (i.e. Australia), in consultation with site-managers to put in place on-site monitoring arrangements as an integral part of the day to day conservation and management of sites (House of Representatives 1996:109). But at Uluru-Kata Tjuta it is essential that Anangu themselves are centrally involved in the monitoring and evaluation process.

This is for five reasons:

1. The monitoring system should reflect Anangu concerns and objectives rather than European concerns.
2. Anangu are in the best position to understand changes and impacts which affect them.
3. Anangu themselves must decide when intervention is required.
4. Anangu are themselves in the best position to determine what intervention strategies will and will not work.



5. Some of that which needs to be monitored is sacred and only Anangu business.

At Uluru-Kata Tjuta there is no argument that there is the need to establish a regular, ongoing monitoring, reporting and evaluation system. However, perhaps one difficulty here is that there is no seeming point in monitoring unless there is a willingness and commitment to follow through with whatever actions or funds might be required to ameliorate or restore any damage found to be occurring. As discussed above, Anangu and staff employed by Anangu are currently experiencing great frustration in procuring funds to address outstanding and urgent needs in the Mutitjulu community. This experience is without question a disincentive for them to undertake comprehensive monitoring. What is the point in dedicating precious resources to monitoring impacts when there are no funds available to initiate intervention?

Leaving this aside, below are some proposals for consideration in the design and establishment of a monitoring program. As suggested in previous chapters, there are a number of areas where concerns have been articulated about cultural maintenance and social welfare. This is where monitoring should commence. These concerns include a fear that Anangu culture is somehow 'under threat' and a desire for economic equity and social justice for Anangu, both in their living conditions and in their participation in the regional economy.

As a starting point it is also necessary to establish a base-line data set. Some previous reports (such as the Ditton Report) provide some but it was outside the scope of the CSIA to establish a more comprehensive set of base-line data than that included in this report.⁷

'State of the Culture' Report

Inspired by the device of a 'State of the Environment Report', OJM has proposed the annual preparation of a 'State of the Community' report, discussed below. This could also be complemented by a 'State of the Culture' report. The notion of a 'State of the Culture' annual report to the Board of Management is a new one and it would take time to develop relevant and reliable evaluation criteria which are practical to collect data for. It is suggested that some data might be collected annually (for instance, monitoring of improvement in access to lands, number of beer cans found in the Park), while other data might be collected less frequently. For example, language maintenance might be assessed every five or ten years.

⁷ It might be noted that the budget for this CSIA is less than one sixth of that expended on a social impact assessment at Kakadu National Park the previous year.



Monitoring should take place by way of the collection and collation of hard data about things, which are measurable, and by seeking the views of Anangu. It is important to include the views of non-resident Anangu who live outside the Park and yet have responsibility for Tjukurpa within the Park in the 'State of the Culture' Report, and it is important to include the views of women and youth. While appropriate empirical data are important, the 'State of the Culture' report will no doubt need to rely heavily upon self-reporting by Anangu.

An important component of cultural maintenance is transmission between generations. For this reason, youth issues should be carefully monitored as part of monitoring cultural transmission. Thus the 'State of the Culture' Report might also include a report of curricula design for cultural maintenance and appropriate measures of school results of young Anangu. This, of course, should be linked to Anangu youth being trained in ways, which integrate them into future Park management. For example, it is assumed that a more comprehensive Anangu training and employment scheme (see earlier chapter), would ensure that the necessary skills required to take up identified employment opportunities, and necessary school achievements corresponding to these should be measured. (This of course assumes that school assessment should be competency-based in line with specific occupational categories in the fields of land management, visitor management, administration and management, small business skills, etc.).

The following are drawn from concerns expressed by Anangu about cultural maintenance. They are indicative only and are not provided as a definitive list: The 'State of the Culture' Report, provided annually to the Board of Management, might include:

- outcomes of the proposed annual youth forum
- comments by senior Traditional Owners on how they are coping personally with the demands made on their time.
- Comments by senior traditional people on concerns they may have about any growing differences between current practice and what were earlier forms of practice of Tjukurpa
- demands on the time available to older people with cultural knowledge to be able to communicate this to interested young people.
- access to lands
- the need for time for respite for Anangu and the need to replenish themselves for work
- number of visits to Uluru for ceremony of non-resident Anangu
- demands on the time available to people to actually perform ceremony
- the low level of involvement of young people in Tjukurpa
- lack of opportunity to exchange information amongst themselves
- limitations on non-resident Anangu to control and manage their rights and responsibilities in relation to Tjukurpa in the Park
- artistry, language, natural resource management skills, storytelling, outstation residence, capacity to operate in a cross cultural environment) This could be tied in with reporting for the state of culture report



- activities funded which contribute to cultural maintenance
- annual allocation of expenditure through gate money and by PAN on funding cultural maintenance activities
- provisions of Pan to accommodate ceremonial and family obligations of Anangu PAN employees

It should be noted that there has not been a comprehensive archeological site survey of the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park area and this should be undertaken as a priority.

In relation to monitoring of language maintenance, relevant indicators recommended by Henderson and Nash (1997:27) include:

- Number and strength of traditional languages used as a primary form of communication. The best indications come from continuing sociolinguistic studies in the relevant communities.
- Number of speakers.
- Number and type of indigenous language programs in schools, language centres and other institutions.

‘State of the Community’ Report

As discussed above, Anangu have clearly articulated what they see as the relationship between their own welfare and their ability to properly care for the Park. Monitoring for the ‘State of the Community’, therefore equates directly to monitoring for the ‘State of the Culture’.

Social indicators for the Mutitjulu community that would usually be collated and monitored annually include:

- morbidity and mortality data
- employment status
- education and skills profile
- access to quality housing
- incidence of substance abuse
- arrests and community/domestic violence statistics
- expenditure per capita on infrastructure, services and facilities

All of the above could be provided, where possible, on a comparative basis with non-Aboriginal residents of Mutitjulu and Rangerville, and with residents of Yulara. This provides a local ‘control’ as a basis for measuring change.



However, it is possible that Anangu in fact consider other indicators to be more relevant or useful. Again, indicators should be developed with the input of Anangu.

‘State of the Economy’ Report

The preparation of an annual ‘State of the Economy’ report has two objectives. First it is intended that this report will monitor access and equity outcomes for Anangu. Data collected and evaluated could include those discussed in the previous section on social justice and equity where comparisons were undertaken between incomes and other standard of living measures of Anangu and those of Yulara and Rangerville residents.

As well as individual and household comparisons, it would be relevant to also assess and monitor Anangu participation in the regional economy as owners of businesses. The estimated size of the regional tourism and ancillary industries and Anangu share in these should be monitored, annually or triennially.

The second objective of a ‘State of the Economy’ report is to provide information to Anangu which will enable them to judge the extent to which things are ‘level’ between themselves and PAN at Uluru-Kata Tjuta. The ‘State of the Economy’ Report might include a financial analysis where the allocation of the Park budget in terms of those monies expended on employing and training Anangu in contrast to wages and salary expenditure on non-Anangu is able to be compared. Data collation systems of PAN at the present time do not enable such comparisons to be undertaken.

It is clear that monitoring is a not insignificant task. For this reason the following are important considerations when planning a monitoring system and process:

- Indicators used and data collection systems should be cost effective.
- Anangu should themselves be involved in all aspects of monitoring from development of suitable outcomes to be monitored and indicators to be used, through to evaluation and planning of intervention where needed.
- There will need to be heavy reliance on Anangu self-reporting.
- A comprehensive base line data set will need to be prepared.
- The monitoring system should be developed and refined over an extended time frame.



18. Conclusion



19. Bibliography

Aboriginal Project Committee (1997). *Kakadu Region Social Impact Study*. Unpublished.

Anangu and the Central Land Council, Land Assessment and Planning Unit (1997). *Anangu Culture Strong, Community Culture Strong, Park Piranpa Culture Strong – Ngapatji Ngapatji Learning Together, A Report for the Uluru Community*. Central Land Council, Alice Springs.

Australian Geological Survey Organisation, Dept Primary Industries and Energy, (1997). Ed L. G. Woodcock, *Proceedings 'Back to the Future' Natural Resources Research Workshop, Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park*. Unpublished.

Janke, T. (1997). *Our Culture, Our Future: Proposals for the Recognition and Protection of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. Canberra.

Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service (1986). *Uluru (Ayers Rock – Mount Olga) National Park for the inclusion on the World Heritage List*.

Barry, J. (1996). *'User Pays' at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park: Current and Future Directions*. Paper presented at the Best Practice Ecotourism National Conference, Coolangatta.

Bogle, S. (1990). *Mutitjulu: A Unique Community, Report Summary, A Report Prepared for the Minister for Arts, Sport, Environment, Tourism and Territories*. Canberra.

Central Land Council, Pitjantjatjara Council and Mutitjulu Community (1987). *Sharing the Park – Anangu Initiatives in Ayers Rock Tourism*. Central Land Council. Alice Springs.

Department of Environment, Sport and Territories (1994). *Renomination of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park*.

Ditton, Pamela et al, (1990). *Mutitjulu: A Unique Community – Volume One and Two, A Report for the Minister for Arts, Sport, Environment, Tourism and Territories*.

Durnan, B. (1997). *The Red Plan - A Training and Employment Plan, A Report for the Mutitjulu Community Council Uluru*. Unpublished.

Henderson, J. and D. Nash (1997). *Culture and Heritage: Indigenous Languages*. State of the Environment Australia Technical Paper Series Natural and Cultural Heritage. Environment Australia. Canberra.

House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts. (1996) *Managing Australia's World Heritage*. AGPS Canberra.



House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment, Recreation and the Arts (1998). *Managing Australia's World Heritage – Government Response*. AGPS Canberra.

Phillpot, S.G., M.P. Baczynski; and Mulgan, R. (1998) *Stage Three: Report of an Investigation into Local Government Service Delivery to Indigenous Communities in Australia*. Unpublished.

Rose, B. (1995). *Land Management Issues: Attitudes and Perceptions Amongst Aboriginal People of Central Australia*. Central Land Council. Alice Springs.

Savage, M. (1997). *The Blue Book – Town Planning and Housing Handbook, A Report for the Mutitjulu Community Council Uluru*. Unpublished.

Study Advisory Group (1997). *Kakadu Region Social Impact Study – Community Action Plan*. Unpublished.

Tourism Resource Consultants (1997). *Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Visitor Management Strategy – Interim Report, A Report for PAN*. Unpublished.

UNESCO (1995). "UNESCO Offers Help for Diversity", *Australian National Commission for UNESCO*, Vol. 3, No. 2.

Wynter Hill Consulting (1997). *Action Tables for the Black Plan – A Community Development Plan, A Report for the Mutitjulu Community Uluru*. Unpublished.

Wynter Hill Consulting (1997). *The Gold Plan – A Business & Enterprise Plan, A Report for the Mutitjulu Community Uluru*. Unpublished.

Wynter Hill Consulting Team (1997). *The Black Plan – A Community Development Plan, A Report for the Mutitjulu Community Uluru*. Unpublished.



20. Appendix One

Terms of reference

A Cultural and Social Impact Assessment of the Effects that Operation of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park has on the Anangu residents of Mutitjulu.

Background and Purpose

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (1,300sq. km) is Aboriginal freehold title land which is jointly managed by the Anangu (Aboriginal) Traditional Owners and PAN North (formerly ANCA / ANPWS). The Park is a world leader in joint management between Aboriginal Traditional Owners and a conservation agency. The Park is listed twice as a World Heritage area, as both a cultural and natural landscape.

The majority of the Park's Traditional Owners live at Mutitjulu community. Mutitjulu has a total Anangu population of approximately 180. The Traditional Owners are Pitjantjatara and Yankunytjatjara speakers, usually with English as a second or third language. There are also approximately 80 non-Aboriginal residents of Mutitjulu, mostly comprising community council and park staff.

Mutitjulu is located within the Park and is 20km from the resort town of Yulara. Yulara was constructed by the Northern Territory Government. With the exception of Yulara, all of the lands surrounding the park are also Aboriginal freehold under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act (NT), 1976.

In the last ten years, visitation to Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park has increased almost threefold to approximately 330,000 paying visitors per annum. Visitation is expected to continue to increase at 4-8% per annum. The Sydney Olympic Games may also have an effect of dramatically increasing visitation to the Park, and with that, so would the associated cultural and social pressures.

Current and anticipated visitor numbers present a number of cultural and social impacts for Anangu, particularly those living at Mutitjulu. These impacts are complex and, through Tjukurpa, extend to Anangu living outside the Park.

Methodology

The Coordinator, Office for Joint Management (OJM) will be responsible for overseeing and coordination of the Cultural and Social Impact Assessment. As such, the OJM will facilitate the inputs of Anangu, the BoM Planning Sub



Committee, and associated consultants throughout both the commissioning and research process of this consultancy.

The Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park Board of Management has decided that as part of developing the 1998-2007 Plan of Management, a Cultural and Social Impact Assessment should be undertaken, alongside various other consultancies including assessments of visitor management, visitor safety, environmental impacts and Mutitjulu community's development options. The consultancy has an extremely tight timeframe, ending in October 1997.

The key element which will link all of these consultancies, to eventually be expressed through the Plan of Management, is a comprehensive Anangu Advocacy consultancy based on participatory action planning and research methods. The Cultural and Social Impact Assessment Consultant will be required to utilise this methodology for the community consultation component of their work.

The aims of the Anangu Advocacy consultancy are to:

- 1 reduce the impact of consultation on Anangu, through the coordination and rationalisation of consultations; and
- 2 establish an effective, appropriately supported forum facilitated by Anangu which will:
 - proactively inform Anangu about issues associated with the development of the Plan of Management through participatory workshops and community gatherings
 - provide the opportunities for Anangu to powerfully contribute to the planning and consultative process and their outcomes.

The above arrangements are being coordinated through the Office for Joint Management, and includes representation from the Board of Management, Mutitjulu's Anangu community, the Central Land Council and PAN.

The Central Land Council has certain statutory functions to carry out under the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act, 1976. The statutory functions of particular relevance to this project are described in Section 23 (1) of the Act:

- (a) To protect the interests of traditional Aboriginal owners of, and other Aboriginal interest in, Aboriginal land in the area of the Land Council;
- (b) To assist Aboriginals in the taking of measures likely to assist in the protection of sacred sites on land (whether or not Aboriginal land) in the area of the Land Council;



- (c) To consult with Traditional Owners of, and other Aboriginals interested in, Aboriginal land in the areas of the Land Council with respect to any proposal relating to the use of that land.

The Central Land Council will need to be involved in the assessment process to ensure the above requirements are being met, and to complement this project.

Note: The Consultant will need to utilise a qualified Interpreter. The Consultant will also need to provide a list of proposed research questions to the Office for Joint Management prior to consulting with Anangu so any linguistic and anthropological issues can be resolved.

Objectives of the Study

Using a participatory research methodology, which incorporates both qualitative and quantitative research, the consultant will be required to:

1. Assist Anangu to clarify and articulate the significant social and cultural impacts which the operation of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park (UKTNP) has on Anangu Traditional Owners living at Mutitjulu, and implicitly to identify the individual and cumulative consequences (positive and negative), for Anangu, of leasing their lands for the purposes of a national park.
2. Assist Anangu to develop specific ways and means of avoiding or mitigating any negative effects the Park's visitors (current and projected), visitor management strategies and infrastructure, policies and funding arrangements may have on the cultural and social lives of Anangu.
3. Identify the beneficial effects, including tourism and other (non tourism) employment / commercial enterprises, the Park's operations may have for local Anangu and assist Anangu to explore means of exploiting these advantages.
4. Assist Anangu to identify, with regard to the Park, where further areas of cultural and social impact research and monitoring may be required, and to negotiate appropriate processes for inclusion in the long term evaluation of the Plan of Management.
5. Assist Anangu to identify and articulate the cultural and social impacts of Ayers Rock Resort Corporation, and other tour operators, on Anangu living in the Park.
6. Make recommendations about further research which would be aimed at examining the cultural and social impacts on Anangu and their institutions, of Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park being leased to the Commonwealth. As part of this component an assessment of the likely consequences of Northern Territory statehood in the year 2000 would be required.



7. Assist Anangu to articulate the cultural impacts on Anangu in relation to intensive visitor use of areas immediately adjacent to, and on Uluru and Kata Tjuta.
8. Assess the adequacy of management structures, mechanisms and processes for empowering Anangu to control and manage future impacts.

Scope of Work

The scope of work for this commission will involve investigating and reporting on social and cultural impacts (both positive and negative) which could emerge as consequences from the Plan of Management consultation program itself, the current operational, and visitor management regimes, and the projected use and visitation to the Park would necessarily include PAN's operational, infrastructure (current and planned capital works), and visitor management strategies.

The consultant will also be required to provide recommendations, and where appropriate, cost estimates of mitigation procedures, as part of an overall strategic approach to mitigating the impacts of current and projected visitation, the development and maintenance of park infrastructure, and the effects of participating in a demanding management arrangement with PAN.

The success of this study will depend upon: a comprehensive literature review; inputs from meaningful and effective consultations with both Anangu and organisations which variously represent them; and the critical examination of the outcomes of other consultancies being conducted as part of developing the new Plan of Management.

The objective should be to achieve a clear and accurate representation of Anangu views and perceptions of their country being used as a highly visited national park and the consequence of this, for Anangu.

Consultations should also reflect an understanding of the different levels of rights and responsibilities, enjoyed by Anangu under their system of philosophy and law (Tjukurpa).

The consultancy may have regard to:

- Infrastructure at Mutitjulu (housing, health, education, essential services)
- Community privacy, park visitors, filming / photography and aircraft
- The effects on Anangu lifestyle of living in a National Park
- Aboriginal sacred places, and cultural activity inside the park
- Opportunities for employment
- The presence or absence of visitor management infrastructure and its effects on Tjukurpa
- Establishment of baseline data about consultation levels and other social indicators, cognisant of past impact assessment work



- Anangu involvement in joint management with PA(N), structures, mechanisms, processes for ongoing consultation
- Policy gaps which have a social or cultural impact on Anangu