

Response to Review of IBP June 2006

An individual perspective

Our current actions may not match our current aspirations. But in the future those who come after us will realise our aims far out strip the capacity of bureaucrats to move with the determination and vision we have.

Disclaimer

This submission is a personal response to the IBP discussion paper and in no way represents any sector organisation.

Introduction

Broadcasting needs a funding model that suits the times; a model that is innovative, forward looking, and one that embraces new technologies that are appropriate for the sector.

There is no comprehensive indigenous broadcasting policy; the current ad hoc approach of funding organisations is based on an incomplete draft indigenous broadcasting policy (the red book).

Attempts by the sector to develop a comprehensive policy have been undermined by bureaucracy habituated by government to engage consultants as a panacea for responding to any crisis in the indigenous sector.

Consultants prefer to take advice from other sectors of the industry, CBAA, CBF, ABC, SBS, and any one else before they consult with the indigenous stakeholders; a phone contact with one or two prominent indigenous people is considered to be broad sector consultation.

The reasoning behind this approach is a part of Australia's past entrenched practice of paternalistic exclusion and its failure to recognise that indigenous people have a capacity to speak well enough for themselves.

This form of consultancy leaves the whole country diminished, in its cultural, social, and economic commitment to improving the lives of indigenous people.

The challenge facing government and departments is to fund adequately, democratically & equitably a vibrant industry, which reflects and reinvigorates indigenous culture & art, close to the communities and populations it serves.

Building capacity in indigenous broadcasting is not only a responsibility of current funding agencies but also the responsibility of bodies such as the ABC/SBS giving real meaning to the much used cliché "whole of government approach" which resonates with bureaucrats but experience tells us that in indigenous communities they are only words designed to placate the non indigenous audience, that something is indeed happening with their tax dollars.

Media Background

My involvement in broadcasting began as a volunteer with community radio 3CCC in Harcourt Central Victoria, presenting a 2 hour weekly, indigenous magazine/music program which led to weekly interviews with Derek Guiel on regional ABC, commenting on issues in my capacity as Cultural Officer and Administrator of Dja Dja Wrung Aboriginal Association, located in Bendigo.

I became a representative on the South Eastern Indigenous Media Association (SEIMA) and then in 1993 I became chair of the National Indigenous Media Association, I held this position until 2000.

During this time we established national offices in Brisbane, set up the National Indigenous Radio Service and engaged the BRACS services at a higher profile and improved the service delivery to BRACS, by making NIRS accessible to communities as a form of supplementary programming.

I was nominated by the sector as representative of AMARC for the Oceania region, and then elected to represent the worlds Indigenous peoples in the media industry at the world conference of AMARC in Milan Italy in 1998.

During my time at AMARC, I was involved in international meetings and workshops in Senegal Africa, Montreal Canada, Manila Philippines.

I have had hands on experience and can turn my hand to most aspects of indigenous broadcasting, from everyday tasks to management of Radio Larakia in Darwin, commercial stations 6LN and CFM in Carnarvon, and my current position as radio manager of Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association (CAAMA).

I have also been a long term member of the CBF board and chair of the indigenous grants advisory committee, under Tony Staley, Peter Westerway, and current Chair of the CBF John martin.

ITV

The ITV model is perceived as “Sydney Centric”, owned funded & run by Sydney based stakeholders which disenfranchises a major sector of the Australian indigenous community and further removes rural & remote peoples from a sense of ownership, belonging, or control of funding process or policy.

Under current arrangements there are meetings to set up committees, consultants engaged with no policy direction which benefiting few if any indigenous stakeholders leaving most out of the loop and possibly opening up criticisms of once again setting up projects to fail, that is systematic with indigenous programs improperly implemented and not delivered by indigenous people.

A-Scope of IBP

The current IBP scope of responsibility demonstrates the need for a departmental inquiry and overhaul with terms of reference, into the department's management of indigenous broadcasting program, surrounding breaches of human rights & racial discrimination.

The department is not in a position to manage such a scope of work, indeed the question needs to be put is it proper for the department to be managing projects, at this level, and are other public radio taxpayer funded organisations managed by the department in the same manner.

As a member of the board of the CBF I have not experienced the same level of project management, and attention that the indigenous sector receives. Under the scope of the IBP there remain inconsistencies, in licensing, and also indigenous community broadcasters.

Licensing

Response;

The funding arrangements with Imparja was a derivative of the old ways of ATSIC, and in terms of Carnarvon Commercial radio stations was and still is a discriminatory practise.

Yamatji media were advised by bureaucrats to pursue the commercial license in preference to a community licence, this was to provide the community access to advertising income to support the enterprise.

The community were never advised of the full implications of these two different licensing formats, and did not have the capacity or experience to take on a fully-fledged commercial organisation such as 6LN-CFM

Bureaucrats advised the Carnarvon indigenous community to purchase the licenses, as in their view it was more cost effective, than funding a community service from scratch.

Poor advice left the community with an enterprise that did not serve them, nor could they adequately manage without continued financial support to build the skills capacity within management required to run a commercial radio stations

Because of this arrangement non-indigenous staff with the commercial radio background required, ran the organisation without proper consultation and communication with the sector they served. In seeking to improve an upgrade the situation at Carnarvon I was hamstrung by bureaucratic policy, which was not consistent with current practise, that enables Imparja to enjoy annual funding from IBP for a commercial enterprise.

In my view this continued practise is inconsistent and discriminatory against Yamatji Media Association of Carnarvon. This is an example of public servants not consistently following a policy and undermining the development of commercial capacity by indigenous organisations.

The inconsistent decisions, regarding commercial and community funding allocations and mainstream audience vs. community audience, demonstrates to me that an enquiry into the department's management of IBP needs to be undertaken, failure to do so could see further uncertainty for indigenous broadcasting.

Spectrum allocation

I don't except the papers critique regarding the availability of spectrum in major markets such as Hobart Adelaide, Gosford, Newcastle, and Wollongong, The minister for communications has powers under the *Broadcasting Services Act 1992* to allocate frequencies, I make the comment the ABC/ SBS could give up a frequency to indigenous community as a mark of reconciliation or good will.

The situation in Adelaide, could be easily attended to by reallocating the fine music FM channel to indigenous, and the fine music people amalgamated with a community station, there is no need to have ABC fine music and rest of the conglomerate of ABC stations, ABC, Radio National, JJJ, Regional ABC, Parliamentary, and community fine music. All are public and there is unnecessary duplication.

The same applies elsewhere, maybe the ABC could do a deal with the fine music channels to share spectrum, and also it is just not equitable to have indigenous people shut out of these markets, whilst fine music people and ABC/SBS and general community stations are adequately catered for.

B- Key Issues for Comment

B 1

This is yet another example of why there needs to be an inquiry into the running of the IBP, for the reasons I pointed out in A Scope of IBP.

I question the departments motives, there is, I believe a serious breach of protocols, in terms of the community broadcasting codes of conduct, and the departments bureaucrats ignoring or misunderstanding of the codes, and I repeat my question: are other broadcasting recipients of funding undergoing the same treatment as indigenous broadcasters?

If indigenous broadcasters are re being treated any differently under the broadcasting codes of practise of the act, then this whole process is not only discriminatory but has racist overtones.

B1.1

This statement is confusing, there have not been any indexation increases, to my knowledge for example Imparja have not received an indexation increase ever.

Does B 1.1 mean that there is to be likely increases in line with indexation?

I don't except the papers assumptions that there will be no increases and that new services are to be funded from existing allocations, I make the comment that the ABC, SBS, CBF receive indexation; this is a further discriminatory behaviour practised, against indigenous broadcasting.

The IBP proposition that a new funding model would

- **Address historical funding disparities,**

Comment

Other public radio sectors increase their funding, whilst indigenous broadcasting suffers massive cuts.

CAAMA radio cuts in 06-07 are set at \$97,000, up to an amount of \$300,000 over 3 years, this cut in 06-07 flies in the face of the discussion paper P17 that a gradual reduction in funding would occur over time. No organisation in the country can sustain such cuts, without an injection of funds to increase technology to allow for productivity increases.

This is a further demonstration of the department being out of step with the economy, it is widely known that productivity increases occur when there is an investment in capital infrastructure, to get the increased productivity in organisations there needs to be a massive injection in capital equipment into major radio stations, then we can address the redistribution of funds.

- **Establish a more equitable distribution of funding across capital cities and regional and remote areas**

Comment

It's a complete nonsense to compare Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane with remote Australia, Sydney and Melbourne and Brisbane are mainstream audiences and therefore are more likely to have the services demanded by a mainstream audience, remote Australia in comparison is light years away where the word disadvantage takes on new meanings of disadvantage, the audience in remote Australia is more likely to have social and economic problems sometimes associated with the third world, it is for these reasons alone that funding commitments need to be maintained.

- **Make funds available for new entrants to the indigenous broadcasting market.**

Comment

The term indigenous broadcasting market is further evidence of a complete misunderstanding of the sector by the department.

Community radio is not a market economy where we compete with each other for funds, there is no level playing field in indigenous broadcasting, we are all people with indigenous values, and a commitment to serve our people, and to have a market based economy placed on disadvantage, is simply an appalling situation.

I can't think of any time in Australia's history that a punitive measure, (except the great depression) where leveraging off disadvantage was used against Australian citizens. Funds should be made available for new stations, and not from existing budgets.

- **Provide further transparency to the funding process**

Comment

Providing further transparency to the funding process is an complete oxymoron, the process is as transparent as its always been, to now suggest that it is otherwise, is a reflection on the department, not indigenous organisations, and any inference of impropriety is simply appalling.

Current Funding Model

The current situation of funding is not sustainable, we are kidding ourselves and jeopardising indigenous broadcasting in the process if we have no other choice other than the one offered in the discussion paper.

Rather than tinker at the edges of an unsustainable model it may be time to make adjustments to the way we do broadcasting, that at the very least maintains the focus on changing disadvantage and inequality of indigenous peoples.

Proposed funding Model

A revitalisation of the sector has to be considered without fear or prejudice.

This personal view maybe out of step with some members of the sector, however there are many who silently hold a similar view. There is a culture of silence because no one wants to speak out; they fear the repercussions not only on themselves but also on the whole of the sector.

I see a sector in decline, the massive cuts to CAAMA and to other stations is a tragedy for indigenous broadcasting that we may not survive. Our form of broadcasting is delicately poised and transferring existing funds from one station to another is not the way forward for indigenous broadcasting, a plan that reinvigorates through a robust revitalisation is what is needed.

Suggested RIMO Model

Larger radio stations, can take on greater areas of responsibility, and management, by incorporating RIMO's and taking on responsibility RIBS into larger stations and transferring staff there will be substantial cost benefits, and the community will receive a higher level of service and training.

- A more efficient and effective service
- Increased visits to communities by field officers
- Increased resources into community sites
- Increased indigenous employment opportunities in, radio and video productions
- Increased language and cultural content
- Increased ICTV content
- Management and training opportunities for indigenous employees
- Sales opportunities from government sponsorship
- Regional broadcasts from central studio, guarantees that regions take their own programs in language (example each region has regional program allocation time, as programs would consist of information from that region)
- Broadcast in town, on the town frequency, and broadcast community language programs on a second frequency.

How it can work

For example CAAMA radio has a radio manager responsible for the RIBS, as well as general radio management of CAAMA radio 8 KIN FM, under the manager would be a coordinator of RIBS programs with minimum certificate IV in broadcasting located at the station

Under the Coordinator would be field officers with minimum certificate III in broadcasting, located at station and in the field and under the field officers would be the local remote area broadcasters and video producers.

Further training is available for remote area community broadcasters at the station and also available at station are community broadcasters who can produce language content material to broadcast on separate frequency from central station.

Outcomes

- Guaranteed improved broadcasts into remote communities
- Guaranteed improved training for remote community broadcasters
- More diversity in programming
- Cost savings by not having a manager of RIMO in each area
- Less vehicles and travel allowance costs
- Better coordination and communication
- Greater accountability, in program delivery, & accredited training
- Improved accountability in financial management
- Improved technical services
- Less duplication of services

B2.1

Restructured model

Currently in the Central Australia region, broadcasting funds from IBP amounted to \$1.3m annually; funds from the CBF to supplement program grants amounted to an additional \$263,000

Under a revised model, coordination constructed under one management system has the potential for better outcomes, value for money and substantial savings.

A further example of moving the operations of RIBS under the one structure has advantages also in the financial accountability, as the one accounts manager would take care of all financial responsibility, and not the current four separate accounts.

Technical support to communities under a central location has benefits for the sector in improved service, apprenticeship training, licensing, and accountability.

Some communities are in decline to the extent that, people have moved to Alice Springs in ever increasing numbers, primarily to move closer to services, the Tangentyere council report 05-06 that number s of Aboriginal people in town camps alone, has increased by over 3,687 over the last 12 months. This excludes the people who are camped outside the camps and can only be estimated but the figure is high.

The bright lights and services of Alice Springs are not entirely the preferred destination of Aboriginal people, people other than indigenous attached to media organisations have moved to Alice or are in the planning stage of moving offices here.

This is another reason to identify positions, so that people remain where the funds are targeted, in this case, on the remote communities, everything should be done to discourage this comfort zone and gravy train continuing whilst Aboriginal people are sentenced to life on CDEP, and being trotted out as the black face as the need arises.

Putting it bluntly, it is an appalling situation and should cease immediately funding, rather than talk the funding body needs to get some backbone and make the hard decision.

The situation remains if communities wish to employ media people other than indigenous they can use their own royalty funds.

Examples of New Structures

- Radio Larakia would amalgamate with TEEBA, servicing Darwin and top end communities and Tiwi Islands
- Bummer Bipra would amalgamate with Cape Communities, servicing Cairns and the Cape York communities,
- GOOLARI would amalgamate with PAKAM, servicing Broome and the WA communities
- Warlpiri, PY, & Ng Media would amalgamate with CAAMA servicing the Central Region
- Under this structure, Woorabinda & Mornington Island would become community broadcasters, and be funded accordingly.
- Torres Strait are autonomous within themselves, the same model could apply with Radio Torres Strait taking on the role of coordination.

Cape York communities of Bamaga, Secia, New Mapoon , Umagico and Injinoo should be encouraged to form one broadcast facility even though two are under the banner of Torres Strait, by amalgamation the same advantages with less duplication and accountability to the communities and funding bodies would apply. It makes no sense to maintain the status quo, as each community is serviced by a sealed road within close proximity of each other and each group can share airtime similar to general community stations in the community sector, there is also the possibility of program grants from the CBF. IGAC committee.

Suggested model for Capital City and Regional Stations

Capital city stations are in a position to be come hub stations for the smaller rural stations by producing generic rural programs in their state.

The various models are not new and are very similar to the ABC, and commercial models, a small injection of capital at both ends, the head end being the hub station, and the back end being the rural station.

Option 1

Using the ABC model of rural broadcasting, each rural station would have a manager who does breakfast, and a mid morning announcer that could do news talk back and a part time receptionist.

All other programming would come via a studio at the capital city station dedicated to delivering a generic program that fits in with the rural sectors audiences.

This model takes away all of the duplication of multiple stations doing the same thing, and ensures good quality programming outcomes, all of the stations at the tail end will

need upgrades to computer automation systems, as would the equipment at the head end.

Rural stations would receive program embedded with government sponsorships, again saving the duplication required by each station to run the material, bill it and bank it.

Under a one stop system the sponsorship would come to the central point of the major capital station it would be entered in traffic and go out automatically to the stations.

This ensures accountability of sponsorships going to air, the station receiving the proper payments, by FTP payments into their Activity Generated Accounts, which they manage themselves, rural stations are also able to take on local sponsorship.

Under this model all operational costs such as transmitter site fees, salaries, energy, telecommunications, would be paid from the central point again saving costs in duplication, as in the RIMO model an accountant would take care of all of the accounts.

This model leaves the station free to operate and meet its objectives to the community without all of the administration. Stations are still free to run their own local accounts where there is local sponsorship and grants involved.

Following an initial capital injection and restructure stations will benefit from,

- Effective management & administration
- Indigenous network programming
- Scheduled indigenous news service
- Current affairs & talk back
- Diverse content

Under this model

- 4AAA would be resourced as the head end provider for Queensland stations, even though there maybe good reasons to split the responsibility between Townsville and Brisbane.
- Broome would be the head end providing services to the Kimberley
- WAAMA are in a good position to service Kalgoorlie, Geraldton and emerging services from the south west.

Option 2

Keeping the status quo and moving funding around the sector under a pernicious model as the one in the discussion paper would not fly no matter the circumstance.

From the discussions at the Canberra meeting, there was little support from all sectors for the proposal under the discussion paper.

Option 2, has as a model three levels of radio stations and funding arrangements.

Level 1 Station	Salary
Manager Announcer	\$40,000
Announcer	\$30,000
Part time broadcaster/ 15 hrs week	\$15,000
Volunteers/CDEP	\$11,000
Other operational	\$10,000
Total level 1 station	\$106,000

Level 2 Station	
Manager Announcer	\$40,000
2 Announcers	\$60,000
Part Time announcer	\$15,000
CDEP Top up/ volunteers	\$11,000
Reception part time	\$12,000
Other Operational	\$15,000
Total level 2 Station	\$153,000

Level 3 Station		
Manager	\$70,000	
Sales	\$30,000	
Program manager	\$45,000	
Producer	\$45,000	
Announcer breakfast	\$35,000	
Announcer mid morning	\$35,000	
Senior News Journalist	\$55,000	
Language Broadcaster	\$35,000	
Cadet Journalist	\$28,000	
Reception/Admin	\$28,000	
Sport Broadcaster	\$38,000	
Bookkeeper	\$35,000	
CDEP top up	\$22,000	
Volunteers	\$5,000	
Leave loading	\$7,000	
Superannuation	\$50,000	
Other Operational	\$200,000	Lease, vehicle, energy rent etc
Total level 3	\$763,000	

Employment Training

One of the major challenges for the sector is employment and training, very few indigenous people in the sector have certificate III or IV in broadcasting.

Questions to ask are,

- Is it necessary to have a certificate?
- Will it lead to future employment in the industry?
- Outside of CDEP, Are there enough real jobs in the industry?
- Should positions be Identified positions

The answer is yes it is necessary to have a certificate if you are in a teaching role or a management position, having a certificate allows the manager or designated trainer to work closely with RTO's to achieve real outcomes.

If the expectation is that people need certificates, then one of the many problems with certificate training is that when the student returns to the station there is no one person designated at most station that has a certificate to work with the student.

The student is abandoned and left to their own devices having to contact the lecturer at the RTO' for advice. The process becomes too difficult to most students and they drop out. The situation with the online services is similar, at some point the student needs back up support at the work place, given the lack of funds stations are not able to dedicate attention to the student, and consequently they also drop out or don't complete their certificate.

The RTO has done their bit delivered the training modules, it falls down back at the station simply because of under funding. Large radio stations can play a part by becoming training centres, supporting the RTO's.

I don't agree with the premise that only Aboriginal RTO's have the cultural integrity to train Aboriginal broadcasters, CAAMA for example use AFTRS, and radio Adelaide, both organisations have appropriate training and suit the broadcasters themselves, choice should be left to the individual where he/she would like to train, if a person is forced to go somewhere that has a reputation or they don't like it because of cultural reasons, then they must be supported in their choice.

Commercial radio broadcasters attend a short 6-week course to be able to be announcers on radio, our sector needs something similar where people can be trained in the basics and the rest is done on the job.

Will it lead to future employment, not necessarily, simply because there are not enough jobs in the industry to go around and, CDEP is not the answer, training someone to have a life as a CDEP broadcaster is inhuman and condemning a person to a life sentence its not the way ahead for a modern nation.

Identified positions

All positions should be identified, the only for the employment situation is for the funding bodies to make in compulsory on organisations to employ Aboriginal people with the funds that the department allocates.

Stations are free to employ staff other than indigenous from self generated funds if they wish, this has to be a clear commercial arrangement and open to scrutiny by the funding body.

C1.1

Staffing Indigenous broadcasting services

This sector faces an imbalance employment situation where few indigenous people are in management positions of broadcasting organisations. Currently of the remote RIMO's there are only two indigenous people who manage the remote programs.

I manage a RIBS program as well as manage CAAMA radio station, which in addition to broadcasting in Alice Springs broadcasts and supplies program 24/7 to remote towns and communities within the central RAR2 zone.

There is no tangible reason why Aboriginal people cannot after all this time manage their own enterprises, and there are also many other positions in indigenous broadcasting that are not being filled by Aboriginal people.

Comments that Aboriginal people can not manage are often used as an excuse by non-indigenous managers to not employ Aboriginal people in top positions.

This anomaly also presents itself at major indigenous stations in the sector, the governing committees are caught between wanting to employ their own people, and being faced with the dilemma of not having qualified people to fit the jobs, then the situation raises itself when an non indigenous person is employed they take on a role other than what the community desires and end up occupying the positions, for years and in the process racking up long service leave.

This comfort zone, is major problem and very close to discrimination being practised by people within the organisations, unemployment is a contributing factor to the situations that has developed in communities the majority of key positions in remote broadcasting and indeed in indigenous stations are held by people other than indigenous.

The situation in Central Australia RIMOs needs to change immediately, funding should be targeted at indigenous employment and the people other than indigenous working in the media industry move on and hand over responsibilities to the communities.

If the model put up in this paper is an expectable model then the transitional process to indigenous employment can take place within a very short period of time.

If identified positions were to be attached to funding agreements across the sector the indigenous employment would increase, and the participation rate of youth, women, and indigenous people with a disability given a chance to work in their own media.

Positions must be identified and attached to funding agreements for this plan to have any hope of succeeding and the department can have a real impact if they adopt it.

Stations are still free to employ consultants and people other than indigenous, if they desire from their own activity-generated income.

C1.2

RIBS and employment in IBP

CAAMA report to the senate inquiry into indigenous employment in 2005 recommended that positions be set aside nationally from the current CDEP pool.

Positions would be allocated to a national provider who would manage the training and placement throughout the indigenous media sector, a starting point would be 200 national positions.

C1.3

Training

Separate situations call for innovative training that suits the situation, full time stations, and remote RIBS have differing needs, in some areas indigenous training is in oversupply and inadequate in other sectors, a good example is the move to digital broadcasting and the lack of modules in the sector RTO's. Stations need the flexibility to be able to go outside the sector to train their staff.

Traineeships

Traineeships and apprenticeships are promising. My experience is that they work particularly well, if they are schools based and students stay in the school system allowing them to complete their studies, and gain a certificate as a pathway to other studies, this way the student has a future outside and not left on CDEP.

C2 Other initiatives

C2.1 Peak Bodies

There are in my opinion too many peak bodies in the sector, AICA, & IRCA, need to pool their resources, this will ensure that members and communities are better serviced, the performance of IRCA has been hamstrung by polemics, and there is no reason to believe that situation will change, given the dominance of a sector, largely dictated to by people other than indigenous. This section has effectively hijacked the IRCA sector and made decisions without the full consultations of the members of the sector.

The national peak body of AICA since its reformation has performed well and needs further support to bring it into line with the other sectors, even though the sector in the short term is unlikely to enjoy its own authority like the ABC/SBS our sector has to make the best of what we go. We have been waiting for over 200 years, at some time a government will come along with the commitment to all Australians.

C2.2

National Indigenous radio service (NIRS)

Whilst I agree with the concept of NIRS, being a founding member and as chair of NIMAA I oversaw the setting up of the service. The service was separated out at a later date to give its own autonomy. In terms of membership following the recent activity of some of the people associated with IRCA I am having second thoughts about further opening NIRS to open slather member ship, recent changes to the governing committee now ensure representation nationally, in some regard this is a more representative model than AICA.

There are different models that could be applied to the programs that NIRS supplies to the sector, the current news service is OK but lacks a real indigenous perspective, this is a difficult issue to manage, as there is not always news coming out of the sector. Sport is a major program content contributor particularly the AFL. The AFL have been very helpful in their commitment to NIRS by providing broadcasting facilities alongside the Commercial stations, this single activity has done more to promote indigenous broadcasting then any other single event. The ABC and SBS programs on indigenous issues are not even in the same ballpark in terms of commitment as the commitment given by the AFL. As an example visit the AFL official web site and click on to NIRS.

From time to time programming has been criticised as being too much of CAAMA, 4AAA, or 4KIG this has come about by the stations becoming involved themselves and committing long streams of programming. The criticism is unnecessary with a grudge and an axe to grind, against a successful indigenous entity

NIRS is one of the leading projects undertaken by the Indigenous Grants Advisory Committee and the CBF board, and presents value for money for funding bodies and sponsors.

C2.3

Shared Responsibility Agreements (SRA's)

This form of agreements in my opinion should not be applied to broadcasting, simply because our licences are governed by the *Broadcasting Services Act* and the community radio codes of conduct.

This is where the department is in conflict with its own policy in terms of applying SRA's to broadcasting.

C2.4

Digital Conversion

The issue for indigenous communities is one of funding, what is the level of commitment, by the government to the conversion process in Indigenous broadcasting, if past history is anything to go by we will be waiting for a long time.

More of an issue for remote locations is access to satellite radio broadcasting when it happens, and to ensure that indigenous radio has a piece of the spectrum, the overall cost savings to be able to deliver radio to a car in the remotest locations opens up a new super highway for indigenous broadcasting.

Answers to Questions.

- B.1.2.1 *Equitable no unfair yes*
- B.1.2.2 *Multi year allows for better planning*
- B1.2.3 *I made the point in my paper that indigenous broadcasting is not a market economy it is governed by the rules under the community broadcasting act of 1992, and to ask the most disadvantaged people on earth to compete for funding is simply appalling*
- B 1.2.4 *The same issue arise under the proposal to establish a complete funding pool for festivals and the like.*
- B.1.2.5 *None,*
- B.2.3.1 *There needs to be a consistent audit done to establish what RIBS are getting for the money currently allocated, if broadcasting funds are being used to run other media programs, such as T/V maintenance then that could be a misuse of funds however if the present funds are genuine for RIBS electricity programming materials etc then it would be difficult to cut them off, a proper assessment needs to happen.*
- B.2.3.2 *Yes, if there is already funds allocated for that process, if not approach to councils to rectify and let them know of the changes.*
- B.2.3.3 *What content, if its programming content for radio then a better process maybe the IGAC committee of CBF would be a more appropriate body given their expertise in this area.*
- B.3.1 *yes,*
- B.4.1 *Most of the statements could be classified as motherhood and are meaningless without real commitment*
- C.1.1.1 *Employment will only increase if actions in this paper are considered*

- C.1.2.2 *Read the comments in this paper*
- C.1.1.2 *No, the IBP has only to release funding to Identified positions, it is not necessary for the IBP to take on the role of policeman*
- C.1.2.1 *Only if funds are made available and only if there is a process that guarantees that the funds are being used for the purpose of broadcasting, under my model for a national CDEP the situation would not arise as the people would be working directly for an agency station and not the local council, this ensures that the worker is not pulled away to do wiper snipping.*
- C.1.2.2 *By the RIBS coordinator under my model of RIMO structure*
- C.1.2.3 *My experience with CDEP on most Communities is that people are used all over the place and there is no consistency, it makes it difficult to hold any body at a RIBS as they are usually dragged away to do other things.*
- C.1.2.4 *No Idea*
- C.1.3.1 *Give people choice and fund it accordingly,*
- C 1.4.1 *Traineeships are best coordinated from an apprentice format or schools based, (see my paper*
- C.2.1.1 *Fund just one organisation, simply because of accountability, fund adequate staffing to run an effective secretariat*
- C.2.2 *NIRS can do anything the sector wants, with the adequate funding NIRS could become like radio national allocate NIRS a national broadcasting license and fund additional staff in the same way as SBS and ABS are funded to do national programs.*
- C.2.3.1 *Absolutely nothing, the concept of SRA's does not fit the broadcasting schedule in any way that is positive, it is welfare way of doing radio this is not welfare radio it is a vibrant part of Australia's broadcasting culture.*

Response to the Review of Indigenous Broadcasting Program

