

CHILDREN ON THE APY LANDS COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Part I The Inquiry

Establishment of the Inquiry

On 18 November 2004, the Commission of Inquiry Children in State Care (the CISC Inquiry) was established by the *Commission of Inquiry (Children in State Care) Act 2004*, (as it was then titled) and the Commissioner was appointed by the Governor to constitute that Commission.

The terms of reference of the CISC Inquiry related to allegations of sexual abuse of children in State care or criminal conduct that caused deaths of such children. That Inquiry commenced in December 2004 and had an extensive contact with Aboriginal persons in many parts of the State, including in some of the remote communities. In total ten Aboriginal communities were visited.

Although allegations were made to the CISC Inquiry that Aboriginal children in communities had been sexually abused, there was no evidence that these allegations came within the terms of reference of the CISC Inquiry because the children were not in State care.

On 26 June 2006, the Honourable Jay Weatherill, Minister for Families and Communities and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, attended a Summit on Violence and Child Abuse in Indigenous Communities. The Commonwealth Government convened the Summit which was attended by government ministers of all States and Territories. Counsel Assisting the CISC Inquiry, Mr Andrew Collett, accompanied the Minister to the Summit.

Minister Weatherill requested the Commissioner to prepare a proposal for a process to investigate sexual abuse of Aboriginal children modelled on the CISC Inquiry. By that time, a considerable body of evidence had been received that indicated sexual abuse of children in Aboriginal communities in various regions of the State.

The Summit, and subsequently the State and Commonwealth Governments, considered the CISC process. At the request of the Minister, the Commissioner and staff of the CISC Inquiry prepared a proposal for the investigation of sexual abuse of children in all Aboriginal communities in South Australia, including in remote areas.

Eventually the two governments decided that there be an inquiry into the sexual abuse of children on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands. On 26 June 2007, the Act was amended to establish the Commission of Inquiry Children on APY Lands. The Commissioner was appointed to constitute that Inquiry, which in this report is referred to as 'the Inquiry'. The title of the legislation was changed to the *Commission of Inquiry (Children in State Care and Children on APY Lands) Act 2004* (the Act).

It was expected the CISC Inquiry and the Inquiry would proceed contemporaneously. The amendments included section 4A, which provides (*inter alia*) that the Governor must appoint two Assistant Commissioners to assist in the conduct of the Inquiry, one of whom must be male and the other female and at least one of whom must be of Aboriginal descent. Mr Collett ceased his role in the CISC Inquiry and was appointed an Assistant Commissioner. He resigned as an Assistant Commissioner effective from 12 November 2007. A senior Aboriginal woman was appointed as the other Assistant Commissioner. For personal reasons she chooses not to be mentioned by her name. Pursuant to section 4A, the Assistant Commissioners could exercise all of the powers and functions of the Commissioner in accordance with an arrangement entered into with the Commissioner.

The Inquiry employed 22 staff over the course of the Inquiry. (See Appendix A for a list of staff.)

The Act was amended to provide that the Commissioner complete each Commission of Inquiry and prepare reports before 31 December 2007 or such later date as is nominated by the Governor. The time for completion of the CISC Inquiry was later extended to 31 March 2008 and the time for completion of the APY Lands Inquiry was extended to 30 April 2008.

The CISC Inquiry made a significant contribution to the Inquiry through the provision of administrative staff and resources, including premises, management, computer services, records management and research. Additional investigative, research and support staff were engaged and they were dedicated to the work of the Inquiry.

The scope of the Inquiry

The terms of reference are limited to sexual abuse of persons who were children on the APY Lands. Pursuant to Schedule 2 of the Act, 'APY Lands' means the lands vested in Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara under the *Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands Rights Act 1981* and are the lands described in Schedule 1 of that Act. In this report they are referred to as 'the Lands'. A map of the Lands appears in Appendix E of this report.

Schedule 1 of the Act defines 'APY community' as meaning a community resident on the Lands and 'a child on the APY Lands' as meaning a child who is a member of an APY community and resident on the Lands.

Pursuant to section 3 of the Act, 'child' means a person under 18 years of age. Clause 3 of Schedule 2 provides that the Inquiry is to relate (and only to relate) to sexual abuse occurring before the commencement of the Schedule which is 26 June 2007 when the amendments to the Act

establishing the Inquiry and the terms of reference came into operation.

'Sexual abuse' is defined in Schedule 2 of the Act as meaning conduct that would, if proven, constitute a sexual offence. 'Sexual offence' is defined in section 3 of the Act as meaning a sexual offence within the meaning of section 4 of the *Evidence Act 1929*. The *Evidence Act* defines the term 'sexual offence' to mean rape, indecent assault, any offence involving unlawful sexual intercourse or an act of gross indecency, incest, any offence involving sexual exploitation or abuse of a child, or exploitation of a child as an object of prurient interest; or any attempt to commit, or assault with intent to commit, any of those offences. Some of the sexual offences as defined by the *Evidence Act* as at 26 June 2007 have changed in name, description or penalty over time in accordance with various amendments to the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*. (See Appendix B for a legal analysis of the changes.)

Section 5 of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* states 'a person under the age of 10 years cannot commit an offence'.¹ The view adopted by the Inquiry is that section 5 relates only to criminal responsibility and it does not deal with the descriptive conduct of a sexual act by a child, for the purposes of this Inquiry. Consequently, if a person under the age of 10 years commits a sexual act upon another person of the nature defined as a sexual offence, that conduct constitutes sexual abuse even though no criminal responsibility can attach to the perpetrator.

Approach of the Inquiry

In conducting the Inquiry the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners were not bound by any rules or practices as to procedure or evidence and could inform themselves in such manner as

¹ See *Field & Anor v Gent* (1996) 67 SASR 122 at 128. At common law, as modified by s 5, there is the presumption that a person between the ages of 10 years and 14 years is doli incapax, lacking capacity to commit an offence. This presumption is rebuttable upon proof, not only of the actus reus and any necessary mens rea, but also that the person had sufficient capacity, namely knowledge that, according to the principles of ordinary people, he (or she) was doing wrong: *R v M* (1977) 16 SASR 589; *C v Director of Public Prosecutions* [1996] 1 AC 1.

thought fit: section 5(1)(a). They were obliged to take all reasonable steps to avoid prejudicing any criminal investigation or prosecution: section 5(1)(f). In conducting the Inquiry they were to take evidence in private but conduct any part of the proceedings (including taking of evidence) in public if it was considered in the public interest to do so: section 5(2) and (3). They were obliged to comply with any request by a person providing evidence or information, or making submissions to the Inquiry that it be received in private: section 5(4). There was no specific request, but all evidence and submissions were received in private although some information was received in meetings attended by the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners.

Pursuant to section 9(5) the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners were required in the conduct of the Inquiry and in this report to take all reasonable steps to avoid the disclosure of information that may identify, or lead to the identification of:

- a person who has been, or is alleged to have been, the victim of a sexual offence while a child; or
- a person who has committed, or who is alleged to have committed, a sexual offence against a child, if the interests of justice so require; or
- a person who has provided information about a sexual offence, or suspected sexual offence, against a child if the public interest so requires.

Section 10 allowed for the provision of information of the commission, or alleged commission, of a sexual offence to the Commissioner of Police pursuant to an arrangement established with him. Such an arrangement has been made with the Commissioner of Police in the context of the CISC Inquiry. No persons alleged that they had been sexually abused as a child on the Lands, so no

information received by the Inquiry was provided to the Commissioner of Police.

Section 8 (1)(a) of the Act provides that the Minister must, after consultation with the Commissioner, appoint or engage a person with appropriate qualifications and experience in social work or social administration to assist the conduct of the Inquiry. That consultation occurred in the CISC Inquiry and the Minister appointed Ms Judith Cross, the Chief Executive Officer of Relationships Australia (SA). As no disclosures of sexual abuse were made during the Inquiry, Ms Cross was not required to assist by arranging the provision of services to persons who had been sexually abused on the Lands, but she did provide assistance to the Inquiry in other ways.

This report does not name persons, with some exceptions, who gave assistance, evidence or information to the Inquiry whether Anangu or senior workers of government and non-government agencies. Such an approach is to minimise, as far as possible, any risk of retribution being directed towards them by any person who for some reason may have a sense of grievance however unjustified. The Inquiry heard evidence of some incidents of serious violent criminal conduct in a few communities against persons who had provided information about child sexual abuse prior to the commencement of the Inquiry. Evidence also was received of other violence in communities and threatening behaviour towards Anangu and non-Anangu. In the few instances where persons giving evidence have been identified, it seemed clear that there is no real risk of intimidation.

Clause (2)(a) of the terms of reference provides that a purpose of the Inquiry is to select communities on the Lands to form the focus of the Inquiry. In the proposal prepared by the Commissioner in July 2006 for the State and

Commonwealth Governments for the investigation of allegations of sexual abuse of Aboriginal children, 17 communities in South Australia were identified. The experience of the CISC Inquiry was that it was likely that there was a high incidence of sexual abuse of Aboriginal children in many of those communities and it would be unlikely that widespread disclosure would be readily made. Considerable time would be required to enable victims and survivors to develop confidence in themselves and the Inquiry to make disclosure. Investigation of allegations could be lengthy.

It was decided to undertake field trips to the Lands to inform as many Anangu and other persons living on the Lands about the Inquiry and its terms of reference and purposes. The suggestion had been made to the Inquiry that a few communities on the Lands should be selected to enable the Inquiry to be completed within the allotted time hence the clause 2(a). It was decided that the Assistant Commissioners and staff would visit all of the major communities on the Lands and, in consultation with the Commissioner, make appropriate assessments before deciding which communities, if any, could, or should, form the focus of the Inquiry. Despite repeated visits to the communities and the receiving of considerable information about the high incidence of sexual abuse of children on the Lands, not one victim or survivor disclosed to the Inquiry that he or she had been sexually abused as a child. For this reason, it was decided not to focus on a few communities but to consider all of the communities when addressing the terms of reference and the purposes of the Inquiry.

The terms of reference require that conclusions be made about particular matters, including the incidence and the nature and extent of sexual abuse of children on the Lands. In reaching the necessary conclusions, the test that has been

applied is whether it is reasonably possible that the evidence and information does establish the existence of sexual abuse and, if so, to what extent.

Process of the Inquiry

It was obvious from the outset that most of the evidence and information relevant to the terms of reference would be available only on the Lands. It was decided the Assistant Commissioners and staff should undertake field trips to the Lands and locations near to the Lands, such as Alice Springs, Marla, Coober Pedy and Port Augusta. The Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners also received evidence in Adelaide.

Field trips

During the period from 19 June 2007 to 26 October 2007, the Inquiry undertook five field trips to the Lands. The Assistant Commissioners participated in all of the trips. The Commissioner attended part of the last trip. His availability for the field work was restricted by his conduct of the CISC Inquiry. The first of the field trips occurred shortly before the amendments to the Act that established the Inquiry because of the immense tasks indicated by the proposed terms of reference and the time limit imposed for the completion of the Inquiry.

The field trips were necessary in order to contact as many people as possible in view of the remoteness of the communities on the Lands and the practical inability of Anangu to travel to provide evidence and information to the Inquiry.

During each of the trips the Assistant Commissioners and the staff were based at Umuwa, the administrative centre of the Lands, and travelled to communities on a daily basis; except on two occasions when they stayed at Amata and Pipalyatjara.

Part I The Inquiry

Each of the main communities were visited – Iwantja (Indulkana), Mimili, Kaltjiti (Fregon), Pukatja (Ernabella), Yunyarinyi (Kenmore Park), Amata, Nyapari and Kalka. The Inquiry also visited the following homelands: Tupul, Black Hill No. 3, Black Hill No. 2, Granite Downs, Railway Bore, Pututja, Wallany, Walyinynga (Cave Hill) and Amaralytja. The Assistant Commissioners and the staff remained in the communities and homelands each day for lengthy periods to enable the members of the communities to become familiar with them and not to feel threatened or uncomfortable by their presence. They explained to as many people as possible the role of the Inquiry and its terms of reference and purposes.

The Inquiry established the manner in which welfare, health, education and police services were provided on the Lands and the manner of government of the Lands and the communities. The provision of those four services to the Lands is discussed in Part IV of the report.

It was understood that Anangu who had been sexually abused as children on the Lands, or who had knowledge of the sexual abuse of others, would very likely be reluctant to disclose the abuse. Every effort was made to give the victims and survivors of sexual abuse the confidence in themselves and in the Inquiry to make disclosure.

Submissions and evidence

During the field trips the Inquiry had meetings with:

- teachers at every school
- Aboriginal education workers (AEW) at Murputja, Iwantja (Indulkana), Amata, Mimili, Kaltjiti (Fregon) and Pukatja (Ernabella) and a general meeting of most of them with the Commissioner at Umuwa

- medical practitioners and nursing staff from each full time Nganampa Health Council Inc (Nganampa) clinic
- Aboriginal health workers at the clinics
- police officers living on the Lands and at Marla
- Families SA personnel at Coober Pedy
- NPY Women's Council in Alice Springs
- Minyma (older women) from across the Lands at a meeting near Pukatja (Ernabella)
- groups of women at Mimili, Pukatja (Ernabella), Kaltjiti (Fregon) and Ulapinipina with women from Iwantja (Indulkana)
- senior men from across the Lands at a meeting near Umuwa
- community councils of Pipalyatjara, Amata, Kaltjiti (Fregon), Mimili and Iwantja (Indulkana)
- Nganampa Chairperson and some executive members
- staff and some members of the AP Executive Board.

The Pukatja (Ernabella) community did not agree to, or arrange, a meeting with the Inquiry despite a leader having been requested to do so.

The Inquiry requested the people it met with to encourage others to provide information to the Inquiry. Mr Collett and a member of staff spoke, in an informal setting, to students and staff at Wiltja College and Residence. They are facilities for children and young persons from the Lands and other communities to undertake education at Woodville High School in suburban Adelaide.

The Assistant Commissioners also spoke to individual women in family centres, art centres and elsewhere in communities and the municipal service officers to encourage people to contact the Inquiry.

In all, the Inquiry held 147 meetings that involved 246 people. Of these meetings, 109 were held during the field trips. Four meetings were held in Marla, three in Coober Pedy and the remainder on the Lands. Fourteen meetings were held in Alice Springs and 23 in Adelaide. During one field trip, the Inquiry attended a bush women's meeting where about 100 women were present and a Strategies for Managing Abusive Related Trauma (SMART) Program conference at Alice Springs where 20 school teachers, Aboriginal Education Workers and counsellors attended.

The Inquiry received evidence from 70 witnesses which was taken on the Lands, in Adelaide, Port Augusta, Alice Springs and Coober Pedy. See Appendix C.

Also the Inquiry was informed by the evidence received by the CISC Inquiry from witnesses who had worked on the Lands, or otherwise had knowledge of the sexual abuse of children on the Lands and the general living conditions on the Lands.

Submissions were sought from 50 persons and organisations with knowledge and experience of Anangu affairs on the Lands, including the chairpersons of five of the community councils, the chairperson of the APY Executive, the chairpersons of 12 of the smaller communities and State Government departments and agencies. Some responded with written submissions or evidence, or both, and some did not respond at all. However, the submissions received have greatly assisted the Inquiry. See Appendix D for a list of written submissions received by the Inquiry.

In order to satisfy the terms of reference, Schedule 2, Section 2 (c) and (d) of the *Commission of Inquiry (Children in State Care and Children on the APY Lands) Act 2004*, the Inquiry had to request

records from various government and non-government organisations. As part of its investigations, the Inquiry made 109 requests for records from government and non-government organisations and individuals to:

- examine incidents or allegations of sexual abuse of children on the APY Lands
- obtain either current or historical information about children where allegations of sexual abuse were made and the communities on the APY Lands where the alleged sexual abuse occurred.

Seventy seven (71%) of the records requests were made to government departments or agencies, whilst 32 (29%) were made to private organisations or individuals. Of the government records requests made by the Inquiry, 48% were made to the SA Police, and 38% were made to Families SA. A total of 346 records were received and housed by the Inquiry in response to the 109 record requests. Of these, 314 records came from government departments or agencies and 32 records originated from private organisations.

The Inquiry was aware that it must keep records in good order² and in the same order³; use them only for the purposes of the Inquiry's investigations and return them when requested or at the end of the Inquiry. The Inquiry was also aware of its obligation not to lose or abuse records, endanger their security or integrity, and not to show or distribute them to a third party.

The Inquiry also reviewed files at other premises. As a result of the subpoena process to Nganampa, the Inquiry inspected 408 files relating to children where:

- mandatory reports of children relating to sexual abuse had been made,
- underage pregnancies had been recorded

² *State Records Act 1997*, s. 13.

³ *Evidence Act 1929*, ss. 34C(1), 45A

- third party allegations of sexual abuse had been made against a child, and
- children had been tested for a sexually transmitted infection and a positive result had been made.

The 408 Nganampa files were viewed confidentially at Umuwa. The Inquiry also viewed files at the Coober Pedy District Centre of Families SA, Port Augusta and Coober Pedy CIB, the Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (NPY) Women's Council (Aboriginal Corporation) in Alice Springs and the Mimili Community School.

A description of the Lands

The Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people and their country are often referred to by anthropologists and linguists as being part of the Western Desert cultural bloc, a region covering some 600,000 square kilometres within South Australia, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Western Desert people share similarities in traditional laws and customs, especially language.

The Lands are part of the Western Desert and are in the far north-west of South Australia, in and around the Musgrave Ranges. The Lands cover about 102,360 square kilometres (about one-tenth of the State's land area). The northern boundary of the Lands is the border between South Australia and the Northern Territory. The western boundary is the border between South Australia and Western

Australia. The southern boundary is the border between the Lands and the Maralinga Tjarutja Lands on the western side and the Woomera Prohibited Area on the eastern side. The Stuart Highway intersects the eastern boundary. The map in Appendix E shows the location of the Lands in the State.

Aṅangu own and administer the Lands. Aṅangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) is a body corporate pursuant to the *APY Land Rights Act 1981* and all Aṅangu are members of APY.⁴ There must be an annual general meeting of APY every calendar year. The governing body of APY is the Executive Board of 10 members elected by Aṅangu in accordance with provisions of the *APY Land Rights Act*. The Board is responsible for carrying out the functions of APY and the day-to-day business of APY.

The *APY Land Rights Act 1981* allows all Aṅangu to have unrestricted rights of access to the Lands. Generally speaking, all other people require a permit to enter the Lands. A person who is not Aṅangu who enters the Lands without permission is guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty. The Act provides various exemptions such as for police, Members of Parliament, Electoral Commissioner and in cases of emergency.

The Lands are a dry area. A person must not sell or supply or consume or possess alcoholic liquor on the Lands. The law provides for a maximum penalty of \$50,000 or 10 year's imprisonment.

⁴ The functions of APY are set out in section 6(1) of that Act as:

- a) to ascertain the wishes and opinions of traditional owners in relation to the management, use and control of the lands and to seek, where practicable, to give effect to those wishes and opinions; and
- b) to protect the interests of traditional owners in relation to the management, use and control of the lands; and
- c) to negotiate with persons desiring to use, occupy or gain access to any part of the lands; and
- d) to administer land vested in Aṅangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara.

Population and demographics of the Lands

The population of the Lands varies from time to time and season to season and depending upon activities such as traditional meetings and sporting events. Also population figures vary due to uneven levels of participation in various data-gathering initiatives, literacy levels and migration to and from the Lands. Nganampa conducts an annual population survey. Nganampa is an Aboriginal organisation that provides health services on the Lands through health clinics in all the main communities. Its 2006 survey indicates a total population of 2,734; with the female population being slightly higher than the male. That survey indicated that 34 per cent of the population was aged 15 years or less and only nine per cent of the population was aged over 55 years. The 2006 Census conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics⁵ showed a lower total population of 2,224. Nganampa conducts its annual survey of the population on the Lands shortly before it undertakes a screening program for STIs (sexually transmitted infections). The 2007 Nganampa STI

survey indicated that there were 1,047 people living on the Lands aged 17 years or under. Table 1 indicates the number of children in each age group. The majority are female.

Table 1 Child population (0 - 17yrs) of APY Lands as at April 2007

Age group (years)	Number of children as at 1 April 2007
0 to 5	339
6 to 10	266
11 to 15	318
16	55
17	69
TOTAL:	1 047

Source: Nganampa Health STI Prevention Program, 2007

Information supplied to the Inquiry shows that the communities with the highest number of residents (including those living in the nearby homelands who utilise the communities' services and facilities) are represented in Table 2.

Table 2 Number of residents in communities

	Amata	Kaltjiti	Iwantja	Mimili	Pipalyatjara	Pukatja	Kalka	Total
Population	485	297	456	261	160	675	145	2,479
Median Age	25	25	20	21	20	22	21	
Mean household size	6.8	6.0	5.3	7.6	4.4	7.7	8.7	

Source: AP Services and handout from TKP dated 2006 as given to AP Services.

⁵ According to Australian Bureau of Statistics 2006 Census figures:

- Australia's Indigenous population is 455,016; and
- South Australia's Indigenous population is 25,556.

The 2006 Census figures show that 2,230 persons live on the Lands, of which 1,885 (84.5%) identified themselves as Indigenous. Of those 1,885 Indigenous persons usually resident on the Lands,

- 48.8% were males; and
- 51.2% were females.

Of the total population of the Lands, 84.5% were Indigenous persons compared with 2.3% Indigenous persons in Australia. The Census figures indicate that the Indigenous population aged:

- under 15 was 30.7%;
- over 55 was 9.6%.

Also information was provided as to populations of smaller communities and homelands. There are 110 homelands established on the Lands but only about one-third of them are occupied on a regular basis. A homeland is a location away from communities where families of Anangu and others live.

Table 3 sets out the major services and facilities at the major communities and Watarru and Yunyarinyi (Kenmore Park), which are smaller communities with populations of about 97 and 33 people respectively. During the course of the Inquiry, information was received as to the facilities and services at each of the communities. Municipal Service Officers (MSOs) are administrators employed by community councils in the communities. In each of these communities there is a community council which is, or should be, elected on a regular basis by the members of the community. They are administrators and live in the communities. The MSOs undertake the day-to-day administration of the communities and are subject to the control of the councils. Essential service officers assist in the day to day running of the communities.

Each of the communities has a school and a store from which food and other essentials may be purchased by Anangu.

The following tables were prepared for a meeting of Tjungungku Kuranyukutu Palyantjaku (TKP) a body established in 2005 by the State Government and the Commonwealth Government which is mentioned in Part III of this report.

The information about police community constables is no longer current in that there are now only three of them, including one person who is on extended sick leave.

The main communities on the Lands are a substantial distance apart. There are no sealed roads or public transport. Many of the roads are in poor condition. There are airfields for small aircraft at or near most major communities but only the airfield at Amata is sealed and suitable for all weather use.

Table 3 Services and facilities at some of the major communities on the Lands

	Amata	Kaltjiti (Fregon)	Iwantja (Indulkana)	Mimili	Pipalyatjara	Pukatja (Ernabella)	Kalka	Watarru	Yunyarinyi (Kenmore Park)
Municipal Services Officer	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Essential Services Officer	•	•	•	•	•	•			
Store	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
School Enrolments	75	40	82	73	60	88	-	18	23
Police Station	planned	-	-	-	-	planned	-	-	-
Police Community Constables	1	-	1 (On sick leave)	-	1	1	-	-	-
Swimming Pool	•	-	-	•	•	-	-	-	-
Youth Shed	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Youth Program / Worker	•	• (Vacant)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Art Centre	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Community Housing ^A	34 33 ^B	63 14 ^C (Note 4)	42 5 ^E 20 ^F	36 4 ^C 7 ^F	23 22 habitable	46 30 ^F	14	15	8
Aged Care Facilities	Kitchen	•	•	-	-	• Respite	•	Kitchen	
Families SA social worker	•		•						
Health Clinic	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Meals Program for Aged (HACC)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Environmental Health Worker	•			•		•	•		
Bush Tucker Enterprise	•			•					
Family/Women's Centre	•	•			•	•			•
Social Welfare Officer	•								
TAFE Centre	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Serviced by Pipalyatjara	Serviced by Pukatja
AnTEP Centre*	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•

Sources: include data from APY Services, ABS Census 2001, information from Attorney-General's Office, a draft report prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff on community housing and infrastructure, and information obtained from field interviews conducted by APY Commission of Inquiry, 2007.

^A 2005 data - excludes Govt and Community staff housing

^B of good standard

^C to be demolished

^D most of the rest in poor condition

^E are uninhabitable

^F need major upgrade

* Anangu Tertiary Education Program

Assistance from State Government departments

The Inquiry sought and obtained assistance from the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division (AARD) of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC), South Australia Police (SA Police), Department for Education and Children's Services (DECS), Department for Families and Communities (DFC) and Families SA.

DFC provided information as sought by the Inquiry. The District Centre of Families SA at Coober Pedy provided information and made files relating to mandatory reporting, which is discussed later, available to the Inquiry. Also staff with relevant information were made available to the Inquiry and DFC and Families SA made submissions to the Inquiry.

AARD co-ordinated meetings with appropriate staff of State Government departments relevant to the terms of reference of the Inquiry and provided advice as to witnesses and how to locate them. It arranged accommodation for the Commissioner, Assistant Commissioners and staff at Umuwa. Its own four-wheel drive vehicles were available for use during field trips.

SA Police provided access to police files and records and witnesses to the Inquiry. These witnesses included two Assistant Commissioners, the former officer in charge of the Sexual Crime Investigation Branch, senior police officers responsible for police work on the Lands and a member of the Paedophile Task Force who had recently conducted an investigation of an allegation of child sexual abuse at one of the communities on the Lands. SA Police also made an extensive and valuable submission to the Inquiry.

DECS also provided considerable assistance to the Inquiry by arranging meetings with principals, teachers and AEWs at most communities.

The Assistant Commissioners and staff of the Inquiry had meetings with staff of Families SA at Coober Pedy, members of the NPY Women's Council in Alice Springs, the Nganampa Council Executive, some AP Executive Board members and staff. The Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner Collett met with AEWs from the communities at Umuwa and with the Community Council at Amata. Also the Inquiry received evidence from health professionals and other staff of Nganampa, a submission from Nganampa and access to many patient files.