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8 Existing Environment - Social Aspects

8.1 Introduction

WDRL have commenced the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) of this proposed project. The pre EIS stages of the SIA seek to identify pre-existing social conditions, as well as understanding pre-project concerns, benefits and opportunities as perceived by key stakeholders and communities.

Importantly, WDRL intend to continue to undertake SIA studies throughout the life of the project. This process will inform WDRL about the actual and perceived impacts (both positive and negative) that the project may have on communities and stakeholders, thereby allowing for the revision of activities or strategies to improve the outcomes for all involved.

A detailed community profile and desktop baseline study was conducted prior to stakeholder consultations to help inform the development of the consultation and engagement strategy. This is detailed in Appendix G.

8.2 Stakeholder Consultation

The Stakeholder Consultation Report presented as Appendix H provides a detailed overview of results collected during consultation with community and key stakeholders, undertaken as part of the SIA for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as part of the proposed WDRL Roper Bar Iron Ore Project (the Project).

Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the requirements and objectives stated in the Northern Territory (NT) Government’s Department of Natural Resources, Environment, the Arts and Sport (NRETAS) Draft EIS Guidelines released on 5 March 2012.

The purpose of consultation was to provide information to regulatory agencies, to inform the public of the scope, impacts and possible mitigation measures of the proposed Project, and to facilitate genuine feedback from communities and stakeholders potentially impacted or benefited by the proposed Project.

Stakeholder engagement and consultation is an essential element in the EIS process. The consultation undertaken followed an all-inclusive, equitable and comprehensive approach to information sharing/feedback gathering with results contributing (where appropriate) to the design of the Project.

The goal of the community and stakeholder consultation conducted during this period was to facilitate the sharing of information and to also encourage community feedback with a view to engaging and collaborating with identified community members and key stakeholders during the EIS process. Table 8.1 provides an outline of the engagement objectives established to underpin the community consultation process, together with the results achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Objective</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involve as many people as possible in the consultation process (12th Feb – 24th Feb)</td>
<td>76 people were involved in the consultation process, many on more than one occasion. This group included a wide cross section of stakeholders in the community. While some constraints were experienced within the community, alternative arrangements were able to be scheduled on most occasions. A variety of consultation tools were offered to ensure cultural sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-1: Stakeholder engagement objectives
The average length of consultation meeting was one (1) hour reflecting the comprehensive nature of the subject matter discussed.

Use consultation results to help inform proposed Project decision making, ensuring community and stakeholder concerns are addressed

Work with the community to understand and look at ways to reduce identified project risks and enhance benefits and opportunities

Results from the consultation program have been regularly communicated to the WDRL EIS Project team for consideration in further project studies. An example of this can be seen when consultation undertaken during 2011 revealed some stakeholders were not supportive of the Maria Island transport option and as a result WDRL began investigating the feasibility of a private haul road alternative.

The importance of the consultation program as part of the Social Impact Assessment is reflected in the detailed report submitted as part of the EIS documentation (Appendix G).

Use consultation to continue to build mutually beneficial relationships between the community and WDRL built on trust and respect

Feedback during consultation was favourable regarding the extent of engagement conducted and the involvement of WDRL’s community relations team of Noel Tomes and Conway Bush.

The outcomes of the consultation process will play a key role in the development of a social benefits scheme (or similar).

**Location of consultation**

Consultation took place at four major Indigenous settlements within the Gulf region of the Northern Territory including Borroloola, Minyerri, Ngukurr and Numbulwar. Each of these settlements share traditional ties to land intended for mining.

**Methodology**

To ensure an all-inclusive, equitable and comprehensive approach to information sharing and feedback collection, two stages of consultation were conducted:

**Table 8-2: Stages of Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Commencement date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1 – To Inform and Consult</strong>&lt;br&gt;Community and stakeholders informed about the proposed Project and EIS process, and consulted on their thoughts and feelings</td>
<td>February 2012 (this stage followed on from eight months of consultation, engagement and communication from June 2011) and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIS submitted</strong></td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 – To Inform, Consult, Involve and Collaborate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Community and stakeholders provided with feedback on Stage 1 consultation together with an opportunity to become involved in mitigation steps moving forward. WDRL to continue working closely with community and stakeholders for the life of the Project</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Stakeholder Consultation Report presented as Appendix H focuses on the consultation activities undertaken during Stage 1 (Inform and Consult) in February 2012 following the International Association for Public Participation’s (IAP2) public participation spectrum best practice approach to communication.
and consultation. Stage 1 involved informing and consulting with the community to ensure they understood the proposed Project and the EIS process.

All community members and stakeholders were encouraged to give open feedback about their views and concerns for the proposed Project, and openly discuss the issues and opportunities they saw as being related to the Project.

Following submission of the EIS, WDRL will launch Stage 2 (Inform, Consult, Involve and Collaborate). This stage involves working with community and key stakeholders on the issues, benefits, concerns and opportunities identified during Stage 1, and developing workable management, mitigation and enhancement measures to address these.

Stage 2 will be implemented similar to a continuous improvement model whereby consultation will play a key role in the project communication and engagement moving forward. This consultation loop will ensure programs and initiatives implemented by WDRL, such as a potential social benefit package, will remain relevant to the community and reflect social and government changes that may impact its success.

This whole-of-life approach began in June 2011 with the appointment of Jane Munday, of Michels Warren Munday, to the WDRL project team. During the eight month period leading up to the community consultation period (Stage 1) beginning February 2012, responses to engagement were incorporated into the final project scope and design as appropriate demonstrating true consultation. Stage 2 will continue for the life of the proposed Project.

The consultation reports (Appendix H1 – H3) capture the engagement and consultation conducted from the 12th to the 24th February 2012 (Stage 1) however it is important to acknowledge the previous engagement and consultation work conducted by WDRL and consultant Jane Munday during 2011 as playing a key role in ensuring community and key stakeholders had a prior knowledge and understanding of the proposed Project.

An overview of consultation activities undertaken during Stage 1 is provided below:

- A total of 76 individuals were consulted on a one-to-one basis, with a number consulted more than once throughout the process;
- Stakeholder groups included, but were not limited to, Traditional Owners, local Indigenous groups, Local Reference Groups (LRG), and government and non-government groups;
- The majority of consultation took place via private meetings, set up via outgoing phone calls, indicating consultation was individualised, took into account cultural requirements and allowed for privacy; and
- A number of meetings took place on sacred land where members of the consultation team were specifically invited by Traditional Owners. This was to ensure the consultation team respected the importance of culture and conducted themselves accordingly.

**Key findings**

Consultation involved an intensive period of one-on-one and focus group-style sessions with community and stakeholders to gain an understanding of their thoughts and feelings towards the proposed Project (both positive and negative) and also their vision for the future of their community. These meetings were formal and informal and were supported by visual aids to encourage involvement. Key areas of interest included:

- Employment and training opportunities;
- Infrastructure provision, specifically road access;
- Youth opportunities;
- Protection of Indigenous culture; and
• Establishment of a social benefits scheme or community benefits trust.

Consultation revealed common themes of discussion were raised in each of the four communities of Borroloola, Minyerri, Ngukurr and Numbulwar. It was clear to the consultation team that over past years, these communities had developed a vision for what they wanted for their community and for their young people, and this vision dictated the direction of most engagement discussions.

The consultation results demonstrated the township of Borroloola was a little more progressive in terms of identified opportunities and concerns. This can be attributed to the experience and exposure Borroloola has had over the past 15 years to other resources projects which have enabled the town to become acutely aware of the benefits, opportunities, issues and potential threats of mining projects.

For the communities of Minyerri, Ngukurr and Numbulwar, the focus was on employment generation and training opportunities. There was a clear and determined sense of empowerment in these communities as they saw the proposed Project as an opportunity they should capitalise on and that they want to drive and play a key role in their future and the future of their community.

The feedback and discussion from all communities reflected future-focused towns looking to capitalise on opportunities.

Employment and training opportunities were a key area of interest for representatives across the four communities. While the potential for local Indigenous employment and training was seen as a positive both for the future of the communities and also at an individual level, this topic of discussion also raised some concerns. Specifically, social issues within the community, particularly in relation to the availability of accommodation/housing, humbugging and the negative impacts of increased disposable income (e.g. alcohol and substance abuse).

Social cohesion was also raised as a potential negative as accommodation and humbugging issues sometimes result in the employee choosing to leave the community and undertake alternative arrangements (e.g. Fly-in Fly-out [FIFO]).

Another topic of interest related to current road condition in terms of driver safety and access, particularly during the wet season. Consultation revealed road maintenance was a key concern for community members, with the recent wet season highlighted as contributing to the current degraded state of the roads in the region. While it was widely understood during consultation that the NT Government was responsible for the maintenance of the road system, there was strong advocacy for WDRL to work with government and encourage them to address the current road situation.

The 164km haul road from the proposed mine to the loading facility was discussed during consultation, however did not raise significant concerns, specifically community representatives were in favour of the haul road option being investigated, replacing the original Maria Island pipeline proposal. While the use of the proposed haul road has been deemed for project use only (i.e. not for local use), it was explained to the communities that at the end of the mine life, the haul road could possibly be handed over to the NT Government.

Other topics raised included the need for youth opportunities and activities, protection of cultural heritage and the establishment of a social benefits scheme or community benefits trust.

Table 8-3 provides an outline of the number of times a topic of interest was raised by each stakeholder group. For example, for community organisations, the most frequently raised area of interest was youth opportunities followed by the employment and cultural heritage.
### Table 8-3: Areas of interest raised by stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Number of stakeholders in stakeholder group</th>
<th>Number of events with stakeholder group</th>
<th>Accommodation and housing</th>
<th>Bing Bong</th>
<th>Construction impacts</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Cultural heritage</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment and training</th>
<th>Environment - air</th>
<th>Environment - flora and fauna</th>
<th>Environment - land</th>
<th>Environment - water</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Humbugging</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Procurement</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Royalties and compensation</th>
<th>Social enterprise</th>
<th>Traffic and Roads</th>
<th>Youth opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business owner / manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group member</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General community member</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional owner</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government: Local</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government: State/Territory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government: Federal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Ngukurr</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Numbulwar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Minyerri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community: Borroloola</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is clear from these observations that overall, employment was the primary area of interest for all stakeholder groups across the four communities and WDRL was seen as a means to delivering these opportunities.

**Future stakeholder engagement**

Potential benefits and opportunities identified during consultation related to increased employment and training opportunities, the establishment of a social benefits scheme to help secure the future longevity and sustainability of the communities, and the introduction of activities and opportunities for youth.

Ongoing engagement with the four communities of Borroloola, Minyerri, Ngukurr and Numbulwar will continue throughout the EIS public notification period and for the life of the project to ensure people are informed about progress and provided with ongoing opportunities to provide feedback.

### 8.3 Cultural, spiritual, historic and other values

The consultation team asked Traditional Owners and potentially impacted Indigenous stakeholders generic questions regarding potential impacts, positive or negative, that they think this project may have on a wide range of topics including potential cultural and/or spiritual values. This question was purposely broad so people could discuss perceived impacts on any topic, places of historic and other cultural significance. However, as detailed in Appendix G, the only potential cultural impact raised was that of potential impact on ceremony. There was no mention of, or potential concern about, areas or sites of cultural significance or environmental or other values.

There was significant discussion around cultural/spiritual values relating to ceremony. This featured heavily across the communities consulted with, and was one of the equal top discussion points in Minyerri (18%).

The AAPA Certificate identifies sacred sites and areas to be avoided by the project. The avoidance of these important sites by the project activities is one possible reason for the lack of concern about potential impacts to cultural sites.

Archaeology Surveys for the Mining and associated areas including the Haul Road have been completed and reports are presented at Appendices I and J. The mine site survey report details are briefly summarised here. The consultant archaeologist was required to identify and record any archaeological sites or artefacts likely to be impacted by the proposed construction of an iron ore mine. Six archaeological background scatters of stone artefacts and three isolated stone artefacts were found. The development proposes to mine the sandstone ridges in Area E (north and south), Area F (east and west) and to produce a spoil dump east of a tributary (referred to in this report as Towns Creek) of Towns River in Area F (Pit 1). Mining will not impact on the finds, but the spoil heap between Area E (north) and area E (south), should avoid encroaching upon Towns Creek as delineated in the report.

The second Archaeology report details an archaeological survey of the proposed haul road between the proposed iron ore mine and existing port facilities at Bing Bong. The archaeologist was required to identify and record any archaeological sites or artefacts likely to be impacted by the proposed haul road and to suggest mitigation measures that would either avoid or minimise the impact the development would have on cultural heritage along the route.

Eight archaeological sites, including stone artefact scatters and rock art sites, were found. A 100m corridor was surveyed at major waterways, minor creeks and drainage channels. Construction of the proposed haul road should not deviate more than this specified distance, as more sites are likely to be found at lagoons, billabongs and on riverbanks. The art sites discovered during this survey are unique to the haul road route and should be avoided.

Indigenous stakeholders did not identify any areas of particular interest apart from those sacred sites identified in the AAPA Certificate. Mention of generic types of landscapes that provide productive hunting and gathering and related activities did occur but no potential impact to these sites was identified.
Non-indigenous people have had some opportunities to provide comment on the project and the current project proposal has removed many of the potential impacts to the users of this remote recreation area.

The declaration of the Limmen National Park may provide the opportunity for more people to access and use the area and its natural values. There have been two potential risks identified associated with impacts on people:

1. The proposed haul road and the fact it crosses the Savannah Way and may pass by areas that people utilise. This will provide a potential noise disturbance as well as some other potential impacts during construction such as increased dust.

2. The potential risk is to water resources, as mining activities create a disturbance and therefore potentially impact offsite water quality which may then impact recreational fishermen. This potential issue is addressed in the project Environmental Management Plans. The project is unlikely to impact commercial fishing activities.

### 8.4 Socioeconomic Impacts

In early 2011 WDRL commissioned Social Compass to assist in developing the social components of the EIS for the Roper Bar Iron Ore Project.

The first stage of the Western Desert Roper Bar project (Figure 8.1) requires:

- The establishment of a Mining Lease Application (MLA) for the mine site and camp site;
- Construction of a private sealed haul road, 164km long and crossing crown and leasehold land to the Port of Bing Bong; and
- Construction of a storage area and use of a loading facility at the existing Port of Bing Bong (developed and managed by Xstrata).

Over the longer time frame, WDRL intends to further explore the potential to mine other areas within a number of exploration areas. The original exploration area covered 2500km² (which has been reduced) and features approximately 100km² of known ore.

WDRL’s MLA and part of the proposed haul road are located within the former cattle station of St Vidgeons (NT portion 00819). This area is designated as crown lease and has recently been declared a National Park (currently completing a 60 day public consultation period). The haul road crosses a number of pastoral leases and ends at Bing Bong on the Gulf of Carpentaria. The first three nautical miles out from the territorial sea baseline (low water mark) is governed by the Northern Territory Government. Beyond this distance, the ocean is governed by the Australian Federal Government.

In April 2012 the Northern Territory Government’s Department for Natural Resources, Environment, the Arts and Sport (NRETAS) provided *Guidelines for Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS) for the Roper Bar Iron Ore Project. This part of the EIS addresses the *Socioeconomics* aspects of the Guidelines. Importantly, the development of the Roper bar Iron Ore Project has potential impact (both positive and negative) on the residents and stakeholders of four communities and their surrounds, those being:

- Borroloola;
- Minyerri;
- Ngukurr; and
- Numbulwar.

Accordingly, this section of the EIS is drawn from the detailed analysis provided in Appendix G. This provides in-depth community profiles for each of the four communities with specific reference to the criteria set out in the Guidelines.
Figure 8-1: Project Area
Methodology

The analysis of the potential socioeconomic effects of the project were developed through the following means:

1. Desktop Research

A comprehensive analysis has taken place of all publicly available documents (ABS data, reports, research papers, publications, media reports, and websites) for all of the four identified communities. The findings of the analysis have been arranged according to a set of generic focus areas to allow for monitoring and reporting of changes against the focus areas over time. These are:

(i) Background Information;
(ii) Geographic Region;
(iii) Demographic Profile;
(iv) Assets and Infrastructure – including any impacts of construction;
(v) Education – Early Years to Adulthood;
(vi) Economic Participation and Development – including employment and training;
(vii) Youth Opportunities;
(viii) Health – including accommodation and housing; and
(ix) Cultural Heritage – including effects of cultural practices and traditions (e.g. language).

This has been developed in this way to allow for an ongoing approach to the SIA which will be measured and reported against over and beyond the life of the mine. This will allow WRDL and identified communities to monitor progress and put in place a set of objectives that will allow approaches to be developed that add both community and business value to the project. There is significant opportunity for the development to strengthen the communities most affected by the mine but there are also risks that could over time negatively impact the communities.

The aim of developing the profiles in Appendix G is to allow for (both real and perceived) positive impacts to be enhanced and negative impacts to be managed through the ongoing consultation process and the management of risks as outlined in other places in this EIS.

2. Consultations

While Appendix G is a detailed socio-economic study of each of the four communities, the desktop research has been supported by and is inclusive of consultations that have taken place over the previous 12 months at the community, regional, local government and Territory Government levels.

Importantly, the quantitative data included in the Profiles is contextualised through the qualitative findings of the Roper Bar Iron Ore Project: Consultation Report [‘Consultation Report’ hereafter] provided by Rowland in March 2012. The report provides a detailed analysis of the results collected during consultation with the four identified communities and key stakeholders. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the requirements and objectives stated in the NRETAS Guidelines.

The report is included as Appendix H1 with this EIS and will be an important reference document for the reader of this report.

Importantly, when the information and findings of the Profiles and the Consultation Report are set against the Social and Cultural risks outlined in this EIS, the means to enhance community benefits and outcomes can be better identified. The Profiles contain critical sources of information for future planning, policy and practice that ensures social impacts are addressed, economic benefits flow to communities and cultural practices and traditions are not diminished or damaged over the life of the project.
**Current and Future Data Sets**

The primary source of demographic data included in the Profiles is Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data from Census 2006. There are two main reasons for this:

1. While the reader may make the obvious conclusion that this data is now five years old and therefore lack validity – noting reliability of Census data can sometimes be questioned due to often significant undercounts for Indigenous communities – it remains the most comprehensive data set by which a complete picture of a community can be developed. Notably, for any single community it is the most comprehensive standardised data set by which a community profile can be built and certainly the only data set with which comparable profiles can be constructed for multiple communities.

   Using the Census 2006 data has allowed the profiles to be developed in a uniform way where comparisons can be made within and across communities over time.

   Notably, where other sources of data have been available, comparative analysis has taken place and any changes in findings noted. Overall, there is little data available post the Census 2006 that provides any significant difference to the general findings included in the Profiles and more recent reports and sources have, in the main, relied on the Census 2006 data (e.g. Local Implementation Plans).

2. With the release of the 2011 Census data for the four communities in June/July 2012, one of the first actions of the ongoing SIA process will be to measure the new data against that contained in the Profiles. This allows for comparable data sets to be analysed and any changes reported in updated versions of these profiles at the very commencement of the Project.

   Taken together, these two points ensure the methodological approach allows for mapping changes (or not) over time very early in the Project. Such analysis can then be informed by further community consultations and will ensure that by December 2012 there is a reliable and valid baseline profile for each of the four communities. The currency of the Profiles at that point in time will allow for meaningful recommendations to be made with regard to future engagement, participation and partnership. From this, actions and associated monitoring and reporting can then be developed that will have both currency and salience for the communities and WDRL.

   This is the primary means for developing the ongoing approach to the SIA and community strengthening.

**Findings**

The main reports in Appendix G and H, provide significant detail on a community by community basis. Here we note that while there are variations in the findings for each of the communities, there are some findings which are consistent across the four communities. These include:

- All four communities have a very young population with nearly 40% of the populations under the age of 25 years, and for many of the communities almost one-third of the population is below 15 years of age. Alternatively, the data suggests that life expectancy across the communities is low with very small numbers reported in the 65+ years age group (Borroloola being the exception).

- The median age for Borroloola is 25 years and for the other three communities is below 21 years. Remembering this data is from 2006, there will currently be large numbers of young people from that data set that have embarked on one of the most critical transitions in life from high school education to employment and training.

- Related to this finding it the fact that all communities report low levels of high school attainment with few students completing Year 10-12 and large percentages having Year 8 and below as the highest level of schooling or not having attended school at all. This does not make engagement with labour market easy.
Accordingly, in all communities there are low levels of engagement with the labour market and as at 2006, CDEP participation was the highest reported employment category in each community. Further non-schooling qualifications are also low. This provides real challenges for WDRL in terms of developing employment and training opportunities for local populations.

Consultations provided evidence that the communities are acutely aware of the limited capacity for employment and training opportunities and are most optimistic about the potential for the Roper Bar Iron Ore Project to change this. Expectations are high across the communities and WDRL will need to carefully and respectfully manage these expectations.

Notably, the economic base across the communities is currently limited though there appears to be opportunities for WDRL to contribute to the development of some Indigenous Business Enterprises in areas that support the goods and services required for such a large scale operation and wider industry needs in the region.

As expected with a young population, all communities are keen to see the Project make a positive contribution to the opportunities that either currently exist or can be developed for young people.

There is significant community strength that can be harnessed and enhanced including a number of Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations (ACCOs) and strong cultural heritage, traditions and practices. The communities are firm in ensuring all are preserved and not damaged over the life of the Project.

It should be noted that by far the highest area of interest to emerge from over 12 months of consultations has been in the area of employment and training. As noted, expectations are high in relation to the ability of the Project to expand the labour market and the ability of Indigenous people to meet the increased labour demand.

The NRETAS Guidelines for Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the Roper Bar Iron Ore Project require some information on identification of employment by industry and occupation and these are provided in Appendix A.

WDRL has currently employed six Indigenous employees on the project being four Heritage Officers working at the exploration site as field workers, a Community Liaison – Indigenous Employment Manager and a Cultural Heritage Advisor. During the ongoing process of the development of the SIA and the continued engagement with the communities WDRL will develop an Indigenous Employment Pathways Strategy that will seek to maximise the potential for employment from within the communities. Successful recruitment, retention and creation of meaningful and long-term career pathways for Indigenous people will be one of the criteria for success of the project.

Finally, the topic of royalties and compensation is something WDRL will need to give careful consideration to and the concept of a Social Enterprise Scheme is addressed in the Offsets section in this EIS. However, consultations revealed discussions relating to royalties and compensation was heightened in Borroloola due to talk in the community that compensation would be dispersed to specific individuals whose properties the proposed haul road was primarily designed to cross. Consultation revealed that from previous experience with royalties and compensation, the majority of community members from Borroloola do not view individual payments as the best approach. The establishment of a Social Enterprise Package is preferred to ensure benefits are received by the greater community.

While not an area of interest as heightened in the other communities as it was in Borroloola, the issue will still be a critical one prior to development of the project commencing, as communities seek assurances with regard to the administration, management and governance arrangements of any royalties and compensation to be paid.

Critical to the next stage of developing the means for enhancing the socio-economic impacts and minimising any negative impacts will be:
1. Implementing the Community Liaison and Consultation Plan to ensure all communities have the appropriate means for providing input and receiving information (please refer to Appendix H for the WDRL Community Engagement Plan);

2. Measure the new Census 2011 data against current data. This allows for comparable data sets to be analysed and any changes reported in updated versions of the Profiles at the very commencement of the Project;

3. In consultation with the communities, developing an Indigenous Employment Pathways Strategy (Appendix H) that ensures there are recruitment and retention strategies that support long-term meaningful employment of Indigenous people from all four communities; and

4. Ensuring the Indigenous Employment Pathways Strategy is built into the broader development of a Social Enterprise Package.

1. Social Compass provides social research and evaluation to organisations across the government, business, university and community sectors with extensive experience working with Indigenous people, organisations and communities and has undertaken Social Impact Assessments for clients across Northern and Central Australia.