1. OVERVIEW
(RECOMMENDATIONS 1 - 3)

The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (‘RCIADIC’) was established in October 1987 in response to a growing public concern that deaths in custody of Aboriginal people were becoming too common and public explanations were too evasive to rule out the possibility that foul play was a factor in many of them. Although the RCIADIC concluded that the immediate causes of the deaths did not involve foul play, this finding did not detract from the gravity of the problem being faced in relation to Indigenous deaths in custody.

1. Introduction

Chapter 1 of the National Report noted that the alarming rate at which Indigenous people were taken into custody was significantly higher than the rate of detention of the general community. The National Report found that there are two levels at which this issue can be addressed:

- Firstly: at the level of the criminal justice system itself.
- Secondly: at the level of those more fundamental factors which bring Indigenous people into contact with the criminal justice system.

The National Report highlighted the important role of strong Indigenous organisations with adequate resources in raising the status of Indigenous people in their own eyes and in the eyes of non-Indigenous societies. Such influential and highly respected organisations are able to negotiate with non-Indigenous societies to gain respect and attention. The National Report, through the Recommendations outlined in this Chapter, supports the continuation and extension of services provided by Indigenous organisations in key areas and opposes the mainstreaming of those services.

2. Adoption of the Recommendations (Recommendation 1) – Reporting

**Recommendation 1:** That having regard to the great input which has been made to the work of the Commission, not only by governments and departments of government but also by Aboriginal communities, organisations and individuals, on the one hand, and non-Aboriginal organisations and individuals, on the other, it is highly desirable that the attitude of governments to the recommendations and the implementation of those adopted be carried out in a public way as part of the process of education and reconciliation of the whole society. To this end the Commission recommends:

---

1 The ‘National Report’ refers to the findings of the RCIADIC. The National Report and Recommendations can be found in the following link: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/IndigLRes/rciadic/>. 
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That the Commonwealth Government and State and Territory Governments, in consultation with ATSIC, agree upon a process which ensures that the adoption or otherwise of recommendations and the implementation of the adopted recommendations will be reported upon on a regular basis with respect to progress on a Commonwealth, State and Territory basis;

That such reports should be made not less than annually and that, subject to the agreement of its Commissioners so to do, ATSIC be given special responsibility and funding to enable it to monitor the progress of the implementation of the adopted recommendations and to report thereon to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community;

That governments consult with appropriate Aboriginal organisations in the consideration and implementation of the various recommendations in this report;

That, wherever appropriate, governments make use of the services of Aboriginal organisations in implementing such recommendations; and

Ensure that local Aboriginal organisations are consulted about the local implementation of recommendations, and their services be used wherever feasible.

2.1 Overview

Since the 1990s, there has been a proliferation of strategies and policies designed to improve the delivery of criminal justice agency services to Indigenous people and to reduce Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system.

The most important of these has been the development of state-wide Indigenous Justice Agreements (‘IJAs’) negotiated between governments and peak Indigenous bodies in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia and the ACT.

In addition to the IJAs, criminal justice agencies such as police services, corrections, juvenile justice and Attorneys General in many of Australia’s States and Territories have also developed their own strategic plans for working with or responding to Indigenous clients. These are distinguished from the IJAs because they are not negotiated agreements between Indigenous peak bodies and government, although their objectives may be similar.

A third tier of policy developments has been the introduction of overarching government policy frameworks that focus on Indigenous people. Although they are more general in scope, they place some emphasis upon Indigenous justice issues.

We have found that the development of strategic plans to incorporate the RCIADIC Recommendations as well as the reporting on the implementation of these strategic plans by justice agencies has been highly inconsistent.

2.2 Commonwealth

This Report suggests that annual reporting, at a Commonwealth level, on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations is still lacking today, despite the fact that it has been over a decade since the National Report was released.
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2.2.1 Ministerial Councils/Summit

There was strong initial government support for the implementation of the Report and its Recommendations. At a meeting of the Ministerial Council on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs in August 1992, the States (upon receiving funding from the Commonwealth) and Commonwealth agreed to report annually on the adoption and implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADIC.

In response to concerns about the outcomes of the RCIADIC and the consistently high rates of Indigenous incarcerations and deaths in custody, a Ministerial Summit on Indigenous Deaths in Custody was held in July 1997 in which Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers met with representatives of ATSIC, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commission and the National Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee.

At this Summit, there was a renewed commitment to the full implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations. In particular, all Australian governments (except for the NT Government) agreed to develop, in partnership with the Indigenous people, jurisdictional-based agreements (i.e. IJAs) with the aim of addressing these issues and improving the overall delivery of justice to Indigenous people.

At the time it was also recommended that the framework provided by the National Committee to Improved Outcomes in the Delivery of Programs and Services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People be utilised in the development of the IJAs.

2.2.2 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (‘ATSIC’)

The recommendation that ATSIC be given special responsibility and funding applied specifically to the Commonwealth Government. Although the body was formed in 1999, ATSIC was later disbanded in 2005.

Although a Royal Commission Response Monitoring Unit (‘RCGRMU’) was established in 1992 in direct response to Recommendation 1 following the downsizing and restructuring of ATSIC in July 1996, the functions of the RCGRMU were incorporated into ATSIC’s Monitoring and Reporting Section (‘MARS’).

By October 1996, the ATSIC Social Justice Commissioner reported that Recommendation 1:

"...had not been meaningfully implemented. Unfortunately, accountability for the implementation of recommendations of the Royal Commission is still unacceptably poor."

---
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MARS oversaw ATSIC’s role of monitoring Commonwealth agencies’ responses to the implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADIC, with a primary focus on managing the collation of information from the various agencies and the producing the Annual Report. The Annual Report was the predominant means of monitoring the extent to which the Commonwealth upheld its commitment to providing comprehensive, integrated and publicly accountable processes.

MARS provided briefings to the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, ATSIC Commissioners and ATSIC Executive, dealt with RCIADIC monitoring and reporting-related correspondences and issues, and liaised with relevant monitoring networks in Australian States and Territories. MARS also conducted research and published its findings publically as a further means of monitoring the implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADIC.

After ATSIC was disbanded in 2005, some of its duties were transferred to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination. However it is unclear whether there is any coordinated monitoring effort in regards to the implementation of the Recommendations. For example, the Australian Institute of Criminology monitors and reports on trends in Australian deaths in prison, policy custody and juvenile detention.

2.2.3 Australian Institute of Criminology (‘AIC’)

The AIC, through the National Deaths in Custody Program (‘NDICP’), has been monitoring the extent and nature of all deaths that occur in prisons, juvenile justice centres and in police custody since 1992, with data also collected retrospectively back to 1 January 1980. One of the key functions of the NDICP is to serve as a performance and accountability measure for custodian authorities.

Since 2003, the AIC has published a number of reports concerning deaths in custody in Australia, with a major report published in 2013 covering all deaths that have occurred to 30 June 2011.  

The AIC’s reports, however, do not refer to the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations.

2.2.4 National Congress of Australia’s First Peoples (Congress)

The Congress was established in 2010 as a unifying national voice for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in Australia. Its members are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals and organisations, including peak bodies and national organisations such as the National Native Title

---

3 Mathew Lyneham and Andy Chan, ‘Deaths in Custody in Australia to 30 June 2011: Twenty years of monitoring by the National Deaths in Custody Program since the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody’, Monitoring report no. 20 (Australian Institute of Criminology, May 2013). This report can be accessed through the following link: <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/current%20series/mr/1-20/20.html>.
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Council and the Australian Council of Trade Unions – Indigenous Committee and Associated Affiliates, to name a few.

2.2.5 National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework

The draft National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework was released in April 2009 and was open for public consultation for three months. The final National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework was then endorsed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (‘SCAG’) in November 2009.4

As stated in The National Indigenous Law and Justice Framework ('the Framework'):

- It is a national approach to addressing the serious and complex issues that concern the interaction between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the justice systems in Australia, and is intended to support the Council of Australian Government’s (‘COAG’) agenda of closing the gap in Indigenous disadvantage, particularly in relation to community safety.5

- It does not set out to prescribe strategies or actions to be adopted by governments or service providers. Rather it articulates an agreed good practice approach that provides government agencies and service providers with a framework from which they are able to identify the most appropriate responses to specific issues at the local, regional, state or territory level. The Framework draws on existing State and Territory instruments such as the IJAs.

- There are clear links between the Framework and the work undertaken by the Australian, State and Territory Governments through the COAG to close the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians in relation to key life outcomes, particularly life expectancy, child mortality, education, health and employment. COAG has identified a number of building blocks that are critical to ‘Close the Gap’, with the safe communities building block most significant in the context of the Framework.

2.2.6 Framework review

It was proposed that a comprehensive review of the Framework be undertaken in 2013–14. We have not found any evidence of this review taking place.

---


Additionally, the Australian Government has awarded consultancy contracts to evaluate the effectiveness of 20 Indigenous justice programs. The evaluations will be funded by the Australian Government's allocation of $2 million (announced in August 2009) to build the evidence base to support the Framework.

2.2.7 Indigenous Advancement Strategy

A new Indigenous Advancement Strategy (‘IAS’) began on 1 July 2014 and replaced more than 150 programs. The total Indigenous specific funding managed by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet is $8.6 billion. It does not appear, however, that the IAS is designed to focus on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations.

2.3 New South Wales

This Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations in NSW to date has been lacking.

2.3.1 Statement of Commitment to Aboriginal People

In 1997, the NSW Government published a Statement of Commitment to Aboriginal People. The Government asserted that the statement was intended to be a symbolic and tangible expression of the NSW Government’s commitment to achieving justice and equality for Indigenous people and to reconcile the interests of Indigenous people with those of the broader community.

2.3.2 NSW Aboriginal Justice Advisory Council: report on the NSW Government’s Implementation of the Recommendations

Since the publication of the RCIADIC’s Recommendations, five responses to the Recommendations were compiled by the NSW Government.

The most recent of which was published in 2000 when the NSW Aboriginal Justice Advisory Council (‘NSW AJAC’) published a report (‘the 2000 Report’) containing its assessment of the implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADC, covering the 1998 calendar year.

The 2000 Report discusses the structure of Recommendations, comments on the reporting process, and provides an overall assessment of the implementation of the Recommendations by the NSW Government. It presents an overview of the areas where action is needed and addresses Recommendations collected under headings of major activity.

Notably, the 2000 Report found that there are a significant number of Recommendations yet to be implemented by NSW Government agencies. Of the 339 Recommendations, approximately 42 are specifically directed towards other States, the Commonwealth Government or Indigenous organisations, leaving 299 that apply to NSW. According to the 2000 Report, a conservative
assessment found that over 140 (approximately one half) of these Recommendations do not appear to have been implemented in NSW.

According to the 2000 Report, implementation has occurred more effectively in some agencies than others and in some areas of policy than others. For example, the NSW Police Service has largely implemented the recommendations relating to coronial inquiries and custody practices. However, the recommendations that suggest a substantial change in style of policing, such as those relating to negotiation and community policing with Indigenous communities, have not been implemented.

2.3.3 NSW Aboriginal Justice Agreement

In 2003, the NSW Aboriginal Justice Agreement was signed and the NSW Aboriginal Justice Plan was subsequently implemented in 2004.

Also in 2004, the NSW Two Ways Together 2003-2012 Aboriginal Affairs Plan policy framework was published.

2.4 Victoria

Our findings suggest that, out of all jurisdictions in Australia, reporting by the Victorian Government has been the most comprehensive, despite not occurring on an annual basis as recommended.


- Subsequently, Victoria’s key strategy for responding to the RCIADIC Recommendations was the Victorian Aboriginal Justice Agreement, which was signed in May 2000. The Agreement, prepared in consultation and collaboration with Indigenous stakeholders, is a partnership between the Victorian Government and the Koori community to achieve improved justice service delivery to the Koori people.

  o Phase 1 was launched in 2000. It laid the foundation for improved Koori justice outcomes in Victoria by developing robust partnerships and infrastructure, and putting in place a range of new Koori justice initiatives.

  o Phase 2 was launched in June 2006. It focused on preventing the progression of young Koories into the system, reducing reoffending, and changing the justice system to be more responsive and inclusive in its approach to Koories. It had a strongly place-based approach, focusing on strengthening community justice responses to address issues locally.

  o Phase 3 was launched in March 2013. It continues the work to improve Koori justice outcomes and reduce over-representation in the criminal justice system.
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The 2013 Victorian Government Aboriginal Affairs Report, tabled in Parliament on the 2nd of April 2014, confirms significant progress has been made toward closing the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. The report noted that "[t]he signing of the third phase of the Aboriginal Justice Agreement, the appointment of the first Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and the recognition of the Dja Dja Wurrung people as Traditional Owners for some 266,532 hectares of public land in central Victoria, are further milestones".  

In March 2015, the Victorian Department of Justice and Regulation launched the Aboriginal Social and Emotional Wellbeing Plan to focus on improving the mental health and wellbeing of Indigenous people while incarcerated and upon their release. The Victorian Department of Justice and Regulation, the Victorian Department of Health, and Corrections Victoria are responsible for driving the implementation of the plan in partnership with relevant government and community organisations. The plan is due to be completed in June 2018 to coincide with the conclusion and evaluation of Phase 3 of the AJA, and is intended to allow learnings from the evaluation of the plan to inform future activity for the next iteration of the AJA.

2.5 Queensland

This Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations in Queensland to date has been lacking.

- In 2000, the Queensland Government signed the Queensland Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Justice Agreement (‘QLD IJA’). This Agreement expired in 2010.

- In 2005, the Queensland Government published the Partnerships Queensland: Future Directions Framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy 2005-2010.

- The Queensland Government introduced an Indigenous-focused strategy, known as ‘Just Futures 2012-2015’, which references the QLD IJA. However, the policy has a broader focus in addressing the roots of Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system by preventing Indigenous people from even coming into contact with the criminal justice system in the first instance.  

---


2.6 Western Australia

This Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations in Western Australia to date has been lacking.

- Our findings suggest the Western Australian Government only reported on their implementation of the Recommendations up until 1995, and only intermittently thereafter. In June 2001, the Government published an implementation report\(^8\) for the period ending 30 November 2000.

- The Western Australian Aboriginal Justice Agreement was signed in 2004, but subsequently expired in 2009. From February 2011, the Department of the Attorney General in Western Australia commenced oversight of the Aboriginal Justice Program, signalling a change of direction from the Agreement.

2.7 Australian Capital Territory

This Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations in the ACT to date has been lacking.

- In 2010, the ACT Government published the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreement.

- Our findings suggest that in relation to the ACT, the last government report on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations was released in 2001.

2.8 Northern Territory

This Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations in the NT to date has been lacking.

- The NT Government published implementation reports in 1993, 1994 and 1996 with the final report being published in 1997. It does not appear that NT Government has reported on their implementation of the RCIADC Recommendations after 30 December 1997. A possible reason for the cessation of reporting is the absence of Commonwealth funding, which ran out in 1997\(^9\).

At the 1997 Ministerial Summit, the NT Government did not agree to develop, in partnership with Indigenous people, jurisdictional based agreements relating to Indigenous issues including those which were the subject of the RCIADC Recommendations.
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2.9 Other Australian states and territories

None of the other Australian States and Territories have developed Indigenous Justice Agreements. Consequently, this Report suggests that annual reporting on the implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations to date has been lacking. Additionally, these are the jurisdictions where specific justice agencies, such as the police or correctional services, have been least likely to develop any form of current strategic framework relating to Indigenous justice issues.\(^\text{10}\).

3. Establishing independent Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committees and Secretariats (Recommendation 2 & 3)

**Recommendation 2**: That subject to the adoption by governments of this recommendation and the concurrence of Aboriginal communities and appropriate organisations, there be established in each State and Territory an independent Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee to provide each Government with advice on Aboriginal perceptions of criminal justice matters, and on the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

The Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee in each State should be drawn from, and represent, a network of similar local or regionally based committees which can provide the State Advisory Committee with information of the views of Aboriginal people. It is most important that the views of people living outside the urban centres be incorporated.

The terms of reference of each State, local or regional Advisory Committee is a matter to be negotiated between governments and Aboriginal people. The Commission suggests however that matters which might appropriately be considered include, inter alia:

- The implementation of the recommendations of this report, or such of them as receive the endorsement of the Government;
- Proposals for changes to policies which affect the operation of the criminal justice system;
- Programs for crime prevention and social control which enhance Aboriginal self-management and autonomy;
- Programs which increase the recruitment of Aboriginal people to the staff of criminal justice agencies; and
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The dissemination of information on policies and programs between different agencies, and between parallel bodies in different States.

**Recommendation 3:** The Commission notes that some of the recommendations of this report, particularly those relating to the custodial environment, are particularly detailed. The monitoring of the implementation of recommendations could only be carried out in close liaison with the authorities responsible for implementing them. In order to ensure that the State Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee is able to give informed advice to the Attorney-General or Minister for Justice, it should be assisted by a small Secretariat, staffed by people with knowledge of Aboriginal interactions with the criminal justice system. The role of the Secretariat should be to provide information to the Advisory Committee, assist it in the development of policy proposals, and liaise on behalf (and at the direction of) the Committee with other agencies. The Secretariat should be located within the Department of Attorney-General or Minister for Justice but be accountable to the Advisory Committee on terms to be negotiated between government and Aboriginal people but with the maximum degree of autonomy from government as may be consistent with it fulfilling its function to assist the Advisory Committee to give informed, independent advice to government.

This Report shows that these Recommendations were partially implemented by the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments following the RCIADIC, although it has been difficult to find current evidence of their implementation.

### 3.1 Overview

In the period immediately following the RCADIC, all Australian States and Territories established their own respective Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committees (‘AJACs’). In four of the five States with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Agreements, an Indigenous peak advisory body was instrumental in its conception. However, in subsequent years, many of the AJACs were either abolished or allowed to collapse by governments.

### 3.2 Commonwealth

In 2005, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General established the National Aboriginal Justice Advisory Council (‘NAJAC’) consisting of the Chairperson of each State’s and Territory’s Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee (‘AJAC’), with secretarial support provided by the Attorney General’s Department. The current status of the NAJAC is unclear with a 2009 Government report stating that the Attorney General’s Department was developing a new national advisory body to replace it.

### 3.3 New South Wales

The NSW Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee commenced in November 1998 and included a chair person, an executive officer and six community representatives representing the six ATSIC regions of New South Wales. It provided a framework for a partnership between Indigenous communities and criminal justice system agencies.

In 2009, the NSW Government replaced the NSW AJAC with a broader and more thorough consultation process for Indigenous people. We understand that the NSW
Government will now be consulting with a network of 20 Aboriginal Community Justice Groups on law and justice issues affecting Indigenous people in NSW.

Currently the NSW Office of Communities Aboriginal Affairs (‘the OCAA’) provides strategic policy advice and advocacy for the Indigenous people of NSW. The OCAA supports Indigenous communities to leverage and enhance their leadership capacity, assets and resources, culture and knowledge to create opportunity, healing, responsibility and empowerment for themselves. The OCAA is led by a general manager, Jason Ardler, who is responsible to the Secretary of the Department of Education and Communities for the management of all resources, programs and performance of the agency.

3.4 Victoria

The Victorian Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee, which was established in 1993, is the Victorian Government's primary source of advice from the Indigenous community on issues relating to the RCIADIC and other justice related issues. AJAC’s membership comprises two Indigenous community nominees and representatives from a range of government departments and Indigenous organisations.

The Victorian AJAC, which has been decentralised into regional and local AJACs, currently comprises nine regional Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committees. They are the only advisory committees still in existence.

3.5 Queensland

The Queensland Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee was established in May 1993. This Committee was formed to provide advice to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General on Indigenous criminal justice issues.

The Queensland AJAC was replaced by the Indigenous Advisory Council, which in turn was replaced by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Advisory Board (‘ATSIAB’) in June 1999. The Board has a diverse membership that consists of elders and community people from across a wide range of experience with the capacity to provide advice to the Queensland Government. The ATSIAB's terms of reference included the provision of advice on the implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADIC. The ATSIAB was disbanded when the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Justice Agreement expired in 2011.

Although the Just Futures Taskforce was formed on 1 January 2012, it does not appear to provide advice on the implementation of the Recommendations of the RCIADIC.

3.6 ACT

The Aboriginal Justice Centre (‘AJC’) which replaced the ACT AJAC in 2006 was developed to assist the Government in implementing the RCIADIC Recommendations. The Centre provides support services to Indigenous persons in the criminal justice system, including prevention and case management programs.

The AJC board is comprised of members of the ACT Indigenous community. The focus of the AJC is to provide programmes and support services to the local Indigenous
community with the aim to reduce the numbers of Indigenous people in the ACT and criminal justice system. The AJC is committed to seeking solutions to address Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system.

Additionally, the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body (‘ATSIEB’) consists of 7 people elected by the ACT Indigenous community to represent its interests and aspirations. Its Board is comprised of members of the ACT Indigenous community. The AJC provides support services to Indigenous persons in the criminal justice system, including prevention and case management programs. It provides direct advice to the ACT Government with the ambition of improving the lives of Indigenous peoples in ACT.

3.7 Western Australia

In Western Australia, the AJC assisted with the development of the Aboriginal Justice Plan (WA) 2000 which was a precursor to the WA AJA. The Western Australia AJC was subsequently disbanded and therefore not involved in the formulation of the later Aboriginal Justice Agreement.

3.8 South Australia

The South Australian Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee was established by the South Australian Government in 1989. The Committee was made up of senior government officers and Indigenous community representatives, and was convened by the Division of State Aboriginal Affairs. In 1994, the Committee was re-established as a community-based Committee that worked closely with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement Inc. and the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs.\(^{11}\)

In 1990 the South Australian Cabinet formed the Aboriginal Justice Interdepartmental Committee (‘AJIDC’) to provide advice and monitor government implementation of the RCIADIC Recommendations. The Committee established five groups to respond to the National Report. The groups included: Custodial Health, Non-Custodial Sentencing Options, Juvenile Justice, Policing Issues and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands.

In 2002, the AJIDC was replaced by the Aboriginal Justice Consultative Committee (‘AJCC’). The role of the AJCC is to create partnerships between the Indigenous community and the justice agencies.

3.9 Northern Territory

The NT Government did establish a NT Aboriginal Justice Advisory Committee, however, it is unclear when that occurred. Its period of existence is unclear, and it seems to have been dormant between 1997 and 2001\(^{12}\), and to have ceased its operation most likely in 2004\(^{13}\).

---

\(^{11}\) The Department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation's Status Report on Monitoring the Royal Commission to Aboriginal Wellbeing (2006).

\(^{12}\) An NT AJAC officer published an article in 2001 in response to a legislative amendment introduced on 29 May 2001 - see Christopher Howse, "State and Territory Implementation of the Recommendations of"
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3.10 Tasmania

This Report suggests that, despite undertaking extensive searches, there is no evidence of the Tasmanian Government’s implementation of this Recommendation. Although, the Tasmanian Commissioner of Police has appointed a State Aboriginal Liaison Coordinator and four District Aboriginal Liaison Officers with Assistants who have responsibility for liaison and advisory matters between the Tasmanian Police and Indigenous community.¹⁴


¹³ NT AJAC was consulted on the draft NT IJA formulated in 2003, and Alison and Cunneen state that after the NT AJAC was disbanded the draft IJA was not finalised. It would also make sense if the NT AJAC was abandoned in 2004 given that ATSIC was disbanded in 2004 and the NT IJA was never ratified, however that is mere speculation.