

CONVENE: Cape York Region Package (CYRP) Taskforce
LOCATION: Bauxite Den, The Albatross Hotel, Weipa
DATE & TIME: 2pm – 5pm Thursday 11th August 2016
CHAIR: Allan Dale

ITEM	DETAILS	TIME
1.	MEETING OPEN	2pm
	<p>Welcome by Chair to CYRP Taskforce.</p> <p>Objectives of meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity on progress to date, status and process for 2016 CYRP Program of Works and future works 2. Update on Cape Indigenous Mayors Alliance (CIMA) status and future directions 3. Update on Indigenous Land Use Agreement and regional native title claim (as relevant to the CYRP) 4. Agreement on Taskforce Terms of Reference for future <p>The Chair provided background to the project and process to date.</p>	AD
2	ATTENDANCE & APOLOGIES	2.15pm
2.1	<p>Attendance</p> <p>AC – Andrew Clarkson (DPMC) AD – Allan Dale (Chair Taskforce & SWG, Chair RDA FNQ&TS) AP – Amelia Pratt (DIRD) AY – Arthur Yates (RoadTek – TMR) BD – Bernadette Dall'Ozzo (TMR) CG – Christina Garbin (DIRD) EN – Eddie Newman (NPARC) GW – Greg Williams (NQCEC) JC – Jann Crase (RDA FNQ&TS) JG – Julie Guest (NASC) JMcD – John McDowall (Musgrave Roadhouse) KP – Karen Peut (TMR) KS – Katrina Savo (PBA) MM – Mark Meaney (NQCEC) PA – Peter Agar (TMR) PS – Peter Scott (Mayor, Cook Shire Council, Board member RDA) (via teleconference) SB – Sandra Burke (TMR) SU – Stephen Ung (DATSIP) TB – Trish Butler (CYSF) TM – Trent Mulley (Exchange Hotel Coen)</p>	AD

2.2	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Aileen Addo (MASC), Allen Cunneen (DATSIP), Andrew Yeatman (KLT), Bob Sullivan (CRA), Brad Welsh/Linda Murry (Rio Tinto Alcan), Darren Cleland/Kelsey Ormsby (DSD), Dereck Walpo (ASC), Greg Wittaker (Gungarde CC), Harvey Douglas, Les Dunn/Sanjay Ram (TMR), Mike Hintz (CYSF), Paul Ryan (OVP), Peter Inderbitzin (Swiss Farms), Ross Higgins (HASC), Stephen Kitchener (DAF), Tim Cronin (CSC), Wayne Butcher (CIMA/LRASC) Wendy Wust..</p>	
3	PREVIOUS MINUTES	2.20pm
3.1	<p>Previous meeting Minutes 13th October 2015 considered with no further amendment. Noted by the Taskforce</p>	AD
4	AGENDA ITEMS	2.30pm
4.1	<p>TMR Update on works to date</p> <p>Sandra Burke gave a presentation. <i>Refer to attached powerpoint for details.</i></p> <p><u>2016 program of works</u> Different scale of prequalification for range of pieces of work <u>4.6km – 22km</u> enabled TMR to accommodate a range of contractors in different locations.</p> <p><u>Industry, business and community briefings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TMR broadened its briefings to include subcontractors and the community. • Most sessions were really well attended especially Weipa with good positive feedback from connecting subcontractors with major contractors. <p><u>Tender Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two stage tender process was undertaken for Archer to Wolverton (13km – R1-R3) and Coen South (22km – R2 -R5). Decision to be announced 12th August. • Little Laura to Fairview (4.6km R3) single stage tender process – tenders closed 4th August – still in assessment process. • Musgrave (12km) – sole invitee (RoadTek) – works due to commence soon. • Noting that, in 2015, three of the four projects were delivered by RoadTek on a sole invitee basis, with Mein Deviation open for tender through the two stage tender process. • RoadTek is able to look at capability building and initiatives available for people to build opportunities moving into the future, as well as provide leadership and management skills. <p><u>Key Result Areas & Outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KRAs for 2015 works retained for 2016-17, with heightened focus on KRA 2 – Indigenous Economic and Opportunity Plan. • Performance against KRA's 1 and 2 exceeded targets in 2015 • KRA 2 has been modified for 2016 projects. This will require a minimum of 15% of contract direct costs to be expended on local Indigenous businesses (an increase from 1.5% in 2015). • TMR Director General Neil Scales immensely proud of TMR's recent Reconciliation Award, with the Cape York Land Council, on their negotiations and outcomes regarding native title/ILUA progress to deliver the PDR component of the CYRP. Focus is on engaging with customers about economic development outcomes and ongoing commitment to continuously 'improve how we do things'. <p><u>2017/18</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and design work under way along with securing water and gravel resources. 	TMR SB/PA

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four projects along the PDR totaling – 24.3km. • TMR and DIRD looking at 2016 performance vis-à-vis 2015 performance against KRAs to inform future tender approach with no view locked in, but looking for incremental improvement. <p><u>2018/19</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three projects along the PDR totaling – 19.1km <p><u>Endeavour Valley Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoU between TMR and Hopevale Aboriginal Shire Council setting parameters for the partnership, led by RoadTek to deliver this work. • HVASC is happy with the progress and capability building and is now eager to seek opportunities for prequalification with Cook Shire Council on road activities. <p><u>Community Indigenous Works</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some works commencing – Aurukun starting to seal some of their road. • Delivery and procurement of works for each project by Councils is up to the Councils. TMR is the facilitator and funding provider, with monthly reporting requirements from Councils back to TMR (similar to ATSI TIDS funding). <p><u>CYLC ILUA Framework Agreement</u></p> <p><i>Apologies from CYLC Principal Legal Officer Adam McLean noted.</i> <i>Circulation of CYLC information sheet on the status of the regional native title claim and ILUA process.</i></p> <p>Sandra Burke provided an update from TMR on the progress of the Priority Agreement. The Priority Agreement is a vehicle enabling TMR to do work on the PDR while progressing the development of an ILUA. The renegotiated Priority Agreement ends December 2016 with the aim to have an ILUA in place before then.</p> <p>TMR and CYLC are continuing discussions around the draft ILUA and draft Cultural Heritage Agreement.</p> <p>TMR has a very positive relationship with CYLC and good discussions with members of the Steering Committee (the signatories to the Priority Agreement/ILUA).</p> <p>Greg Williams asked whether the content of the ILUA would be made public.</p> <p>TMR clarified that details would not be released as ILUA under negotiation.</p> <p>SU (DATSIP) confirmed that, as a general rule, ILUAs are not publicly released; rather, they are treated like normal contracts. If both parties agree there is information they are happy to release, they can release it.</p> <p>Greg Williams stated that Cape York stakeholders would find it unacceptable if details would not be released.</p> <p>TMR advised that they would seek to work with CYLC and provide a summary outline of the ILUA once authorized.</p>	
4.2	<p>TMR Update on status of 2016 CYRP Works Program, including tender and procurement processes and future works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PDR - EVR 	<p>TMR</p> <p>SB/PA</p> <p>SB/PA</p>

- Community Indigenous works

SB/BD'O

Refer to item 4.1 above

Discussion on Issues

Taskforce members identified a number of issues for discussion:

1. Tender process approach;
2. Payment of subcontractors;
3. Capacity of Indigenous business to tender effectively and not underprice themselves;
4. Timing of the release of the tenders;
5. ILUA/NT claim process – Traditional owner engagement and understanding; and
6. Final cost issues.

Note: Discussions across these issues are collated in the minutes for ease of understanding.

1. Tender process approach

GW queried the tender process for the 2017-2018 program of works – what the approach would be regarding restricted contract, sole offer and two-stage process etc.

PA responded that this was yet to be determined, noting that TMR is still assessing the benefits of the two-stage process – from both a departmental and industry perspective. Further, noting that it is an imperative of government to achieve value for money, also taking into account benefits of both sole invitee and open market tenders.

KP reconfirmed the commitment given to the Taskforce and the Sub Working Group was that TMR/DIRD would compare performance from 2015 and 2016 and that engagement with industry would be part of this review. TMR is receiving feedback that performance has improved 'out of sight'.

2. Payment of subcontractors

JMcD raised issue of subcontractors approaching him with concerns of non-payment by the principal contractor. Part of the issue is around the price of the tender, which 'we all knew was too low'.

SB clarified that part of the tender finalization process is for the principal contractor to satisfy TMR it has done the right thing by their subcontractors; contractors have to sign a statutory declaration confirming these elements are addressed.

SB further clarified that TMR has a contractual relationship with the principal contractor, not with the subcontractors. The principal contractor then has a contractual relationship with the subcontractors.

SB stated that the particular principal contractor in question was going through the finalisation process now.

PA stated that subcontractors in dispute with the principal contractor have legal options to pursue through the *Subcontractors Charges Act 1984* (Qld) and the *Building and Construction Industry Payments Act 2004* (Qld).

TM queried whether non-payment of subcontractors would be noted on principal contractors 'file' possibly affecting future tender opportunities.

PA confirmed these matters were looked at in the prequalification section of the tender process.

3. Capacity of Indigenous business: effective tendering

KS raised the issue that every Aboriginal business lost money through their work on 2015 projects which was raised at a PBA meeting a few months ago. This is a very concerning issue and important to put on the table. Noting that some businesses may not be quoting properly.

GW stated that there were tough contractors out there and was genuinely concerned about the outcome for businesses on Cape York, suggested there needed to be more effort into assisting businesses and being able to access more qualified people to advise on tender processes. However, ultimately, it is the responsibility of the business itself to get it right.

KS disagreed with GW to a point, noting that Indigenous subcontractors were told their prices were too high and were under pressure to drop prices to get the work. Noting the purpose of the PBA is capacity building for Aboriginal businesses on the Cape and that KS is keen for clarity on where government responsibility to support this capacity development sits.

GW noted the capacity support provided by RoadTek, to some degree, through sole invitee work.

KS stated that RoadTek was really good and that the issue was with the principal contractors.

AY stated that sub-contracting of activity types, rather than lengths of roads, was an approach used by RoadTek in 2016. Shortlisted preferred suppliers were asked to justify their prices, whether too low or too high, to provide an opportunity to get it right and develop Indigenous businesses.

AD noted the progress from the first phase to second phase of the CYRP with the increase in PBA and capacity being a big step forward, also learning from the first phase was important. Need to think about capacity in the broader context and continuous improvement, as well as what we can do in the short-medium term.

KS raised the issue that some companies engage with Indigenous businesses just to tick the box that is "black cladding", which has happened more than once. Some companies look at it as a way of being more competitive by partnering with Indigenous businesses who have no capacity at all – then the Indigenous business subcontracts their gear, so it looks like they do have capacity. For example, one business, which only started in January 2015, was working on the PDR over and above all other more established businesses. This is a critical issue for the PBA which is being looked at this year, as it happens and it undermines everybody. KS stated she did not want to see this happen either this year or in the future, reinforcing that there are capable Aboriginal businesses on the Cape, who are qualified and able to do the job having the capacity and the gear.

KS noted that it was not TMRs responsibility to sort out these types of 'joint ventures'/partnerships, but there needed to be some level of having checks and balances in place that protect the companies in the Cape. KS also stated that these projects were also created for economic development on the Cape, and it still is the case that the majority of the money has gone off the Cape.

GW stated that it was important for semi-qualified people/businesses to be nurtured to achieve full prequalification.

AY responded to a query on a specific project regarding RoadTek support, noting that there were three weekly reviews of work and these reports assisted the businesses involved to move towards prequalification i.e. as evidence of capacity.

KS clarified that the PBA has very specific membership requirements for businesses to joining – they must be based in one of the 8 Cape communities or in Weipa, Laura or Coen. The PBA is focused on making sure their members and businesses (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) are from the Cape to ensure benefits flow back to the Cape.

PA noted that the TMR definition of 'local' included Cook Shire and surrounding Indigenous councils.

AD noted that the expectation for improvement was moving things in the right direction and that the strengthening of the PBA was beneficial. AD also stated that there was significant value in the RoadTek style of process. There was a tension that TMR had to balance between keeping the big end and the small end of the market happy, and that a key feature of the CYRP is the diversity of businesses, noting that more could happen at the smaller end of the scale which would be good for the Cape. AD stated that the process is moving us forward and that the Taskforce needs to be thinking about other big strategies with PMC, DATSIP etc.

PA noted that JVs will be given more scrutiny this year and that TMR is working with DATSIP on this issue, taking note of the % of businesses accredited, proportional to the risk. PA further stated that TMR and all partners need to be serious about getting the right outcomes and appreciated KS's comments.

AD reminded people to keep these issues in the back of their minds regarding what the Taskforce could do moving forward.

4. Timing of the release of the tenders and decisions

TM raised the issue of timing of works noting that de-mobilisation and re-establishment of contractors over the wet season was inefficient and costly. Preferable to get tender process starting in February.

KP stated that all remaining CYRP project were approved early May 2016. Any savings would be looked at next year to see what other projects could be brought onto the CYRP, within the approved funding envelope. TMR would then seek to obtain federal government approval to ensure works all approved are delivered within the 5 years.

- PDR works approved for 2016, 2017 and 2018 are outlined on slides 6, 17 and 18 of TMR presentation
- See slide 21 for approval status of Endeavour Valley Road works
- See slide 24 for details of approved Community Infrastructure works.

AD raised the importance of annual feedback to feed into the next priorities from any savings.

KP confirmed that the long list of priorities would be discussed with the Taskforce.

5. ILUA/NT claim process

Traditional owner engagement and understanding

TB raised issue of continuing unrest from some Traditional Owners on the ground with the NT/ILUA process, including some TOs actively engaged in the claim process. This issue hasn't gone away and TB is concerned that TOs may be signing onto an outcome that is not fully understood.

Public information and concerns with framework/content

PA

	<p>AD stated that CYLC is prepared to have a conversation around the content and process of the ILUA. How deep it goes depends on the conversation. He recommended the Taskforce takes CYLC up on its offer to present to the Taskforce, with the permission of State, on the broad outcomes and intent of the process in the interim and final agreements.</p> <p>GW noted the real concerns people have who are not involved in the ILUA process.</p> <p>KP stated that if there are any Traditional Owners who do not feel that they are being genuinely consulted, they can bring those issues to TMR. TMR will follow-up in further discussions with CYLC.</p> <p>AD confirmed that those with issues and evidence of issues should contact TMR.</p> <p>6. <u>Final cost issues</u></p> <p>GW and JMcD raised concerns about the pricing of tenders and that one tender was below what would actually be sufficient to deliver the project.</p> <p>SB clarified that TMR looks at the lowest tender when undertaking the assessment process and queries (with the tenderer) if it is too low. This is the same process that RoadTek uses. TMR would then engage with the tenderer to justify how they can deliver the job for the price provided. This is the same approach as applied to works for last year, which relates to the project to which GW and JMcD are referring.</p> <p>GW is keen to see how we can do it better.</p> <p>PA clarified that TMR does not normally disclose the final price of the contract, but does disclose the final price of the PROJECT (including TMR design and other costs).</p> <p>JMcD also raised the issue of over-servicing from cultural heritage monitors for some works, noting this was potentially wasting funding.</p> <p>AD directed this issue to the ILUA discussion and better understanding of the content of arrangements regarding cultural heritage monitors etc.</p>	
4.3	<p>CYIP CIMA status and future directions <i>Wayne Butcher's apology due to illness was noted.</i></p>	WB
	<p>Check in before break TM noted that the road was 'in pretty good nick'.</p> <p>JG stated that this meeting was providing a good learning curve.</p> <p>AD noted that the PBA explicit story was important, with the main message that the CYRP has done some good things, is an important program and is performing fantastically well in the bigger picture, with a need for continuous improvement.</p> <p>KS noted that the PBA has support in place, including a lawyer and accountant that members can utilise for free i.e. to assist with contracts and tendering.</p> <p>Everyone welcomed this support and additional capacity.</p> <p>MM stated that he was very appreciative of the work of the group.</p> <p>GW thanked us for having the meeting in Weipa, bringing everyone to this end of the PDR. Congratulations to all for the achievements so far.</p>	

	<p>EN noted that he was the new Mayor of the NPA and was keen to see the issues fixed before coming up to his end of the road. EN reiterated GW's previous comments about getting it fixed first (tender process and so on), so we don't need to sit around a table and argue about it. EN also backed up JMcD's comments about getting the TOs working right and noted that tourism was going well.</p> <p>AD supported EN's comments, noting that this was a very positive message bringing the infrastructure and economic development focus on Torres Strait, keeping the NPA and Torres voice in the conversation.</p> <p>PS (via teleconference) stated that the CYRP was an important process to go through to build capacity and had linkages to getting clarification on the NDRRA works program over the next few months. Cook Shire Council (CSC) put out our tenders at beginning of year, so important for TMR to upskill contractors as much as possible. CRC received a letter from the PBA regarding tender process and 'locals first' approach, stating that CRC does have consideration and discount for local operators, as well as an Indigenous component. PS reinforced that, without the NRDA, there was little happening and this needed to be sorted.</p> <p>AD noted that the Taskforce work added value to other complementary programs like NRDA, IAS, etc.</p>	
	Afternoon Tea	3.30pm
4.4	<p>Updates on related activities</p> <p><u>DIRD – Christina Garbin</u></p> <p>CG noted that DIRD had been working for the previous two years on the CYRP with TMR and PMC. She noted the progress that has been made and that DIRD is trying to take on board feedback from the Taskforce to make things better for 2017 and 2018 works. The works for 2017 and 2018 have all been approved by the Federal government. CG advised that DIRD and TMR will now need to work on the procurement plan for 2017/8 and 2018/19 projects.</p> <p>AD reminded everyone of the CYRP link with the Beef Roads and Northern Australia Roads Programmes under the Northern Australia White Paper (\$700m) across Qld, NT and WA. Confirming that RDA is looking to build on the delivery principles from the Taskforce and SWG to see these incorporated with the roll-out of other major projects, including road investments.</p> <p><u>DATSIP – Stephen Ung</u></p> <p>SU noted that DATSIP has been providing feedback to TMR and RoadTek for additional clarifications for contractors – to get further granular detail – until all parties satisfied. SU has been fielding requests for Black Business Finder (BBF) registration through ICN, noting the benefit to principal contractors for this project, but also for other government procurement throughout the Cape.</p> <p>SU noted the linking of businesses to training funding opportunities eg, cert I, II civil and administration. DATSIP has been engaging with PMC and others to find associated funding buckets. Suppliers able to win work can then offset training costs from other buckets of funding, rather than from their profit margin.</p> <p>SU is observing good operational level engagement with TMR on improving their knowledge and how they go about procurement processes, with additional benefits, that will help Indigenous businesses around broader government procurement. SU further noted other side</p>	Various

benefits coming out of the project to set up a good platform into further parts of this contract and other government procurement.

AD noted the real value of the project through greater integration of activities/programs across State agencies.

PMC – Andrew Clarkson

AC stated that PMC's complementary programs were going really well, with good working relationships with DATSIP and TMR. There is a lot of on-ground knowledge enabling programs to be tailored. AC acknowledged the common frustration with slow processes, but encouraged applications to the IAS.

AC advised that organisations/businesses need to be positioning a lot earlier instead of waiting. With 2017 works program on board people should start applying for funds and positioning themselves now.

AD noted the value of the Federal Government's Indigenous procurement policy.

AC noted the value of dialogue and face-to-face engagement, but also the importance of 'computer work' for businesses, and that registering on BBF did not mean that there is not more work to do.

Peninsula Business Alliance – Katrina Savo

KS advised that the PBA was now incorporated and is planning a two-day summit in September 2016 to launch the organisation and engage with all of their stakeholders. KS noted that there are very sophisticated businesses that are members; PBA is attracting interest from the bigger end of town wanting to become members (non-Indigenous businesses) which was very exciting.

KS praised the support of PMC noting that its funding went through quickly. PBA is also meeting with CIMA to look at what this group can do together to support what is happening in local communities, not just road works but around other businesses as well – for example support services, electricians and so on.

KS stated that feedback from PBA members was that they find BBF and ICN a very difficult way to engage, noting that there is not necessarily a high level of computer savviness. Another BBF issue is that there are still non-Indigenous businesses saying they are Indigenous. KS spoke to her positive relationship and regular communication with ICN managers, who are working hard to make sure information is accurate, but acknowledged the challenge with this as there were so many businesses being managed. KS noted that good relationships were critical to talking through the issues to make sure there was accurate information on BBF. KS also confirmed that the PBA knows which businesses on the Cape are Indigenous and that the PBA is getting bigger and better, a model that could be duplicated around the nation.

Black Business Finder

SU advised that Nick from ICN (based in Brisbane) was doing interviews, putting businesses into BBF and seeking on-ground clarification around directors, the nature of agreements for JVs, as well as consulting with Land Councils and LGAs, including verification through Supply Nation and cross-referencing information with PMC.

SU noted that:

- the amount of info requested is quite significant and seeks to determine the capacity of businesses in purporting to be a provider of supply chain;
- information on BBF is commercial in nature and not released;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> businesses that enter into a JV and are not benefiting, do have the option to dissolve the JV, not prevented by BBF from doing this; and that, registration on BBF was a matter for individual businesses commercial interest. <p>KS noted that some untruths are recorded on BBF by a very small group of operators.</p> <p>SU advised he had received a number of these inquiries and that part of the process was to test their knowledge and enquire about directors and company structure.</p> <p>GW noted one BBF company that incorporated in 2015 had more equipment than Theiss.</p> <p>AY stated that the BBF does give TMR more confidence, especially with DATSIP's extra work/checks, also noting that many Cape Indigenous businesses are not on BBF.</p> <p>KS raised the computer literacy issue again.</p> <p>SU advised that Nick could be contacted to talk the business through the registration process.</p> <p>SU noted the increase of BBF registrations by 30% from the processes that DATSIP has run over the last 18mths, now including an extra 100 businesses.</p>	
	<p>Other Matters</p> <p><u>Endeavour Valley Road</u> AD passed on concerns expressed by Hope Vale Aboriginal Shire Council's Ross Higgins (CEO) and Greg McLean (Mayor) with completion of the sealing of the Endeavour Valley Road, as well as potential issues/lack of clarity around the Isabella bridge. AD was raising these as future issues that may be relevant for EDV.</p> <p><u>Jardine Bridge – update on status</u> KP advised that DIRD wrote to TMR regarding the Jardine Bridge and that TMR is working on options to scope a solution. TMR will need to review the plan and discuss options with Council and respective Ministers, noting the Federal Government commitment of \$10m.</p> <p>EN advised he is talking to Warren Entsch about it.</p> <p>KP advised that the Ministers are communicating, with the Federal Government requesting a commitment from the State, noting further planning work is required by the State to get a realistic cost estimate.</p>	
4.5	<p>Taskforce Terms of Reference Discuss revision of ToR to clarify purpose and membership.</p> <p>AD provided background that the current ToR are out of date, and were developed when the project was dealing with foundation issues that have been addressed (prioritisation, procurement arrangements). Noted we are now in the operational phase.</p> <p><u>Purpose and direction of Taskforce</u></p> <p>AD stated that we are in the delivery phase with the approvals, noting that when the Taskforce formed, members had a view to the long term investment.</p> <p>AD reminded everyone of the purposes of the Taskforce:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) point for community engagement around CYRP; 2) benefit from discussion around projects and what it means for Cape York Region Package; 3) keep longer term view about future; 4) points of integration and opportunity across other programs/opportunities; and 5) to provide feedback and continuous improvement 	AD

AD also reminded Taskforce members that the group was originally self-selecting from a forum in 2013 chaired by the former Member for Cook at the time, so we do need to think about membership, core membership continuing and opening up discussions.

Chair discussion

AD advised that the former Member for Cook, David Kempton initially chaired the CYRP Taskforce and Sub Working Group, with the support of AD and RDA Secretariat. After the State election in 2015 there was agreement at the subsequent Sub Working Group meeting for AD to remain as the independent Chair of the SWG and Taskforce.

AD noted the secretariat support provided by RDA, noting limitations.

AD posed the following questions to Taskforce members to inform discussions about the way forward: Is there value in continuing the Taskforce? If so, in what form? How should the ToR be reformed?

From a process perspective any redrafted ToR would be taken to the next Sub Working Group meeting and then the next Taskforce meeting for endorsement.

TB stated that the Taskforce should continue in some shape or form, and that we can't lose sight of big picture and the end game which is sealing the PDR not just to Weipa, but then also on to Bamaga. This is critical to opening up economic development opportunities across the Cape. It has been very beneficial to be a part of this group, people talk to us all the time.

I think if that was lost ownership would be lost. The grassroots are very important to future of the program.

TP stated that it was very beneficial to have the Taskforce the way it is, with some room to open it up to a more local forum for more people to attend.

JMcD agreed with TB and that it was important to keep the Taskforce to gather information, including responses to questions that we get asked eg. payment of subcontractors. JMcD noted that we can't go away from this Taskforce because the people of CY are on it and the feedback we all bring to these meetings is important – we need to keep on going. JMcD also noted that the Taskforce was promised a further meeting before the end of last year and, considering some of the negative feedback that was going around, this would have been a good opportunity to sort things out. Important for the Taskforce to continue to give the public an opportunity to engage, ask Qs and provide feedback.

TM echoed JMcD's comments and that, with organisations and businesses passing on feedback from the community to the Taskforce, was it important to keep it going.

JG stated this was her first meeting and that there was a lot of information which was good for Napranum Shire to be across and be involved in. Keen for the Taskforce to be continued, especially as it is looking at issues in communities and projects in communities in relation to infrastructure.

AD noted that one of the values of the Taskforce was the collective discussion and response to issues; advised that people with issues can also refer them to TMR.

KP noted that the Taskforce was important to get consistent messaging out to Cape York communities.

JMcD stated that often people do not know who to ring, but they know who is on the Taskforce and so talk to us.

KP noted that issues will bubble up and that TMR's District Office will follow issues up. KP further stated that TMR's District Office's staff had been travelling the PDR dropping pamphlets and other hardcopy information. KP believes the communication effort has been really good.

KS stated that the Taskforce is absolutely necessary. The PBA has a voice we can put forward the issues we are facing on the ground. The other thing about the Taskforce is the members – building good relationships, building trust between us. If we have got relationships happening, it means we can be honest. You do not get that unless you have face to face communication. The Taskforce should continue for the whole CYRP project and, hopefully, on into future projects.

PS noted there was tremendous economic opportunity. The Taskforce should be recognised for how far it has come in last four years and the successes made. There are great opportunities going forward to secure further funding and build capabilities in all of our communities with ongoing support used on the ground by locals. PS fully endorses carrying this forward through the RDA.

MM stated that the most important thing he'd seen today is the access provided to the state and federal departments. Once the departments get to see what it is that we experience – we will have more advocates in these departments. MM also noted that civil infrastructure does not stop at bitumen/road building, noting potential opportunities with Weipa having the fourth deepest water harbour port in the State.

GW agreed with everything said previously and that the current Taskforce structure and format is current working perfectly. GW endorses AD as the Chair and thinks he is doing a wonderful job. GW noted that the group has evolved to those that are genuinely interested in outcomes for the Cape and they should remain on the Taskforce. If others want to join they are welcome, but we don't have to advertise or seek them – this will keep it to those interested in outcomes for the people of the Cape. Even at the end of 2019, let's not wrap this up as there is the future of the next lot of funding that needs to be addressed.

EN spoke about Cape Indigenous Mayor's Alliance (CIMA) operations from 2013 – 2015 with everyone working together – working for the Cape and Cape people. EN raised concerns about keeping money in the Cape, not with NSW contractors and the need to get Indigenous mobs trained up and educated. EN flagged a desire to invite CIMA to the next Taskforce meeting to look at the gateway to Torres. All about us working together.

KP agreed the Taskforce should keep going, noting that there were a few elections that got in the way of having the meeting. KP emphasised the importance of being clear on the purpose of this Taskforce going forward – noting that government departments/staff cannot be part of discussions regarding potential funding submissions for future tranches of the CYRP. Public servants cannot lobby for money. Departments have their own processes, and will work through these internally and other members of the Taskforce will do what you do externally. KP noted the importance of two way communication – adding that the membership list has sorted itself out. KP stated that she did not think it was a good idea to organise an open forum – in her view, it would just be a talk fest and this group has an opportunity to do real work, supporting the point KS made around building trust, so if there are issues you can have the conversation to resolve them. This would not happen in an open forum.

AD added that the Taskforce had additional value in making sure there were linkages with other Cape York processes.

CG noted that she found this group very useful and that the Commonwealth want to be a part of the two-way process to getting information about what is going on which does help us

	<p>understand things a lot better. CG supportive of the Taskforce going forward and very glad to be able to participate.</p> <p>ACTION: Redraft Terms of Reference for Taskforce – for next SWG and Taskforce meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General discussion about timing of meetings and regularity; agreed a Taskforce meeting twice a year was the preferred option; Meet to discuss post-delivery outcomes – how things have worked; • Meet to discuss approach for following year and any prioritisation work; • Receive information on achievements/performance of contractors etc. • Note also need to fit in with the CYRP Board meetings (1st Tuesday of every quarter – March, June, Sept, Dec) – information/feedback flows; <p>Suggested meeting date claimers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWG – Nov/Dec • Taskforce – Mid Feb/March 	
4.6	<p>Communication and Engagement <i>Discussed above.</i></p>	AD
4.7	<p>Next steps</p>	AD
4.8	<p>Other matters</p>	AD
	<p>Next meeting date – TBC Meeting Closed: 5.10pm</p>	

Attachments:

1. CYRP Taskforce Meeting Draft Minutes 13th October 2015
2. CIMA projects list under CYRP (TMR factsheet)
3. CYRP Sub Working Group Communique May 2016
4. CYLC One Claim Information Booklet
5. TMR Power point Presentation 11 August 2016
6. Media Release 12/8/2016 Peninsula Developmental Road sealing rolls on
7. Media Release 17/8/2016 Contracts awarded for Peninsula Developmental Road upgrades

ACTIONS

Redraft Terms of Reference for Taskforce – for next SWG and Taskforce meetings.