

Governance Framework Review Attachment A: Policy issues

File No.: <<leave blank – Infocouncil will insert this when the report is saved in Trim>>

Purpose

1. This paper sets out issues considered and recommendations for the following topics:
 - regional policy and decision-making processes
 - local decisions that may have regional impacts (development of a ‘call-in’ right)
 - delegations under the Reserves Act 1977
 - the respective roles of local boards and Auckland Transport in place-shaping
 - a proposed Waiheke Local Board pilot project.

Comments

Regional policy and decision-making processes

2. The initial report of the Governance Framework Review found that there were a number of issues with the way that regional policy is developed.
 - there is no agreed strategic framework for regional policy development that adequately addresses governing body and local boards’ statutory roles¹
 - the planning of regional decision-making across the organisation does not provide local boards with good visibility of the timing of regional decisions
 - considerable time and resource commitments are required to seek local board input on regional decisions
 - local boards often do not receive quality advice to inform their input, and advice to the governing body and local boards sometimes provides limited analysis of local impacts.
3. To address these issues, the review recommended that the council should develop a process for regional policy development that provides a more structured and transparent method for both governance arms to fulfil their statutory roles.
4. The review also recommended that the council should consider developing a clear policy on the commissioning of contestable advice, including a conflict resolution process between the governing body and local boards, that it should continue to embed the programme for improving the quality of policy advice and that it should consider limiting the ability of local boards to advocate on regional policy issues (particularly investment), once due consideration has been given.
5. Two options were assessed for implementing better policy development processes that would ensure effective local board input to regional policy decisions.
 - **Option 1** involves implementing a framework with mechanisms to ensure effective local board input to regional policy decisions, and sets out ways of working to address the issues identified.

¹ The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 sets out the following respective statutory roles for regional policy and decision-making:

- Each local board is responsible for ‘identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the content of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of the Auckland Council’ [s.16(1)(c)]
- The governing body must ‘consider any views and preferences expressed by a local board, if the decision affects or may affect the responsibilities or operation of the local board or the well-being of communities within its local board area’ [s.15(2)(c)] when carrying out its decision-making responsibilities, including regional policy-making.

- **Option 2** involves the same framework plus adoption of a set of politically-endorsed principles, in order to provide greater political direction and set public and political expectations.
6. Both options were assessed as leading to better policy development, more empowerment of local boards, and to better fulfil statutory obligations. The political working party supported option 1 as being appropriate to meet the requirements of a robust policy development process.
 7. These new mechanisms to ensure effective local board input to regional policy decisions would include, at a minimum:
 - a process for involving local boards in the development of regional work programmes at the beginning of each term and in an annual refresh
 - earlier and more joint engagement between local boards and the governing body in regional decision-making processes
 - requirements for analysis of local impacts and local interest of regional decisions and options, and reporting of this to local boards and the governing body
 - specified criteria for categorising the potential local impact and local board interest in regional decisions
 - processes and methods for tailoring local board engagement in line with the local impact and local interest of regional decisions e.g. high categorisation requiring more specific local engagement and analysis, low categorisation requiring more clustered or joint local board workshop sessions and less in depth analysis
 - specified methods for engagement and communication with local boards at all stages of the decision-making process.
 8. There would be some initial costs associated with the development of this framework, but these will be absorbed within existing staffing levels. Once the framework is in place there should be no additional costs.
 9. The political working party also adopted the following additional positions:
 - The quality advice programme should continue to be a priority for the organisation.
 - Auckland Council should not implement a policy or process on the commissioning of contestable advice, nor a formal conflict resolution process, as neither are considered proportionate to the scale of the problem and would create unnecessary costs.
 - Auckland Council should not implement a policy to limit the ability of local boards to advocate on regional policy issues, as it would not be in line with local boards' statutory role to advocate on behalf of their communities.
 10. Local boards unanimously support these positions and noted that, in their view, the issue of the organisation providing sufficient capacity and resources for provision of policy advice to local boards is important. This is critical to the effective functioning of the Auckland governance model and to enabling local boards to fulfil their statutory functions. How the organisation provides local policy support to local boards is being considered through the Organisational Support workstream.

Implementation and next steps

11. The development of a draft framework has begun and an internal team has been created to guide its development. The new draft framework will be workshopped with local boards prior to finalisation and implementation. We anticipate that the framework will be implemented early in the 2018 calendar year.
12. The roll out, training and communication of new processes will be key to their successful implementation. Training methods and an internal communications plan will be developed.

Tension between local and regional priorities (development of a 'call-in' right)

13. The governance framework review concluded that the current governance model 'provides limited incentives for local boards to consider local assets in a regional context, or contemplate divestment or re-prioritisation of assets or facilities in their local board areas. This leads to situations where conflict between local decision-making and regional decision-making arises.'
14. The report cited the hypothetical example of a local sports field which has been identified as having capacity to be developed and contribute to the regional strategy to grow regional capacity in the sports field network, but the local board does not support this development because of the possible impacts on local residents of increased noise, traffic and light. The local board has the ability to decide against the development on the basis of those concerns, with the regional impact of that decision being a resultant shortfall in sports field capacity.
15. To address this issue, the review recommended that council should develop a process which would allow the governing body to 'call in' decisions about local assets where there is an important regional priority. Our analysis showed that these situations occur very rarely, but when they do they usually have significant or serious implications.
16. Legal analysis showed that an explicit 'call-in' right is not possible under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 (LGACA) or the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) but could be achieved through an amendment to the allocation table. A range of options to address the problem were developed.
 - **Option 1** is an enhanced status quo, with a focus on council staff ensuring that advice to local boards covers possible regional implications of a decision where they exist.
 - **Option 2** involves establishing a process to bring both arms of governance together to attempt to reach a solution that appropriately provides for regional and local priorities.
 - **Option 3** involves amending the allocation of decision-making to allocate to the governing body decision-making over an asset that is currently local in a situation where there is a regional or sub-regional need or impact.
 - **Option 4** involves amending the allocation of decision-making as per Option 3, and also delegating the decision to a joint committee of the governing body and local board members.
17. The political working party has recommended Option 1. The view of the working party was that local boards are able to make decisions with sub-regional or regional implications if appropriate advice is provided. To that end, a mechanism should be implemented to ensure that local boards are clearly advised of any potential regional or sub-regional implications of a decision that they are asked to make.
18. Local boards unanimously supported the political working party's position. It was noted that every local board has a statutory obligation to 'collaborate and co-operate with one or more other local boards in the situations where the interests and preferences of communities within each local board area will be better served by doing so' (Section 16(3) LGACA). This provision puts the onus on local boards to consult other local boards on decisions that affect them and their communities.

Implementation and next steps

19. Should the recommendations be accepted, a regional impact statement will be included in reports to local boards where the decision required has the potential to have an impact beyond the immediate local board area. This will be included in the rollout of the new report template in November 2017 and in training for report writers on the new report template.
20. The quality advice programme is developing guidance on impact assessments and will also consider incorporating regional impact assessments into a quality advice seminar for Auckland Council report writers in 2018.

Delegations under the Reserves Act 1977

21. The Governance Framework Review found that most elected members 'felt that the split of decision-making allocation was reasonably well understood and sensible', but there were

- several areas where the allocation (and/or delegations) was challenged. The review recommended that council look at the delegated responsibilities to local boards for swimming pool fencing exemptions, setting time and season rules for dog access, the role of local boards in resource consent applications, and in various Reserves Act 1977 decisions.
22. These issues have either already been addressed or will shortly be addressed through existing work programmes. Therefore, the analysis focused on issues regarding the role of local boards in decision-making under the Reserves Act.
23. Currently, local boards are allocated non-regulatory decision-making for 'the use of and activities within local parks', and 'reserve management plans for local parks'. However, the council's Reserves Act regulatory decisions are the responsibility of the governing body. The review concluded that 'where a local park has reserve status under the Reserves Act, it can impact or limit the decision-making authority of local boards in relation to that park'. It recommended that there 'is a case for local boards having consistent decision-making rights across all local parks', regardless of which legislation they are managed under.
24. Options were developed for the following Reserves Act powers:
- declaring land to be a reserve under section 14(1), which brings it into the regime set out by the Reserves Act
 - classifying or reclassifying a reserve under sections 16(1), 16(2A) and 24(1) which has an impact on how the reserve can be used
 - requesting the revocation of reserve status from the Minister of Conservation under section 24(1) (for the purposes of managing council-owned land under the LGA)
 - reserve land exchanges under section 15(1).
25. The role of local boards in exercising the Minister of Conversation's delegated supervisory powers, which are a process check that requires council to ensure that Reserves Act processes have been followed correctly, was also considered.
26. The options considered were generally:
- status quo (decision-making continues to lie with the governing body)
 - delegate decision-making for local reserves to local boards
 - delegate decision-making for local reserves to local boards, subject to development of a regional policy to provide some consistency across the region.
27. Staff recommended that decision-making for all of the above powers, with the exception of reserve exchanges and the Minister's supervisory powers, should be considered for delegation to local boards.
28. It was recommended that the Minister's supervisory powers remain delegated to staff on the basis that the supervisory decision is a technical check that the correct process has been followed, and it should be exercised by a different decision-maker than the maker of the substantive decision.
29. The political working party agreed with these recommendations. Clause 36C of Schedule 7 to the LGA states that "in deciding whether to make a delegation, the Governing Body must weigh the benefits of reflecting local circumstances and preferences...against the importance and benefits of using a single approach in the district". Appendix D sets out this test in detail to inform governing body decision making on this matter.

Reserve exchanges

30. An exchange of reserve land is an acquisition and disposal carried out at the same time. Acquisitions and disposals of property are currently governing body decisions. It was recommended by staff that decisions on reserve exchanges should remain the responsibility of the governing body for the following reasons.

- Delegating this decision would create a different set of decision-making rights (on acquisition and disposal) for open space held under the Reserves Act compared to local parks managed under the LGA, which would remain governing body decisions.
 - The decision-maker (either the governing body or the relevant local board) would differ depending on the financial implications of the reserve exchange, which creates uncertainty. For example, if a proposed exchange would have an impact on council's debt, the decision-maker would need to be the governing body.
 - Delegating reserve exchange decisions could have the effect of providing a veto right to local boards over the outcome of some Resource Management Act 1991 plan change and consent decisions (which are governing body decisions). This would introduce further complexity, time and cost to these processes.
31. The working party was evenly split on whether or not the decisions on reserve exchanges should be delegated to local boards (noting that a majority of local boards support these decisions being delegated). It recommends that both positions be considered by the governing body, which should determine whether or not to delegate this decision to local boards.

Implementation and next steps

32. There will be no additional resourcing requirements arising from these recommendations, and officers' advice is that the delegation could take effect from when the governing body has made its decision.

The role of local boards and Auckland Transport in place-shaping

33. The governance framework review found that there has been frustration among some local board members with respect to transport decision-making and their ability to carry out their place-shaping roles within and beside the road corridor. It noted common concerns among local board members that:
- there is a lack of timely, high-quality information about local transport activity
 - the community holds local board members accountable for local transport decisions, but they have very little influence over them
 - Auckland Transport could be delegating some transport responsibilities to boards, particularly in relation to local transport and place-making in town centres.
34. There are mixed views amongst local board members on the quality and purpose of consultation: while some local board members feel there is genuine consultation and engagement from Auckland Transport, others feel that it can be late or lack authenticity.
35. There also appears to be different expectations of the roles of Auckland Transport and local boards in consulting the public, concerns about a lack of timely, high-quality information, and the quality of advice on the Local Transport Capital Fund. Auckland Transport has stated that it is committed to working closely with local boards to fulfill their place-making and community representation roles and to tailor local delivery where possible.
36. A contributing factor is likely to be the tension between the decision-making allocation, which allocates a decision-making role to local boards over maintenance of and improvements to the local street environment and town centres, and Auckland Transport's statutory role to manage the whole transport network, including the road corridor (which extends from property boundary to property boundary). The decision-making allocation is qualified by the statement that 'Auckland Transport has significant decision-making responsibilities within the street environment and town centres.'
37. Notwithstanding, there are possible opportunities to empower local boards' place-shaping and community representative roles through more influence over specific aspects of the road corridor. Auckland Transport has stated that it is committed to working closely with local boards to fulfill their place-making and community representation roles and to tailor local delivery where possible.

38. To address these issues, the political working party investigated various options for decision-making roles, funding for local transport initiatives, and engagement between Auckland Transport and local boards.

Potential delegation of Auckland Transport functions to local boards

39. Section 54 of the LGACA provides that Auckland Transport may delegate to a committee or employee, or to the Auckland Council, any of its responsibilities, duties, functions and powers. The LGACA also states that, if delegated, any functions can be exercised 'without confirmation by Auckland Transport'. However, the legislation also explicitly states that no delegation relieves Auckland Transport of the liability or legal responsibility to ensure the performance of any of its functions, which means that Auckland Transport would have to be satisfied that any risk is adequately mitigated.
40. A range of transport decision-making functions were assessed for potential delegation to local boards. This included, for example, decision-making over roads that are not main arterial routes (i.e. 'local roads'), footpaths, major and minor capital investment, non-road parts of the road corridor for a variety of uses, event permitting and traffic management planning, signage and banners, regulatory controls over parking, traffic and transit lanes, traffic calming, physical infrastructure (including town centre infrastructure as well as kerb and channelling or swales for stormwater), and community education programmes.
41. Delegation of decision-making functions to local boards did not perform well against the evaluation criteria. While local boards do and should have a role in place-making, of which the road corridor and town centres are a significant part, it is practically difficult to split up formal decision-making for parts of the transport network.
42. In addition, Auckland Transport remains liable for the impacts of decisions even if they are delegated. Therefore, the functions that could be delegated tend to be quite low-level and operational in nature. As a result, the administrative and transactional costs of numerous operational decisions being made by local boards would be high.
43. There are a range of levers available to Auckland Council to influence Auckland Transport to deliver and act in a certain way. They are set out in the LGA in relation to CCOs generally, and in the LGACA for both substantive CCOs and Auckland Transport in particular.
44. These range from section 92(2), which enables the governing body to direct Auckland Transport to act consistently with any plans and strategies of the council (including local board plans), through to the annual letter of expectation and statement of intent development process (with associated monitoring), through agreeing operating rules e.g. design guides, roads and streets framework, to the delegation of operational decision-making.
45. Our advice to the political working party is that every effort should be made to make most effective use of the available governance levers before considering delegation of decisions to local boards that are currently exercised by Auckland Transport staff. This approach is consistent with the aims of the review to empower local boards as governors over a range of services and activities with their local community, including place shaping at the local level.
46. For these reasons, advice to the political working party was that the place-shaping role of local boards would be better given effect to through other options assessed:
- earlier and more consistent engagement by Auckland Transport which acknowledges the local governance and place-shaping roles of local boards, and is in line with the expectations set out in the Governance Manual for Substantive CCOs
 - a direction for Auckland Transport to undertake various other actions that will empower local boards' place shaping in the transport corridor
 - an increase in the local board transport capital fund, which would likely result in greater delivery of local transport projects and local transport outcomes.
47. The political working party has not recommended delegation of any transport decisions to local boards.

Auckland Transport – local board consultation and engagement

48. The political working party explored various options for improvements to consultation and engagement between Auckland Transport and local boards, including local board engagement plans and more consistent reporting and monitoring of local board engagement.
49. Analysis showed that improving Auckland Transport-local board engagement, both at a strategic level and on a project by project basis, would be the best way to empower local boards that takes into account local boards' local governance role and Auckland Transport's statutory responsibilities.
50. This could most likely be achieved if the existing requirements for local board engagement, as set out in the Governance Manual for Substantive Council-Controlled Organisations, are consistently met and monitored. These requirements specify expectations for, amongst other things:
 - local board engagement plans, incorporating schedules of board-specific priorities and projects, and setting out how Auckland Transport will give local boards an opportunity to influence or respond to decisions affecting a local boards' governance role, decisions having a significant local impact, and decisions requiring Auckland Transport to undertake community consultation
 - annual workshops between Auckland Transport and local boards for direction-setting
 - regular reporting against local board engagement.
51. There is opportunity for significant improvement in the way that Auckland Transport develops its engagement plans and carries out their strategic engagement each year. The council's monitoring and reporting of these requirements could also be improved.
52. The working party also received advice on council's current review of the use of section 92(2) of the LGACA, and the possibility of council directing Auckland Transport to comply with local board plans. Section 92(2) states that:

'Each substantive council-controlled organisation must act consistently with the relevant aspects of any other plan (including a local board plan) or strategy of the Council to the extent specified in writing by the Governing Body of the Council.'
53. In February 2017, the Appointments and Performance Review Committee agreed to a timeline for a review of accountability mechanisms for substantive council-controlled organisations (CCO), including possible direction under s92(2) for both Auckland-wide plans and strategies and local board plans.
54. While the scope of s92(2) direction has yet to be confirmed, early advice indicates that it could not be used to direct Auckland Transport to undertake new activities that would have funding implications i.e. it could not conflict with the Long-term Plan or create additional unfunded obligations for Auckland Transport. Therefore, the nature of direction from local board plans to CCOs may be more focused on the way that Auckland Transport works with boards or leveraging planned investment to provide for local priorities.
55. It is recommended that the governing body endorses the CCO accountability review looking at s92(2) direction in regard to local board plans.
56. Various functions of Auckland Transport were assessed for potential local board empowerment. The political working party considered that Auckland Transport should:
 - ensure that local boards have a strong governance role in determining the 'look and feel' of town centres and streetscapes, in line with their allocation of non-regulatory decision-making
 - improve co-ordination between local place-shaping projects, such as town centre upgrades, and its renewals programmes

- provide more opportunities for local board direction on the prioritisation of minor traffic safety projects, with the exception of those which Auckland Transport considers are of critical safety importance
 - be more responsive to local place-shaping initiatives in non-transport parts of the road corridor, including reducing or removing barriers to community place-making initiatives e.g. looking at ways to reduce the costs of developing traffic management plans for community events
 - take direction from local boards on how and where to implement community-focused programmes.
57. It was also proposed that these directions are more actively monitored by council staff and reported annually to the governing body.
58. The working party agreed with the recommendations to improve the relationship by requiring Auckland Transport to be more consistent on meeting its obligations, and through more consistent monitoring of this. It also supported directing Auckland Transport to further empower local boards in their place-shaping role as described above.
59. It also noted that not all ward councillors are regularly engaged or informed of transport projects and issues within their ward areas, and that there should be improved communication to ward councillors.

Funding for local transport projects

60. The Local Transport Capital Fund has been in existence since 2012. It provides approximately \$11 million per annum from Auckland Transport's capital budget to fund local board transport priorities. The fund was implemented to address local board concerns that local board priorities were not being appropriately considered through the Regional Land Transport Plan and that there was a lack of transparency about what local projects were planned in local board areas.
61. The objectives of the fund are to:
- ensure locally important transport projects are given appropriate priority
 - provide local boards with more direct ability to influence local transport projects.
62. Auckland Transport has identified some potential improvements to the fund and the way it is administered. This includes taking a more systematic approach to managing projects agreed by local boards.
63. The political working party considered the following options for the fund.
- **Option 1** is the status quo: the fund remains at approximately \$11 million with no changes to its allocation across local boards.
 - **Option 2** involves an increase to the size of the fund from the current inflation-adjusted value of \$11 million to \$20 million, as well as improvements to provide local boards with better advice and a more systematic approach to managing projects. Process improvements and better advice to local boards may improve outcomes from the fund.
 - **Option 3:** a full review of the purpose and operation of the fund.
64. The political working party took the position that the Local Transport Capital Fund should be increased significantly, and that an appropriate quantum for the increase should be determined through the Long-term Plan process alongside other funding priorities. The method of allocating this fund across local boards should also be considered through the long-term plan process.
65. It also agreed that Auckland Transport should provide local boards with a more systematic approach to identifying options for projects and local transport outcomes through the fund.

Implementation and next steps

66. Implementing better monitoring of Auckland Transport's performance against the Governance Manual for Substantive Council-Controlled Organisations will take some planning. Staff consider that this can be implemented in time for the 2018/19 financial year and can be achieved within existing Auckland Council resources.
67. Auckland Transport will need some lead in time to develop local board engagement plans that satisfy the requirements of the Governance Manual for Substantive Council-Controlled Organisations. The manual stipulates a process and expected timeframes for each financial year, beginning with strategic and direction-setting sessions with each board in the lead up to new financial years. These could be started early in 2018, so that new engagement plans are in place for the 2018/19 financial year.
68. Work on options for the quantum and allocation of the Local Transport Capital Fund has begun. These will be reported through the local board workstream of the LTP process, therefore it is expected that any change to the fund would be in place at the start of the 2018/19 financial year.
69. The quality advice programme is working with Auckland Transport to improve reporting and advice to local boards. This includes planning regular six-monthly surveys of local board members' satisfaction with Auckland Transport advice, engagement and reporting to local boards.

Waiheke Local Board pilot project

70. The Governance Framework Review identified that there are some practices that are constraining local boards from carrying out their role, including the inflexibility of funding arrangements and difficulties in feeding local input into regional decision-making. It looks at whether some local boards should have greater decision-making powers depending on the extent of the regional impact of specific local decisions. It suggested that this could be piloted on Waiheke Island given:
 - the more clearly defined community of interest on the island (relative to most other local board areas)
 - the separation of the island from wider Auckland services such as roading, stormwater or public transport
 - the desires of the local board for greater decision-making autonomy, and a feeling that the regionalisation of services across Auckland has failed to reflect the unique nature of the island.
71. The Waiheke Local Board has consistently sought greater autonomy, arguing that this would deliver better outcomes for the community and better reflect the principles of subsidiarity and the policy intent of the Auckland amalgamation.
72. Some of the matters that were proposed for devolution in the review are, in fact, already allocated to local boards or provided for under statute, but boards have not had access to the resources to support them, such as local area planning or proposing bylaws, or they have not been assessed as a priority in an environment where large regional projects have tended to dominate (such as the Unitary Plan).
73. In response, a proposed three-year pilot project for Waiheke has been developed in conjunction with the local board. The activities proposed are broader than the technical allocation or delegation of decision-making, and include operational issues, policy and planning, funding, compliance and enforcement and relationships with CCOs. The pilot will include the following projects:
 - A programme of locally-initiated policy, planning and bylaw work that includes responses to visitor growth demands, a strategic plan for Matiatia, and development of a proposal for a community swimming pool.
 - Addressing a number of operational issues that frustrate the local board. For example there are a number of longstanding compliance and encroachment issues on the island that have not been resolved and have become almost intractable, resulting in

ongoing negative environmental and social impacts. This may be addressed through better locally-based operational leadership from council.

- Developing some key local transport strategic approaches, such as a 10-year transport plan and Waiheke and Hauraki Gulf Islands design guidelines for the road corridor.
74. Additional projects will be considered and added to the pilot in response to issues arising during the pilot period. The pilot has been developed with intervention logic and an evaluation methodology built-in from the beginning. This will enable a sound evaluation of the pilot to be undertaken, particularly to assess success and the applicability of the findings to the rest of Auckland. These, and more information about the projects considered for the pilot, are set out in the pilot proposal attached as Appendix E.
75. The Waiheke Local Board will oversee governance of the pilot project. It is proposed that the pilot be implemented from 1 October 2017. The political working party has endorsed the development of the project and the approach set out in the pilot proposal.
76. All local boards support the pilot project, with eleven boards stating there should be an explicit commitment to report either the evaluation or regular update reports on the pilot to all local boards. This has been included in the political working party's recommendations.
77. The Waiheke Local Board provided additional detailed feedback by resolution.
- Note the recommendation to establish an Operations Manager position for the Waiheke Pilot with the authority and departmental support necessary for it to be effective.
 - Thank the Governing Body for supporting a Waiheke Pilot and notes its hope and intention that the Pilot will enable real and meaningful progress on the issues and aspirations of the Waiheke community, including improvements in its relationships and how it works with CCOs.
 - Confirm its commitment to sharing Pilot findings with other boards and the Governing Body and ongoing engagement with them where learnings, opportunities and other board's ideas can usefully be tested through the Pilot.
 - Consider that current costs to servicing Waiheke can be significantly reduced, and/or deliver better outcomes, if the administrative and operational structures are changed to an islands centric approach and wishes to test some of these through the Waiheke Pilot by benchmarking against the costings in the recent Morrison Low report commissioned by the Local Government Commission.
 - Support in principle the idea of a local rate being investigated and tested as part of the Waiheke pilot subject to the board having full authority and accountability over local matters, operational practices and expenditure.
 - Request that, in conjunction with the Great Barrier Local Board, the coming representation review give consideration to an Auckland Council Hauraki Gulf Islands only Ward Councillor position in recognition of the difference between the islands and the mainland and the importance of these communities being fully represented.
 - Request that the Governing Body forward the above resolutions to the Local Government Commission for its information.
 - Draw the Governing Body's attention to its position on Reserves Act and Auckland Transport delegations, which differ from officer recommendations.
 - Invite the Governing Body to a visit to Waiheke hosted by the Board to see and discuss these matters for themselves.

Next steps and implementation

78. A draft implementation plan and an evaluation plan will be developed and workshopped with the Waiheke Local Board for its consideration. The organisational implications of the pilot are currently being worked through, which includes consideration of recruitment for a

DRAFT

programme manager for Waiheke to oversee the pilot project. These costs are being met from within existing budgets.