

Review of CAB services: Draft options

| Option | Description | Pros | Cons | Implementation |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Option 1: Enhanced status quo | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall funding envelope unchanged • Governing Body remains the decision maker for funding • Council has funding agreement with ACABx • The funding agreement includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A review of the population-based funding model with up-to-date local board population estimates, current CAB sites and exploring the use of deprivation as a proxy for need - Improved reporting with consistent trend information at regional and site level - A local relationship framework developed to support strengthened and more strategic relationships between local boards and bureaux | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valued community service is maintained • Continued contribution to regional strategies and improved contribution to local board plan outcomes • Updated funding model to include some aspects of need, including population growth and potentially deprivation • Improved reporting on the use and value of the service regionally and locally (who is using the service, why and where) • Community intelligence is shared to support local decision making and advocacy • Efficient bulk funding model because Governing Body would allocate bulk funding to ACABx to distribute to the bureaux | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to the fixed funding envelope • Does not address the overall number and location of service sites or opening of new sites in high growth areas • No strategic approach to the region's service needs • Does not address that some local boards are providing additional funding for bureau services from LDI budgets • Does not address the CAB as a largely passive service with limited resources to undertake outreach to vulnerable groups that are currently underrepresented as users • Does not address responsiveness of the service to changing demographics and evolving community needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be implemented for 2018/2019 with a two-year funding agreement (July 2018 - June 2020) • This is the most achievable of the options |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Option 2: Locally driven</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAB operates as a local service rather than a regional service • Governing Body transfers responsibility for existing budget to local boards. Locally driven initiatives (LDI) budgets adjusted accordingly • It would be up to each local board to decide if local bureaux are funded and to what level. From the bureaux perspective, their funding agreement would be with Auckland Council instead of ACABx • Local boards govern the relationship with bureaux • The funding agreement includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting local board priorities - Improved reporting and local relationship framework as under Option 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to strengthen alignment of bureaux services with local board plan outcomes and with other local community services • Local boards and bureaux work together to respond to growth and local changes • Council funding of the service can be more responsive to local need, e.g. seek rationalisation of bureau sites at a local or cluster level, outreach to vulnerable groups that are currently underrepresented as users • Boards can direct funding to providers best placed to serve the local community • Improved reporting on the use and value of the service regionally and locally (who is using the service, why and where) • Community intelligence is shared to support local decision making and advocacy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fixed funding envelope constrains the ability to open new sites • No strategic approach to the region's service needs • Significantly higher administrative burden on CAB which will need to seek local board support for funding arrangements • Would require increased dedicated resource from council (Community Empowerment Unit) to administer multiple funding agreements and accountability reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be implemented for 2018/2019 • Funding could be ring fenced for the 2018/2019 during phased implementation • From 2019-2021, local boards could fund on an annual or multi-year basis and could also fund on a local board cluster basis • This option is achievable but would require significant change for bureaux and local boards |
|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Option 3: Regional service provision</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment undertaken to understand the value of the service which would also determine the appropriate level of Auckland Council support required • This option requires active participation from CABNZ and Auckland bureaux • Regional Network Provision Framework developed by council, CABNZ and bureaux that reviews the location of bureau sites across the region to address service gaps and opportunities around accommodation • Could also include potential for a single CAB entity for whole of Auckland with a mandate to develop the service regionally – requires major constitutional change for bureaux | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive review of the CAB service going forward and role for Auckland Council in supporting the service • Only option that allows for a review of the level of council funding for the service • Strengthened contribution to regional strategies and local board plan outcomes • Only option that would be able to comprehensively address the overall number and location of service sites, including new sites • Strategic approach to the region’s service needs and addresses responsiveness of local service delivery | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires significant commitment and change from a volunteer-based organisation • Relies on substantial council involvement and increased dedicated resource | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new approach would be developed during 2018/19 and implemented in 2019/2020 • Enhanced status quo would apply in 2018/2019 • This option is the most difficult to achieve and would require long term commitment from all parties and council resourcing to implement |
|--|--|---|--|---|