

Options analysis of engagement process

	<p>Option 2: Recommended option Standard Consultation Process supported by enhanced engagement (Schedule 1, Part 1 Preparation and change of policy statements and plans by local authorities, 3 Consultation)</p>	<p>Option 3: Collaborative Planning Process - (Schedule 1, Part 4 Collaborative Planning Process of the Resource Management Act)</p>
<p>Pros</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> allows members of the public significant rights of participation, including the right to submit, pre sent to a hearings committee, and appeal a decision to the Environment Court recognises and protects the particular rights and interests of those affected and more general public interests a strong front end engagement process focuses on giving all sectors of the community the opportunity to be involved in shaping the plan change an enhanced engagement process can be an agile process using a range of engagement techniques to involve sectors of the community who otherwise would not be able or willing to engage in a statutory process adoption of a very strong front end engagement process produces quality plan outcomes as the plan change has benefited from community input at all stages (from development to notification of the plan change) an enhanced engagement process enables the community to submit better informed submissions therefore reducing time and cost during the hearing and decision making phases improves the quality of decision-making as the risk of policy failure has been reduced through community input (engagement process) doesn't preclude non-statutory consultation of outcomes of work, prior to notification of a plan change and avoids 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> collaborative group representing the community is an active partner in developing planning provisions and decision-making an empowering engagement process for those involved promotes open and democratic process as it encourages front end public participation and deliberation of community values. Focus on identifying what is best for the catchment rather than what is best for the stakeholder promotes transparency and strengthens accountability and ensures that there is well-informed debate and dialogue between council and stakeholders

	<p>costly mistakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> allows integration with other water engagement activities the process for enhanced engagement is already in place through the Wai Ora Healthy Waterways Programme costs predominately met through existing Healthy Waters staff time and budgets (circa. \$3.3m over 3-5 years) generally most cost effective engagement process 	
<p>Cons</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> public participation can be time-consuming and sometimes expensive public perception of information provided by the council at the initial stage of the process e.g. discussion document, may be interpreted as unhelpful as the issue could appear to be pre-determined or is too complicated the credibility and effectiveness of the process is important as preserving the integrity of agreed plan provisions can't be guaranteed as they are subject to the hearing and appeals process if public participation is done poorly it could result in loss of faith in the council. A negative experience of the process may lead participants to have negative perceptions and little or no support of the outcomes may not meet community expectations as the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management infers a 'collaborative' approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> determining who participates on the collaborative group is a significant challenge. While more representatives ensures perspectives are represented, too many can make collaboration difficult. Also, some interests e.g. youth and ethnic groups may not be able or are unwilling to participate difficult to get balanced representation as the process better suits those with vested interests not great for urban environments where there is a much less clear group of stakeholders uncertainty of outcomes as there is a risk that the collaborative group agree on recommendations that the council is not comfortable with shift in mind-set for council as council is giving up some of the control of planning processes and empowering people who have not traditionally had decision-making power duration and time resource constraints as process is lengthy, resource intensive and time consuming. Some councils believe that the same environmental outcomes could be achieved with a simpler and shorter engagement approach it is often a long collaborative process (up to several years) which requires community capacity and motivation to be involved can be resource hungry for both the council and participants. Significant effort is required to avoid 'stakeholder burnout' or 'consultation fatigue' public focus on plan change engagement (rule book of the

		<p>Auckland Unitary Plan) could undermine engagement on other water initiatives being developed by council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost and time requirements – proponents argue that it will cost less in the long run, or will produce more durable outcomes, but the cost might be front-load
<p>Efficiency and Effectiveness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the value of engagement (as long as it is conducted effectively) is greater than the upfront costs e.g. spending money upfront on engagement rather than on appeals and legal costs • effective engagement benefits decision-makers as the community become better informed, more motivated to get involved, resulting in increased buy-in of stakeholders. • risk of policy failure is reduced as engagement improves the information you are basing decisions on • not efficient as does not make use of existing programme of engagement through the Wai Ora Healthy Waterways Programme • makes efficient use of existing programme of engagement through the Wai Ora Healthy Waterways Programme • no additional cost over and above operational expenditure already that committed for the Wai Ora Healthy Waterways Programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may not be efficient to try and establish objectives and limits across the range of environments and issues faced by Auckland – risk that there will be inconsistencies between different watersheds not based on environmental / issue differences • critical importance of coastal receiving environments in Auckland means there is a need to ensure all freshwater responses address coastal waters • some councils are moving away from the collaborative planning process as it has been very resource intensive and time consuming, leading some councils to believe that the same environmental outcomes could be achieved with a simpler consultative approach • although some regional councils have used an informal collaborative process preceding a Standard Process, the new Collaboration Planning Process under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act is untested. • collaboration at the scale required by this process is new Auckland Council and to be effective council would need to build capacity and train staff new skills and approaches
