

# Review of CAB services

## Summary of local board input

### Resolutions July-August 2017: Input on current state

### Resolutions November 2017: Feedback on options

---

## Purpose

To provide a summary of local board input to the council led review of the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) services in Auckland, following a resolution by the April 2016 Regional Strategy and Policy Committee.

## Executive Summary

The review has sought input from local boards on their relationship with the local bureaux and Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Incorporated (ACABx) and the local CAB service provision. This report provides a summary of local board feedback across the wider Auckland region and focuses on common themes. As such, it does not include all of the matters raised in local board resolutions.

Local boards have provided information and views (through resolutions) on various questions asked by the Auckland Council Community Empowerment Unit.

Questions focused around:

1. Current relationship
2. Value of the CAB service
3. Funding levels, equity and fairness – the ACAB funding model
4. Local board reporting needs
5. Local board understanding of the ACABx role
6. Aspirations for the future

Key themes when answering these questions were:

1. Most local boards have a good relationship with CABx. However, boards generally seek a more formalised relationship to support improved two way communications.
2. There is a general agreement that the CAB provides a valuable wide-ranging service available to all the community.
3. Local boards vary in their view of the funding model. Nevertheless, there is a clear majority voicing the need for a fairer and more equitable model.
4. Many local boards seek improved reporting to enable better interaction and conversations between CABx and local boards.
5. Boards seem to understand that ACABx as the group that represents all Auckland CABx. However, understanding seems limited.
6. The general theme of the local board aspirations for the future was predominantly around positive suggestions for funding, service responsiveness and reporting improvements.

Local board input will inform the development of options for the future state as part of the next part of review.

## **Summary of local board feedback and input**

The general themes of local board views and input are summarised below.

### **Current relationship**

Most local boards have a good relationship with CABx. However, local boards generally seek a more formalised relationship to support improved two way communications.

#### **1.1 Funding relationship**

Funding is one way the relationship between local boards and CAB offices is maintained.

Some local boards supplement the regional funding by allocating funding and local grants for things such as technology, office furniture and accommodation. For these local boards there is a concern that, if funding for its local CAB is reduced or if CAB accommodation costs increase, additional pressure will be placed on locally-driven funding creating an expectation that local boards will make up the shortfall.

#### **1.2 Interaction between local boards and CABx**

Interaction between local boards and CABx varies significantly. However, in some areas it has diminished since the amalgamation into one Auckland Council.

Interaction is described as mainly informal and it is believed it could improve from a more strengthened relationship.

Some local boards receive either reports (six monthly or annual) or invites to CAB Annual General Meetings.

A few local boards also expressed the view that they would like to see local CABx have a stronger presence within existing community networks (through community centres, houses, churches and other community service providers) in order to raise their profile and improve connections with the community.

#### **1.3 Mutual support**

CABx are explained to be in a good position to support the local board community by answering questions that council can't or isn't best placed to respond to (such as issues between private property owners). Regarding council questions, CABx may also be seen as friendlier and more independent place for people to go to.

In one location the CAB participates and supports the local board in engagement processes, such as the 2017-2020 Local Board Plan engagement. Another local board suggests that helping with council engagement could be something to explore.

## **2 Value of the CAB service**

There is a general agreement that the CAB provides a valuable wide-ranging service to all the community.

### **2.1 Value of CAB service to the local community**

A majority of local boards believe that the CAB provide free quality face to face services which are intangible and cannot be measured with tick boxes. A number of different services are mentioned as particularly valuable:

- legal advice and information on central and local government services
- advice for students (in particular on student loans, budgeting, housing, employment law)
- advice for new immigrants
- free services for poorer residents
- guidance for woman looking for privacy and safety outside of their direct community
- wide ranging advice for older members of the community
- support for those who have urgent unmet accommodation needs
- JP services

To one local board it is unclear what value is provided “The board receives insufficient information from CABx to answer this question fully”.

### **2.2 CAB alignment with local area and local board objectives**

Majority of local boards believe the community benefit from the services aligns with local board outcomes and issues such as connected communities, employment and housing.

On the contrary one local board is concerned that central government funding is dictating and directing the services being provided at CABx, diminishing the link to local community need.

Others are less sure about how local board objectives and CAB outputs and targets are aligned “we just assume they fill the requirements that they have...”

## **3 Funding levels, equity and fairness – the ACABx funding model**

The current funding model is a population based model. Local boards vary in their view of this approach. Nevertheless, there is a clear majority voicing the need for a fairer and more equitable funding model.

### **3.1 Funding levels**

Many local boards took the opportunity to highlight that a higher level of funding is generally required to sustain and grow CAB offices. This includes a number of local boards mentioning that current funding is stretched to meet the demand and that there appears to be no funding available to set up new CABx.

It is highlighted that user numbers do not reflect the actual need for the services. That is, the needs are significant and the numbers of people coming through the doors do not give the full picture of the complex and multiple needs involved with CAB service users.

A couple of local boards mention that they are concerned that the review is a budget cutting exercise and instead an increase is needed to sustain the current service.

### **3.2 Effectiveness of the current funding model in terms of delivering CAB services**

A majority of local boards voice concern that the population based approach is unsustainable. Reasons for this varies but seems to reflect either; the perceived need for more funding (high demand areas) or less funding (low demand areas).

There is a general sense of unfair distribution of available funding. Comments made include:

- Funding needs to be based on need and not based on population - that should be the base of the evaluation.
- The current funding model is not effective. The local board request that the model include the area's demographics and weigh deprivation high as a criterion.
- Under the Local Board Funding policy, funding for local activities is allocated to local board based on - Population 90%, deprivation 5% and land area 5%. This formula can be adapted to consider weighting deprivation as a greater factor, and not population alone.
- With an ageing population (relative to the whole of Auckland) and a significantly lower average income (relative to the whole of Auckland) equity of provision needs to take those factors into account.
- CAB on Waiheke Island serves to provide advice in a vacuum of services. On the Auckland isthmus there are a multitude of other social and health agencies (NGOs, churches, marae, and government services) that are available to provide advice and services, whilst Waiheke only has a very small number of agencies/services, so equitable provision needs to take that into account.
- The number of people coming into city centre and using the service should be factored into the funding for local CAB
- We are currently being asked on behalf of local branches to provide additional funds, so this shows equity issues with funding.
- CAB may play a stronger role elsewhere in the region, which may require different levels of funding and support.
- What are the pros and cons if funding would be directly distributed by Auckland Council to the local CABx. Or, couldn't a more localised model of distribution funds be developed?

A couple of local boards believe the current CAB funding model is generally effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally.

### **3.3 Factors to considered to ensure fair and equitable service distribution across the region**

A number of suggested factors have been proposed to improve fairness and equity in relation to the distribution of existing funding. Suggestions focus around deprivation levels, demographics (age, migrants, ethnicity), location and usage statistics (hub for workers, students and commuters).

In addition there are a few calls for the governing body and/or central government to consider allocating additional funding to meet unmet needs, ensuring the CAB can service all of Auckland effectively.

One local board encourage Auckland Council and Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux (ACABx), given the rapid growth of Auckland, to develop a regional plan for Auckland Bureaux provision to guide future assessment of and investment in local Citizens Advice Bureau services, as there appears to be a considerable gap in planning for the future and local boards shouldn't be expected to fund new CAB services.

#### **4 Local board reporting needs**

Many local boards seek improved reporting to enable better interaction and conversations between CABx and local boards.

There exists a general consensus for consistent annual or bi-annual reporting, with reporting focused on easy to understand statistics and explanatory narrative.

One local board suggests they receive better information from ACABx to how its local board plan outcomes are measured against ACABx and Auckland Council's funding agreement. This information could inform the local board's future support to local CABx.

Other local boards would like to understand how CAB services may respond to Māori and cultural perspectives (what alignment of volunteers and those seeking support in term of culture and ethnicity may exist). Some boards were also interested in what support CABx get locally from central government particularly related to new migrants and job seekers.

#### **5 Local board understand of the ACABx role**

Local boards seem to understand that ACABx as the group represents all Auckland CABx.

However, understanding seems limited and a few individual questions have been raised:

- The local board has limited understanding of the role of ACABx, only that it is a regional umbrella for distributing funding and doesn't seem to have any other purpose.
- The local board suggests that models be considered that provide direct funding from the Auckland Council to individual CABx.

On the other hand one local board explains that they are not sure if they need to know the ACABx role is. Another feel they just want to know that there is a strategic relationship and that the local branches are getting what they need from ACABx.

#### **6 Aspirations for the future**

Local boards were asked "what would you change if you could?". The response was predominantly positive and a snapshot of typical comments can be found below:

- The local CAB could be more integrated with the library service.
- The CABs could look to improve marketing for further reach into the community and transition further into the digital age to connect with more young people.

- Create a mechanism within the system to identify critical needs and changes to these within the community.
- More funding needed for CAB.
- The bureaux need new furniture. Needs to sharpen up as they currently look tired.
- More focused on getting a cultural mix through the door, but recognised that it would be difficult to 'manage' who comes through the door.
- The funding model to include criterion, highlighting deprivation.
- The CAB report could have wider awareness from both board members and the community. The relationship with other community groups needs to be better understood.
- There is still a general feeling that the CAB provides services for 'old people' - they do not engage with Youth and are not attractive to Youth.
- The local board considers that there could be mutual advantages for the local board and local CABx if they were regularly to share their learnings on current community issues.

## Contents

1.1	Albert-Eden Local Board — 26 July 2017.....	8
2.1	Devonport-Takapuna Local Board — 15 August 2017 .....	9
2.2	Devonport-Takapuna Local Board — 21 November 2017 .....	10
3.1	Franklin Local Board — 22 August 2017 .....	11
3.2	Franklin Local Board — 28 November 2017.....	11
4.1	Henderson-Massey Local Board — 15 August 2017 .....	11
4.2	Henderson-Massey Local Board — 21 November 2017.....	12
5.1	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board — 16 August 2017.....	12
5.2	Hibiscus and Bays Local Board — 15 November 2017 .....	13
6.1	Howick Local Board — 21 August 2017 .....	13
6.2	Howick Local Board — 20 November 2017 .....	14
7.1	Kaipātiki Local Board — 16 August 2017 .....	14
7.2	Kaipātiki Local Board — 15 November 2017 .....	15
8.1	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board — 16 August 2017 .....	15
8.2	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board — 15 November 2017.....	18
9.1	Manurewa Local Board — 20 July 2017 .....	19
9.2	Manurewa Local Board — 16 November 2017 .....	20
10.1	Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board — 25 July 2017.....	21
10.2	Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board — 25 November 2017.....	21
11.1	Ōrākei Local Board — 17 August 2017 .....	21
11.2	Ōrākei Local Board — 1 December 2017.....	22
12.1	Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board — 15 August 2017.....	22
12.2	Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board — 21 November 2017 .....	23
13.1	Papakura Local Board — 26 July 2017 .....	23
13.2	Papakura Local Board — 22 November 2017 .....	25
14.1	Puketāpapa Local Board — 17 August 2017.....	25
14.2	Puketāpapa Local Board — 16 November 2017.....	27
15.1	Rodney Local Board — 17 August 2017 .....	28
15.2	Rodney Local Board — 16 November 2017 .....	29
16.1	Upper Harbour Local Board — 17 August 2017 .....	29
16.2	Upper Harbour Local Board — 16 November 2017 .....	29
17.1	Waiheke Local Board — 27 July 2017.....	30
17.2	Waiheke Local Board — 23 November 2017.....	31
18.1	Waitākere Ranges Local Board — 10 August 2017.....	31
18.2	Waitākere Ranges Local Board — 23 November 2017 .....	32
19.1	Waitematā Local Board — 15 August 2017.....	32
19.2	Waitematā Local Board — 4 December 2017 .....	33
20.1	Whau Local Board — 23 August 2017 .....	33
20.2	Whau Local Board — 22 November 2017 .....	35

## 1.1 **Albert-Eden Local Board — 26 July 2017 (AE/2017/101)**

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

- a) Approves the tabled Albert-Eden Local Board input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services.

Attachment: Albert-Eden Local Board Feedback on the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux Services

Current relationship

- While the Board doesn't fund the CAB directly, it does supplement the regional funding with local grants for things such as technology and office furniture. However, the Board considers that if funding for its local CAB is reduced or if CAB accommodation costs increase, additional pressure will be placed on the Board's locally-driven initiative funding as the Board will be expected to make up the shortfall. It was not intended that LDI funding was to substitute for regional funding.
- Board members have visited the CAB informally on numerous occasions but would value a formal interaction with the CAB on a regular basis.
- The CAB participates and supports the Board engagement processes, such as the 2017-2020 Local Board Plan engagement. The Board Chair also attended a CAB-hosted 2017- 2020 Local Plan engagement session.

Value of the service

- The CAB is the primary go-to hub of Albert-Eden and other for communities for our information about a range of financial, legal and governmental processes, including job search, small business, employment and other human rights, citizenship and budgeting matters and is a conduit to connect people with the right place to find out information. The CAB provides a quality face-to-face service.
- Importantly, the CAB fills a gap in the market for legal advice and information on central and local government services for younger people, woman, the elderly, migrants and other lower income people. It provides useful advice for students (in particular on student loans, budgeting, housing, employment law). It is worth noting that those populations that struggle to access information online, in particular older people and people whose first language is not English (both groups that are well represented in our demographics), benefit most from the face-to-face services offered by the CAB.
- The vast majority of those assisted are not NZ-born. For example, more than two thirds of those attending the Job Search and Small Business Clinics run at the St Lukes CAB since October 2016 are from India, the Philippines, 'Other Asia', Middle East, China and rest of the world.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

- The CAB is a key part of delivering on the Albert-Eden Local Board Plan, in particular the Proud, Connected and Secure Communities outcome. It is also consistent with the Board's enthusiastic adoption of the community-led approach to community development.

Equity and Fairness

- ACABx distribute operational funding to bureaux using a population-based funding model based on 2013 census data. Is the current funding model effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally?
- The current CAB funding model is generally effective in terms of delivering

what is required for Auckland and locally. Given its limited funding, it could be argued that the CAB delivers an outstandingly cost-effective service, relying as it does on volunteers to provide the bulk of its services.

What kind of factors should be considered in the funding of local bureaux to ensure fair and equitable service distribution across the region?

- The CAB provides a wide-ranging service to all the community and provides a key service for new immigrants. The funding model could therefore have some weighting with respect to the number of new immigrants, but population should remain as the key allocation criterion in line with the Local Board funding policy. Any review should also take into account the high level of population growth enabled by the Unitary Plan for the central isthmus area in the medium term.
- The Board considers that if some areas of Auckland have unmet needs then the Governing Body should seriously consider allocating additional funding to ACABx to ensure the CAB can service all of Auckland effectively.

Reporting

- The CAB has presented reports to the Board in the past and the Board understands that the CAB has improved its data gathering and has committed to reporting to the Board more regularly in the future. The Board looks forward to seeing the improved reporting and trends which will enable more comprehensive conversations between the CAB and the local board.
- The board considers that an annual formal report to a Board business meeting is sufficient for formal reporting plus 6 monthly reporting at a meeting of the CAB and Local Board where more in-depth discussions can take place. The service is evolving over time and needs change, but is a long-established, well-managed branch and more frequent reporting is not considered a good use of time.

Do you understand the role of ACABx in relation to your local bureau?

- Yes.

Aspirations for the future

- This is outlined above. The local CAB is near a large mall and busy library, so it's very well utilized by both local residents and people from across the region alike. Those using its services continue to grow. For example, migrants using CAB increased from 310 in July-December 2016 to 450 in January-June 2017. The Chinese-speaking interviewers assisting users of the St Lukes CAB are a good example of the way in which that Branch responds to Chinese-speaking migrants' needs, which is important given that Albert-Eden has one of the largest populations of Chinese-speaking migrants in Auckland.
- The CABs could look to improve marketing for further reach into the community and build on its internet presence in order to connect with more young people.

## **2.1 Devonport-Takapuna Local Board — 15 August 2017 (DT/2017/193)**

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

- a) provides the following feedback on the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services:

Current relationship

- The local board notes that the relationship has diminished and is not as strong as it once was. In addition, it was highlighted that the services provided appear to be

central government-centric, rather than being driven by strong local knowledge and relationships.

- As a result, the local board is of the view central government should also contribute to subsidising the CABs.
- The local board noted that there appears to a reduction in reporting from CABs since the formation of Auckland Council.

#### Value of the service

- The local board appreciate and value the contributions made by the CABs and see them as an important social service for the community.
- The local board is concerned that central government funding is dictating and directing the services being provided at CABs, which is subsequently diminishing the value of CAB services as they no longer reflect community need.
- It should be noted that the real value of CAB services is often their privacy and discretion for cliental issues. Often people go outside their local area to access CAB services as they feel it's a more private and safe environment.
- The local board notes that CAB services to the community are intangible and therefore cannot be measured with tick boxes.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

- The local board does not know what CABs strategic plan, outputs are targets are. There is an assumption that they are fulfilling and meeting the requirements
- The local board recognize that at a high-level, there is alignment between CAB and local board plan outcomes

#### Equity and Fairness

- The local board believe that the funding model should be based on need, not population, as it cannot be assumed a larger population base means greater reliance of need.
- The local board questions whether CAB services should only be for NZ residents and citizens, or should it be extended for those on a temporary work visa as well.

#### Reporting

- The local board support a mixture of reporting which details both relevant statistics, and stories about how CAB services are making a difference in the local area.
- The local board support the CAB coming to present to the local board both data and statistics relevant to CABs located in the local area.

#### Aspirations for the future

- The local board believe that overall the CAB model is working well.
- The local board supports appropriate funding for CABs based on need.
- The local board supports the funding model being updated so that more weighting is given to need of services for each local area.

## **2.2 Devonport-Takapuna Local Board — 21 November 2017 (DT/2017/247)**

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

- a) recommends option one: enhanced status quo to guide the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services across the Auckland region.
- b) requests Local Board Services staff organise quarterly meetings with the Takapuna Citizens Advice Bureaux to improve and strengthen local relationships.

- c) thanks Sonette de Koster, Manager Citizens Advice Bureaux North Shore and Joan Lardner for their presentation and attendance.

### **3.1 Franklin Local Board — 22 August 2017 (FR/2017/137)**

That the Franklin Local Board approves the following input to the Review of Citizen's Advice Bureaux (CAB) services:

- i. There are currently no CAB services located in Franklin and residents therefore need to use the Papakura CAB if they require assistance;
- ii. It follows that there is not currently a relationship between CAB and Franklin Local Board, nor any form of reporting;
- iii. The wide geographical spread of the Papakura CAB needs to be taken into account in the funding model;
- iv. CAB services need to be future proofed, in view of the significant growth already taking place and planned over the next two decades, particularly at Pukekohe, Paerata and Drury;
- v. The scope for introducing CAB services to Pukekohe should be explored and the current funding model amended to enable the effective delivery of new services.

### **3.2 Franklin Local Board — 28 November 2017 (FR/2017/207)**

That the Franklin Local Board provide the following feedback on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) services to Auckland's communities:

- a) Option 3 is preferred (regional service provision) as it enables a comprehensive review of how and why the service is being provided, including funding levels and the number and location of service sites;
- b) Franklin has two organisations currently providing a similar service to CAB sites and seeks a more equitable approach to funding such services, so that non-CAB organisations have an opportunity to receive financial contributions;
- c) A move to contestable funding should be considered, as it will provide a level playing field for other service providers, particularly in locations where there are no current CAB service sites.

### **4.1 Henderson-Massey Local Board — 15 August 2017 (HM/2017/142)**

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) endorse attachment A as the local board's input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services.

Current relationship

- Sits with individual members and local groups, not with board as a whole.
- Would like to understand and acknowledge what they do.
- Extend a deputation to LB.

Value of the service

- Do feel that CAB members would have valuable insight to community trends and emerging matters.
- Do understand is a level of way finding support provided to clients and that do help to connect people to services.
- Would like transparency around the value of the accommodation provided.
- Governance review feedback will be held at a later date.

#### Reporting

- With growth in service trends would like to understand CAB view on why this has occurred?
- Improved data collection.
- Changing local circumstance.
- More volunteer support leading to more advice.
- Would like to understand how much support is to new migrants.
- Would like to understand what support CAB get locally from central government particularly new migrant and job seekers.
- Six monthly reporting.

#### ACABX

- Would like to ensure that value is being obtained by having a coordinating group
- Do see CABx network as having a regional relationship with Auckland Council and that funding not devolved to Local Boards.

#### Equity & Fairness

- Should give consideration to funding model picking up matters of deprivation
- Do value translation services and see these be used.
- Would like to understand what alignment of volunteers and those seeking support (relating to culture and ethnicity).
- See key role as knowing and brokering - have concerns around the giving of legal advice by volunteers who are not legally trained.
- Note new library /community centre at Westgate and that space for CAB to relocate from.
- Massey library is included.
- Would like to understand how Cab services may respond to Maori and cultural perspective.

#### **4.2 Henderson-Massey Local Board — 21 November 2017 (HM/2017/194)**

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) Support Option 1: Enhanced status quo (a refined funding model, reporting improvements and strengthened local relationships) for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland's communities.

#### **5.1 Hibiscus and Bays Local Board — 16 August 2017**

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

- a) provides the following feedback on the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services:

##### Current relationship

- The local board has a very good relationship with the two Citizen Advice Bureaux in the local board area, Orewa and Browns Bay and understands the role of the two local services and the additional outreach services to Rodney, Upper Harbour and Whangaparaoa ii.
- The local board has assisted the local board area Citizens Advice Bureaux with funding to support operational equipment such as a display boards, shelving, computer equipment and a refit of their lease areas.

##### Value of the service

- The local Citizens Advice Bureaux are considered to be very valuable to the community as they provide a wide range of services that are not otherwise readily

available and easy to source.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

- Align with local board priorities as there are no local alternatives or easy access to the services provided ii. Locally provided legal advice is limited and the local Citizens Advice Bureaux can support people in the first instance and this is considered a helpful service iii. Local Citizens Advice Bureaux volunteers are well trained for their roles and knowledgeable in providing information and advice.

Is the current funding model effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally?

- The local board is satisfied with the locally provided Citizens Advice Bureaux services being provided and from a Justice of the Peace point of view the organisation is trying to move this particular service to be more public and centrally located rather than people having to visit Justices of the Peace in their own homes.

#### Equity and Fairness

Consider that the local Citizens Advice Bureaux should be able to:

- Offer budgeting programmes and services which can be effective particularly for families that are struggling on limited discretionary incomes ii.
- Consider more creative ways that the local Citizens Advice Bureaux could be working in a more meaningful way to address community needs.

#### Reporting

- Assurance that people are using the service and that the variety of services being catered for is meeting the community's needs reporting should not be overly prescriptive and either six monthly or annually reporting is sufficient.
- Six monthly or annual reporting in the form of a deputation would be sufficient.
- Local Citizens Advice Bureaux should be centrally funded but report locally ii. It is considered that the current funding approach seems inequitable iii.
- It is understood that the Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux is a centralised unit however it is not clear how democratic decision making occurs.

#### Aspirations for the future

- Need to have visible relevance of local Citizen Advice Bureaux to illustrate how they are addressing the needs of the local community.

### **5.2 Hibiscus and Bays Local Board — 15 November 2017 (HB/2017/189)**

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

- a) Supports Option 1: the Enhanced Status Quo to support the future provisions of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland as it believes this is the most achievable option to provide equitable funding and service across the region.

### **6.1 Howick Local Board — 21 August 2017**

That the Howick Local Board:

- a) approve the Howick Local Board input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux service.

#### Current relationship

- The board has a good relationship with the local CAB. They are an essential part of the community. The Board Chair is invited to the Annual

General Meeting.

Value of the service

- The board values the CAB as a one-stop shop service that is informative. There is a public perception of the CAB

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

- The CAB is a key part of delivering on the Howick Local Board Plan, in particular through the connected community outcome.

Equity and fairness

- ACABx distribute operational funding to bureaux using a population-based funding model based on 2013 census data.
- The current funding model is good value for spend. The board would like to see a CAB in Howick Village and a CAB in Ormiston; however noted under the current model,
- Whilst the current model appears to be good value (as above), the board would like to see a review of the funding model, to have fairer funding and sees the need to bring in a geographical factor so that the funding is not purely population based.

Reporting

- The board would like to see quick statistics on visitor numbers, age and perhaps used as justification for funding?
- Would you prefer that the local bureau report quarterly or six monthly to the local board?
- The Board considers that an annual formal report to a Board business meeting is sufficient for formal reporting.

ACABx

- Yes

Aspirations for the future

- This has already been answered above.

What would you change if you could?

- The board would like to see the Howick Information Centre to become a CAB and a new CAB in Ormiston Town Centre. They would like to see more funding and improved furniture the current furniture is very old compared to WINZ offices.
- The CABs could look to improve marketing for further reach into the community and electronic interaction; however the human contact of the CAB is very important and does not suit websites.

## **6.2 Howick Local Board — 20 November 2017 (HW/2017/194)**

That the Howick Local Board:

- a) Support Option one - Enhanced status quo, enhancements are a refined funding model, reporting improvements and strengthened local relationships.

## **7.1 Kaipātiki Local Board — 16 August 2017 (KT/2017/117)**

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) provides the following feedback regarding the provision of Citizen Advice

Bureau (CAB) services in the local board area:

- the face-to-face services provided by CAB branches are invaluable to a large number of residents, particularly in relation to private or confidential matters;
- the volunteer and paid staff supporting CAB services in the local board area are friendly, approachable and professional in the assistance and advice they provide customers
- local board recognizes that CABs may play a stronger role elsewhere in the region when compared with Kaipātiki, which may require different levels of funding and support provided to CABs across the region;
- the local board believes that engagement with local CABs through Community Forum has worked well historically, and feels that the existing frequency and manner in which engagement between the local board and CABs is undertaken works well;
- the local board would like to see local CABs have a stronger presence within and with Kaipātiki community centres and houses, as it is unclear what relationship currently exists between the local CAB branches and Kaipātiki community centres and houses; and
- the local board would like to see local CABs conduct more outreach in the community via existing community networks (through community centres, houses, churches and other community service providers) in order to raise their profile and improve connections with the community.

## **7.2 Kaipātiki Local Board — 15 November 2017 (KT/2017/168)**

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) Support option one as articulated in the agenda report (enhanced status quo through seeking enhancements via a refined funding model, reporting improvements and strengthened local relationships).

## **8.1 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board — 16 August 2017**

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

approve the local board's input to the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services as circulated and tabled at the meeting.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Feedback on the review of CAB Services

Current relationship

- Two Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board members are volunteers as Justice of the Peace agents at Māngere CAB. The relationship with the local board and this CAB is very close and cooperative, a collegial relationship.
- The board has funded the Māngere and Ōtāhuhu CAB agencies previously
  - \$26,000 and \$12,000 respective (2015/2016).
- The board also funded the Māngere CAB for the ongoing provision of CAB agency services to the community of Ōtāhuhu in the 2015/16, 2016/17, and again made this commitment for 2017/2018 financial year. Ongoing operational funding of \$26,000 will be required every year for this CAB for services to the Ōtāhuhu area.
- The board approved a new multi-premises lease to ACAB in August 2016 for local Māngere and Ōtāhuhu CAB services.

Value of the service

- The local CAB volunteers are marvellous. They provide 'day to day' guidance to their customers including legal information, budgeting and immigration advice, and customer referrals to local foodbanks and other

social services.

- The volunteers are knowledgeable and experienced, and knowing when to refer people to specialist services like, the law office.
- The local CAB benefits from having a number of Pasifika volunteers who can communicate with Pasifika customers in their native language.
- The Māngere CAB is a very busy service. For people new to the area this service is considered a point of entry into the local community. Customers with multiple queries have found it useful in accessing support in one location.
- The local CABs are vital and connecting customers to other services i.e. foodbanks, is important, having local CABs near town centres is an advantage and are easily accessible for CAB users.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

- The board members speak highly of the services provided in the local CABs.
- The experience, knowledge professionalism of the volunteers, and the care for its customers are characteristics linked to the local CABs
- The board disagree with ACAB not funding the Mangere and Ōtāhuhu CAB's budgetary advice. The board request ACAB to reverse this decision, and commence funding the CAB's in Mangere and Ōtāhuhu, as a matter of urgency. This service is vital, as affordability concerns for basic needs, like accommodation, transport, and health is sometimes compromised due to low income and compounded by the lack of budgeting skills.
- Typically the cases handled by the Māngere CAB services are for multiple queries, with schools, social welfare, education and compounded sometimes with interpreting these concerns when English for customers is a second language. For that reason visitor/ entry through the door numbers do not reflect the actual need for the services. That is, the needs are significant and the numbers of people coming through the doors do not give the full picture of the complex and multiple needs involved with CAB service users.

### Equity and Fairness

- Deprivation
  - The board request that deprivation is given more weight as a criterion when allocating funds to CABs in the region. The current funding model fails to reflect the diverse needs and low socio-economic factors in the local area when compared to other communities across the Auckland region.
- The following criteria should be included:
  - Transport provision — include public transport ii. affordability — home ownership
  - NZ index decile rating iv. Negative health indicators i.e. obesity rates
  - Online and communication accessibility
  - Volunteers that can communicate in more than one language
  - Housing NZ development in the local area
- Growth and development
  - Housing NZ development is increasing in the local area. A need for social, community services, efficient and affordable public services for a growing low income and beneficiary reliant population is required.
  - The Ōtāhuhu -Middlemore Spatial priority area has led to investment for development of major transport hub in Ōtāhuhu

and town centre improvements. And predictions are that there is significant residential growth now and in the years ahead.

- The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu area is also where people transit through — airport, and a high rental community.

Is the current funding model effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally?

- The current funding model is not effective. The board request that the model include the area's demographics and weigh deprivation high as a criterion.
- Under the Local Board Funding policy, funding for local activities is allocated to board based on — Population 90%, deprivation 5% and land area 5%. This formula can be adapted to consider weighting deprivation as a greater factor, and not population alone.
- That the board prefers sustainable funding models and for services offered by
- Māngere CAB to be fully funded under the ACABx — council funding arrangement

#### Reporting

- The board resolved to encourage Auckland Council and Auckland Citizens' Advice Bureaux (ACABx), given the rapid growth of Auckland, to develop a regional plan for Auckland Bureaux provision to guide future assessment of and investment in local Citizens Advice Bureau services, as there appears to be a considerable gap in planning for the future and local boards shouldn't be expected to fund new CAB services.
- The board would like to receive better information from ACAB to how its local board plan outcomes are measured against ACAB and Auckland Council's funding agreement. This information will inform the board's future support to local CABs.
- The board will accept six-monthly reports including the following: how the board's support has contributed to the local board plan outcomes, customer numbers and the services they access. Providing data analysis highlighting trends and recommendations is also welcomed by the board. The analysis should be easy to understand at a glance.
- The board have not received regular and sufficient information to properly inform its support and governance role to the local CAB in particular Ōtāhuhu. The board would welcome this information.

#### ACABx

- The board has worked hard to help resolve tension between ACAB and Mangere CAB. The board has expressed its support for local CABs, and seek to resolve this matter and continue its successful operations
- The board has limited understanding to ACAB's role, only that it is a regional umbrella for distributing funding and doesn't seem to have any other purpose. ACAB does not have a plan for more equitable distribution of funding or for funding to respond to Auckland's growth and diversity. The board question if ACAB is the best funding distribution model.
- The board would like to ask what are the pros and cons if funding is directly distributed by Auckland Council to the local CABs. Or, couldn't a more localised model of distribution funds be developed — incorporating the formula and criterion in

Aspirations for the future

- Be interesting to understand the ethnicity of the volunteers in the local CAB. Seems to be well representative of the local community
- CAB a great stepping stone for the local community- a great confidence booster for the community
- The funding model to include criterion noted in # 3 highlighting deprivation

## 8.2 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board — 15 November 2017 (MO/2017/219)

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) Receive the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services report.
- b) Support in principle the officer recommendation Option 3: Regional service provision/Collective review of funding levels and number and location of service sites.
- c) Request committee to consider its August 2017 input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services (Resolution number MO/2017/153) specifically comments under Equity and Fairness.
  - i. The current funding model is not effective. The model should include the area's demographics and weigh deprivation high as a criterion. Under the Local Board Funding policy, funding for local activities is allocated to board based on – Population 90%, deprivation 5% and land area 5%. This formula can be adapted to include deprivation as a factor, and not population alone.
  - ii. That the board prefers sustainable funding models and for services offered by Māngere CAB to be fully funded under the ACABx – council funding arrangement.
  - iii. The board request that deprivation is given more weight as a criterion when allocating funds to CABs in the region. The current funding model fails to reflect the diverse needs and low socio-economic factors in the local area when compared to other communities across the Auckland region.
  - iv. The following criteria should be included:
    - a. Transport provision – include public transport
    - b. affordability – home ownership
    - c. NZ index decile rating
    - d. Negative health indicators i.e. obesity rates
    - e. Online and communication accessibility
    - f. Volunteers that can communicate in more than one language
    - g. Housing NZ development in the local area
  - v. Growth and development
    - a. Housing NZ development is increasing in the local area. A need for social, community services, efficient and affordable public services for a growing low income and beneficiary reliant population is required.
    - b. The Otahuhu-Middlemore Spatial priority area has led to investment for development of major transport hub in Otahuhu and town centre improvements. And predictions are that there is significant residential growth now and in the years ahead.
    - c. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu area is also where people transit through – airport, and a high rental community.
- d) Note that clear information that funding support for budget services to CABs that were stopped was from the Ministry of Social Development and not ACAB.

## 9.1 Manurewa Local Board — 20 July 2017 (MR/2017/150)

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) approve the Manurewa Local Board input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) services as follows

### Current relationship

- The relationship between Manurewa CAB and the Manurewa local boards is positive. The relationship is reflected in the following ways:  
The CAB meets on a monthly basis with a board member. This time is used to discuss the relationship with the board and any emerging issues. The CAB manager attends the Manurewa Local Board business meeting on a monthly basis. The CAB attends the weekly homelessness meetings and has made a considerable contribution to this forum. Anecdotally individual board members receive positive feedback from users of the CAB service.

### Value of the service

- The monitoring figures provided by Manurewa CAB reflect the immense and essential value of the service provided. The board acknowledges the great work of the CAB manager in achieving this. The CAB is doing the best it can with the resources available to deliver outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives. If the funding model worked more effectively the local bureau would be able to serve more need.

### Equity and Fairness

- Equity and Fairness: the current funding model is not effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally. The funding model does not use up to date data. The board queried if ACABx receives funding from sources other than Auckland Council. The kinds of factors that should be considered in the funding of local bureaux to ensure fair and equitable service distribution across Auckland Council should include: deprivation statistics, population data, using most up to date census data ethnicity demographics — this recognises there are members of the community that may need to use the service more than others, diversity of languages, accessibility, range of services provided, number of sites - the Manurewa CAB wants to extend its service out to Clendon and the board recognises some areas require more than one CAB, age demographics.

### Reporting

The types of information the board would like to receive when the Manurewa CAB is reporting includes:

- Content that would assist the local board with decision making around policy, grants, planning any advocacy the CAB finds itself having to undertake more detail about emerging trends
- budgeting services and how often the CAB is directing people for food parcels as it is a missing link for the board in its planning — the information could be broken down and provide more detail
- legal services enquiries as there is scope to link in with other services more
- Currently monitoring information is provided to the link local board member who in turn shares with the local board and Local Board Services staff. There is a desire for the CAB to report to the whole board more frequently, potentially on a 6 monthly basis both informally at workshops and formally at business meetings

- The role of Auckland CABx In relation to the local bureau: the board understands ACABx distributes funding to local CABs. Each CAB has its own committee and chair, set out nationally, and the ACABx brings all the chairs together once a month. The board noted it is unsure of the value of ACABx distributing funding. ACABx is the governing group for Auckland CABs and there is a relationship between the national CABx and ACABx.
- Aspirations for the future: the board noted the following as working well in the local area: the CAB relationship with the local board is very effective, the enthusiasm of the CAB staff is commendable and the manager goes above and beyond the job description
  - Manurewa CAB has aspirations to set up a satellite in Clendon as people from Clendon are not coming to Manurewa and is looking at temporary premises in Clendon that would enable it to establish need. with the option of using the Clendon library space now being investigated.
- The board noted the following as potential areas for change:
  - there is scope for the local board to help more with building modification and maintenance. For example, one issue is disability access to the meeting rooms. Wheelchair users do not have access to the inside of the office so meetings are held in the corridor. As an Auckland Council premise this modification should be recognised by Auckland Council within an appropriate renewals plan. There is also scope for increased involvement of the library following the Libraries Reshape
  - as a result of rough sleepers using the access lobby into the CAB an Increased level of cleaning was required. While this is now cleaned every morning the library lobby and foyer do need to be cleaned more regularly. The lack of cleanliness does not generate a sense of pride
  - here could be further exploration of the CAB's role in supporting young people. Manurewa has a young population compared to the rest of Auckland. While young people often know what they need in terms of support, they don't necessarily know where to access it. The CAB already has some younger volunteers and some of the consultation for a youth space has involved the CAB - from a service provision perspective. The CAB could also test if the space and service is/feels youth friendly
  - board noted that the Manurewa Marae has a philosophy that spaces are provided where all generations can interact — there is the potential for the CAB to link with the Manurewa Youth Council and the marae to explore this further
  - recognition needs to be given to future demand and future proofing — this needs to be reflected in the budgeting and planning of the CAB and might include exploring its model of delivery, reflecting on the use of online services, and improvement of IT systems noting IT support is independent of the council and impacts on the hours of work.

## **9.2 Manurewa Local Board — 16 November 2017 (MR/2017/251)**

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) Note that Manurewa Local Board and other local boards' feedback has informed the development of the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizen Advice Bureaux to Auckland communities.
- b) in principle support the enhanced status quo model which seeks reporting improvements and strengthened local relationships.
- c) seek clarity on the funding measures in the enhanced status quo model. In particular, the adopted model needs to address issues around equity as there

is an aging population in Manurewa and significant lower than average income. The model also must recognise that an increase in funding is required to sustain and grow Citizen Advice Bureaux offices.

- d) support formalising the relationship between Auckland Citizen Advice Bureaux, the local Citizen Advice Bureau and the local board through improved reporting

#### **10.1 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board — 25 July 2017 (MT/2017/123)**

That the Maungakiekie- Tāmaki Local Board:

- confirm it has a good relationship with the local CAB offices in the local board area and note that their presence and contributions in the local board area is highly valued;
- note that the services CABs deliver complement and do not duplicate the services that Council and other agencies deliver in the community and further notes that all of these services do contribute collectively to the high level community outcomes in our local board plan;
- is supportive of the review and welcome a regional funding model that is based not just on population but is also tailored according to the need/demand for services in different communities;
- welcome reporting from CAB under any future model so that there is more sharing of information about the issues and trends in the community in order to continuously inform the work of Council and other partners as well as providing us with understanding of the needs of the local CAB offices;
- encourage the review to look at what resources within the funding model, if any, may need to be targeted towards supporting Māori outcomes and Māori in general;
- encourage the review to look at the evolving needs of our diverse communities and ensure CAB services are responsive to any particular needs such that those of new migrants.

#### **10.2 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board — 25 November 2017 (MT/2017/220)**

That Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board:

- Support option 2 in the report on agenda which transfers responsibility for existing budget to local boards.

#### **11.1 Ōrākei Local Board — 17 August 2017 (OR/2017/159)**

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

- note that it would like a stronger relationship and more formal interaction with the Remuera/Eastern Bays Citizens Advice Bureau on a regular basis, noting the Strategic Relationship Agreement between Auckland Council and Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux requires the Citizens Advice Bureau to report to the Board quarterly on service usage and other matters of interest and to present annually to a Board meeting relating specifically to the Citizens Advice Bureau at 4 Victoria Avenue, Remuera.
- request information about the visitor trends and statistics for the Remuera/Eastern Bays Citizens Advice Bureau, including a monthly breakdown, and cumulative reporting on:
- Enquires by way of method of contact, enquiry type and ethnicity. The number of local residents using the service the number of visitors for the Justice of the Peace service.

- Request that the Remuera/Eastern Bays Citizens Advice Bureau provide quarterly reports to the Board which would be discussed at a quarterly meeting between the Remuera/Eastern Bays Citizens Advice Bureau and the Board.

**11.2 Ōrākei Local Board — 1 December 2017 (OR/2017/232)**

That the Ōrākei Local Board delegates authority to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman to provide the Board's feedback on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland's communities by 1 December 2017

**12.1 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board — 15 August 2017 (OP/2017/133)**

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

approve Attachment A to the report which is the local board's input to the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services.

**Current Relationship**

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board makes decisions about leases of buildings occupied by Papatoetoe CAB and Ōtara CAB, and occasionally receives applications from these CABs for community grants.

The local board is interested in CAB activities, but has no direct relationship with them. Ōtara CAB sends the board an annual report of their activities and sends some local board members monthly activity reports. Nothing is received from Papatoetoe CAB.

**Value of the service**

The board receives insufficient information from CABs to answer this question fully. Local board members know local communities value some CAB services, including consumer clinics, information brochures on various topics, radio talks, JP services, and day to day walk in advice. The board supports continued delivery of these services by CABs, which provide a safe and friendly atmosphere to convey information.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

Board members are aware that some services provided by CABs align with and support local board plan outcomes.

Ōtara CAB sends the board an annual report of their activities, but the report is not specifically tailored to Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board plan outcomes (and is not required to be) so it is difficult to comment on what extent their activities deliver or reflect the board's priorities. There should be a standard template or formal reporting process. Regular reports would be valuable to enable the board to monitor current issues in the local board area.

There is still a general feeling that the CAB provides services for 'old people' - they do not engage with Youth and are not attractive to Youth. Our board area has 3 times as many people under 15 years of age as there are people over 65, so the CAB service is perceived to have a narrow focus and reach into our community. Engaging with the wider community would be one of my suggestions for improvement - especially with Youth.

**Equity and fairness**

The board does not have enough information to be sure. Board members think that current funding is stretched to meet the demand. There appears to be no funding available to set up new CABs, as highlighted by Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board.

Population funding is not working nor is it equitable. Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board does not support population as the only basis for funding. Other considerations should go into funding decisions, such as relative deprivation, and local demand for service. Demand from new immigrants needs to be specially considered, as this may be additional to demand indicated by population numbers and deprivation statistics.

#### Reporting

Information on the number of people applying for different kinds of services and a breakdown of service use.

Six monthly.

#### ACABx

The board understands that ACAB distributes Auckland Council funding to CABs in Auckland. The board is not aware of any other activities carried out by ACAB. The board questions whether ACAB is needed and supports a review. The board suggests that models be considered that provide direct funding from the Auckland Council to individual CABs.

#### Aspirations for the future

The board does not have enough information to be sure. The services mentioned under question 2 address some clear community needs and appear to be delivered satisfactorily. However, the board had no reason to believe that the Papatoetoe CAB had problems before its closure in 2016, which illustrates the lack of information available to the board.

#### What would you change if you could?

The board would like greater engagement with its local CABs. The closure of the Papatoetoe CAB in 2016 occurred without any engagement with OPLB, and the board would like to be kept informed of events such as this, as well as routine information about CAB activities. The board considers that there could be mutual advantages for the board and local CABs if they were regularly to share their learnings on current community issues.

### **12.2 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board — 21 November 2017 (OP/2017/200)**

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- a) provide feedback on the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services, that the board supports Option 1: Enhanced status quo – including a refined funding model, reporting improvements and strengthened local relationships.
- b) request also that consideration be given to the idea of having mobile Citizens Advice Bureaux for areas of Auckland that are currently not serviced.
- c) request that the Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) funding model be revised, so that each CAB is funded directly by Council based on a percentage of approved annual budgets.
- d) request that the CAB funding model recognise the proportion of visits to each CAB that are for JP services, as distinct from CAB services

### **13.1 Papakura Local Board — 26 July 2017 (PPK/2017/160)**

That the Papakura Local Board:

- a) approve the Papakura Local Board input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) services as follows:

#### Current relationship

- The relationship between the Papakura CAB and the Papakura Local Board is strong, vibrant and apolitical.

#### Value of the service

- The board sees the service delivered by the CAB as an extremely valuable one. The Papakura CAB receives \$78,000 annually but provides far more value than what they are funded for. The statistics show that 15,000 residents are positively benefitting from the services delivered. The board views the CAB as an integral part of the available support services in the area. They also contribute to the local board's delivery on the Papakura Local Board Plan.
- The local board also recognises that as there is no such service in Franklin that the Papakura CAB receives a significant number of enquiries from that area. This wide geographical spread needs to be taken into account in the funding model and the development of new services.
- The Papakura CAB is supporting the delivery of the local board plan and annual agreement objectives. The local board is also supporting the CAB through regular contact.

#### Equity and fairness

- The current funding model is not seen as effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally. The deprivation and growth of an area should be considered when determining a funding model. Working to the 2013 Census is now over four years out of date and not addressing the geographical coverage of providing a service to Franklin residents does not match reality. Other factors that should be considered in the funding of local bureaux are:
  - Population data such as ethnicity demographics as this can impact on the range of services such as high percentage of young people, refugees.
  - Number of volunteers, opening hours, building and assets (utility expenses).
  - Future proofing in terms of population growth in area where urban development is taking place eg. Takanini, Karaka and Drury.

#### Reporting

- The local board has a good relationship with the CAB and at least once a year they attend a local board workshop where statistical information is disseminated. Extending this arrangement to twice a year is being explored. The information found useful includes the range of emerging trends and issues; services that could be provided if funds were available.

#### ACABx

- There is a lack of clarity about the role other than an umbrella funding body and that the CAB Chairs attend a monthly meeting. It is understood that ACABx funded by Auckland Council and distributes some of these funds to local CAB's and also deals with funding administration and annual reporting

#### Aspirations for the future

- The board noted that the following is working well in the local area:
  - The legal, counselling and Justice of the Peace clinics are well received by the community.
  - The volunteers are from all walks of life and able to relate well with Papakura's population. They are dedicated and enthusiastic.
- the board noted the following as potential areas for change:

- There is scope to further improve the social services provided for to help and address issues like homelessness and alcohol misuse in the Papakura and potentially the wider Auckland region.
- Would there be a need for a CAB in Pukekohe to further build out and improve access to the CAB services in the South.

**13.2 Papakura Local Board — 22 November 2017 (PPK/2017/153)**

That the Papakura Local Board:

- a) request staff to investigate whether there is a need for a Citizens Advice Bureau at Takanini and whether it could be accommodated in the new Takanini community hub and library building.
- b) acknowledge the Citizens Advice Bureaux work with regards to supporting new migrants.
- c) request the funding envelope be reviewed to ensure that the Papakura Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) receives the appropriate amount of funding given the fact that the Papakura CAB's catchment area is wider than the Papakura Local Board area and also serves the Franklin area.
- d) provide the following feedback on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux (CAB) services to Auckland's communities:
  - The Papakura Local Board's preferred option is option one (enhanced status quo) with bullet points one and three added from option 3 (regional service provision), creating the following hybrid model:

Option	Description
Option 4: A hybrid of Option 1 (enhanced status quo) with bullet points one and three from Option 3 (regional service provision)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall funding envelope unchanged</li> <li>○ Governing Body remains the decision maker for funding</li> <li>○ Council has funding agreement with ACABx</li> <li>○ The funding agreement includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Improved reporting with consistent trend information at regional and site level</li> <li>- A local relationship framework developed to support strengthened and more strategic relationships between local boards and bureaux</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Assessment undertaken to understand the value of the service which would also determine the appropriate level of Auckland Council support required.</li> <li>○ 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.</li> </ul>

**14.1 Puketāpapa Local Board — 17 August 2017 (PKTPP/2017/146)**

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

- b) provide the attached feedback to the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services.

Puketāpapa Local Board Feedback – Review of CAB Services

### Current relationship

What is your relationship with your local CAB?

- c) The Puketāpapa Local Board (the Board) has a good relationship with the Mt Roskill bureau. The local bureau provides valuable information on a quarterly basis.
- d) The Board does not make too many direct demands on the CAB. The Board office and Board members sign post people to the CAB. One of the Board members volunteers at the CB and another provides JP services. The local bureau has thanked the Board for its support.
- e) In the previous term the Board chair would meet every couple of months with the local CAB manager. This relationship is now managed through the Board's Community Cluster.

### Value of the service

I. What is the value of your local bureau service to your community?

- a) People who use the service find it useful.
- b) The board does not know if there are people that could be using the service but do not as they are unaware of the service.
- c) The Language Link service funded through settlement support is much needed in the Puketāpapa Local Board area. The Board would like to see African languages better catered for by Language Link. The CAB has been responsive to Maori.
- d) Former refugees may not be well served by the CAB service. The Board has a high need for services for migrants and former refugees.
  - i) Local community leaders play role in advocacy which is not provided for by the CAB.
- e) The Board is aware that some locals use the CAB in a neighbouring board area. Many seniors prefer the service available at neighbouring CABs (e.g. Mt Albert).
- f) Advice regarding housing, domestic violence and mental health services is in demand"
  - i) The bureau has a comprehensive way to approach family violence.
  - ii) There is an increase on the number of enquiries relating to mental health and the local bureau has good links with health services.
- g) The Board supported and advocated on behalf of the bureau when WINZ was erroneously referring people to the CAB for emergency accommodation.

II. Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support that local area and local board objectives?

Yes, the bureau is delivering advice on issues, such as housing and employment, which are aligned with the Board's objectives.

### Equity and fairness

I. Is the current funding model effective in terms of delivering what is required for Auckland and locally?

- a) Need based funding for CABs would be the preferable model.
- b) If deprivation was reflected in funding, this would not adequately address the need in the Puketāpapa Local board area where there is 'average' deprivation but this masks mesh blocks with low and very high deprivation. To adequately address deprivation, the funding model would have to factor in the number of high deprivation mesh blocks.
- c) High need in the board area with vulnerable population e.g. high rates of young people not educated, employed or trained and low rates of rental and state housing.

- II. What kind of factors should be considered in the funding of local bureaux to ensure fair and equitable service distribution across the region?
  - a) The Board noted that some local board areas are better served with CAB sites than others. Some board areas have one bureau and others have multiple bureaux, so there is not equitable service provision and therefore funding, across the region.
  - b) Average funding to CAB sited also seems to be different according to the CAB cluster area.

#### Reporting

- I. What type of information does the board wish to receive when local bureau are reporting?
  - a) The local CAB is reporting to the Board through the Board Community Cluster.
  - b) Does the CAB carry out satisfaction surveys of clients?
  - c) Additional measures of community knowledge of the CAB services apart from actual client use
- II. Would you prefer that the local bureau report quarterly or six monthly to the local board?
 

The information provided by the local bureau is useful to the Board and in general six monthly reporting is working well. It was also noted that quarterly information would highlight seasonal issues, such as homelessness, the level of which in summer months can tend to be masked in six-monthly data.

#### ACABx

- I. Do you understand the role of ACABx in relation to your local bureau?
 

The Puketāpapa Local Board has little interaction with ACABx.

#### Aspirations for the future

- I. Regarding CAB service, what is working well in your local board area?
 

The CAB volunteers do a great job.
- II. What would you change if you could?
 

The Board seeks the following improvements:

  - a) That CABs identify unmet needs in the local area
  - b) Improved data capture on the CAB service
  - c) Improve awareness of the service amongst all communities
  - d) Improve awareness of opportunities for people to volunteer at CABs
  - e) Improve signage of the Mt Roskill bureau from the street
  - f) The MT Roskill bureau is located in a key environment in a community facility and when the CAB office is not open, it could be made available by us for community groups

### 14.2 Puketāpapa Local Board — 16 November 2017 (PKTPP/2017/208)

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

- a) provide feedback on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland's communities by 1 December 2017.

#### A. General comments

Option 1: enhanced status quo is the preferred option as local boards may not have the resources (time and expertise) to deliver option 2. Additionally, option 3 has merit, however revision and refinement is needed before it can be considered a viable option.

Auckland Council needs to advocate to central government for more funding for new migrants.

Central Government needs to create a comprehensive strategy to deal with the complexity around this diversity of need.

Deprivation is listed as a basis of the review, language should also be considered as a future measure.

Further consideration should be made to whether an alternative option, with elements of option 1 and 3, could be viable.

## B. Specific comments

### Option 2: Locally driven

The Local Board does not support this option for the following reasons:

- ☐ Local Board members may not have the required capacity (time and expertise)
- ☐ Local Boards are transient (3 year term), this option requires stability

### Option 3: Regional service provision

The Local Board does not support this option for the following reasons:

- This option requires an independent review. Auckland Council should not lead this, instead it should be peer-reviewed
- The timeframe for deliberation is too short, however this could be considered in the future with careful consideration of the risks involved

## 15.1 Rodney Local Board — 17 August 2017 (RD/2017/136)

That the Rodney Local Board:

Provide the following feedback on the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services:

- Supports the work that Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx) do in the community, particularly in Wellsford and Helensville where the Bureaux in Rodney are based.
- Notes that Rodney has a large population of commuters who may find it more convenient to use CABx services in other areas and it is possible that many Rodney residents are making use of CABx in areas other than Wellsford and Helensville.
- Notes that Wellsford has a small CAB service staffed by volunteers and considers that this is likely to limit the delivery of services in this area.
- supports the Auckland Citizens Advice Bureaux Inc undertaking an internal review of their governance model with individual CABx, noting that the CABx in Rodney feel disenfranchised and disconnected from governance decisions and that there is a lack of communication between CABx on governance issues.
- Supports Auckland Council increasing the amount of promotion it does for CABx and the funding council providers, especially as the population of Rodney is rapidly increasing and the potential need for the CABx services increases.
- Considers that funding CABx based on economic deprivation alone is a blunt instrument and that the model needs to take into account geographic isolation as well, as economic deprivation does not consider the high costs of living,

particularly in rural areas that lack public transport of other social infrastructure close to where people live.

- Supports a review of the Auckland Council funding model for CABx to ensure that it properly assesses the needs of the community and what other services may be available in a local area and not just the economic status of the area.
- supports the co-location of CABx services with other council services, such as libraries, noting that many of the issues local librarians are asked (such as broadband access) are best dealt with by the CABx and the colocation of services is more cost effective than operating
- Out of separate or commercial premises.
- Supports a specific model for CABx services in rural areas being investigated and trialled in the Rodney Local Board area, noting that there are substantial differences between CABx offered in urban areas compared to rural areas and a one size fits all approach for funding of supporting CABx is not the best method of delivering these services to rural communities.
- Does not require local CABx to regularly report on their activities to the local board, and notes that while individual local board members maintain an ongoing relationship with CABx staff formal reporting should be via council officers and the Auckland Community Advice Bureaux Inc.

#### **15.2 Rodney Local Board — 16 November 2017 (RD/2017/185)**

That the Rodney Local Board:

- a) does not have a view on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland's communities as it considers this a regional function that should be addressed by the governing body

#### **16.1 Upper Harbour Local Board — 17 August 2017 (UH/2017/125)**

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

Provide the following input to the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services:

- There is merit in being able to speak to someone face-to-face in one particular location, particularly in relation to private or confidential matters, and especially when technology is not available or the use thereof is not a particular strength.
- there is no one-size-fits-all solution, the local board recognises that, when compared with Upper Harbour, the CAB may play a stronger role elsewhere in the region, which may require different levels of funding and support
- There is a degree of overlap with services provided within Auckland libraries and it may be prudent to investigate the expansion these services as an alternative.
- It is unclear as to exactly what the services provided in the Upper Harbour area is and what the direct benefit to the community is.
- Factors considered for funding the CAB should be dependent on actual reportable beneficial outcomes for the Upper Harbour community.
- The local board wishes to receive more evidenced-based reporting from the CAB, covering off aspects such as which services are primarily requested, demographics of those utilising the services, etc.
- Six-monthly reporting from the CAB is adequate. but should be provided holistically in conjunction with neighbouring local boards.

#### **16.2 Upper Harbour Local Board — 16 November 2017 (UH/2017/179)**

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

- a) does not support any of the options articulated in the agenda report, particularly as a sub-regional funding model, which was discussed at a local board workshop, has not been included for consideration

## 17.1 Waiheke Local Board — 27 July 2017 (WHK/2017/121)

That the Waiheke Local Board:

- a) approve member J Meeuwsen to provide input on behalf of the Waiheke Local Board to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services by 18 August 2017.

Current relationship

- The Board has a positive relationship with the local CAB in a proactive role. They receive a six monthly/annual report.

Value of the service

- The board sees the present CAB system as very good and essential that it is retained. It is meeting a significant need that is not being met elsewhere and needs to be flexible enough to meet Waiheke's needs.
- The local CAB is very busy particularly with older members of the community who have a wide range of needs. There is an absence of care facilities, social housing and affordable housing on Waiheke Island as well as a chronic shortage of permanent rentals. CAB is often the first port of call for those who have urgent unmet accommodation needs. Additionally, the CAB assists members of the community with a variety of issues including employment contracts (e.g. foreign workers/payments), employment advice (bullying, exploitation) and accommodation issues. These relate to the high level of seasonal work and the significant hospitality industry on Waiheke Island.

Equity and Fairness

- Waiheke is isolated from other Auckland CAB offices so can't amalgamate. With an ageing population (relative to the whole of Auckland) and a significantly lower average income (relative to the whole of Auckland) equity of provision needs to take those factors into account. Moreover, CAB on Waiheke Island serves to provide advice in a vacuum of services. On the Auckland isthmus there are a multitude of other social and health agencies (NGOs, churches, marae, and government services) that are available to provide advice and services, whilst Waiheke only has a very small number of agencies/services, so equitable provision needs to take that into account. For these reasons CAB funding is needed on a by-site basis rather than by a strictly per capita basis as fair baseline funding is required to continue operations.

ACABx

- ACABx has explained its role to some members of the Local Board and it is clear that there is some central coordination, support, advocacy and reporting/policy/quality control role required.

Aspirations for the future

- Board members are not aware of any issues and welcome open dialogue if there are any. A greater understanding of the Council contract funding obligations would be useful. The CAB report could have wider awareness from both board members and the community. The relationship with other community groups needs to be better understood.

Note: Waiheke hosts more than 1 million visitors per annum and there is a significant gap in the provision of visitor information in the main village, Oneroa. Because of the high profile central location of the local CAB it is frequently asked to provide this service to visitors informally. The local board would be keen to see a diversified funding model explored across Council to formalize the existing CAB

to include a visitor service and therefore to support its viability going forward as CAB is an essential service.

### **17.2 Waiheke Local Board — 23 November 2017 (WHK/2017/199)**

That the Waiheke Local Board:

- a) note the feedback report on the draft options for supporting the future provision of Citizens Advice Bureaux services to Auckland's communities by 1 December 2017.
- b) agree option two as its preferred option

### **18.1 Waitākere Ranges Local Board — 10 August 2017 (WTK/2017/97)**

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

- a) provide feedback to the review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services:

Current relationship

Existing relationship between the local boards of CAB office

- Two local board members provide direct support — one for Justice of the Peace services and one Legal assistance.
- There has been minimal contact a present, however the three WEST LB Chairs recently met with CAB Leads from across cluster — this was useful.
- Note that previously had Chairs invited to CAB ACM's.
- The local board would like to have more contact in future as they provide important services, part of social infrastructure; they have on the grand insight to local needs and pressures faced.

Value of Service

- Is on average around \$1.40 per year per ratepayer to maintain service and each enquiry cost to Auckland Council is only \$6 — great value for money. CAB is very responsive to individual need and assisting with capacity building of individuals to access other services and to improve personal understanding/knowledge.
- CAB contributes significantly to social capital of area.
- The model enhances the opportunity for self-help.
- CAB is an accessible and supportive avenue for those wishing to help via volunteering.

Reporting

- Useful to have high level understanding of budget allocations.
- Would like to understand levels of volunteerism more.
- Like local office insight to trends and areas of local service demands.
- Invite local CAB to annual workshop and 6 monthly Chair Clusters.

Funding and Equity

- Do need to look at aspect of demand (this may relate to deprivation) and have opportunity to somehow top up on this if funding would make a difference.
- Each CAB needs to be funded at level to support the required staffing
- Do look to maintain levels of funding as a base for each CAB space with them consideration to what top up financially maybe purposeful.
- Do agree CAB provide incredibly important service and continue support.
- Keep as a regionally funded programme.
- Note that CAB are repositioning of community information and who's who and

what's where.

## **18.2 Waitākere Ranges Local Board — 23 November 2017 (WTK/2017/162)**

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

- a) Supports the Enhanced status quo option for supporting the future provision feedback subject to funding for CABs in Waitākere Ranges Local Board area remaining at the same level or greater.
- a) Expresses its satisfaction with the CAB services in its area

## **19.1 Waitematā Local Board — 15 August 2017 (WTM/2017/164)**

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) receive the Input to the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services report and provide any comment by 18 August 2017.
- b) endorse the board's feedback on the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux as outlined in Attachment A.

### Current relationship

We've had a very close relationship with the branches through the Community portfolio over the last two terms, which included site visits and regular communication, but not that much visibility for rest of the board. We have identified the need to take our good working relationship with local CAB to a more strategic relationship with ACABx.

In the past we have assisted with lease issues in Grey Lynn, provision of adequate space in the Central Library and local CABs have received community grants.

Overall we have a positive relationship with our local CAB but they appear to be operating self-sufficiently.

### Value of the service

The central branch serves a broad community of visitors to the city Centre and local residents; it is more like a regional service, while Grey Lynn is locally focused.

Non-Aucklanders, in particular overseas students, need and use the central CAB for information about services and issues that are external to their studies and relate to Auckland and New Zealand generally. It is vital for Auckland's reputation and duty of care that an adequate and sustainable long-term base for the Central CAB is provided.

The board also observed that there is a need for clarity around the potential overlap between the services offered by community law services, counselling services at universities and CABs.

CABs support the community by connecting people to services and information (thus avoiding social isolation), addressing tenancy and homelessness issues. Often they are filling a gap caused by central government funding cuts.

The board is aware of cases where CAB offered legal support to victims of family violence or sexual abuse; this is seen as a very valued service.

We consider the local bureau to be delivering outcomes that support Waitematā and local board objectives.

### Equity and fairness

The current funding model appears to be effective to a point but doesn't take into account accommodation requirements in the city Centre or the higher burden placed on CAB services due to a rapidly increasing population.

Funding needs to be directed at adequate and suitable spaces/facilities with provision of sufficient funds to cover capital expenditure. For example, furniture and shelving cost have

been requested from the board via grants, but should be planned for by ACABx. The board

would like to know what the expectation of the local board in this space is.

It is also considered inequitable that the service is funded on population for central CAB, as the City Centre receives 130k people per day which are not resident ratepayers.

The number of people coming into city Centre and using the service should be factored into the funding for local CAB

#### Reporting

The board would like to receive numbers and statistics. They would also like to know if there are community outcomes/KPIs in the funding agreement and what does Council get for its \$1.4m investment. We would like CAB to report annually in person to the local board, similar to the reporting received BIDs.

#### ACABx

No, we don't, but we are unsure that we need to.

We are currently being asked on behalf of local branches to provide additional funds, so this shows equity issues with funding.

We just want to know that there is a strategic relationship and view and that the local Branches are getting what they need from ACABx.

The board understands that the volunteer training is really robust and that the work force is in general a part time paid manager, but offices run full time with volunteers.

#### Aspirations for the future

It is a mature organisation providing an essential service. They are a well-established service, easy to access in Waitematā. People want to volunteer for them as CAB has a reputation for providing great training.

We would like to support the central CAB into more sustainable, suitable accommodation

### **19.2 Waitematā Local Board — 4 December 2017 (WTM/2017/222)**

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) support Option 3 for regional service provision.
- b) support the council working with CABx and CABNZ to undertake a fuller assessment with local board involvement to determine a new approach for future CAB service provision across the region - Option 3 (Regional service provision).
- c) support an increase in Council funding of Citizens Advice Bureaux to reflect increases in population and need.
- d) request that in assessing both the service need and funding model for Citizen Advice Bureaux services in Auckland consider population, deprivation, diversity and the needs of overseas and domestic students, new migrants and visitors

### **20.1 Whau Local Board — 23 August 2017 (WH/2017/82)**

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) endorse the input to review of Citizens Advice Bureaux services (Attachment A).

#### Current relationship

- The local board acknowledges the good work that both local CAB groups do, and recognises the significant contributions made by the many volunteers

- The local board feels it has a good understanding the CABs role and what it does.
- It is a hand off relationship at the local board level, however also note three of local board members do volunteers duties with two undertaking Justice of the Peace activities and one providing volunteer legal support.
- The local board had some contact with Avondale CAB in the second term with regards to accommodation following parts of the Avondale Community Centre being closed for health and safety reasons.

The local board see benefit in the co-location of CAB alongside of other council community facilities.

#### Value of the service

The CAB provides a very practical hands service for a wide variety of persons with many not have access to any other places of support.

The CAB act as a local information hub for people who are trying to help themselves. They are an effective free service who provide non-biased information and help people help themselves or link those in need that they cannot assist with other groups who may be able to help.

Is your local bureau delivering outcomes that support the local area and local board objectives?

Yes. There are many high level outcomes that are shared

The CAB is driven by the values of service and helping others and significantly contributes to supporting community resilience.

The members who volunteer did observe that there is significant demand in the areas of Justice of peace duties and Legal advice.

Staff and volunteers are seen as being neutral people who can give advice and help guide people towards their own solutions.

#### Equity and fairness

The funding appears to be working for the two offices in the local board area.

It appears to be growing demands on the services provided by CABs across all of Auckland and consideration needs to be given.

Having a central group as one point of regional contract seems to make sense in adding value of eases of access to the collective CAB network, foster consistent baseline report requirements, and advocating as a collective voice in Auckland as well as to Wellington.

The benefit of the community leases should be clearly articulated as is an additional signification contribution supported by the general rate.

The local board support the current model of regionally allocated and managed funding to help ensure equity of access to a vital community led and delivered programmer to all Aucklanders.

It is noted that CAB funding models varied across the various legacy councils with greater funding being provided by Waitākere and Manukau City Councils.

It appears that areas Auckland that that comparatively higher levels of deprivation have higher levels of visitation however given the complexity of our communities this may not be a simple direct cause and effect correlation.

Auckland Council needs a funding model that does give consideration to demand.

The local board would not like to see any redistribution between areas within the current funding pool, rather should a model emerge that may mean due to a new formula that an funding area(s) should increase, then additional new funding should allocated.

The local board do see that central government funding is important and the opportunity for CAB to access this funding whilst still being enabled to retain its independence of advice and support.

#### Reporting

The Local board support annual reporting to the governing Body

It is useful to be able to access the local insight that is developed by local CAB offices and their cluster collectives: information around type of assistance, trends in this, and demographic utilization-

Would be useful to understand who each CAB work most closely with, make most referrals to interest in being made aware of issues that community may be facing that the local board has influence over.

The members would appreciate an opportunity to meet annually with CAB's feeling comfortable to raise any matter that may arise as and when they do.

The three west local board chairs had a meeting with the Waitākere Cluster and found this useful.

#### ACABx

Members were briefed on the role and relationship and feel they understand it and see benefit in having such a group for both Auckland Council and for CAB clusters/offices.

#### Aspirations for the future

Provision of accessible and compassionate services:

Provide support to groups who may be new to the area/Auckland/New Zealand and have little local knowledge or contacts to call upon.

Provision of independent and well-intended support and advice:

Is a service that is based upon local volunteers, helps provide a means that many people can give back and contribute to their communities in a meaningful and beneficial way,

The volunteers give a lot and see benefits for themselves.

CAB services contribute to welcoming and inclusive communities and should continue to be supported by Council as provide benefit to all Aucklanders beyond those just involved in the direct encounters.

Any change must be about enhancing the services. The model appears to be working well at present. Need to look ahead and at current pressures and assist with core funding, provision of adequate and appropriate spaces, and support around retaining and growing the volunteer base it all relies upon.

### **20.2 Whau Local Board — 22 November 2017 (WH/2017/142)**

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) supports the Enhanced status quo option for supporting the future provision feedback