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Those powers which cannot legally be delegated:

(a) the power to make a rate
(b) the power to make a bylaw
(c) the power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the long term plan
(d) the power to adopt a long term plan, annual plan, or annual report
(e) the power to appoint a chief executive
(f) the power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under the Local Government Act 2002 in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement
(g) the power to adopt a remuneration and employment policy.

Additional responsibilities retained by the Governing Body:

(a) approval of long-term plan or annual plan consultation documents, supporting information and consultation process prior to consultation
(b) approval of a draft bylaw prior to consultation
(c) resolutions required to be made by a local authority under the Local Electoral Act 2001, including the appointment of electoral officer
(d) adoption of, and amendment to, the Committee Terms of Reference, Standing Orders and Code of Conduct
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(f) approval of the Unitary Plan
(g) overview of the implementation and refresh of the Auckland Plan through setting direction on key strategic projects (e.g. the City Rail Link and the alternative funding mechanisms for transport) and receiving regular reporting on the overall achievement of Auckland Plan priorities and performance measures.
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 **Affirmation**

His Worship the Mayor will read the affirmation.

2 **Apologies**

An apology from Deputy Mayor BC Cashmore has been received.

3 **Declaration of Interest**

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

4 **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Governing Body:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Thursday, 19 April 2018 including the confidential section, and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 30 April 2018, as a true and correct record.

5 **Petitions**

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

6 **Public Input**

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than **one (1) clear working day** prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of **thirty (30) minutes** is allocated to the period for public input with **five (5) minutes** speaking time for each speaker.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public input had been received.

7 **Local Board Input**

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to **five (5) minutes** during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give **one (1) day’s notice** of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.
Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

   (i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

   (ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

"Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

   (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

   (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

   (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."

Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Local Electoral Matters Bill and trial of online voting

File No.: CP2018/07446

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To approve Auckland Council’s submission to the Justice Select Committee on the Local Electoral Matters Bill; and to support in principle Auckland Council trialling online voting for the 2019 local elections.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Auckland Council has been closely involved in the working group leading the local government sector’s effort advocating for an online voting trial in the 2019 local elections.

3. Staff have drafted a council submission to the Justice Select Committee (Attachment A) on the Local Electoral Matters Bill (Attachment B). The draft submission:
   - highlights the importance of trialling online voting at the 2019 local elections
   - supports the amendments proposed in the Bill
   - recommends additional amendments on matters that should be put in place before the 2019 local elections. These amendments relate to:
     - allowing candidate nominations and profile statements to be submitted electronically
     - enabling the council to change the number of Governing Body members and to modify local board boundaries to maintain alignment with ward boundaries.

4. Staff ask that a Governing Body member be appointed with knowledge of the local electoral legislation to speak to the submission at the select committee with the General Manager Democracy Services.

5. Staff ask that the Governing Body support in principle Auckland Council participating in a trial of online voting in 2019 subject to specific conditions being met.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) approve Auckland Council’s submission to the Justice Select Committee on the Local Electoral Matters Bill as contained in Attachment A of the report

b) appoint a member of the Governing Body to appear before the Justice Select Committee on behalf of Auckland Council

c) support in principle Auckland Council conducting an online voting trial in the 2019 local body elections for a subset of electors, either alone or in partnership with other councils, subject to the following conditions:
   i) the enabling legislation and subsequent regulations being passed in time to procure and implement an online voting solution
   ii) all risks, including security risks, being appropriately managed
   iii) the cost being acceptable
   iv) the Governing Body giving final approval for any trial to go ahead.
Submission on the Local Electoral Matters Bill

6. The Bill includes several important amendments to the local electoral legislation, which will enable and support local authorities in their efforts to increase democratic participation.

Trial of online voting

7. Online voting has been lawful since 2001. It is included in the definition of voting methods in section 5 of the Local Electoral Act 2001. However, there are no regulations allowing online elections. The Bill amends the Local Electoral Act 2001 to allow voters to choose from alternative voting methods and to enable a voting method to be offered to a specific subset of electors at an election for the purpose of a trial.

8. This provides a mechanism to limit the risks of trialing a new voting method on the whole elector population. In Auckland Council’s case, this means we could offer online voting as an additional voting method alongside postal voting to specific categories of electors such as overseas electors, disabled electors, or electors within a ward or local board area, or a combination of these.

Date of birth

9. The Bill will allow the Electoral Commission to provide date of birth information to local authorities if required to conduct a local election. This will enable the elector’s date of birth to be used as a factor to authenticate electors in the design of online voting.

Research into voter participation

10. The Bill will amend the Electoral Act 1993 to clarify that electors' age group information may be used for the purpose of research relating specifically to participation in local elections.

11. The benefit of this change is twofold:
   - firstly, it enables the evaluation of trials of new voting methods using age group demographics, which will inform further improvement to the design of the new method;
   - secondly, it ensures that any local authority can access information to better understand voter turnout and support its efforts to improve voter participation.

Allowing electronic transmission of nominations

12. For the 2016 Auckland local elections, over 600 nomination forms and profile statements were supplied by candidates and had to be typed and proof-read. The potential for mistakes and the cost associated with manually handling these would be significantly reduced if nominations could be submitted electronically.

13. Section 55 of the Local Electoral Act 2001 requires that nominations be submitted “in the prescribed manner” and the Local Electoral Regulations, clause 25, states this must be in writing. It appears there is conflicting legal advice as to whether nominations that were scanned and emailed were ‘in writing’ for the purposes of this act.

14. Therefore, staff recommend that 'nomination in writing' be clearly defined and that a nomination received electronically should be valid provided the particulars are all clearly legible, including the signatures and addresses of the nominee, nominator and seconder.

Improving processes for a review of representation arrangements

15. In September 2017 the Governing Body resolved to:
   “ff) approve council continuing to advocate to central government for legislative amendments that would allow changes to the number of Governing Body members, and simplification of the process for changes to numbers and boundaries of local boards.” [GB2017/121].
16. Staff are taking the opportunity of making a submission on electoral matters to request the legislative changes that would give effect to the Governing Body resolution.

17. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 sets the membership of Auckland Council’s Governing Body as the Mayor and 20 members, which means the council is not able to review the number of members when conducting a review of representation arrangements under the Local Electoral Act 2001.

18. The Local Government Act 2002 requires a reorganisation application for local boards to be created, amalgamated, disestablished or for local board boundaries to be changed. This means that the council is not able to restore alignment between ward and local board boundaries if ward boundaries need to change as a result of the review of representation arrangements.

19. In the submission, staff recommend that:
   i. the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 be amended to enable Auckland Council to review the number of Governing body members when conducting representation arrangement reviews under the Local Electoral Act 2001.
   ii. the Local Electoral Act 2001 be amended to provide a process to restore alignment between ward and local board boundaries if ward boundaries need to change as a result of the review of representation arrangements and maintaining alignment is supported by affected local boards.

Supporting Auckland Council’s involvement in a 2019 online voting trial

20. On 27 July 2017 the Governing Body approved the council's submission on the previous parliament’s Justice and Electoral Select Committee inquiry into the 2016 local authority elections. The submission advocated for councils to be able to trial online voting [GB/2017/83]. The inquiry was ultimately abandoned, but we have appended that submission to our submission on the Local Electoral Matters Bill.

21. At its December 2016 meeting, the Finance and Performance Committee resolved to “request the Minister of Local Government to explore a pilot trial of an electronic voting system including by-elections” [FIN/2016/164].

22. The council’s demographic advisory panels strongly support the introduction of online voting to encourage democratic participation of Auckland’s diverse communities. For instance, on 21 November 2017 the Disability Panel recommended “that Auckland Council seriously consider supporting online voting in the 2019 local elections, in particular for disability communities, many of whose members experience difficulty casting their votes independently. “

23. Democracy Services and ICT staff have been closely involved in the working group leading the local government sector’s effort to organise an online voting trial for the 2019 local elections. This effort has been coordinated jointly by Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) and the Society of Local Government Managers (SOLGM).

24. At the end of 2017, LGNZ wrote to the Minister of Local Government seeking a financial contribution from central government to assist with the cost of running a trial, with the local government sector meeting the remaining cost. Due as much to timing as to the multiple demands faced by a new government, LGNZ was not successful in its funding bid and the possibility of sector-wide funding was lost for this financial year once councils began their Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 consultation process.

25. As a result, the national procurement approach that the working group had been developing will not proceed for 2019. The original proposal for a single online voting provider jointly procured on behalf of the 12 – 20 councils that had expressed interest, has become non-viable. Councils can now choose to collaborate together and jointly commission an online provider, or to run a trial on their own.
26. Our preferred option would be to join with other councils to run one trial together, for three reasons:
   - It would minimise costs.
   - It would reduce the risk of several independently-run trials to fail. If one or more trials proceed in 2019, it is imperative that they succeed. Any failure could set back the introduction of online voting in New Zealand for many years.
   - It would be more effective to run a coordinated public information campaign to educate the public and address concerns.

27. LGNZ and SOLGM will continue to work with the Department of Internal Affairs on getting the regulatory delivery and security framework in place to enable trials to proceed, should councils wish. They will also continue to advocate for and coordinate councils who are keen to trial online voting in 2019, as well as lead on those matters that need to happen at a national level.

28. For all the reasons outlined in our submission to the Justice Select Committee, Auckland Council staff are still keen to run an online voting trial in 2019 for a subset of electors, subject to the following conditions:
   - the enabling legislation and subsequent regulations being passed on time to procure an online voting system
   - all risks, including security risks, being appropriately managed
   - the cost being acceptable
   - the Governing Body giving final approval for the trial to go ahead.

29. If the legislation is enacted, regulations will need to be made setting up the functional and security requirements for the online voting system. These will need to be known as early as possible for a provider to be able to meet them on time for the 2019 elections.

30. Project risks will need to be properly assessed and appropriate mitigation strategies will need to be developed. In addition to the risks usually associated with sourcing any IT system, specific risks include:
   - security risks – protecting the integrity of the voting system will be paramount to the success of the trial
   - public acceptance – there are vocal international anti online voting activists who will actively seek to undermine the project.

31. Staff are not recommending running a trial at any cost, and there are presently no provisions in the draft LTP for an online voting trial. However, we are not able to provide exact costings at this stage. We need to be able to engage with providers to assess costs, and for this we need in-principle support from the Governing Body for a trial. Costs will be different if we use a local provider or an international one. Costs will also depend on how many councils participate in the trial. As a guide, however, staff estimate that the costs of running a trial for about 75,000 eligible voters in Auckland would be in the order of $1m to $1.5m. This assumes a subset of 5,000 visually-impaired eligible voters, 20,000 eligible overseas voters and about 50,000 eligible voters from a chosen ward.

32. To be able to proceed, staff are seeking the Governing Body’s in-principle support for the trial subject to the four conditions outlined in paragraph 28.

33. This support will enable us to approach other councils and form a consortium to work together, run a request for proposal process and engage with a preferred vendor to establish a timetable and budget. If we ascertain that a trial is feasible, we will then come back to the Governing Body with a formal proposal for final approval.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

34. All local boards made comments on Auckland Council’s submission to the inquiry into the 2016 local elections, which specifically advocated for the introduction of online voting.

35. There has been no other formal engagement with local boards on trialling online voting since then. We will engage with local boards if the trial is likely to go ahead.

36. The Waitematā Local Board has indicated it intends to make a submission on removing the cap on the number of Governing Body members as part of its submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

37. Voting turnout has historically been lower among Māori than non-Māori, with Māori who are younger and less well off the least likely to vote.

38. In 2014, in its advice to the Department of Internal Affairs on the pros and cons of introducing online voting, the Māori Internet Society declared that online voting would offer mixed benefits for Māori.

39. On the one hand, Māori are less likely to have an internet connection than non-Māori. On the other hand, online voting has the potential to increase political participation, particularly among young people, as research shows that 85 per cent of Māori aged 15-24 use the internet for social media networking.

40. No formal engagement was conducted with Māori groups and community on trialling online voting or our submission on the Bill.

41. However, the council will engage with communities, including Māori communities, as part of the development of an online voting system should a trial be confirmed for the 2019 local elections. It will also look at ways to maximise internet accessibility so that as many eligible voters as possible can vote online.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

42. Making a submission on the Bill has no financial implications.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

43. There is a reputational risk where iwi, business or community views differ from the council submission. This is mitigated by an ability to make a submission supporting their view.

44. Privacy risks related to online voting have been covered in our submission.

45. The risks of running an online voting trial will be thoroughly assessed before seeking Governing Body approval for the trial.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

46. Submissions are due by 22 June 2018.
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Government Bill

Explanatory note

General policy statement
This Bill is an omnibus Bill introduced under Standing Order 263(a). That Standing Order states that an omnibus Bill to amend more than 1 Act may be introduced if the amendments deal with an interrelated topic that can be regarded as implementing a single broad policy. The single broad policy of the Bill is to provide greater flexibility to enable local electoral arrangements to adapt to changing circumstances. This omnibus Bill achieves that single broad policy by—

• amending the Local Electoral Act 2001 to support the conduct of trials of novel voting methods;
• amending the Electoral Act 1993 to enable the design of future voting methods to utilise date of birth information;
• amending the Electoral Act 1993 to ensure that analysis of voter participation in local elections (including trials) can utilise age group information.

Departmental disclosure statement
The Department of Internal Affairs is required to prepare a disclosure statement to assist with the scrutiny of this Bill. The disclosure statement provides access to information about the policy development of the Bill and identifies any significant or unusual legislative features of the Bill.

A copy of the statement can be found at http://legislation.govt.nz/disclosure.aspx?type=bill&subtype=government&year=2018&no=50
Regulatory impact assessment
The Department of Internal Affairs produced regulatory impact assessments on [date] to help inform the main policy decisions taken by the Government relating to the contents of this Bill.
Copies of these regulatory impact assessments can be found at—


Clause by clause analysis

Clause 1 is the Title clause.

Clause 2 is the commencement clause, which provides that the Bill comes into force on the day after the date of Royal assent.

Part 1
Amendments to Local Electoral Act 2001

Clause 3 provides that Part 1 of the Bill amends the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Clause 4 amends the definition of voting method in section 5 of the Local Electoral Act 2001. The amendment clarifies that the term voting method includes a method of voting that involves a choice between methods of voting.

Clause 5 amends section 36 of the Local Electoral Act 2001. Section 36 provides that an election or a poll conducted by a local authority must be conducted using 1 or more methods of voting adopted by resolution of the local authority. The amendment enables the local authority to adopt a voting method for a specified class of elector if regulations authorise the use of that voting method by a specified class of electors for the purpose of conducting a trial of the method.

Clause 6 amends section 139(1)(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 to enable regulations to be made that authorise, for the purpose of conducting a trial of a voting method (for example, an electronic voting method), a local authority to adopt the voting method for a specified class of elector.

Clause 7 amends section 141 of the Local Electoral Act 2001 to provide—

- that regulations under section 139(1)(c) may specify a class of electors by reference to a local government area or subdivision, or any other characteristic that makes a voting method suitable for the specified class of electors; and

- that, where regulations authorise a voting method that involves date of birth information, the default measures to protect information that are set out in section 89 of the Act apply to the date of birth information and that regulations must also prescribe measures to prevent unauthorised access to, or use of, such information.
Clause 8 amends section 142 of the Local Electoral Act 2001 to provide that regulations relating to electoral rolls must not provide for any electoral roll to include an elector’s date of birth.

Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment to regulation 11 of the Local Electoral Regulations 2001. Regulation 11 sets out the information that must be included on an electoral roll. The consequential amendment to regulation 11 provides that an electoral roll must not include an elector’s date of birth.

Part 2
Amendments to Electoral Act 1993

Clause 10 provides that Part 2 of the Bill amends the Electoral Act 1993.

Clause 11 amends 112 of the Electoral Act 1993. Section 112 provides for persons conducting research to request that the Electoral Commission supply them with lists of electors within certain groups for the purpose of research that relates to scientific matters or to human health. If a request meets certain conditions (and the Electoral Commission is satisfied that the requested lists should be provided), the Electoral Commission is required to supply the lists. An amendment to section 112(1) provides for the Electoral Commission to supply lists of electors in a particular age group for the purpose of research that relates to elector participation in any election, by-election, or poll conducted under the Electoral Act 1993 or the Local Electoral Act 2001.

Clause 11 also amends section 112(3) to provide that a request made under section 112 may seek information about electors who appear to be entitled to vote in 1 or more local board areas. Currently, section 112(3) provides that a request may seek information about electors who appear to be entitled to vote within 1 or more other local authority subdivisions (for example, wards or community board areas), but local board areas are not included.

Clause 12 amends section 113 of the Electoral Act 1993. Section 113 requires the Electoral Commission to supply local authorities with specified information for the purpose of any election, by-election, or poll. An amendment to section 113(10) requires the Electoral Commission to supply local authorities with electors’ date of birth information for the purpose of conducting any election, by-election, or poll.

Clause 12 also amends section 113(10)(f) to provide that the specified information may include a description of the local board area in which each elector appears to be entitled to vote. Currently, section 113 provides that specified information may include, in respect of each elector, a description of each local authority and subdivision in which the elector appears to be entitled to vote, but local board areas are not included.

Finally, clause 12 adds a new subsection (11) to section 113, which provides that date of birth information must not be provided by the Electoral Commission except to an electoral official of a local authority for the purposes of an election, by-election, or poll. It also provides that the date of birth information may be provided for the purposes of an election, by-election, or poll only if regulations have been made under
section 139(1)(c) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 (as amended by clause 6) that authorise a voting method that requires the use of date of birth information for the election, by-election, or poll.
Hon Nanaia Mahuta
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</table>

**Part 2**

Amendments to Electoral Act 1993

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amendments to Electoral Act 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Section 112 amended (Supply of information on age and Maori descent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Section 113 amended (Supply of computer-compiled lists and electronic storage media to local authorities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Parliament of New Zealand enacts as follows:

1 Title
This Act is the Local Electoral Matters Act 2018.

2 Commencement
This Act comes into force on the day after the date of Royal assent.

Part 1
Amendments to Local Electoral Act 2001

3 Amendments to Local Electoral Act 2001
This Part amends the Local Electoral Act 2001.

4 Section 5 amended (Interpretation)
In section 5(1), definition of voting method, paragraph (d), after “combination of”, insert “or choice between”.

5 Section 36 amended (Voting method for elections and polls)
After section 36(3), insert:

(4) Subsection (5) applies if—

(a) regulations authorise the use of a voting method, for the purpose of conducting a trial of that method, by a specified class of elector in any specified class of election or poll or in any specified election or poll; and

(b) the local authority adopts that voting method by resolution in accordance with those regulations.

(5) The voting method to be used by the specified class of elector in the election or poll must be the method adopted by resolution under subsection (4).

(6) If, under subsection (5), any election or poll of 1 or more territorial authorities in which a voting method is to be used by a specified class of elector is to be conducted in conjunction with 1 or more other elections or polls, that voting method is to be used by the specified class of elector in each of the elections or polls.

(7) If subsection (5) or (6) (or both) apply to an election or a poll, the voting method or methods to be used for other electors in the election or poll must be determined in accordance with subsections (1) to (3).

6 Section 139 amended (Regulations)
In section 139(1)(c), after “or any specified election or poll”, insert “(or, for the purpose of conducting a trial of a voting method, by a specified class of elector or by all electors in any specified class of election or poll or in any specified election or poll)”.

2
7 Section 141 amended (Voting methods)

In section 141, insert as subsections (2) and (3):

(2) Regulations made under section 139(1)(c) may specify a class of elector by reference to—

(a) a local government area or subdivision in which the specified class of electors is eligible to vote; or

(b) any other characteristic that makes a voting method suitable for the specified class of electors (for example, in relation to an electronic method of voting, the members of the specified class may reside overseas or in remote locations, or have a relevant disability).

(3) If regulations made under section 139(1)(c) authorise the use of a voting method that requires the use of electors’ date of birth information,—

(a) the regulations must also prescribe—

(i) measures to prevent unauthorised access to, or use of, electors’ date of birth information; and

(ii) the manner in which documents or records containing electors’ date of birth information must be secured after the completion of the count (in accordance with section 89(1));

(b) any document or record containing an elector’s date of birth must be treated as specified material for the purpose of section 89(5).

8 Section 142 amended (Electoral rolls)

In section 142, insert as subsection (2):

(2) Despite subsection (1) and section 139(1)(f), regulations made under section 139(1)(f) must not provide for any electoral roll to include an elector’s date of birth.

9 Consequential amendment to Local Electoral Regulations 2001

(1) This section amends the Local Electoral Regulations 2001.

(2) After regulation 11(2), insert:

(2A) Despite subclause (2)(a)(iii), the electoral roll must not include any elector’s date of birth.

Part 2

Amendments to Electoral Act 1993

10 Amendments to Electoral Act 1993

This Part amends the Electoral Act 1993.
Part 2 cl 11  Local Electoral Matters Bill

11 Section 112 amended (Supply of information on age and Maori descent)
(1) In section 112(1)(b)(ii), after “descent”, insert “; or”.
(2) After section 112(1)(b), insert:
   (e) without limiting paragraph (a), for the purposes of research by that person that relates to elector participation in an election, a by-election, or a poll conducted under this Act or the Local Electoral Act 2001, a list of electors in a particular age group as defined in section 114(9).
(3) In section 112(3)(f), replace “;—” with “; or”.
(4) After section 112(3)(f), insert:
   (g) 1 or more named local board areas;—

12 Section 113 amended (Supply of computer-compiled lists and electronic storage media to local authorities)
(1) After section 113(10)(a), insert:
   (aa) the elector’s date of birth:
(2) After section 113(10)(f)(iv), insert:
   (iva) local board area; or
(3) After section 113(10), insert:
(11) However, the Electoral Commission must not supply electors’ date of birth information except under subsection (1) and may supply that information only if regulations made under section 139(1)(f) of the Local Electoral Act 2001 authorise a voting method that requires the use of electors’ date of birth information to be used for the election, by-election, or poll.
Placeholder for Attachment B

Local Electoral Matters Bill and trial of online voting

Local Electoral Matters Bill
Decision-making delegation to Waiheke Local Board over public land, 10 Ocean View Road, Matiatia, Waiheke Island

File No.: CP2018/05269

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek a delegation to the Waiheke Local Board to make land use and development decisions over public land at 10 Ocean View Road, Matiatia on Waiheke Island.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The intention of the Waiheke Governance Pilot is to devolve more decision-making to the Waiheke Local Board to test whether this can provide better outcomes.
3. The Waiheke Local Board is seeking a delegation from the Governing Body to enable it to lead development of public land at Matiatia which has been stalled in the thirteen years since Auckland Council purchased the land.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

That the Governing Body:

a) delegate non-regulatory land use and development decision-making over public land at 10 Ocean View Road, Matiatia, Waiheke Island described as Lot 8 DP 146325 and Lot 51 DP 159304 to the Waiheke Local Board in accordance with Schedule 7, Clause 36C of the Local Government Act 2002

b) confirm the following expectations associated with this delegation:
   i) development of the land is expected to include open space, commercial long-term leases, visitor and cultural infrastructure and transport services
   ii) excludes land acquisition or disposal decisions
   iii) the land will be managed by the Community Facilities department
   iv) the delegation will be reviewed after five years
   v) Panuku Development Auckland’s non-service portfolio on Lot 8 DP 146325 will be transferred into the service portfolio and managed by Community Facilities in line with current lease terms
   vi) existing Auckland Transport parking leases will initially be retained on current terms
   vii) all land use and development proposals will be consistent with Auckland Council plans, policies and existing regulations or if amendment is needed, these are agreed with respective decision-makers
   viii) land development decisions will seek to balance the investment return intentions outlined when 10 Ocean View Road was purchased in 2005 with current transport, environmental, cultural, economic and tourism needs
   ix) Auckland Transport and the Waiheke Local Board will work together to agree transport outcomes for the land and associated road/parking areas, with short term development being made within current budgets and longer-term development decisions being subject to Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and the Auckland Transport Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 budgets being confirmed
x) the Waiheke Local Board will work with mana whenua to ensure their aspirations for Matiatia are recognised in planning and development outcomes

c) note that the above expectations are consistent with and give effect to:

i) the September 2017 Governing Body resolutions to commence a Waiheke Local Board Governance Pilot project under the Governance Framework Review aimed at testing an increased level of devolved decision making to the Waiheke Local Board

ii) the March 2018 Local Government Commission’s ‘Enhancing local government for Auckland - Recommendations to Auckland Council’ and in particular recommendation 12 that Auckland Council, the Waiheke Local Board and council-controlled organisations work towards solutions at Matiatia.

Horopaki / Context

4. This report responds to the following 22 February 2018 resolution of the Waiheke Local Board:

Request that the Governing Body delegate land use and development decision-making over the undeveloped and Panuku Development Auckland managed parts of the public land at Mātiatia to the local board to enable it to lead and make decisions on future public land use at Mātiatia as agreed under the Mātiatia Strategic Plan, noting that this is consistent with the Auckland Council Governance Review decision to test more devolved decision-making on Waiheke.

5. That report contained a detailed discussion of the issues and status around land use and management at Matiatia. Its conclusion is that local board leadership of decisions and actions at Matiatia is necessary if current issues are to be resolved and a development plan agreed and implemented.

Past decisions

6. In 2005 Auckland City Council purchased 8.7 hectares of land in the bay at Matiatia for $12.5 million to prevent a level of private development that was considered to be inappropriate and to enable coordinated land use and development planning and decisions to be made. The purchase included an expectation of achieving a minimum return of $7 million by a combination of land sale and long-term commercial lease of 8,000m² of land. This return was intended to mitigate $7 million of debt the council has on the books in relation to the original purchase.

7. The land purchased is the area shown on Attachment A (bordered teal) and consists of 8.7 hectares in two lots. It is held in fee simple under the Local Government Act 2002. The areas bordered in green in Attachment A are commercial leases managed by Panuku Development Auckland. The area bordered red is leased by Auckland Transport for public parking. The bulk of the land is undeveloped.

8. The wider public landholding in the area also shown in Attachment A consists of:

- Church Bay Esplanade Reserve (Waiheke Local Board - bordered in white)
- Auckland Transport managed road reserve, wharf keyhole, foreshore carpark and the long-term carpark further up Ocean View Road (bordered in red)
- Watercare Services Owhanake wastewater treatment plant and surrounding undeveloped land (bordered in purple).

9. These land management arrangements were passed to Auckland Council and in the case of the Panuku leased areas and the undeveloped land, represent a holding pattern pending future decisions.
10. The 2009 Auckland City Council 20-year Matiatia directional plan was never progressed by Auckland Council. The 2011, 2014 and 2017 Waiheke Local Board Plans and Essentially Waiheke, which is seen as Waiheke’s guiding document, all include outcomes prioritising the development of a Mātiatia plan and seek funding to deliver these plans.

11. Despite these plans and strong, continuous advocacy by the Waiheke Local Board and community, no substantive progress has been made. Lack of funding, other council priorities and the disconnected land management structure, have all contributed to a lack of progress. While the respective management agencies are meeting immediate needs, this fragmentation is seen as a constraint on agreeing and delivering integrated long-term development outcomes at Mātiatia.

12. In September 2017 Auckland Council’s Governance Review included a decision to test more devolved decision-making to the Waiheke Local Board. That decision recognised that Waiheke is a unique community with different needs and a strong desire for decisions to be made locally.

13. In March 2018, the Local Government Commission reported to Auckland Council making recommendations in response to the unsuccessful applications for Waiheke and North Rodney unitary authorities. The Commission’s report included a specific recommendation that Auckland Council with all relevant parties, including the Waiheke Local Board and council-controlled organisations, work towards a solution at Matiatia on Waiheke Island.

**Delegation**

14. The Governing Body may delegate to a local board any of its responsibilities, duties, and powers but with some exceptions. In deciding whether to make a delegation, the Governing Body must weigh the benefits of reflecting local circumstances against the importance and benefits of using a single approach in the district. The delegation enables the local board to act in the same way as the Governing Body would have without further reference to the Governing Body.

15. In deciding whether to make a delegation under Schedule 7, Clause 36C of the Local Government Act 2002, the Governing Body must weigh the benefits of reflecting local circumstances against the importance and benefits of using a single approach in the district. In this case, the local board is better acquainted with the land and the needs and preferences of its community in relation to the land. A delegation is considered to be the best way to enable development of the land which is the purpose for which it was purchased in 2005. Further, as the land is on an island, and is not part of a council network or identified as a strategic or growth area, it is not considered necessary for the Governing Body to make the decision in order to ensure a single approach in the district.

16. It is noted that pursuant to Schedule 7, Cl 36C (5) of the Local Government Act (2002), the Governing Body retains legal responsibility to ensure the performance of any decisions that it has delegated.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

**Delegation expectations**

17. The delegation will enable the Waiheke Local Board to lead and make decisions on the future use and development of the Matiatia area. Only non-regulatory matters are to be delegated. Planning, funding and development will be managed by the respective Auckland Council departments that report to the Waiheke Local Board. In the case of Auckland Transport managed land, decisions will be made by Auckland Transport in consultation with the Waiheke Local Board.
18. Implicit in this request is an expectation that Waiheke Local Board leadership will enable outcomes that both the Waiheke community and the Auckland Council group can support. To provide certainty and structure to the delegation, the following current and planned processes are in place:

- A Matiatia Strategic Plan is currently being developed by community, mana whenua and council representatives that will determine the best development option for this land via a public consultation process
- An area plan for Waiheke is about to commence led by the council’s Plans and Places department and this will support and direct future land use zoning provisions when the Hauraki Gulf Island District Plan is integrated into the Auckland Unitary Plan
- Specific Long-term Plan 2018-2028 budgets for Matiatia are being sought by both Auckland Council and Auckland Transport and implementation of agreed outcomes will be subject to budgets being available.

19. The intention is that council's Community Facilities department manages the majority of the Matiatia land and reports directly to the Waiheke Local Board. As can be seen from Attachment A, the bulk of this land is wetland and regenerating bush and its management will largely involve maintaining and enhancing these natural areas. The grass foreshore area is currently maintained by Community Facilities.

20. The areas currently managed by Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport represent 15 per cent of the total 8.7 hectares land area, or 1.3 hectares. The current district plan zoning for Matiatia provides for up to 10,000m² of mixed use development as a permitted activity and for 10,000m² - 12,000m² as a discretionary activity. Within this a minimum of 35 per cent must be open space and 4000m² of this must adjoining the esplanade reserve.

21. Transfer of Panuku Development Auckland’s commercial lease to Community Facilities enables the local board lead on land-use and development because the local board will be the delegated decision-maker for Community Facilities activities. It enables the local board to test outcomes it is seeking at Matiatia which include activating commercial destination options in this area and supporting mana whenua aspirations.

22. Panuku Development Auckland understands the purpose of the Waiheke pilot, recognizes the value of this approach and supports the transfer of its commercial non-service leases to Community Facilities. Four such leases are in place, two expiring in 2021 and two on a monthly basis. Community Facilities intends to continue to manage these leases on a commercial basis.

23. Auckland Transport manages Matiatia wharf, the road reserve including the keyhole and foreshore carpark which are not part of 10 Ocean View Road. Because Governance Framework Review decisions already direct Auckland Transport to work with the Waiheke Local Board to agree outcomes, these areas apart from the wharf itself are in scope for the Matiatia strategic plan and development project.

24. Subject to funding and stakeholder consultation, Auckland Transport has already had an initial discussion with the Waiheke Local Board about some parking modifications. This will take into account a tour vehicle area trial that ran over summer 2017-18.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

25. This report seeks to give effect to the Waiheke Local Board’s request for decision-making over Matiatia and will support the Waiheke Governance Pilot’s aim of testing more devolved decision-making to the Waiheke Local Board. Local board governance over Matiatia is the first real test for this initiative.
26. The Waiheke Governance Pilot includes a formal recording, monitoring, evaluation and reporting process led by the pilot programme manager and the council’s Research, Evaluation and Monitoring Unit. These parties will report to the Waiheke Local Board and the pilot programme manager will report as needed to the new Joint Governance Working Party and other local boards.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

27. The 22 February 2018 Waiheke Local Board resolutions include a resolution that the board agree to pursue planning for and implementation of the Mātiatia Strategic Plan with Ngāti Paoa and to meet with Ngāti Paoa representatives as soon as possible to advance this proposal.

28. Recommendation b. x) in this report confirms the Governing Body’s expectation that The Waiheke Local Board will work with mana whenua to ensure their aspirations for Matiatia are recognised in planning and development outcomes.

29. Recently the Ngati Paoa Iwi Trust approved the public release of a cultural values assessment for Matiatia. This assessment provides a high-level overview of the associations and broad cultural values of Ngāti Paoa which apply to the Matiatia area. It documents the cultural significance of Matiatia to Ngāti Paoa, including specific sites, features and values; and includes recommendations to achieve Ngāti Paoa aspirations for consideration by Auckland Council and Panuku Development Auckland, which funded the assessment.

30. Ngati Paoa is supportive of the requested delegation and the Waiheke Local Board and officers expect and intend to work closely with Ngati Paoa to give effect to its Matiatia aspirations.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

31. The governance delegation itself will have no financial implications as costs associated with managing Matiatia land will continue to be borne by current management agencies or in the case of Panuku leases, by Community Facilities.

32. Matiatia Strategic Plan and area plan development costs are currently budgeted. Further development of Matiatia land will either be via existing budgets or subject to budgets being sought both by the Waiheke Local Board and Auckland Transport through respective ten–year plan processes.

33. If a decision is made that prevents any commercial return or reduces the maximum potential return to less than the $7 million anticipated on purchase in 2005, then council debt will be higher than anticipated. The land was valued at $21 million in 2016, which is its current value in the council’s financial records.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

34. If the Governing Body does not approved the delegation request this may put at risk implementing outcomes for Matiatia. It could also create a risk to the Waiheke Governance Pilot as the delegation request is the first real test for that proposal.

35. It is noted that Matiatia decisions and outcomes will be subject to normal plan development, land use and financial processes. The five-year initial term for the delegation and a review after that time, along with the evaluation and reporting process noted above, provide a further mitigation of any risk which might arise.

36. The Auckland Council legislation’s presumption of subsidiarity where non-regulatory activities are managed locally unless there is a reason to manage them regionally supports this delegation. The activities at Matiatia are not a regional matter, with the exception perhaps of ferry services which are outside of the scope of the requested delegation.
Another key risk is that the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2018-2028 and the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan do not provide sufficient funding to deliver the long-term vision or the subsequent Auckland Transport and Auckland Council business case processes determine the plans are low priority and regional funding is delayed.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

Waiheke Local Board decision-making over Matiatia will be led by the land use planning processes and funding requests outlined in this report. Long-term Plan 2018-2028 budget decisions will be known by July 2018 with some funding requests taking longer under business case processes. Development decisions which can be funded are expected to be made from late 2018 onwards.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Matiatia Public Land Map</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>John Nash - Programme Manager, Waiheke &amp; Gulf Islands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment A

Item 11
Recommendations from the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee - Value for Money (s17A) Review programme

File No.: CP2018/07390

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive the recommendations from the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee and approve the terms of reference for the group Information, Communication and Technology and group Customer Services value for money reviews.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. At its meeting on 3 May 2018, the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee considered the attached report and resolved as follows:

That the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee:
   a) approve the terms of reference for the following two value for money reviews, so that they can be recommended to the Governing Body for final approval:
      • group Information, Communication and Technology
      • group Customer Services reviews for commencement in May 2018

3. The original report and attachments are included in Attachment A.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Governing Body:
   a) approve the terms of reference for the group Information, Communication and Technology value for money review
   b) approve the terms of reference for the group Customer Services value for money review.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3 May 2018 Original Value for Money (s17A) Review programme report to Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarndra O’Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations from the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee

Value for Money (s17A) Review programme

File No.: CP2018/04070

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve the terms of reference for two new value for money reviews so that they can be recommended to the Governing Body for final approval.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. At its 22 March 2018 (GB/2018/57) meeting the Governing Body approved the terms of reference for the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money (APRVFM) Committee. This incorporated the oversight for the value for money review programme under section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002.

3. The review programme is in the process of being reset in consultation with the executive leadership team and will be confirmed and tabled at the next APRVFM Committee. In the interim, this report is seeking approval from the APRVFM Committee for the next two terms of reference for the following activities:
   - group Information, Communication and Technology (ICT)
   - group Customer Services.

4. These reviews have been selected as they both build on previous review work that looked at communications and engagement for customer services and group procurement for ICT. They are also likely to have a bearing on the possible development of a group corporate support strategy. Both reviews are part of the governance and operational support in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 which represents a large group expenditure over 10 years ($4.2 billion in operating expenditure and $1.3 billion in capital expenditure) and both undertake activities that are common across the group.

5. The reviews are in place of earlier proposals indicated in the 21 March 2017 programme. The original reviews impact the Finance function namely finance, financial planning and transactional services. After consultation with the business it is recommended that the original reviews be deferred until after the long-term planning workload has peaked and managing year end is undertaken as the function’s workload is very high at present.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee:

a) approve the terms of reference for the following two value for money reviews, so that they can be recommended to the Governing Body for final approval:
   - group Information, Communication and Technology
   - group Customer Services reviews for commencement in May 2018

b) note that an indicative and revised value for money review programme together with a detailed evaluation of review priorities will be presented to the next Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee meeting.
Tātaritanga me ō āגרסה / Analysis and advice

Previous decisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Recommendation Number</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2017</td>
<td>Finance and Performance</td>
<td>FIN/2017/23</td>
<td>endorsed a value for money programme for the council group and approved four terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 September 2017</td>
<td>Finance and Performance</td>
<td>FIN/2017/128</td>
<td>two terms of reference (group procurement and parks &amp; open spaces) were approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2017</td>
<td>Finance and Performance</td>
<td>FIN/2017/153</td>
<td>the first four completed reviews were endorsed by the F&amp;P Committee for implementation by the council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 March 2018</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>GB/2018/57</td>
<td>approved oversight for the value for money (S17A) programme be moved to the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money (APRVFM) Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The value for money review programme is in the process of being revised and reset in consultation with executive leadership team and will be confirmed shortly and tabled at the next APRVFM Committee. The next two reviews proposed in this report have been endorsed for approval by the council’s executive leadership team.

7. This report is seeking approval from the APRVFM Committee to recommend to the Governing Body the next two new terms of reference attached in Attachment A and Attachment B:
   - Group Information, Communication and Technology (ICT)
   - Group Customers Services

8. The reasons for proposing these next two reviews include:
   - Acknowledgement that the group shared services strategy work is about to get underway. The value for money review will complement the development of the strategy by reviewing areas of significant group expenditure with high levels of potential duplication customer services and ICT.
   - The two new reviews seeking recommendation today build on two previously approved and underway reviews (namely communications and engagement for group customer services and group procurement for group ICT). These are also likely to have relevance in the development of a group corporate support strategy both representing a large group spend and both having activities that are common across the group.
   - Feedback received verbally from the business on the capacity to accommodate review work given the current workload of certain functions. For example, the Finance function and the workload associated with obtaining approval for the long-term plan and managing year end over the next quarter.
   - Considering Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development is undertaking a review of its purpose and, given this review, it is desirable that the continuation of the economic development review await the outcomes of that work.
Reviews including an investment scope (covering Ports of Auckland Limited) need to consider the timing with reference to central government’s anticipated port study.

### Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Terms of Reference Group Information, Communication and Technology VfM Review</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Terms of Reference Group Customer Services VfM Review</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
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<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terms of reference

Value for Money (s17A) Review:
Group Information & Communication Technology

March 2018
[Sentient ID #XXXXXXXX]
1 Document control

1.1 Document purpose
This Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the purpose of the review, the way it will be structured, governed and how it will be executed.

1.2 Document history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Update by</th>
<th>Update details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>26 March 2018</td>
<td>S Garrett</td>
<td>Final to accommodate the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money (APR) Committee governance changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Document Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Introduction

2.1 Finance and Performance Committee resolution

1. At its meeting on 21 March 2017, the Finance and Performance Committee approved a three year programme to review effectiveness and value-for-money across the major activity and service lines of Auckland Council group, to ensure that its services continue to best meet Auckland’s needs for good-quality infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions into the future.

2.2 Statutory requirements

- This programme meets Auckland Council’s statutory obligations under section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA02). Under s17A, Auckland Council “must review the cost effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions”.

- Good quality is defined in s10 of the LGA02 in relation to local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions to mean infrastructure, public services, and performance that are efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances. The Auditor-General has defined “cost effectiveness” to mean “the relationship between the levels of resources used (cost) and progress towards a predetermined outcome”.

- Local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions include essentially all of council’s functions.

- The transition provisions (Schedule 1AA of the LGA02) in relation to s17A require that the first reviews need to be completed by August 2017. After that, s17A requires that reviews are conducted every 6 years, or when:
  - council is considering a significant change to relevant service levels;
  - a council contract or binding agreement in relation to delivery of infrastructure, service or regulatory function is expiring within the next 2 years.

- There are exceptions to the review requirements where:
  - the delivery of that infrastructure, service or regulatory function is governed by legislation, contract or binding agreement such that it cannot reasonably be altered within the following 2 years;
  - Auckland Council is satisfied that the potential benefits of undertaking a review in relation to that infrastructure, service or regulatory function do not justify the costs of a review.

3 Review Framework

3.1 Services Covered: Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

The proposed ICT review will cover all the current and future planned technological services, activities and expenditure and resources associated with the creation, dissemination, storage and management of information in Council and its council controlled organisations. It includes the devices used to communicate, the software applications and hardware, the communication networks and the associated support services.
It includes ICT policies and strategies, the operational uses, people and governance in supporting the following ICT service areas:

- **Online services**: The digital systems used to enable online customer services including transactions
- **Business intelligence systems**: Including the systems that automate the collation, analysis and presentation of geographic information, financial information, management information and metrics including information about business performance and relevant progress indicators across an organisation.
- **Business systems**: Including the database applications through to the large enterprise resource planning and transactional systems supporting the operation of revenue collection and payments.
- **Back office systems**: Including finance, human resources, procurement, customer and facilities management systems to manage operations.
- **Infrastructure**: Including the communication networks and other infrastructure for the modern working environment such as desktop computers, printers, laptops, video conferencing, telephones, data centers and servers, software applications and email.

### 3.2 Objectives & Lines of Inquiry

- The objective of the review is to evaluate the value for money of ICT services across the council group and consider the relative merits of alternative options for the governance, funding and delivery of those services in supporting Auckland Council’s collective objectives and outcomes.

- In reviewing ICT’s value for money, the review will be inquiring:
  - How investment in ICT has or plans to contribute towards achieving business objectives and outcomes involving a review of strategies, business plans and major projects.
  - If ICT is improving user access to good quality, timely and consistent information and enabling more informed decision-making.
  - How ICT is supporting better financial, asset, capital and customer service management and users.
  - How the group ICT organisations have progressed in evolving the efficiency and effectiveness of systems and services including securing benefits from increased collaboration including the extent to which group buying power for ICT shared solutions, contract negotiations and procurements have been exploited to gain cost efficiencies.
  - The review will consider if the systems are designed and operated in a way that they are affecting the required systems improvements and are flexible enough to enable continuous improvement, both for service users but also for front line staff or other parties providing services.
  - What future improvement opportunities present for ICT services and what is their potential value.
  - Whether the current portfolio of ICT services, the allocation of resources, and performance in delivery of those services, is optimal in terms of meeting council group’s objectives.
  - Whether the current governance, funding and service delivery arrangements for ICT services are the best approach to deliver value for money and achieve the key outcomes for Auckland Council group.
3.3 Scope

- The review will consider ICT services across the Auckland Council group including council and the substantive CCOs.
- The review is concerned with value for money in a broad sense – i.e. how well the existing policy and institutional arrangements deliver on council’s strategic objectives and desired outcomes for Aucklanders. Noting that this extends beyond the legislative requirement in s17A to look at cost efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of services.
- In undertaking the review it is expressly acknowledged that Auckland Council and its CCOs are designed to operate with significant independence in delivering ICT services as each organisation has distinct mandates, objectives, budgets and performance objectives.

4 Review Methodology

- Each value for money review is undertaken using a consistent evidence based value for money methodology.

5 Approach

- The review will be undertaken by a specialist project team within Finance, supported by an external Independent Reference Panel (with expertise in public finance, public policy/public management and local government operations), under the direction of a governance structure as set out overleaf.
- The review is undertaken in four parts described below:
  1) **Terms of Reference**: The approval of the review’s service and organisational scope, its objectives, the general lines of inquiry and governance structure.
  2) **Current State Assessment**: In this part of the review we seek to understand the current operating approach and framework. It assesses the current drivers of value, the issues and challenges of delivering services, identifies value delivered and future improvement opportunities. This phase will result in the production of a current state assessment report which will include high level opportunities for improving value for money through changes to the level or mix of services provided, to business practice, or to organisational arrangements.
  3) **Terms of Reference**: The approval of the review’s service and organisational scope, its objectives, the general lines of inquiry and governance structure.
  4) **Current State Assessment**: In this part of the review we seek to understand the current operating approach and framework. It assesses the current drivers of value, the issues and challenges of delivering services, identifies value delivered and future improvement opportunities. This phase will result in the production of a current state assessment report which will include high level opportunities for improving value for money through changes to the level or mix of services provided, to business practice, or to organisational arrangements.
  5) **Options Assessment**: In this part, we consider the relative merits of the opportunities and alternative arrangements for governance, funding or delivery of those services in supporting Auckland Council group’s objectives and desired outcomes. We analyse the opportunities and value their potential in a set of “value propositions”. We evaluate
6) **Final report:** This includes a summary of the reviews findings and makes recommendations on the next steps required to deliver the value that the review has identified.

- The review team will prepare progress reports on each part of the review for consideration by the independent reference panel and report progress on key milestones to the APR Committee.
- The review team will consult with relevant parties in the council in developing the material for the assessment.
- The review team will consult with council and the Independent Maori Statutory Board on relevant matters in preparing the final report.
6 Governance and roles

6.1 Governance

The governance structure for the review is set out in the chart below.
### 6.2 Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme /Review Roles</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Purpose &amp; Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Sponsor/Lead Officer</td>
<td>Acting Group Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>• Programme sponsor who champions the group value for money programme and has accountability for the review aspects of programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council Executive Leadership Team (ELT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews and recommends to the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee the forward timetable of review work and the review reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Programme Business Owner | General Manager Corporate Finance and Property | • Business owner who ensures the programme is adequately resourced to deliver on its objectives.  
• Authorises (and recommends to the Sponsor) key programme reports.  
• Resolves issues and manages risks escalated by the Programme Manager.  
• Briefs the Programme Sponsor and the Steering Group.  
• Engages stakeholders to assist with timely responses to information requests and socialisation of deliverables.  
• Ensures the participation and co-operation of business resources. |
### Value for Money Review: Group ICT Value for Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Supporter</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Director Finance and Policy, Mayoral Office | • Responsible for communications to the Chairs of the CCOs.  
• Resolves CCO-related issues escalated by the Sponsor or Business Owner.  
• Supports the group value for money programme. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Review &amp; Oversight</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair and Deputy Chair APR Committee</td>
<td>• Primary programme customer who will approve the terms of reference and receive the draft reports and findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Review</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR Committee</td>
<td>• Receive and consider proposals and recommendations for value for money review proposals and the final reports from value for money reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Advice &amp; Quality Review</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Independent Reference Panel | • A core panel of three members with expertise in public finance, infrastructure, public policy, economics and/or local government governance experience supplemented by subject matter experts for particular reviews as required.  
• Reporting to the Lead Officer.  
• Panel members will be asked to:  
  • Provide input (which may be by way of comment, suggestion or recommendation) as appropriate on objectives, lines of inquiry, issues, options and recommendations for the Programme.  
  • Review and comment on documentation as requested by the project team, which may include:  
  • That the research, analysis and evaluation undertaken is appropriate to support the objectives, lines of inquiry, options and recommendations for consideration; appropriate consistency across the Programme; coherent drafting, reasoning and content.  
  • Help promote confidence in the Programme. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Specialist with Industry Knowledge (SME)</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICT Expert -TBD</td>
<td>• Advising the expert panel, provide independent Expert advice and commentary on the assessment and evaluation of opportunities as they arise based on industry experience with similar undertakings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>Programme Manager-Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Co-ordinates, recruits and manages programme Office resources and approach and is responsible for the delivery of the agreed programme plan to schedule and budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develops the programme plan, review methodology and the production of the associated deliverables for authorisation by the Business Owner, the Sponsor, the Steering Group and APR Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develops and manages the programme calendar and associated engagement requirements including steering group management and the supply of documentation to the expert review panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefs the Programme Business Owner and Sponsors regarding project status, risks/issues and decisions required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Financial Analyst</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Defines and supervises the collection of the Data requirements needed for evidence-based value for money reviews from council and CCOs to support the programme methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyzing financial and non-financial records And plans, reports relating to past and planned expenditures and revenues including relevant reviews and benchmarking to distil relevant performance-related trends, issues, opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work on the application of the public service value for money analytics and modelling between expenditure, inputs, outputs and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Economist</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Define and develop the value for money modelling approach and value-based data requirements for each review including key value drivers and public policy/outcomes for each review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervise the collection of the data requirements needed for evidence-based value for money reviews from council and CCOs to support the programme’s value-based methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyse records and plans, reports relating to past and planned expenditure, revenues and social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes to distil relevant performance-related trends, issues, opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversee the application of the public service value for money analytics including the relational modelling between expenditure, inputs, outputs and outcomes and draw conclusions and insights form this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Analyst</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting the senior financial analyst, collect the data requirements needed for evidence-based value for money reviews from council and CCDs to support the programme methodology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist with the analysis including modelling of financial and non-financial records and plans, reports relating to expenditures and revenues including past reviews and benchmarking to distil relevant trends, issues, and opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor-Te Ao Māori</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• provide the reviewers with advice to assist the review to take account of Māori perspectives including tikanga Māori, the Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi, and cultural, social, economic and environmental Māori aspirations relevant to the review;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• assist with the development opportunities and options that will improve the knowledge, understanding of Māori in relation to the review’s findings and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Involved Parties

The key parties involved in this review are as follows.

- Mayor Phil Goff - Chairperson
- Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore (ex officio)
- Christine Fletcher - Deputy Chairperson
- Ross Clow – APR Committee
- Desley Simpson – APR Committee
- Penny Hulse – APR Committee
- Chris Darby – APR Committee
- Richard Hill - APR Committee
- Chairperson David Taipari – Independent Māori Statutory Board & APR Committee (ex officio)
- Kelvin Norgrove - Policy Project Manager, Independent Māori Statutory Board
- Taha MacPherson - Chief of Staff, Mayoral Office
- David Wood - Director Finance and Policy, Mayoral Office
- Margaret Devlin – Chair Watercare Services
- Dr Lester Levy – Chair Auckland Transport
- David McConnell – Chair Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development
- Rt Hon Sir Don McKinnon – Chair Regional Facilities Auckland
6.4 Dependencies

There are no dependencies for this review
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Recommendations from the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee - Value for Money (s17A) Review programme
2 Introduction

2.1 Finance and Performance Committee resolution

1. At its meeting on 21 March 2017, the Finance and Performance Committee approved a three year programme to review effectiveness and value-for-money across the major activity and service lines of Auckland Council group, to ensure that its services continue to best meet Auckland’s needs for good-quality infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions into the future.

2.2 Statutory requirements

- This programme meets Auckland Council’s statutory obligations under section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA02). Under s17A, Auckland Council “must review the cost effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district or region for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions”.

- Good quality is defined in s10 of the LGA02 in relation to local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions to mean infrastructure, public services, and performance that are efficient, effective and appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances. The Auditor-General has defined “cost effectiveness” to mean “the relationship between the levels of resources used (cost) and progress towards a predetermined outcome”.

- Local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions include essentially all of council’s functions.

- The transition provisions (Schedule 1AA of the LGA02) in relation to s17A require that the first reviews need to be completed by August 2017. After that, s17A requires that reviews are conducted every 6 years, or when:
  - council is considering a significant change to relevant service levels;
  - a Council contract or binding agreement in relation to delivery of infrastructure, service or regulatory function is expiring within the next 2 years.

- There are exceptions to the review requirements where:
  - the delivery of that infrastructure, service or regulatory function is governed by legislation, contract or binding agreement such that it cannot reasonably be altered within the following 2 years;
  - Auckland Council is satisfied that the potential benefits of undertaking a review in relation to that infrastructure, service or regulatory function do not justify the costs of a review.

3 Review Framework

3.1 Services Covered: Customer Service Management

- The review will cover the management of customer services in the Auckland Council group including the people, process, systems and organisational features and resources involved in interacting with customers. It includes activities associated with taking care of the customer’s needs through the provision of services and assistance before, during, and after the customer’s requirements are met.
Recommendations from the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee

3.2 Objective & Lines of Inquiry

The objective of the review is to evaluate the value for money of customer service management across the council group and consider the relative merits of alternative options for the governance, funding and delivery of those public services in supporting Auckland Council group’s objectives and outcomes.

In undertaking the review it is expressly acknowledged that Auckland Council and its CCOs are designed to operate with significant independence in delivering customer services as each organisation has distinct mandates, objectives, budgets and performance objectives.

In reviewing value for money, the review will be inquiring into:

- the cost effectiveness of Auckland Council group’s customer service management, compared with relevant public sector benchmarks and best practices;
- the performance of Auckland Council group’s customer service management, including an assessment of the economic, environmental, social and cultural value delivered in respect to the relevant entities strategies and outcomes being sought;
- Whether the current governance, funding and service delivery arrangements are the optimal to deliver value for money and achieve the prescribed outcomes for the Auckland Council group.
- The review will include a consideration of options for improving value for money, alternative service delivery and governance options such as out-sourcing, insourcing and shared services and making recommendations to improve value for money in customer services in support of Auckland Council group’s objectives and prescribed outcomes.
- What future improvement opportunities present for customer services and what is the potential value of those opportunities
- Whether the current portfolio of customer services, the allocation of resources, and performance in delivery of those services, is optimal in terms of meeting the relevant objectives for services.
- Whether the current governance, funding and service delivery arrangements for customer services is the best approach to deliver value for money and achieve the key outcomes for Auckland Council group.

3.3 Scope

The review is to consider customer services across the Auckland Council group including council and the substantive CCOs. It excludes citizen and community engagement services.

The review is concerned with value for money in a broad sense – i.e. how well the existing policy and institutional arrangements deliver on council’s strategic objectives and desired outcomes for Aucklanders. Noting that this extends beyond the legislative requirement in s17A to look at cost efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of services.
4 Review Methodology

- Each value for money review is undertaken using the same evidence based value for money methodology and drawing on a range of data sources.

5 Approach

- The review will be undertaken by a specialist project team within Finance, supported by an external Independent Reference Panel (with expertise in public finance, public policy/public management and local government operations), under the direction of a governance structure as set out below.

- The review is undertaken in four parts described below:

  1) Terms of Reference: The approval of the review’s service and organisational scope, its objectives, the general lines of inquiry and governance structure.

  2) Current State Assessment: In this part of the review we seek to understand the current operating approach and framework. It assesses the current drivers of value, the issues and challenges of delivering services, identifies value delivered and future improvement opportunities. This phase will result in the production of a current state assessment report which will include high level opportunities for improving value for money through changes to the level or mix of services provided, to business practice, or to organisational arrangements.

  3) Options Assessment: In this part, we consider the relative merits of the opportunities and alternative arrangements for governance, funding or delivery of those services in supporting Auckland Council group’s objectives and desired outcomes. We analyses the opportunities and value their potential in a set of “value propositions”. We evaluate governance, funding and service delivery options in terms of their impact on the four well-beings. We identify the action required to deliver the value on the most significant of the improvement opportunities, and to provide orders-of-magnitude estimates.

  4) Final report: This includes a summary of the reviews findings and makes recommendations on the next steps required to deliver the value that the review has identified.

- The review team will prepare progress reports for consideration by the independent reference panel and report progress on key milestones to the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money (APR) Committee.

- The review team will consult with relevant parties in the council in developing the material for the assessment.

- The review team will consult with council and the Independent Maori Statutory Board in respect to relevant matters in preparing the final report.
## Governance and roles

### 6.1 Governance

The governance structure for the review is set out in the chart below.

![Governance Chart](image)

### 6.2 Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme /Review Roles</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Purpose &amp; Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Sponsor/Lead Officer</td>
<td>Acting Group Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>• Programme sponsor who champions the group value for money programme and has accountability for the review aspects of programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council Executive Leadership Team (ELT)</td>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>• Reviews and recommends to the Appointments, Performance Review and Value for Money Committee the forward timetable of review work and the review reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Programme Business Owner | General Manager Corporate Finance and Property | • Business owner who ensures the programme is adequately resourced to deliver on its objectives.  
• Authorises (and recommends to the ELT) programme review reports.  
• Resolves issues and manages risks escalated by the Programme Manager.  
• Briefs the Programme Sponsor and the ELT.  
• Engages stakeholders to assist with timely responses to information requests and socialisation of deliverables.  
• Ensures the participation and co-operation of business resource. |
### Value for Money: Customer Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Supporter</th>
<th>Director Finance and Policy, Mayoral Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible for communications to the Chairs of the CCDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resolves CCO-related issues escalated by the Sponsor or Business Owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports the group value for money programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Review &amp; Oversight</th>
<th>Chair and Deputy Chair APR Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Primary programme customer who will approve the terms of reference and receive the draft reports and findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Review</th>
<th>APR Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Receive and consider proposals and recommendations for value for money review proposals and the final reports from value for money reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Advice &amp; Quality Review</th>
<th>Independent Reference Panel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A core panel of three members with expertise in public finance, infrastructure, public policy, economics and/or local government governance experience supplemented by subject matter experts for particular reviews as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting to the Lead Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Panel members will be asked to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide input (which may be by way of comment, suggestion or recommendation) as appropriate on objectives, lines of inquiry, issues, options and recommendations for the Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and comment on documentation as requested by the project team, which may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• That the research, analysis and evaluation undertaken is appropriate to support the objectives, lines of inquiry, options and recommendations for consideration; appropriate consistency across the Programme; coherent drafting, reasoning and content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Help promote confidence in the Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Specialist with Industry Knowledge (SME)</th>
<th>Customer Services Expert - TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advising the expert panel, provide independent Expert advice and commentary on the assessment and evaluation of opportunities as they arise based on industry experience with similar undertakings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Value for Money Review: Customer Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Management</th>
<th>Programme Manager</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                       | Programme Manager-Value for Money | • Co-ordinates, recruits and manages programme Office resources and approach and is responsible for the delivery of the agreed programme plan to schedule and budget.  
• Develops the programme plan, review methodology and the production of the associated deliverables for authorisation by the Business Owner, the Sponsor, the Steering Group and APR Committee.  
• Develops and manages the programme calendar and associated engagement requirements including steering group management and the supply of documentation to the expert review panel.  
• Briefs the Programme Business Owner and Sponsor regarding project status, risks/Issues and decisions required. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Financial Analyst</th>
<th>Programme Manager-Value for Money</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                         | Defines and supervises the collection of the Data requirements needed for evidence-based value for money reviews from council and CCOs to support the programme methodology.  
• Analyzing financial and non-financial records And plans, reports relating to past and planned expenditures and revenues including relevant reviews and benchmarking to distil relevant performance-related trends, issues, opportunities.  
• Work on the application of the public service value for money analytics and modelling between expenditure, inputs, outputs and outcomes. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Economist</th>
<th>Programme Manager-Value for Money</th>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | Define and develop the value for money modelling approach and value-based data requirements for each review including key value drivers and public policy/outcomes for each review.  
• Supervise the collection of the data requirements needed for evidence-based value for money reviews from council and CCOs to support the programme’s value-based methodology.  
• Analyse records and plans, reports relating to past and planned expenditure, revenues and social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes to distil relevant performance-related trends, issues, opportunities.  
• Oversee the application of the public service value for money analytics including the relational modelling between expenditure, inputs, outputs and outcomes and draw conclusions and insights form this work. |
### 6.3 Involved Parties

The key parties involved in this review are as follows.

- Mayor Phil Goff - Chairperson
- Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore (ex officio)
- Christine Fletcher - Deputy Chairperson
- Ross Clow - APR Committee
- Desley Simpson - APR Committee
- Penny Hulse - APR Committee
- Chris Darby - APR Committee
- Richard Hill - APR Committee
- Chairperson David Taipari - Independent Maori Statutory Board & APR Committee (ex officio)
- Kelvin Norgrove - Policy Project Manager, Independent Maori Statutory Board
- Taha MacPherson - Chief of Staff, Mayoral Office
- David Wood - Director Finance and Policy, Mayoral Office
- Margaret Devlin - Chair Watercare Services
- Dr Lester Levy - Chair Auckland Transport
- David McConnell - Chair Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development
- Rt Hon Sir Don McKinnon - Chair Regional Facilities Auckland

---
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- Keith Taylor – Chair Auckland Council Investments Ltd
- Richard Aitken – Chair Panuku
- Stephen Town – Chief Executive Auckland Council together with the executive leadership team comprising the Chief Operating Officer-Dean Kimpton, Matthew Walker – Acting Group Chief Financial Officer Auckland, Jim Quinn-Chief of Strategy, Phil Wilson-Governance Director, Patricia Reade—Director People & Performance, Ian Maxwell- Director Community Services, Penny Plint-Director Regulatory Services, Barry Potter-Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services.
- Shane Ellison – Chief Executive Auckland Transport
- Richard Morris – Chief Financial Officer Auckland Transport
- Roger McDonald – Chief Executive Panuku
- Carl Gosbee – Director Corporate Services Panuku
- John Crawford – Chief Executive Auckland Council Investments Ltd
- Chris Brooks – Chief Executive Regional Facilities Auckland
- Simon Tran – Chief Financial Officer Regional Facilities Auckland
- Nick Hill – Chief Executive Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development
- Joy Buckingham – Chief Financial Officer Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development
- Raveen Jaduram – Chief Executive Watercare Services
- Brian Monk – Chief Financial Officer Watercare Services
- Local Board Chairs
- National Secretary, PSA

6.4 Dependencies

There are no dependencies for this review.
Value for Money Review: Customer Services

Terms of reference

6.5 Schedule

To be determined.
Ngāti Paoa – Treaty settlement redress

File No.: CP2018/07404

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To provide a high-level outline of matters relating to the Crown’s Treaty settlement negotiations with Ngāti Paoa that will be presented to the Governing Body in the confidential agenda.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The Crown is seeking the views of Auckland Council on a revised Treaty settlement redress proposal for Ngāti Paoa. Auckland Council views will be relayed to the Crown’s Lead Negotiator, the Hon Rick Barker, and will inform final Cabinet decisions on the revised settlement package. If an alternative offer is finalised, the Crown and Ngāti Paoa intend to make a joint public announcement. Until then the matter remains negotiations sensitive and the Crown and Ngāti Paoa have agreed there will be no public communication.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) note there is a confidential report on the agenda, providing information and recommendations on a Crown-proposed revised Treaty settlement redress package for Ngāti Paoa, and seeking the views of Auckland Council.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>John Hutton - Manager Treaty Settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Governing Body information memos and briefings - 24 May 2018

File No.: CP2018/00241

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that may have been distributed to Governing Body members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to Governing Body members via memo-briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.
3. The following information only reports are attached:
   • Report on Visit to Hong Kong by Mayor Phil Goff, 8 – 11 April 2018
4. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:
   • 27/4/18 – Briefing on ATAP and Regional Fuel Tax
5. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link:
   o at the top of the page, select meeting “Governing Body” from the drop-down tab and click “View”;
   o under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.
6. Note that, unlike an agenda report, [staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary.](#) Governing Body members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Governing Body:

a) receive the Summary of Governing Body information memos and briefings – 24 May 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mayors Report on Visit to Hong Kong, April 2018 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Alignment Project and Regional Fuel Tax Briefing - 27 April 2018 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarndra O’Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary.](#)
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Governing Body:

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(c)(ii) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information would be likely to damage the public interest.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) - The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular, the report contains information provided by the Crown to council in confidence on the understanding the information is negotiation sensitive between hapū / iwi and the Crown. If confidential information is made available, it will prejudice both those negotiations and the provision of similar information to council in the future.