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## Facility Partnerships Policy

**High level summary of key proposed policy positions**

| A focus on shared outcomes | When selecting, managing and evaluating partnerships, we will prioritise the outcomes delivered (i.e. community benefits), not just the outputs (e.g. a new building).  
|                           | We will partner based on aligned values and a shared vision.  
|                           | We will only enter facility partnerships to develop an asset where an asset-based solution is essential to delivering the outcomes. |
| Recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori | We will enter facility partnerships with Māori that align with Treaty Principles and provide for tino rangatiratanga.  
|                           | We will acknowledge the special significance and role of marae. |
| Multiple models, fit-for-purpose arrangements | We will provide clear pathways for a variety of partners, facility types, partnership structures and investment mechanisms.  
|                           | We will ensure our processes and requirements take account of each individual partnership’s scale, complexity, risk and the partners’ capability. |
| Proactive and Responsive partnership tracks | ‘Proactive’ partnerships: Council will seek partnerships through an open tendering process to address network gaps.  
|                           | ‘Responsive’ partnerships: Council will also consider partner-initiated funding requests at set times to feed into the Annual Plan. |
| Investment principles to shape eligibility and priorities | We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions, and invest strategically, equitably, wisely and sustainably.  
|                           | We will invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.  
|                           | We will support businesses / commercial activities playing a role in enabling viable facility partnerships in certain circumstances. |
| Valuing (and costing) in-kind support | We will estimate the value of ‘in-kind’ investment on both sides (e.g. use of council land, volunteer effort) to support better assessment of costs and benefits.  
|                           | Access to council expertise can be critical to our partners’ success. Where necessary we will build capability support into business cases. |
| Greater focus on the partnership relationship | We will resource quality relationships over time, acknowledging these are foundational for successful partnerships.  
|                           | We will allocate a lead relationship broker to every partnership to ensure joined-up support and a better partnering experience. |
| Acknowledge the complexity of developing and managing assets | We will ensure community partners are well-equipped and/or supported to design, build, operate and maintain quality facility assets.  
|                           | We will ask better questions and involve subject matter experts earlier to support decision-making and reduce wasted effort on both sides. |
A facility partnership is...

Where Auckland Council invests in community facilities owned or operated by others, so Aucklanders can access more of the quality facilities they need, faster and more cost-effectively.

Community facilities are...

Places and spaces where Aucklanders can participate, play, learn, share, improve their health and wellbeing, celebrate and belong. They include...

- Community centres, hubs, halls and mobile facilities and special purpose facilities (e.g. youth centres, men’s sheds)
- Marae and cultural centres
- Libraries
- Arts centres and performing arts centres
- Indoor sports centres like multi-sports centres, swimming pools, leisure centres, indoor courts / gymnasiums
- Outdoor facilities like sports fields, skate parks, playgrounds, splashpads and outdoor courts
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1. The purpose

Why we have facility partnerships

Through facility partnerships, the council may invest in tangible things, like buildings, equipment, staff salaries and services. But what we are really investing in is the short, medium and long-term benefits these things will deliver: ultimately, a better quality of life for our communities.

We provide facilities not for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve, and because they make Auckland a better place to live. Community facilities contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities and foster belonging and pride. They are an important part of realising the vision for Auckland as a ‘world class’ city. The council has already set a number of specific priorities around the outcomes that Aucklanders most need and want to see delivered through facilities.

We seek facility partnerships because they can enable the council and the community to provide more of the facilities Auckland needs, faster and more effectively. This aligns with our obligations under The Local Government Act, which requires the infrastructure we deliver to meets current and future needs, in a way that is most cost effective for households and businesses.

Given that these outcomes and benefits are the purpose of facility partnerships, they’re an important factor in our selection, management and evaluation of facility partnerships.

At the selection stage, a focus on outcomes helps decision-makers target the council’s limited investment where it can have the biggest impact.

At the management stage, the outcomes we’ve agreed will help staff work with facility partners to shape provision, and target access to those the facility is intended to benefit. These outcomes also help us monitor the facility (and the services and activities it enables) throughout its life.

During regular evaluation, we and our partners will be assessing if the benefits we wanted have been realised, and reflecting on the experience of the partnership itself.
We provide facilities because...

They benefit Aucklanders

Supporting local community identity, pride, belonging, participation and improving people's wellbeing

Helping Aucklanders to be more active, more often

Helping to make arts and culture part of our everyday lives

Valuing Te Ao Māori and enabling Māori aspirations

Enhancing and protecting our natural environment and our built and cultural heritage

Facilities enable a wide range of social, cultural, environmental and economic outcomes that benefit the community, including:

- e.g. Auckland Plan, Thriving Communities, I am Auckland, Toi Whāriki
- e.g. Auckland Plan, Sports and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- e.g. Auckland Plan, Māori and Indigenous Communities
- e.g. Auckland Plan, Thriving Communities, Toi Whāriki

“We have a lot of new migrants in our neighbourhood. We needed somewhere welcoming for them to go to meet new people and learn about life in Auckland. It helps to bring the community together.”

“My teenagers play sport down there – it’s good for their fitness and confidence, and it helps them learn respect and teamwork. And keeps them out of trouble - there wasn’t much to do round here before!”

“Having the art centre is great for the town - they run lots of classes there, and it's made the whole place feel more vibrant and alive. Well, you can see - the art has spilled out onto the streets!”

“We run programmes at the marae that improve people’s lives; that build mana and connection with culture. Māori feel more comfortable here; most don’t go to the community centre.”

“We are trying to improve the environment down there. We are planting native plants, and people aren’t dumping rubbish in the stream anymore.”

“Community gardens have really improved the environment down there, and I think it’s changed how people feel about the reserve. They’re growing native seedlings there to replant along the stream banks, and people aren’t dumping rubbish in the stream anymore.”
We seek facility partnerships because they enable us to...

**Leverage**
- Partnerships can leverage external investment, infrastructure and effort to deliver better community facilities and spread their cost between more stakeholders. This is critical in a context of financial constraints, growing demand, scarce land and increasing construction costs.
- The council, community and sector organisations, iwi, businesses, government agencies and other funders each bring unique and complementary knowledge, skills, networks and strengths to the table.

*“The school has offered the land for the new centre, the council is managing the design and construction, the sports trust has signed up a major donor, and local businesses are providing building materials at cost. And the local community is going to get an incredible facility!”*

**Empower and enable**
- Partnerships are a way for the council to empower and enable communities and build their mana, prosperity, resilience, skills and capacity.
- Partnerships are a tangible way to meet our Treaty of Waitangi obligations to work in partnership with Māori, which go beyond our role relative to other sectors of the community. By supporting Māori-led facilities, we show respect for Māori mātauranga (knowledge), manaakitanga (hospitality) and kaitiakitanga (guardianship).
- Auckland is becoming super-diverse, and community-led, Māori-led or sector-led facilities may be more effective at meeting needs than a council-led alternative.

*“Our organisation has a reputation in this community that stretches back decades. We know all the service providers, and can help people get the support they need. But we really value the council’s technical expertise around managing buildings, and the legal and accounting side of things.”*

**Optimise**
- Partnerships can optimise space and maximise investment, by bringing together multiple groups to share one facility, or by breathing new life into existing assets that the community already use and value, instead of building new ones.
- Investing in partnerships may not require building bricks-and-mortar assets, which reduces financial pressure and delivers a flexible network that can respond faster to growth and change.

*“We welcome everyone who wants to come here - thousands of people do, every year - and we will manakī our visitors as we always have done. But we would welcome greater council recognition of our role. Funding is a huge help, but for us the relationships and respect are just as fundamental.”*

*“Our users said they didn’t visit the council centre because their English was poor and they felt embarrassed. We offer much the same services and activities, but they are among people of a similar age and cultural background, and they can practice their English together.”*

*“Our group started as a few volunteers wanting to reduce crime in our town centre, but we ended up registering as a charity and working with local youth, rough sleepers and the long-term unemployed. The men’s shed is going to really enhance the work we can do, but it’s a big step for us.”*
We need a facility partnerships policy for...

**Clarity**

Policy helps develop a shared understanding of partnership, through:

- Establishing clear and consistent language around partnerships
- Setting out why, when and how we will partner, including being both more intentional and more responsive in our partnering with Māori
- Better differentiation of the different types of partnership, reflected in fit-for-purpose decision-making pathways and processes that are proportionate to their scale and risk.

**Strategic decision-making**

Given limited resources, policy helps us partner more strategically, by:

- Aligning our partnerships investment to existing strategies, policies and plans, with a focus on addressing the greatest needs first
- Ensuring we consider the costs and opportunity costs, downstream benefits and savings, trade-offs and risks before making decisions
- Ensuring we’ll see evidence of the outcomes we’ve invested in and the value that’s been delivered, while recognising partnerships can benefit communities in multiple ways.

**Sustainability**

Policy commits us to investing and supporting for success, by:

- Requiring ongoing costs and a realistic business and operating model to be identified, ensuring partners are able to run and maintain safe, quality facilities to the standards the community expects
- Setting realistic expectations of partners and partnership, ensuring we consider and cost support needs upfront and ‘play to strengths’
- Treating partner relationships with the care and seriousness they deserve, including coordinating our support and advice within council to ensure a consistently good experience for partners.
Where does the facility partnerships policy fit?

**Auckland Plan**
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
- Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan
- Toi Whiti: Arts and culture Strategic Action Plan
- Thriving Communities Strategic Action Plan
- I am Auckland - Children and Young People's Strategic Action Plan
- Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau

**Local Board Plans**
- Unitary Plan

**Outcomes**
- What is the vision? What specific outcomes do we want for different populations, sectors, places, activities?
- What is our role in delivering them?

**Our role**
- What should council invest in, and where, to deliver these outcomes?
- What are the priorities, to address needs and gaps?

**Priorities**
- Will we deliver the outcomes by providing land, facilities or services, or a combination?

**Delivery**
- How much will we invest in the outcomes?
- How will we allocate: Capex (for assets) Opex (for everything else)

**Budget**
- How will we enable the community and the market to deliver the outcomes, alongside direct council provision?

**Mechanism**
- Community-Led Policy
- Community Occupancy Guidelines
- Community Grants Policy
- Facility Partnerships Policy
- Council-Led Policy
- Council Facilities Policy
- Council Services Policy
- Market-Led Policy
- Procurement Policy
- Unsolicited Proposals Policy
- Strategic Partnerships Policy

**We are here!**
- Long-Term Plan
- Annual Plan
- Local Board Agreements

**Sports Facilities Investment Plan**
- Open Space Provision Plan
- Community Facilities Network Plan
- Tākaro - Investing in Play
Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori

Building on our founding partnership: Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi is our nation’s founding document and recognises the special place of Māori in New Zealand.

Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with the Treaty Principles. This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices.

Facilities contribute to Māori well-being by providing spaces to connect, socialise, learn, participate in and celebrate Māori identity and culture. Partnerships enable the council and Māori to share mana, maturanga and resources to support Māori aspirations and deliver Māori outcomes. Facility partnerships provide a way to jointly deliver Māori outcomes through marae, facilities, and other spaces and places.

Delivering Māori outcomes through facility partnerships

Supporting Māori values / directions
- Whanaungatanga / Develop vibrant communities
- Rangatiratanga / Enhance leadership and participation
- Manaakitanga / Improve quality of life
- Wairuatanga / Promote distinctive identity
- Kaitiakitanga / Ensure sustainable futures
  - The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau

Māori outcomes through arts and culture
- Promote and develop marae as regional cultural hubs
- Promote Māori art and culture, locally and internationally through the development of Māori cultural centres

“Māori culture is ‘Auckland’s point of difference in the world’... we are proud of Māori cultural identity and celebrate it.”
- Toi Whitiki - Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan

Māori outcomes through sport and recreation
- Health and wellbeing for Māori
- Value Te Ao Māori

“We will acknowledge the special role of Māori and enable participation in decision-making, to build lasting reciprocal relationships and improve physical activity outcomes for Māori... This will be achieved through working in partnership with iwi and appropriate organisations.”
- Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
The Treaty Principles / Te Tiriti Mātāpono

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts – the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

Rangatiratanga – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

Partnership – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

Active protection – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

Ōritetanga / mutual benefit – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, to enable both to participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

Options – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

The right of development – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).

Applying the Principles

We will seek facility partnership opportunities and arrangements with Māori that:

- Recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination.
- Actively build the capacity and capability of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka.
- Are a shared enterprise, offering mutual benefit to Māori and non-Māori.
- Take account of the needs and interests of Māori partners, and ensure our needs and interests are clear to Māori looking to partner with us.
- Help to achieve equality of outcomes for Māori.
- Assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga.
- Respect Te Ao Māori and Māori tikanga, including:
  - accommodating Māori decision-making structures and processes
  - referring to marae as marae, not facilities, upholding their mana by observing tikanga, and encouraging others to do the same
  - acknowledging and valuing the maaturanga and resources that go into providing manaakitanga
  - acknowledging that the needs of iwi, hapū and whanau must take precedence on marae.

Further, we will:

Acknowledge Māori hold a long-term holistic view of the world, where values and relationships are paramount.

Acknowledge that individual partnership arrangements need to align with the kaupapa and aspirations of individual hapū, marae or Māori organisations.

Welcome partnership discussions with marae and Māori facilities already serving their communities, to explore how the council can awhi (support) their activities.
Facility partnerships with marae

We recognise marae as focal points for Māori social, cultural, and economic development.

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential partners.

Marae in Tamaki Makaurau may be mana whenua¹, mataawaka² or taurahere³, large or small, rural or urban.

Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapu, others are situated within school, church and institutional settings.

Many play a broader community role, hosting a holistic range of activities including

- papakainga and emergency accommodation
- formal and informal gatherings
- language and cultural instruction
- Māori arts and cultural activities
- health and wellbeing centres
- community and rongoā (medicinal) gardens
- whanau-centred social service

Marae have distinct characteristics that facility arrangements will acknowledge and reflect.

**Marae are unique.**

Marae are inseparable from their whenua, their tupuna, their people and their history.

The word ‘facility’ doesn’t fully express their unique role, or recognise the integral practice of manaakitanga.

**Marae are taonga.**

Marae have mana; they are a taonga. Marae have specific tikanga that must be followed to uphold their mana.

Marae also contain many taonga, especially in their wharenui, and some have pā or uru pā on their sites that are off-limits for visitors.

**Marae are turangawaewae.**

For Māori, marae are their home and ‘a place to stand’, and their needs must take precedence.

Marae may be required by iwi, hapū and whenau at short notice – e.g. for tangi – and can’t be available to the community at these times.

---

¹ Mana whenua: Māori with territorial rights in Tamaki Makaurau, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

² Mataawaka: Māori who are not mana whenua and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawaka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

³ Taurahere: Urban Māori who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurahere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tamaki Makaurau, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop marae there.

The council may partner with:

- Iwi and hapū
- Marae (mana whenua, mataawaka or taurahere)
- Other whakapapa-based groups (where members descend from a common ancestor)
- Kaupapa-based Māori organisations (formed around a specific purpose)
- Takiwā-based Māori organisations (focused on a particular place)
2. The model

Shaping facility partnerships

Facility partnerships are not ‘one size fits all’.

The council will consider a wide range of partnership arrangements, within broad parameters. The important thing is not a partnership’s size or shape, but whether it has the necessary ingredients to successfully and sustainably meet the community’s needs.

This section outlines the key decision-making and management stages in our process, and the building blocks of our facility partnership model: Tracks, Types, and Scales.
The facility partnerships lifecycle

All facility partnership proposals pass through the same overarching process decision-making process, but what happens at each stage will vary depending on the model of each individual partnership.

Staff will work with potential partners to establish their proposed partnership’s Track, Type and Scale, and develop a customised “road map” to help them anticipate the journey ahead.

### Stage 1
- **Introduce & identify**
  - Outline the proposal at a high level and gauge support
  - Early conversations between council and potential partners to scope the facility idea, the outcomes it will deliver and likely investment required

### Stage 2
- **Strategic assessment**
  - Build the case for the proposed facility and partnership
  - Research the need or opportunity to provide an evidence base for the proposed facility and partnership, and make the case for investment

### Stage 3
- **Initiate / scope**
  - Scope the facility, the partnership and funding plan in more detail
  - Flesh out the proposal to outline a high level facility specification, potential location(s), likely governance and operating model and a business plan

### Stage 4
- **Plan & evaluate**
  - Make the business case for the project’s desirability, feasibility and viability
  - Prepare and cost facility concept plans, firm up the location, operating model and business plan, and undertake a cost/benefit analysis

### Stage 5
- **Detailed planning**
  - Prepare a detailed project and funding plan and partnership agreement for approval
  - Complete detailed project planning, confirming costs, funding and timeframes, obtaining approvals and consents and finalising legal arrangements

### Stage 6
- **Execute & deliver**
  - Execute the project plan, open the facility
  - Complete and sign off any capital works (build and fit-out or re-purpose and refit), open the new facility and formally celebrate the launch of the facility partnership

### Stage 7
- **Review / renegotiate**
  - Monitor and periodically review facility partnership over agreed term
  - Monitor and evaluate facility and partnership performance as agreed to ensure requirements are met, appropriate support is available and outcomes will be delivered

---

### Key Documents at each stage (actual documentation required will vary depending on the individual partnership)

- **Stage 1**
  - Facility Partnership Canvas
  - Initial proposal
  - Strategic assessment
  - Needs assessment

- **Stage 2**
  - Full proposal
  - Schedule of spaces, bulk and location plan (if appl.)
  - High-level funding plan and business plan

- **Stage 3**
  - Feasibility study
  - Business case(s)
  - Facility concept plans
  - Draft partnership agreement

- **Stage 4**
  - Final facility design
  - Detailed project, funding and business plans
  - Partnership agreement
  - Performance agreement

- **Stage 5**
  - Project reports
  - Performance reports
  - Facility Partnership Review

---
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Is it a facility partnership?

Auckland Council invests in community outcomes in a range of ways. These include operating facilities and services directly, supporting the community sector’s delivery through grants, partnerships and leases, and procuring services from market providers. The table below shows where facility partnerships fit, and how they relate to these other key mechanisms for investing in outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the council funding or providing?</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services only</td>
<td>Community grants for services and activities delivered by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and assets</td>
<td>FACILITY PARTNERSHIPS with sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets only</td>
<td>Community leases for council properties (land and buildings) – occupied by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is leading delivery?</td>
<td>Council-led</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This diagram shows some of the particular characteristics or changes in circumstance that could trigger a move between a facility partnership and one of the four other investment mechanisms shown.
## Starting the partnering conversation

Partnerships can be initiated by either the council or the partner(s). The Track a partnership starts on will impact the investment available, and when and how proposals will be accepted.

### PROACTIVE TRACK

- Council actively seeks potential facility partners through an open tendering process

### RESPONSIVE TRACK

- Council approaches a potential partner(s), with an opportunity specific to them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully or partially budgeted through the Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Unbudgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind support may also be available</td>
<td>In-kind or contestable funding support may be available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting started</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starts with Community Facility Tender (EOIs) (Stage 2)</td>
<td>Starts with early conversations (Stage 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities may be advertised and proposals progressed at any time of the year</td>
<td>Stage 1 and 2: decisions to progress twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3 and 4 proposals requiring funding: decisions to progress once per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tracks

Proactive Track

Proactive Track partnership opportunities are aligned to network gaps identified by the council in the relevant network and investment plans.

The council allocates budget to address high priority network gaps through the Annual Plan and Long-term Plan processes. When an indicative budget has been allocated to address a high priority gap, the council will identify those opportunities which may be suitable for partnership delivery, and release a Facility Partnership Tender to call for proposals from potential partners.

As these opportunities have been identified by the council through its own network planning processes, some aspects of the business case for a facility partnership on the Proactive Track will already be in place. These specifications will inform the Facility Partnership Tender, which begins with an Expressions of Interest round (Stage 2), followed by the preparation of detailed project plans and business cases for shortlisted proposals (Stages 3 and 4). Business cases for market and direct delivery options may be considered alongside partnership options.

In some cases, the council may have a specific gap where there are only one or two potential partners due to the nature of the location, activity or population being targeted. In these cases, the council may approach a partner or partners directly to explore the opportunity together.

Decisions to progress Proactive track proposals through the key gates in our decision-making process (Gates 2, 3 and 4) will be made by the relevant decision-maker at regional or local level.

Responsive Track

Responsive Track partnerships are those where a partner identifies a gap or unmet need in their community or sector, and approaches the council for support.

By their nature, there is no ‘budget’ set aside for Responsive Track partnerships, and potential partners will have to do more upfront work to make the case for investment. This includes not only any funding that may be required, but the staff resource to support the relationship over time.

If the investment required is significant, Responsive Track partnerships would need their regional or local decision-maker (as appropriate) to advocate for new funding through the Annual Plan or Long-term Plan process.

However although funding is more limited for Responsive Track partnerships, decision-makers may still be able to commit other kinds of support – e.g. use of council assets, or support from staff – if they accept the idea has merit and meets a genuine community need.

Partners can initiate early conversations on the Responsive Track at any time (Stage 1). Responsive Track Proposals at Stages 1 and 2 will be assessed by staff twice per year, with decisions to progress to the next stage made by the regional or local decision-maker.

In some cases, the decision-maker may agree that the need identified in a responsive Track proposal is a priority, but want to initiate a wider tendering process to explore alternative ways of addressing it before committing to a specific partner or partnership.

Responsive Track proposals at Stages 3 and 4 that require funding will be assessed by staff once per year, prior to the Annual Plan, to enable unbudgeted funding requests to pass through approval Gates 3 and 4 as part of the Annual Plan process.
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### What the partnership will involve, and who owns the facility

All facility partnerships will fit into one of our four broad types. The types are differentiated by the ownership of the land, and whether we are building new or working with an existing property.

The facility partnership Type is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for funding, or committing the use of council assets (land and buildings)</th>
<th>Whether we will be working with other funders / investors</th>
<th>Steps we need to go through at each stage, including planning and consenting through the council’s regulatory arm</th>
<th>Form and complexity of the legal agreements that will underpin the partnership</th>
<th>Some projects may transition from one Type to another, through discussions, research and reformulating the proposal, or as new opportunities present themselves over time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1 DEVELOPMENT partnership

When the council partners with another organisation(s) to:

- Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by the council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Five sports codes get together to develop an indoor sports centre on the site of an old squash club on a council reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2 ASSET partnership

When the council partners with another organisation(s) to:

- Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by a partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. New outdoor courts and playing fields for community use are developed on school property owned by the Ministry of Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3 ACTIVATION partnership

When the council partners with another organisation(s) to:

- Activate a vacant or under-utilised council property as a community, arts or sports facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Artist studios and exhibition space are established in an empty council property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4 ACCESS partnership

When the council partners with another organisation(s) to:

- Open up (or increase) community access to an existing facility owned and operated by a partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. A marae is funded to provide bookable community space in a fast-developing rural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths of this partnership type

**1. DEVELOPMENT partnership**
- May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs
- Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers
- Activates existing council land - often well-located with other community infrastructure
- Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input
- Long-term network solution, as the asset will usually be vested to council at conclusion of partnership

**2. ASSET partnership**
- May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs
- Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers
- No reduction of open space
- No council land involved can mean a shorter process: faster to progress to design and build stage
- Partner may be an experienced facility operator with proven track record

**3. ACTIVATION partnership**
- Majority of investment is in-kind, so lower upfront (cash) cost, reducing cost to ratepayers
- Activates existing council property - often well-located with other community infrastructure
- Can build on existing relationships with proven delivery partners
- Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input
- Low risk arrangement, either side can exit relatively easily

**4. ACCESS partnership**
- Provides a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers
- Good option in growth areas with limited land available for facility development
- Suits partners with spare capacity looking to increase their use and revenue
- Partner likely to be an experienced facility operator with proven track record
- Opportunity to recognise role and build capability and sustainability of existing community facilities
- Low risk arrangement, either side can exit relatively easily
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development Partnership</th>
<th>Asset Partnership</th>
<th>Activation Partnership</th>
<th>Access Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Challenges for this partnership type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)</td>
<td>Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)</td>
<td>Smaller partners may need substantial support to develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)</td>
<td>Presumes existence of partners with desirable facilities + spare capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces public open space (or other council land)</td>
<td>Multiple partners involved in funding, owning, managing, using asset and land can make decision-making more complex</td>
<td>Removes a property from another portfolio (e.g. venues-for-hire)</td>
<td>Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional steps in planning and consenting process where the council is the landowner</td>
<td>Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time (e.g. facilities on school land)</td>
<td>Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements</td>
<td>Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can be complications if commercial activities planned to sustain facility operation, especially if land is held under Reserves Act</td>
<td>May not be a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term</td>
<td>Where capital work is required, council as property owner means additional steps in planning, consenting, procurement processes</td>
<td>Not a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If asset paid for by community, need clear governance, legal structure and exit strategy - as the landholder, ownership technically remains with the council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activating a council property will impact already stretched maintenance and renewals budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fit-for-purpose process

Because no two partnerships are the same, it’s important to ensure that our assessment, decision-making and management processes and practices are fit-for-purpose, and will protect the interests of the council, our partners and our communities.

We won’t over-burden simple, low-cost, low-risk partnerships with excessive costs, processes and paperwork. But we will make sure that we fully investigate and monitor larger, higher risk and more complex partnerships that will receive significant public investment. This is about balancing our ‘empowering and enabling’ role with our obligations as a public entity.

The facility partnership Scale is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine:

- the planning, financial planning and due diligence we will undertake, and expect partners to undertake
- the documents and evidence we will need to inform our decisions, and how in-depth these will need to be
- any council support available to help partners complete each stage and progress to the next decision gate
- who will make the decision at each gate, and how this will happen
- approximately how long each stage might take and any associated costs (e.g. consent fees, professional services)
- the level of risk management and monitoring we will require
- the level of benefits management and monitoring we will require.

Influence over decision-making

Ideally, all partners would invest equally in a facility partnership, hold equal power, and share the risks equally, but this won’t always be the case. In most facility partnerships Auckland Council has been involved with, the council has been the biggest investor, taken on the most risk, and had the most at stake if the partnership or the facility were to fail.

We will expect a level of influence over key decisions that is proportionate to our level of investment and risk in the partnership, and the capability of our partners.

By ‘key decisions’, we mean those relating to:

- The facility’s location, size, design, construction and fit-out
- The facility’s operating model, financial management and key staff appointments
- The partnership’s legal structure, governance arrangements, and exit provisions.

Staff will work with partners during the early and middle stages of facility partnership development to shape governance and management arrangements that enable our agreed decision-making role.

Even where the council has a greater say in decisions, partners should still benefit from being in the partnership, and feel respected and supported in all of their dealings with us.
### Allocating Scale

There are six determining factors that will determine a partnership’s Scale:

- Overall value of our investment over first 10 years
- Proportion of the total cost council is investing
- Complexity / complicating factors
- Level of risk to council
- Use of council assets
- Proven capability of partner(s)

### Table: Allocating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor / Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall value of investment over first 10 years</td>
<td>&lt; $2m</td>
<td>$2m - $5m</td>
<td>$5m - $10m</td>
<td>&gt; $10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the total cost council is investing</td>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>20% - 49%</td>
<td>50% - 74%</td>
<td>75% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity / complicating factors</td>
<td>Low complexity</td>
<td>Medium complexity</td>
<td>High complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of risk to council</td>
<td>Low risk for council</td>
<td>Some risk for council</td>
<td>Medium risk for council</td>
<td>High risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Funding support only</td>
<td>Occupying an existing council building</td>
<td>Building on council land</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>High capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record + professional support</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we see our status within the partnership</td>
<td>Minority partner</td>
<td>Cornerstone partner</td>
<td>Primary partner</td>
<td>Guiding partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated decision-making role</td>
<td>Partner(s) keep council closely informed of key decisions</td>
<td>Partner(s) consult council prior to key decisions</td>
<td>Council and partner(s) take key decisions together</td>
<td>Council guides key decisions in consultation with partner(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Different partnership proposals will sit at different points on the grid for each of the six factors.**

*In assessing a specific facility partnership, we will use the highest scoring factor to determine the Scale.*

The higher the Scale, the longer the project is likely to take, and the more costs partners should expect along the way.
The *overall level of investment* will include both capital (construction) and operational (overhead) costs calculated over the first ten years of the partnership. We will also take into account the market value of any assets made available to the partner.

Our *proportional level of investment* will be calculated on the basis of council’s share of the total costs of the project over the first ten years of the partnership.

*Complicating factors* could include land status, zoning and condition, numbers and types of partners involved, and the proposed ownership, governance and management model for the new facility. Greater complexity may shift the project into a higher scale, even if the overall value is low.

Where the land or building involved is a *council asset*, the council has an even greater responsibility to safeguard the wellbeing and interests of the wider community, and consider how the facility partnership may impact them. Accordingly, we will expect to have more influence where council-owned assets are involved.

Our *level of risk* will be assessed by council staff based on the specific circumstances of the partnership, the partners, the facility and the site.

Our *partners’ capability* will be assessed primarily on the basis of their track record of facility delivery and/or service delivery at an appropriate level, and/or whether they have factored in the support of suitably skilled and experienced professionals.
Who makes investment decisions?

Auckland Council has two complementary decision-making parts. The two governance arms each have distinct decision-making responsibilities for facility partnerships.

**The governing body...**
- Focuses on region-wide strategic decisions
- Decides where and when the council will invest in the facility network to address gaps and respond to growth
- Develops regional strategies - e.g. for arts and culture, sport and recreation - that set outcomes and priorities for investment
- Sets budget envelopes for overall facility network, and any major facility investments or upgrades through the Long-term Plan
- Govern regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting

**Local boards...**
- Make most decisions on local places, facilities and activities
- May work together to support facilities that benefit several local board areas
- Set outcomes and priorities for local investment through local board plans
- Identify local facility needs and advocate for investment through the Long-term Plan
- Govern local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting
- Allocate local discretionary funding
3. The investment

This section sets out the ways in which we and our partners might invest in facility partnerships, what kinds of partnerships we can invest in, and the principles that will guide that investment.

How the council can invest in facility partnerships

- **Funding**
  - Capex and Opex
  - One-off or ongoing grants, contracts and operating subsidies

- **Use of Assets**
  - Land Leases
  - Building leases / licenses to occupy
  - Foregoing revenue earned from use of council assets

- **Support and Expertise**
  - Maintenance and renewals programme
  - Wide range of expert support staff
  - Contracted specialists / technical advice
  - Brokering

How our partners can invest in facility partnerships

- **Funding and Assets**
  - Partners' own financial contributors, including revenue from other activities (e.g. social enterprise)
  - Grants and finance from other funders / lenders
  - Use of partners' land and buildings

- **Voluntary contributions**
  - Fundraising in the community
  - Pro bono professional services
  - Unpaid governors (e.g. Board of Trustees)
  - Volunteer labour (e.g. working bees)
  - Donated or discounted materials

- **Professional expertise, community knowledge**
  - Facility management expertise
  - Service and activity expertise
  - Community knowledge and contacts

We will value our ‘in-kind’ support to provide a more accurate picture of our investment.

Where a partnership includes investment ‘in-kind’ – e.g. free or very low-cost use of a council property, technical expertise or ongoing staff support – we will estimate the equivalent market value of the resource and include this in our calculations. We will encourage and support our partners to do the same.

This will enable the council to compare the true cost and value of different partnership options when making investment decisions, and when calculating the returns. In many cases we will want to compare in-house delivery, market provision and a range of partnership options before making investment decisions.
Our investment principles

We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions. These investment principles underpin our eligibility criteria and investment priorities.

We will:

Principle 1
Invest strategically, based on outcomes:
We will invest to deliver the outcomes outlined in our strategies, policies and plans. We will judge success based on the benefits delivered for communities on the ground.

Principle 2
Invest to help achieve equity for all Aucklanders:
We will invest to address known community needs and network gaps first. This is about enabling everyone to have access to good quality services and assets, and not just for those whose circumstances will balance the needs of their communities.

Principle 3
Invest wisely, to deliver the maximum value for Aucklanders:
By value, we mean the outputs, activities and assets of our services, activities and assets. Our social, cultural, economic and environmental outcomes will determine the value of our investment. We are confident that a partnership approach will enable us to deliver the best overall return on investment.

Principle 4
Invest for sustainability:
We will seek investments that balance our desire to support community led innovation with the need to protect our community assets. We are confident that we will only invest in facilities that we are comfortable are in a strong position to be delivered and operated by our partners unless we commit to resourcing an ongoing relationship.
What the principles mean for eligibility

Facility partnerships may take a wide range of forms, reflecting their diverse communities and circumstances. The eligibility criteria for receiving council investment through facility partnerships reflect our investment principles, and our duties and obligations as a local authority.

Ineligible proposals won’t be progressed, although staff may be able to suggest alternative funding partners if the council can’t assist.

Principle 1

Investing strategically

We will only invest in:

1. Facility partnerships where the outcomes sought are a good fit with the council’s and the other partner(s)’ kaupapa (purpose) as set out in our strategies, policies and plans, and the partner(s)’ own vision, constitution, organisational strategy and/or business plan.

We won’t invest in facilities that:

2. Primarily deliver housing, education, health or other services that are the responsibility of central government, UNLESS the council is a minority investor alongside the relevant central government agencies. AND we’re satisfied that our investment will support enhanced community, Māori, arts, sport or recreation outcomes in line with our responsibilities as a local authority.

Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:

3. Non-discriminatory, physically accessible to people of all abilities, and in all other respects compliant with New Zealand (and applicable international) human rights legislation.
Principle 2
Investing equitably

We will only invest in:

4. Facilities that address identified facility network gaps or unmet community needs. We will consider the broader picture of provision when assessing ‘need’, including the availability of non-council facilities that are accessible and affordable to the same target users. Our definitions of community are not just place-based, but also encompass communities of identify and interest.

5. Facilities that will be open for use by the wider community. (Facilities may be purpose-built for a particular activity, but shouldn’t be exclusively for the use of the partner organisation(s) and their members, or their membership should be open to anyone who wishes to join).

We won’t invest in facilities that:

6. Are places of worship or other buildings with religious purposes, OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a religion.

7. Are political party offices OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a political cause.

8. Are, or include, commercial premises, unless certain conditions are met (see ‘Facility partnerships and commercial activities’ p.31).

Once operating, all partnership facilities must be:

9. Affordable, i.e. set their fees and charges at or below the level charged by similar community facilities.
Principle 3

Investing wisely

**All facility partners must be:**

10. A registered charitable organisation, OR agree to invest profit (beyond any agreed cap) back into the facility, or an approved community purpose.

**We will only invest in:**

11. Developing new facilities where we agree that a new built asset is essential to deliver the outcome, rather than a service, activation or access response.

12. Facility partnerships that we are confident will deliver the same level of service to the community over the same period compared with the alternatives,

a) **AND at a lower total cost** to ratepayers (accounting for all forms of support and investment over the life of the partnership, including any opportunity costs).

b) **OR at a similar or higher cost** than alternatives, but where additional value will be delivered in return (in line with other strategic priorities).

**We won’t invest in facilities where:**

13. Analysis shows it would be more cost effective for the council or partner(s) to deliver the facility directly, and there isn’t sufficient extra value gained to outweigh the costs.

**Where the facility partnership will include capital works:**

14. That are paid for by the council (in part or in full) or involve council-owned property, at any point during the term of the partnership, the procurement of goods and services must align with Auckland Council’s Procurement Policy.

**Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:**

15. Safe, properly maintained and legally compliant for **public use**.

16. Willing and able to meet reasonable accountability and monitoring requirements.
Principle 4

Investing sustainably

We will only invest in:

17 Facilities that we are confident will be financially viable and sustainable – i.e. have credible business models to meet establishment costs and ongoing operating costs (including any council investment).

All facility partnerships must be:

18 Formally constituted organisations with a recognised legal structure.

We won’t invest in facilities that:

19 Have joint ownership (e.g. where the council would own one level, storey or area of a building or structure, and partner(s) would own another).
Facility partnerships and commercial activity

We recognise businesses and commercial activities can play a role in enabling viable facility partnerships, and we will support this in certain circumstances.

Facility partners may engage in commercial activities to offset their costs. Council will actively encourage community partners to explore appropriate revenue generation opportunities to help them meet their ongoing operating costs. This could include commercial activities run directly by the partner (e.g. a gallery shop or a coaching programme), a concession run by a private operator (e.g. a café), or operating a social enterprise that supports the facility (e.g. a community garden).

The following conditions will apply to facility partnerships that incorporate commercial activities in their business model, including social enterprises:

1. We must agree that the proposed commercial activity complements the purpose of the facility, and will increase public use and enjoyment of the facility and/or the surrounding site.

2. The zoning of the land must allow commercial activity of the type proposed, OR the land can be re-zoned to allow it, and the relevant decision-maker must support this change (investment in the partnership will remain contingent on this re-zoning).

3. Any commercial activities related to the facility partnership must return all profits to offset the operating costs of the facility, or in the case of a concession run by a private operator, to pay a lease set at market rates.

4. Any surplus generated by commercial activities must be reinvested in the facility, or a community purpose approved by us.

Businesses can be co-investors in facility partnerships. Council will consider co-investing in a partnership alongside businesses that want to sponsor or otherwise support facilities in their communities. In these cases, Auckland Council’s Strategic Partnerships Policy will apply.

Businesses can express interest in a facility partnership opportunity.

Proposals on the Proactive Track: Businesses can respond to a Facility Partnership Tender advertised by the council. If selected to proceed past the first (EOI) stage, the relevant sections of the Auckland Council Procurement Policy and processes will apply thereafter.

Proposals on the Responsive Track: Auckland Council’s Unsolicited Proposals Policy will apply where businesses approach the council about a facility partnership outside of the Facility Partnership Tender process. Refer to ‘Proactive and Responsive Partnership Tracks’ in section 4: The Model for more information about the Tracks.

From time to time, the council may contract commercial enterprises to manage council facilities through a formal procurement process, with opportunities advertised in the usual way. These are not facility partnerships for the purposes of this policy.
Facility partnerships and commercial activity
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Charitable organisations and social enterprises can enter facility partnerships with us, and engage in commercial activities to offset their costs (subject to the conditions outlined on the previous page).

Charity supported by trade

Charity supported by grants & donations

Social purpose business

Social benefit enterprise

Socially responsible business

Commercial enterprise

For-profit

Not-for-profit

Trades in order to fund a core social mission fulfilled by others

Directly fulfils a core social mission through trading

Sells some good or services to help fund core social mission

Donates to support a social mission fulfilled by others

Businesses can be co-investors, or express interest in an advertised partnership opportunity.
Using the principles to prioritise

In a growing city, with constrained funding and limited land and buildings available for community use, the council can’t support every facility partnership proposal we receive. Decision-makers will consider a range of factors to determine which partnerships will deliver the most benefits for Auckland – both financial and non-financial - and are the soundest choice.

We will prioritise some facility partnership projects over others, in line with the commitments made to Auckland, and with Aucklanders, in our existing strategies, policies and plans. We will identify the partnerships that are most likely to make an impact, in the areas Aucklanders have agreed investment is most urgently needed.

Our priorities directly align with our investment principles, and we expect all successful proposals will address at least one priority. Partnership proposals that meet multiple priorities will have a considerable advantage.

Principle 1
Investing strategically

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

1. Will deliver **priority outcomes** in line with our existing strategies, policies and plans.
2. Are Māori-led, and/or help to **celebrate Māori** as Auckland’s unique point of difference in the world, and/or honour documented commitments to Māori made by the former councils in the Auckland region.
3. Will capitalise on opportunities presented by the development or transformation of areas of **rapid growth and intensification**.

Principle 2
Investing equitably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

4. **Target underserved populations** (communities of place, interest and identity).

Principle 3
Investing wisely

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

5. Optimise use of the council’s or the community’s **existing facilities and assets**, including current facility partnerships that can make the case for further investment.
6. Are for multi-purpose facilities (i.e. which can be used for a broad range of activities), and/or bring together **multiple organisations and groups**, who would otherwise require separate premises.

Principle 4
Investing sustainably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

7. Can **leverage other sources of income or investment**, meaning the council will be covering less than 50% of the construction and/or establishment costs, and/or less than 25% of the ongoing operating costs.
8. Will develop facilities which are environmentally low-impact and sustainable in their design, construction and operation.
Boosting the likelihood of investment

Even after applying our investment principles, eligibility criteria and priorities, our funds and assets will still be oversubscribed. This page outlines other matters our decision-makers will take into account when choosing between partnership proposals.

Staff will look for the following when advising decision-makers:

**Principle 1**
Investing strategically

✔ Where the partnership will build the capacity, skills and resilience of the partner(s) and the community.

**Principle 2**
Investing equitably

Where the proposed partnership would:

✔ honour a historical commitment between the council and the partner(s) to work together,

✔ significantly increase goodwill, confidence or trust in the council within the facility’s host community from a low base,

✔ otherwise have a significant positive knock-on or ripple effect in the host community.

**Principle 3**
Investing wisely

✔ Where the partnership would secure a prime location for the facility otherwise unavailable or unaffordable to the council, and this location is likely to be a major contributor to its success.

✔ Where the partnership facility would likely be better used than a standard council-managed facility of the same type, because the partner(s):

   o have an established reputation with the local community,
   o have better access to the facility’s intended users than the council, and/or are better positioned to provide locally or culturally appropriate services.

✘ Where one or more partners (including the council) feel they’d need to control the majority of decisions, to an extent that is disproportionate to their level of investment and risk.

**Principle 4**
Investing sustainably

✔ Where the partnership would leverage an established working relationship between the council and the partner(s).

✔ Where the partnership would attract significant volunteer input, pro bono expertise, or discounts on goods or services for the facility which are otherwise unavailable to the council.

✔ Where each partner’s proposed roles and responsibilities reflect their individual strengths.

✔ Where the proposed partnership is ‘win-win’ and will provide clear mutual benefit for all parties, without undue workload, pressure or risk falling on smaller partners.

✘ Where there’s either no ability or no desire to adjust the partnership – e.g. its structure, deliverables, investment levels – if circumstances change, or initial expectations prove unrealistic.
4. The relationship

Partnerships may be agreed between organisations – but ultimately, they are formed between people. Relationships are what make partnerships different to contracts, and lift the commitment between partners above a transactional arrangement.

Quality relationships are foundational for a healthy facility partnership: they set the tone for all of the work the partners do together, and are the springboard for any future collaboration. Good relationships are built on trust and good faith, mutual understanding and mutual respect. Good relationships can only be built over time and require ongoing effort.

Auckland Council has committed to taking an Empowered Communities Approach when entering relationships with community-led organisations and projects – including facility partnerships. An empowered community is one where individuals, whānau and communities can influence decisions, take action and make change happen about the issues that matter to them.

The council’s Empowered Communities Approach is based on principles of equity, inclusion and collaboration, and aligns closely with our commitment to realise Māori aspirations and outcomes. Our partnering principles provide guidance to council staff about how to work in ways that are more empowering of communities.

Our partnering principles

Auckland Council will resource and treat facility partnership relationships with the care and commitment they deserve. This commitment to quality partnership relationships means we will:

1. Be open, honest and upfront with our partners (and potential partners) about what we can and can’t commit to and why, and follow through on the commitments we make. We will communicate regularly with our partners, and keep each other in the loop.

2. Take responsibility for ‘partnering on the inside’, acknowledging the council’s size and complexity can make us difficult to partner with. We will prioritise continuity in our relationships, and actively manage the transitions when key people change.

3. Factor in adequate frontline and specialist staff support as part of the business case for any new facility partnership.

4. Recognise and value partners’ financial and non-financial contributions, and the risks all parties take by working in partnership. We will agree roles and responsibilities that play to our strengths, and allow all partners to meaningfully participate in decisions.

5. Support our partners in a way that builds capability in both directions: building the capability of our partners to do things for themselves, and of our own people to work alongside them.

6. Seek to respond together to any challenges we encounter, with formal disputes processes only used as a last resort. We will seek to work through any issues related to differences in our working style and culture.
潜在的设施伙伴

许多不同的组织和群体可能会在提供或投资于为奥克兰设施中发挥作用。

潜在的未来设施伙伴包括奥克兰市议会。

- 国家和地区组织
- 毛利人的组织和机构
- 专科学校
- 地方信托、合作社、群体和俱乐部
- 设施发展信托（旨在使较小的组织能够集体资助、发展、治理和管理一个共享的设施）
- 社会企业家，或其他商业组织，提供社区成果

潜在的未来联合投资者包括设施伙伴关系。

- 业务改进区
- 政府部门
- 资金机构/慈善机构
- 后期安置治理实体
- 私人、公司和慈善机构

我们的合作伙伴可以包括：

- 董事会和董事会的成员——可能是已付费或志愿者
- 伊乌或 huapu 联络
- 管理委员会
- 管理人员—例如：首席官员、董事、总经理和设施管理人员
- 前线人员—例如：接待人员、协调员、教练、清洁人员—已付费或志愿者
- 咨询师、律师、会计师、筹款人或其他合同专业人士
Council support for facility partnerships

Our partners

- Customer service staff
e.g. Call centre & service centre staff
- Land, building & asset staff
e.g. lease advisors, maintenance staff and contractors
- Specialist staff
e.g. arts and culture advisors, sport & recreation advisors, librarians, kaivirika/heritage advisors
- Facility managers, partnership managers & other key staff
- Locally focused advisors
e.g. local board staff, local community advisors, council kaiwhakarearea, community user groups
- Policy, strategy & research advisors
- Trust boards, directors, management committees
- Māori and Tuakana
- Coaches, tutors, community users & volunteers
- Infrastructure, planning & consents advisors
- Legal, risk & financial advisors

Our elected members

The council family includes a range of skilled and experienced staff, each of whom helps to support facility partnerships in different ways. No one group of staff can provide quality support and advice on their own – we need everyone on board to do this well.

Staff involvement includes:

- Having early conversations with potential partners, co-investors and council decision-makers
- Helping to prepare and assess facility partnership proposals and plans, and making recommendations to decision-makers
- Giving technical, financial and legal advice to partners and decision-makers, helping partners to navigate council processes and systems
- Helping to design, plan, cost, consent and project manage facility partnership building projects
- Holding relationships with partners and managing funding and lease agreements once a facility is operational
- Helping to build the capacity and capability of partners, when needed
- Evaluating and reporting on the benefits delivered through facility partnerships

Working directly with partners

Supporting frontline staff & elected members
Our roles and responsibilities

The council is a large and complex organisation, with many different roles it must play simultaneously. These include regulatory / kaitiaki roles, and empowering / awhi roles. These roles may sometimes be in tension, or even direct conflict.

We can’t avoid this complexity, as each function and role we play is an important part of serving Auckland. But there will be limits to what we can do through partnerships, what we can do with or for our partners, and what our partners can do themselves.

In particular, the council must always:

- Keep people safe
- Ensure we and others comply with the law, and are seen to do so
- Act in ways that are consistent with our duties as a local authority and kaitiakitanga, and in alignment with our own policies and plans
- Balance competing interests among communities of place, interest and identity
- Set out to allocate scarce resources fairly, transparently, and for maximum benefit.

To help manage any tension between our roles we will:

- Be upfront: we will acknowledge, discuss and actively manage tensions as they arise, accepting that in some cases finding common ground will not be possible
- Be coordinated: where our different roles are in tension internally, we will try to ensure this is flagged early and resolved, before (further) commitments are made or work progressed
- Champion where we can’t act: sometimes, we may not be able to partner ourselves, but if we strongly support the kaupapa, we can help bring together others who can.

Lead relationship broker

We know that the council’s large size and complexity as an organisation can make us difficult for partners to build relationships with. Every facility partnership will be allocated a lead relationship broker within the council.

This person:

- Will establish a relationship with the key people in the partner organisations
- Will be the first port of call for the partner(s), elected members and other council staff interacting with the partnership
- Is responsible for assisting the partner(s) to navigate council processes and systems, and accessing and/or coordinating advice from the ‘virtual team’ of specialist and technical staff involved in each facility partnership
- May change over the lifecycle of the partnership, but where this needs to happen the transition will be carefully managed
5. The agreement

Clarifying and formally documenting the legal arrangements relating to the facility and the partnership is an important way to protect the short, medium and long-term interests of all parties.

Facility partnerships are some of the most complex arrangements we enter into, because they cover physical assets, often big investments and usually long periods of time - sometimes generations. The financial stakes are higher, the potential risks are greater, the considerations are more technical, and every choice carries an opportunity cost.

The graphic at right identifies a number of aspects relating to the legal side of facility partnerships, which underpin the formal arrangements Auckland Council can make with our partners and protect everyone’s interests.

As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific legal considerations will vary between projects. Staff will consult with our in-house legal team and ensure partners and decision-makers understand the potential implications of individual proposals from Stage 2 onwards. All parties must fully investigate and resolve the legal dimensions of a facility partnership to their mutual satisfaction before entering any formal agreement at Stages 3 or 4.

---

Our ethical practice principles
Auckland Council will run an ethical, prudent and inclusive facility partnerships programme. This means we will:

1. **Be accountable for how we invest public money** in facility partnerships and how we show the return on that investment, and require our partners to do the same.

2. **Only take justifiable risks**: we will balance our desire to support high-potential, community-led innovation, with our need to prudently invest public funds and protect the council and the community from risk.

3. **Seek prior legal advice and formally document** all facility partnership commitments and agreements (and any subsequent material changes), to ensure clarity for all parties.

4. **Act fairly and transparently**: we will be open and honest, and aim to balance the needs and interests of everyone involved in or impacted by facility partnerships.

5. **Be Inclusive**: in our intent, our processes and requirements, our decisions and our behaviours. We will work with partners who value inclusion and diversity.

6. **Have a culture of seeking feedback, listening, reflecting and continuously seeking to improve**, and we will encourage our partners to do the same.
Legal considerations

Organisational types
Auckland Council has specific rules and practices around partnering with some types of organisation – e.g. facility trusts, social enterprises, other types of commercial organisation and schools.

Partnership and facility management structure
The council, partner(s) and co-investor(s) will need to agree and document arrangements for the funding, ownership, governance and operation of the facility. This will include negotiating levels of partner and community access, identifying and mitigating conflicts of interest, agreeing when and how the partnership will be wound up, and if there will be options for early exit.

Financial obligations
Many facility partnerships will involve council grants or contracts for service as part of their funding model. These may be paid out in advance, in arrears, or as the project hits key milestones. Different types of payments have different tax obligations and accounting requirements.

Leasing council property
Partners establishing a facility in a council building will require a commercial lease, community lease or license to occupy the property. Lease negotiations will include expectations and arrangements for property maintenance, renewals and improvements, and any sub-letting or co-tenancy arrangements.

Leasing council land
A partner-owned facility built on council land will require a ground lease, with provisions made for renewing the lease, vesting assets to council or remediating the land at the end of the lease.

Managing risk and disputes
The council and partners will need to identify a range of possible risks early on, monitor these as the partnership proposal progresses, and actively manage them once the facility becomes operational. Partnership facilities will need to be fully insured and legally compliant for public use, with clear operational policies, clearly defined liability and a process for managing disputes.
6. The facility

Land and building considerations

As an experienced facility provider, we understand how much is involved in planning, designing, constructing, running and looking after built assets that will do the job they’re built for, endure thousands of hours of community use, weather and all sorts of change in and around them – year in, year out.

This can be complex, specialised and expensive work. In entering facility partnerships, the council and partners will need to navigate both land considerations (planning, leasing and technical aspects), building considerations (design and construction, leasing, operation and maintenance). As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific considerations will vary between projects.

We don’t develop community facilities for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve. We enter facility partnerships to enable activities where a physical space and/or built asset is an essential ingredient, and where this is currently missing.

If the space or asset isn’t critical or is already available, then a service-based solution – such as a new programme in the library, at the mall, or on the internet – might meet the need just as well as developing a new facility, and more cost-effectively. That’s why we will always look for service solutions first, which could include a facility partnership through our Access partnership model.

However many facility partnerships will involve developing new built assets, re-purposing or upgrading existing ones. They may not always involve developing buildings – an outdoor basketball court, for example – but there will always be a physical component.

The land

All facility partnerships have land considerations – they will sit on a specific site that is owned by someone, next to other properties, reached from a particular street, located in a neighbourhood, precinct, suburb and local board area, in the rohe (customary territory) of one or more mana whenua.

The area may have specific cultural, heritage or geotechnical features or significance, and it will grow and develop in accordance with its zoning under the Unitary Plan. Facilities will also take their place in a natural ecosystem – with its own character, behaviour, patterns and vulnerabilities.

The building or asset

A facility’s design, configuration, fit-out and operation can be the difference between a successful facility, an under-used facility, and a failed facility.

If building new, the planning, design and construction are critical phases for the project; they can be costly, complex and involve multiple decisions and trade-offs. Partners will require the support of qualified professionals.

If developing, re-purposing or activating an existing building, it may need renovation, new fittings or equipment, or improvements to come up to specification for public use. It may have special cultural or heritage significance, with added protection under the Unitary Plan. It may have existing tenants, or the potential to sub-let or bring in co-tenants.

All facilities need plans in place to manage regular community access and use, comply with leases and funding agreements, and the ongoing management, maintenance and renewal of the asset to keep it safe and in good condition.
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1  Context / Horopaki

Summary of background

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of community facilities, including community centres, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, sports fields and swimming pools. Most are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.

The Community Facilities Network Plan (adopted 2015) states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, but noted there was no consistent policy for selecting and supporting them. In 2016, a project was initiated to develop a new Facility Partnerships Policy.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori. Facility partnerships with marae are an obvious starting point.

However our stocktake had identified fewer than five facility partnerships with Māori out of 300+ in our existing portfolio. We wanted to make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for marae or Māori organisations.

To achieve this, we met with seven marae and three Māori organisations to explore how facility partnerships might fit within Te Ao Māori, and insights from these conversations were refined at four findings hui with a wider group. This report summarises what we learned through this work.

1.1  Project background and context

Community facilities are an important part of realising our vision of Auckland as a world class city. They contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities by providing spaces where Aucklanders can connect, socialise, learn and participate in a wide range of social, cultural, art and recreational activities.

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of facilities that benefit the community, including community centres, venues for hire and rural halls, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, recreation centres, sports fields and swimming pools.

Most of these facilities are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. A number of these are sited on council parks or in council-owned buildings, or were built or operate with some financial assistance from Auckland Council (or its predecessors). These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.
The Community Facilities Network Plan states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, as a way of ‘doing more with less’ in a growing city, and empowering communities that want to actively contribute to their own development.

However, it noted that the council currently has no consistent policy for selecting and supporting facility partnerships. Following the adoption of the plan in 2015, a project was initiated in 2016 to develop a new regional Facility Partnerships Policy.

### 1.2 Facility partnerships with Māori

Auckland Council recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand, and as establishing an enduring partnership between Māori and the Crown. The council has committed to engage and work with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori in line with this commitment.

The Treaty Principles provide an overarching context for all our relationships with Māori, and need to guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements in future (relevant Treaty Principles are listed at Appendix B).

**Facility partnerships and marae**

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential community facility partners, and are an obvious starting point for exploring facility partnerships with Māori.

Marae are already a focal point for Māori social, economic, environmental and cultural development, and ‘enabling Māori aspirations for thriving and self-sustaining marae’ is an Auckland Plan priority.

Valuing marae is also a tangible way of recognising Māori perspectives and preferences in providing for their own health and welfare needs. In supporting marae and other Māori-led facilities, the council demonstrates respect for matauranga Māori (knowledge), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and manaakitanga (hospitality).

### 1.3 Rationale for this research

The first phase of the Facility Partnerships Policy project included a stocktake of existing facility partnerships. During this process, fewer than five formal facility partnerships with Māori organisations were identified by council staff, out of the 300+ in our current portfolio.

The council does provide grants to marae each year through the Cultural Initiatives Fund, but we found investment provided in this way is not characterised by either the council or marae as a ‘facility partnership’. These grants are ring-fenced for capital improvements to marae buildings,
and are not tagged to the marae playing a formal role as facilities within a regional network, or delivering particular outcomes in return for the investment. Further, the Cultural Initiatives Fund does not provide for an ongoing partnership relationship with the marae alongside the grant.

In developing the new policy approach, we wanted to understand why so few marae or Māori organisations have sought formal facility partnerships with the council in the past, and make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for those that may be interested in them in future.

1.4 Summary of methodology

During Phase 1 of the Facility Partnerships Policy project we conducted key informant interviews related to a sample of 10 partnerships. During Phase 2, we selected an additional sample of seven marae and three Māori organisations to enable us to specifically explore a Te Ao Māori perspective.

Where possible, we also interviewed the council staff members who ‘hold’ the relationship, or who have the most in-depth understanding of their interactions with the council (past and present), to provide an internal perspective.

The project team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. We then held four findings hui to test our draft insights with a broader roopu (group). Additional issues raised at hui are incorporated into our findings. The key stages of the research are outlined in more detail in Appendix B.

1.5 Out of scope feedback

Our conversations with Māori were wide-ranging, covering not only experiences of ‘partnering’ with the council, but broader issues around the council’s relationships with Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau.

Although some of this feedback was beyond the scope of the Facility Partnerships Policy Project, it has been captured here as a full account of what we heard, and what we committed to our informants to ‘take back’ and share with the wider organisation. Feedback that is related to a partnerships kaupapa but out of scope for the Facility Partnerships Policy specifically is included separately at the end of the Findings section, and noted in the summary (Appendix A).

This broader feedback will be of interest and value for council staff currently holding relationships or with obligations to hold relationships, for the governing body and local boards, and for the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
2 Key findings / Tātaritanga me ēhī tohutouhu

This section summarises the common themes that emerged from 11 one-on-one interviews, which were then further refined and expanded by 39 participants at four findings hui.

It is intended as an account of ‘what we heard’ from Māori we spoke to, and is not assumed to represent the views of all Māori. Although summarised and themed by staff, it is written from the perspective of our research participants.

Summary of key research findings

The research findings directly related to the Facility Partnerships Policy kaupapa have been grouped under the following key themes:

- Marae are more than just ‘facilities’.

- Māori-led facilities (especially marae) are already delivering outcomes in their communities and want more recognition and support from council.

- Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision.

- Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships.

- The relationship between mana whenua, mataawaka Māori and the council is complex and needs careful navigation.

Additional (out of scope) research findings

- Generally, council relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement.

- Māori want to be more involved in developing policy that particularly interests or impacts them.
Findings on the Facility Partnerships kaupapa

2.1 Maarae are more than just ‘facilities’

For Māori, marae are at the centre of Te Ao Māori and cannot be labelled simply as ‘facilities’. The pākeha concept of a facility is seen as a very limited one, which doesn’t adequately convey the special role and significance of marae for Māori.

What we heard:

- **Marae are inseparable from the whenua, the tupuna (ancestors), their people and their history.** Marae are homes; they have mana; they are a taonga (treasure).
- **Marae often support a holistic range of functions, services and/or activities.** For example they may provide housing (papakainga) and emergency accommodation, host formal and informal gatherings, offer language and cultural instruction in a whanau-centric learning environment (e.g. kohunga reo, puna reo), act as a centre and showcase for Māori arts, and deliver or host social services.
- **Marae often hold relationships** with iwi, other marae, the wider Māori community, their local community, and also local and national organisations, central government and the council. Because of this, they often have broad oversight of issues and initiatives in their area.
- **Each marae is different.** They serve different communities in different ways, and have different tikanga, history, aspirations, capacity and governance structures.
- **The marae is turangawaewae: a place to stand for Māori.** Marae serve the needs of Māori first and foremost, and if a marae is needed by the iwi and hapu, this must take precedence.
- **Marae have specific tikanga (protocols) that must be followed** by visitors to show respect and uphold the mana of the marae. Marae contain many taonga, especially in their wharengai (meeting house), and some have uru pa (burial grounds) on site.

“Marae are being repeatedly referred to as ‘facilities’ – that is a very broad and pākeha word. Marae is the term [that] should be used.”

“For Māori, your marae is your ‘community centre’... If we have too fixed an idea of what a ‘community facility’ is, what has to happen there, or how it supports itself... we may miss the opportunity.”

“It would be silly to identify all marae as ‘the same’. Ensure this does not happen.”

“Our obligation to the community should not take precedence over our tikanga and traditional practices.”
• **Marae have a strong tradition of manaakitanga** (hospitality) and hosting guests may incur costs that are not covered by hireage fees. Traditionally, visitors offer koha voluntarily to acknowledge these efforts, but many non-Māori don’t understand or account for this. Sometimes manaakitanga appears to be unintentionally exploited by the council.

**How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:**

Any partnership arrangements with marae must fully acknowledge their place within Te Ao Māori. This includes:

• **Not defining marae as ‘community facilities’**. Marae are unique, even if they fulfil some of the same roles as facilities.

• **Committing to uphold the mana, tikanga, and matauranga Māori of marae**, including ensuring council staff understand their special role and significance. Pā sites are tapu, and visitors must respect cultural safety requirements.

• **Recognising that a marae may be needed by the iwi and hapu**, sometimes at short notice (for example to host tangi) and ensuring allowances are made for this.

• **Valuing and resourcing the knowledge, time and travel** of Māori providing manaakitanga on marae, and helping educate the wider community to do the same.

Some of these considerations may also be relevant when planning the development of facilities to be operated by Māori organisations.

### 2.2 Value the outcomes that marae and Maori-led facilities are already delivering

There is a perception that the council prefers to develop new facilities from scratch; “reinventing the wheel” rather than investing in supporting and improving what already exists.

Marae in particular are already active in the community space, and are playing an emerging role in supporting cultural learning and understanding in an increasingly diverse city. Many marae want the council to recognise the value they provide and build on
their strengths. This includes providing them with support and resources to fulfil their role more effectively.

What we heard:

- Many marae have a broader focus already; they are welcoming spaces for the whole community, not only Māori – for example working with local schools, and hosting wananga, programmes and events.

- Marae take pride in their manaakitanga, and in sharing their strong connection to the whenua and mātauranga Māori with newer residents.

- Marae fulfil work in the community that the council and other agencies do not do. Further, some Māori feel more comfortable accessing services through their marae or a kaupapa Māori facility or provider.

- Marae are charitable organisations run by volunteers and it can be difficult to meet the expectations of their own people, the wider community and the council. Further, as Auckland has grown and changed, some iwi and hapu members have had to move out of their rohe (customary territory) and must travel back to look after the marae and manaaki visitors. This makes it more difficult to expand the role of the marae.

- Marae aren’t fully reliant on the council to sustain them. Marae rely on others within their immediate community to support each other – including ‘marae to marae’. However, the council should ensure the protection and sustainability of marae in the same way it recognises, resources and helps to maintain other community infrastructure, like sports clubs and community centres.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- Council needs to look for opportunities to increase the use and capacity of existing facilities (in the broadest sense) that are serving the community – not always look to create new ones.

- The council could play a useful role in supporting marae staff and volunteers to build their capacity and capability,
e.g. through access to training, specialist expertise (e.g. HR, building compliance) and back office support. These non-financial forms of support would be highly valued.

- The council could also proactively notify marae of council employment and procurement opportunities in their area. This would honour the relationships, acknowledge existing skills and expertise, help to sustain the marae, and support the local economy.

2.3 Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision

Genuine partnerships provide an opportunity for the council to honour its Treaty obligations, and give effect to commitments made to Māori. To be meaningful, a partnership must be founded in shared values and a long-term vision. Māori must have an active decision-making role if they are to exercise tino rangatiratanga.

What we heard:

- **Experiences of ‘partnerships’ and other relationships with the council feel unbalanced**, as “Council has all the control.” For Māori, the word ‘partnership’ implies shared power, and reciprocal relationships based on Te Tiriti. Shared power is about acknowledging the mana motuhake of Māori.

- **Under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, mana whenua should not be considered one of many ‘stakeholders’**. The relationship with, and responsibility for place that mana whenua have as kaitiaki in Tāmaki Makaurau is unique.

- **Māori are their own experts who conceive of the world through a holistic lens**. Social, cultural, environmental and economic dimensions are interconnected. This way of thinking cuts across council’s organisational boundaries, and extends before and beyond the council’s timelines – it is holistic and intergenerational.

“It’s not all about money, it’s about help. The council could use its power to make things easier for us... you have a massive team behind you, we don’t.”

“Marae have similar aspirations for the community, just how we get there is different.”

“Walk alongside us (don’t tell us what do do).”

“It’s not just about the marae for us, it’s about the environment, it’s everything – our thinking goes out like this, it goes out to the people, out to the land, out to the moana... We come as a whole, as opposed to a portion.”
• Shared values and aligned outcomes should always be the starting point for any partnership: alignment comes first, relationships second, working out the details third.

• To realise meaningful outcomes through a partnership, there needs to be a long-term vision and commitment. However, change on both sides is inevitable over longer timeframes, and neither side should be locked in forever.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

• Partners need to be conceived of as equal and active participants, negotiating the way forward together. This aligns with the Treaty partnership and Treaty Principles.

• Facility partnership arrangements need to strongly align with the kaupapa and aspirations of the particular iwi and marae involved. In most cases iwi governance / post-settlement governance entities should be involved before detailed discussions with marae.

• Identifying shared values and outcomes should be the starting point for any partnership discussion, facility-based or otherwise.

• Opportunities to renegotiate a partnership should be planned in to allow for change over time

• Skill and talent sharing between marae, and between marae and the council, would help to improve relationships and capability. This would enable both sides to move towards genuine partnerships.

2.4 Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships

Māori think inter-generationally and value enduring relationships. Most marae want to establish / maintain long-term relationships with the council that go beyond any particular issue, project or activity. These relationships would provide the right basis for a facility partnership discussion. Too often relationships with the council are perceived as short-term, project-based and transactional.

“The most important thing is to have an aligned vision, aligned outcomes we want to achieve, aligned aspirations, a shared kaupapa.”

“We want to retain the right to be selective and take bookings that align with our values and kaupapa... it’s not just somewhere to run a birthday party.”

“No-one should be able to sign things away for long periods of time – we risk making others who come after us clean up our mess if we’ve got it wrong.”

“A marae is not a venue for hire. It comes with a relationship that should be nurtured.”
What we heard:

- Some longstanding relationships between Māori / marae and the council have been lost since amalgamation. Not all have been re-established, but there is a desire on both sides to do so.

- There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. For example some iwi have relationships with senior leaders at the council, while others do not.

- Many marae – mana whenua and mataawaka – would like to establish closer relationships with their local board(s). Effort needs to be made to maintain these relationships through and between election cycles.

- Relationships can be lost due to turnover of key people on either side, or where the relationship has been formed around a specific project that comes to an end. These relationships aren’t always handed over well.

- Without a relationship agreement (or MOU, or other formal document) it can be more difficult to maintain the relationship when key people change.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- The council needs to take a long-term perspective, and build enduring relationships with marae and Māori organisations. This would provide the best basis for a facility partnership.

- Initial discussions need to occur at the right level (e.g. rangatira to rangatira / chief to chief).

- The complexity of the council’s structure and its size makes the organisation difficult to navigate. It would be helpful to have one central point of contact between each marae/iwi and the council.

- Written agreements / MOUs may help support [partnership] relationships between council and marae / Māori organisations, to provide a reference point and ensure the commitments made remain clear and will endure. This

"Mutual respect is critical to partnership, and building a deep and lasting relationship. People carry the information and knowledge between them... We don’t want tick-box, transactional relationships.”

"Council should be brokering introductions between local board leaders and marae, particularly mataawaka marae.”

"Local boards need to stick to scheduled meets with the community [and] make an effort to visit mataawaka marae.”

"Formal documents are paramount [to sustaining relationships; given there is likely to be change on both sides... enabling] succession is key.”
would reduce the impact of staff turnover and organisational change on both sides.

2.5 Navigating relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka

The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau can be complicated. The Treaty creates different obligations to mana whenua and mataawaka. This space needs careful navigation, and is often not well understood by pākeha. Māori spoke of the need for the council to carefully consider how to adapt their approach to recognise and respect the differences, while fostering collaboration between the two.

What we heard:

- Mana whenua and mataawaka engagement needs to be well thought through. The council’s approach can sometimes conflate these two groups together when they should be treated separately. At other times, differentiating the two may lead to unnecessary divisions.

- The complex relationship dynamics between mana whenua and mataawaka can complicate engagement with Māori around something like facility partnerships, which are both place-based and outcome-focused.

- Mana whenua and mataawaka need to be given sufficient opportunity to discuss the right approach themselves, prior to engagement and decision-making.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- Where appropriate, the council could resource marae, mataawaka and mana whenua to create/design their own process for working together. This approach was used successfully by Te Ora o Manukau in 2012.

- The council could look for other ways to broker opportunities for collaboration (e.g. around engagement, facilities, services) between mana whenua and mataawaka, where this is desired by Māori.
Out of scope findings

2.6 Improving relationships between the council and Māori, starting with better consultation and engagement

Generally speaking, council consultation and engagement with Māori is perceived as too fragmented, transactional and ‘one-way’, and can end up feeling like a ‘tick box’ exercise. Before the council can enter into effective partnerships with Māori, a council-wide effort is needed to build stronger relationships beyond the scope of ‘consultation’.

Through recognising Te Ao Māori, developing robust and respectful consultation procedures and empowering Māori to take a more active role in decision making, Auckland Council has the opportunity to lead the way in this space.

What we heard:

- Consultation processes appear disconnected and do not always involve the right people. Sometimes the council say they have consulted with Māori, but they have only engaged with some mana whenua groups (and not others, or mataawaka). Some groups seem to have more privileged access to the council than others.

- The council needs to get better at closing the loop after consultation: sharing how people’s feedback was used and how the council has responded to it. This ensures Māori are kept involved and their time and effort is respected.

- When marae (and Māori generally) are asked to consult again on topics they’ve previously been consulted on, this worsens the perception that their relationships with council are disconnected and transactional. This also creates frustration that previous feedback has not been properly recorded or actioned.

- Recording all interactions with marae would allow other areas of council to consult this information prior to planning engagement with Māori. This would allow other
teams to have the required context and understanding of any previous issues, and enable them to be better prepared.

- **Marae are well placed to disseminate information about council consultation and engagement opportunities**, and coordinate participation by their iwi and hapu. Council could better capitalise on these networks in planning and delivering engagement.

### 2.7 Working with Māori to develop future policy

Some marae would welcome the chance to be more actively involved in strategic conversation and policy development related to issues that particularly interest or impact Māori.

**What we heard:**

- **Many marae have skilled people with the right capabilities to participate in strategy and policy discussions.** Marae tend to be very well networked and can more easily discuss issues and agree collective positions with their own people than the council can.
- **Collaborative policy-making** could provide an opportunity for the council to work with Māori directly about issues that affect them. There may be a cost associated with this, in terms of supporting Māori capacity to engage.

“Local people are in the best position to know what is missing and what is needed and how to build off what’s already there, so meaningful open-minded engagement is important. These may not be quick conversations.”

“Marae development cannot and should not be dictated by council, but rather supported and led by marae.”
3 Next steps / Ngā koringa ā-muri

The insights from this work have been able to feed into the main policy development process, which has continued to run alongside the research.

The Facility Partnerships Policy responds to the findings in the following ways:

A dedicated ‘Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori’ section:

- Outlines the relationship between this policy and the Treaty of Waitangi
- Acknowledges the special significance and role of marae for Māori
- Signals how facility partnerships with Māori, and especially marae, may need to differ from other partnerships.

Quality relationships are fundamental to the new approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy. For example:

- The policy’s emphasis on enduring, two-way relationships founded on shared goals and values.
- The need to allocate sufficient resources to support relationships and a commitment to factor this into future facility partnership decisions.

Other key ways that the policy approach addresses the findings:

- Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority.
- A commitment to invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.
- A commitment to capacity building for less experienced or lower capacity partners, for example volunteer-led organisations.
- Acknowledging that non-financial support – for example access to council expertise – is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest.

Further detail is included as Appendix A.

This report will be provided to the Environment and Community Committee alongside the draft Facility Partnerships Policy. The findings report will also be shared with our research participants.

The out-of-scope findings will be shared with the relevant parts of the council organisation. Work is already underway to address some of these findings, for example:

- Development of a new Māori engagement portal
- Further clarification of the funding process and criteria for Marae Development grants
- Additional relationship-building activities with mataawaka marae.
Appendix A: Summary of findings and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marae are more than just ‘facilities’. Marae are taonga and inseparable from their whenua, tupuna, people and history. Marae play a more holistic role for Māori than community facilities do for pākeha. Marae are diverse, not a homogenous group. A marae’s primary responsibility is to Māori. Tikanga needs to be observed on marae. It is traditional for marae to manaaki visitors and although this has a cost, it tends not to be reflected in venue hire fees.</td>
<td>The policy speaks directly to this finding, in order to: - Demonstrate our understanding of the special significance and role of marae for Māori - Increase staff and elected member understanding of this special significance and role - Outline how facility partnerships with marae may need to differ from other partnerships - Encourage marae and Māori-led organisations to seek facility partnerships with the council.</td>
<td>The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to: - the special significance and role of marae for Māori - the tikanga that may apply on marae - where staff can access support or advice when dealing with specific marae. The council could provide more opportunities for staff to attend marae: - in the course of their work (to increase Māori responsiveness and to build relationships with marae) - to build individual cultural competency. Council could proactively work with marae to provide opportunities for staff that are culturally safe for both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae and Māori-led facilities are already delivering outcomes in their communities. Many marae have a broader focus already and welcome the whole community. Marae do work in the community that the council and other agencies does not do. Most marae are run by volunteers with limited capacity. Marae’s existing role should be supported, like other community infrastructure.</td>
<td>The policy states we will invest in spaces that people already use and value, in preference to building new facilities. Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority. The policy encourages facility partnerships with marae in recognition of their existing and potential role. The policy acknowledges that non-financial support – e.g. access to council expertise – is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest in facility partnerships.</td>
<td>The council could better recognise the wider role played by marae and support them in this, e.g. work by the Civil Defence and Emergency Management team to explore the role of marae in building community resilience. The council could also support marae in practical ways, e.g. access to training, or notification of local procurement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FINDINGS What we heard from Māori

**Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti, shared values and long-term vision.**

‘Partnership’ implies shared power, with partners as equal and active participants.

The kaitiaki role of mana whenua is unique in Tāmaki Makaurau.

Te Ao Māori is holistic and intergenerational, which doesn’t align well with council’s organisational boundaries and timelines.

Shared values and aligned outcomes should be the starting point for partnership.

Long term commitment and vision is needed, but with flexibility to adapt.

### POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this

The policy states that Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.

A focus on long-term outcomes is also fundamental to the new approach. In future, all facility partnerships will be founded on shared goals and values, and this will be the focus for early discussions.

### Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope

The Auckland Plan and Māori Responsiveness Plans set out principles and expectations relating to the council’s relationship with Māori under Te Tiriti.

This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices.

### Relationships are the foundation for partnership.

Marae see deeper, enduring relationships as the basis for facility partnerships.

Some marae feel relationships have been lost post-amalgamation.

There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. Māori want more engagement ‘rangatira to rangatira’, and with local boards.

Council has high staff turnover, and its large size makes it difficult to navigate.

Written agreements may help support relationships by providing a reference point.

Generally, relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement.

### Relationships are fundamental to the new policy approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy.

Resources to support enduring relationships will be factored into future facility partnership decisions, e.g. dedicated relationship holders.

Written agreements will be prepared for all future facility partnerships.

### The council could improve ‘BAU’ relationships with marae and Māori-led organisations by:

- Nominating staff to hold and manage relationships
- Establishing stronger relationships between marae and elected members, especially local boards
- Supporting closer collaboration between marae

Council could improve consultation and engagement with Māori / marae by:

- Improving coordination of Māori engagement
- Exploring how marae could support Māori engagement
- Ensuring we ‘close the loop’ with Māori following consultation and engagement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka and council is complex and needs careful navigation. The two groups shouldn’t be conflated, or unnecessarily divided. Mana whenua and mataawaka want the opportunity to agree their own approach.</td>
<td>The policy outlines the distinction between mana whenua and mataawaka. Mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae / organisations are invited to consider facility partnerships.</td>
<td>The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to the differences between mana whenua and mataawaka and the implications of this. Prior to engagement and decision-making, the council should provide sufficient opportunity for mana whenua and mataawaka to discuss the right approach and convey this to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori want to take a more active role in policy-making around issues of particular significance to them. Many marae are eager and capable to participate in strategy / policy discussions. There may be a cost associated with supporting Māori capacity to engage.</td>
<td>The proposed decision-making process provides flexibility to umbrella facility partnerships with a broad range of Māori organisations. If needed, an alternative process taking specific account of the needs and interests of marae could be developed during implementation, in partnership with Māori.</td>
<td>The council could explore future opportunities for a collaborative policy-making with Māori. Marae are interested in supporting iwi and hapū to engage in strategic conversations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Treaty Principles

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts – the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

- **Rangatiratanga** – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

- **Partnership** – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

- **Active protection** – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

- **Ōritetanga / mutual benefit** – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, both would participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

- **Options** – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

- **The right of development** – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).
Appendix C: Research methodology

1. Research and advisory group formed
The research was designed, overseen and delivered by a cross-council project team with representatives from the following departments:

- Community and Social Policy
- The Southern Initiative
- Operations Māori Responsiveness Hub (Nga Waka Angamua)
- Māori Strategy and Relations (Te Waka Angamua)

2. Collated information about marae and Māori organisations, to inform sample
The team collated and reviewed information about marae in Tamaki Makaurau.
Additionally, we identified a small number of Māori organisations that have a facility-based component to their work and some form of relationship with council, comparable to the facility partnerships we researched during our first research phase.

3. Criteria developed and sample selected
A comprehensive set of criteria were developed and applied to help us select as ‘representative’ a sample as possible, acknowledging all marae and organisations would have a different experience and aspirations. We selected a sample of eight marae and four Māori organisations to provide a range of unique perspectives (refer Appendix D).

4. Representatives from selected marae / organisations and council counterparts identified
The team approached the marae / organisations to explain the research and request an interview. Seven marae and three organisations agreed to participate.

5. 11 key informant interviews held to discuss:
- The current role of the marae / organisation in the community
- Their aspirations for the future development of their marae / organisation
- Their past and present relationships with the council (or its predecessors)
- Perceptions of the strengths / advantages and challenges / disadvantages of working with the council
- Conceptions of ‘partnership’
- What marae / organisations would need or expect from council, if they were to enter into a ‘facility partnership’ with us.
(Refer Appendix C for a full list of questions.)

6. Interviews analysed, common themes identified and summarised
The team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. These were summarised in draft findings.

7. Draft findings taken to hui for validation

The team held findings hui at four of the participating marae to test the insights we had identified from the interviews with a broader roopu. We contracted specialist Kaupapa Māori designers from the Nga Aho collective to help design and facilitate the hui.

The hui were shaped partly in response to what we had learned through the informant interviews. For example, we:

- Participated in formal powhiri / mihi whakatau, and observed proper tikanga on the marae (including having kaikorero and kaikaranga to represent us)
- Laid down koha for our hosts in addition to venue hire fees, and offered native seedlings and kai to manaaki (show hospitality to) all attendees
- Invited staff from other council teams with a facility-related kaupapa that might have information or resources of interest to attendees (e.g. resource consents, civil defence and community grants). The intention was that they could learn from discussions, establish kanohi-te-kanohi (face-to-face) relationships and provide advice to attendees as a further form of koha for attendees' time. A total of 20 council staff attended marae (in addition to policy staff, project team and facilitators).

Each hui was guided by our hosts and followed a different format.

A total of 39 people attended hui on behalf of marae, Māori organisations and agencies.

Although our findings were validated by the feedback we received from participants, additional issues were also raised and are captured in this report.

8. Insights from discussions and hui used to shape the Facility Partnerships Policy

9. Findings shared through this report

10. Draft Facility Partnerships Policy shared at consultation hui

Hui will be convened as part of our consultation and engagement phase, to close the loop on the research and seek feedback on the draft. Participants in this research and those who attended our insights hui will be encouraged to attend.
Appendix D: Research sample and selection criteria

There are a diverse mix of mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae\(^1\) in Tamaki Makaurau, which range from small rural marae to large urban marae. Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapu, or are situated within school, church and institutional settings. Others play a broader community role, for example hosting organisations, services and activities onsite.

Although every marae is unique, we worked with a cross-council team to identify a research sample that would include marae with as wide a range of characteristics as possible.

The variables we considered in selecting the sample were:
- Location – across the Auckland region, and mix of urban and rural
- Iwi affiliation – mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere
- Use of the marae – whether the marae primarily serves the needs of iwi and hapu, or plays a wider role in the community
- Land ownership – Māori, council or privately owned
- Size of the marae (property and number of buildings / onsite facilities)
- Financial support from council (current and past)
- Age – from ancestral marae to newly established / emerging marae

Marae in our research sample
- **Hoani Watiti Marae\(^*\)**, Pan-tribal / Ngāti Whataua Kawerau a Maki, Glen Eden
- **Mataatua Marae\(^*\)**, Ngāti Awa ki Tamaki Makaurau te Hapu, Mangere
- **Puatahi Marae**, Ngāti Whatua, Kaipara Coast
- **Poa Whanake Marae (in development)**, Ngāti Paoa, Point England
- **Ruapotaka Marae\(^*\)**, Pan-tribal / Ngā Hau E Wha, Glen Innes
- **Tahuna Pa**, Waiohua Tainui, Awhitu

---

\(^1\) *Mana whenua*: Māori with territorial rights in Tamaki Makaurau, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

*Mataawaka*: Māori who are not mana whenua in Tamaki Makaurau and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawaka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

*Taurahere*: Māori in urban areas who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurahere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tamaki Makaurau, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop a marae for their Auckland-based members.
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- **Umupua Marae**, Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki, Maraetai

  *Hosted findings hui*

**Māori organisations in our research sample**

- **Te Roopu Waiora**, Manukau
  
  *Te Roopu Waiora Trust is a unique kaupapa Māori organisation founded in 2001 and governed by whanau with physical, sensory and intellectual disabilities.*

- **Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa**, Howick
  
  *Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa is a whare built in the Emilia Maud Nixon Garden of Memories which hosts Māori education programmes.*

- **Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust**, Auckland-wide
  
  *The Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust is a charitable trust established to support the revitalisation of a visible and vibrant ‘culture’ of waka for the benefit of all Aucklanders.*

  *Hosted findings hui*

**Additional marae and organisations that attended hui**

- Manurewa Marae
- Papakura Marae
- Te Atatu Marae
- Te Herenga Waka o Orewa Marae
- Papatuanuku Kokiri Marae
- Te Aroha Pā marae
- Ngai Tai ki Tamaki
- Ngā Kaitaiki Trust
- Healthy Families
- Te Puni Kōkiri
- Whanau Community Native Tree Nursery
Appendix E: Informant interview discussion guide

Questions that guided our discussions with marae and Māori organisation representatives:

1. Role
   - Role in relation to this marae / organisation
   - Role in the community that marae / organisation currently plays
   - Current experience / relationships with Auckland Council [or other large organisations if no relationship with council]

2. Collaborative relationships / partnerships
   - Describe what ‘partnership’ means to you?
   - What makes a good relationship?
   - Support [your marae/org] would want to receive from council if entering a ‘facility partnership’?

3. Positives
   - What do you see as the strengths or opportunities of working with Auckland Council?
   - How can we build on / maximise these strengths?
   - What would make [your marae/org] more likely to enter into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What strengths do you think marae offer as community facilities?

4. Challenges
   - What do you see as the challenges of working with Council? How might these be mitigated?
   - What would make [your marae/org] less likely to enter into a relationship like this?
   - What would be non-negotiable for you in entering into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What concerns would you have in entering this kind of relationship?
   - Are there any specific things about marae that we need to consider if entering into this kind of arrangement? (i.e. Tangi getting priority, maintaining the tikanga and mana of the marae etc.).

5. How could Auckland Council play a role in supporting you in these aspirations?
   - What are the specific aspirations for [your marae/org]?
   - What would an ideal ‘facility partnership’ look like to you?
Facility Partnerships Policy

Public feedback summary
This paper provides a summary of public feedback on the draft Facility Partnerships Policy, and an overview of the activities undertaken during the consultation period.

Key messages

- During July and August 2018 the public had the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft Facility Partnerships Policy.
- Seventy-one responses were received online, by email and at a series of public drop-in sessions run at community venues across Auckland.
- Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft policy overall. Those providing feedback generally saw the value of having a policy for this activity, and were positive about its intent. Responses to questions about specific aspects of the policy were also strongly affirmative.
- Concerns mainly focused on how the policy will be applied and how the new approach will work in practice, rather than the content of the policy itself.

Background


2. During July and August 2018, Community and Social Policy staff undertook a series of engagement activities on the draft policy. The intention was to gauge support for the proposed approach, and enable the draft to be refined before final adoption.

3. Staff engaged with local boards, advisory panels, members of the public and existing and prospective facility partners to outline the proposed approach and invite feedback on the draft.

4. A total of 71 public submissions were received on the draft policy during the consultation period. Anonymised comments from survey respondents have been included in the document.

Consultation questions

5. Public feedback was welcomed on any aspect of the policy, but respondents were invited to answer eight specific questions that tested key aspects of the policy:

   a) Do you think the draft policy clearly outlines the purpose and benefits of facility partnership?
   b) Do you think the Treaty Principles is an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori?
   c) Do you think the combination of Track, Type and Scale is a useful way to differentiate partnerships and ensure our processes and requirements are appropriate?
   d) Do you think these are the right principles to guide our investment in facility partnerships?
   e) Do you agree with the council’s position on commercial activities as part of facility partnerships, as outlined on pp. 31-32? Are there any commercial activities that you think should not be allowed?
f) Do you think the Lead Relationship Broker is the best approach to ensuring the council can support quality partnership relationships?

g) Do you think the ‘Agreement’ and ‘Facility’ sections provide a helpful overview of the technical aspects of facility partnerships? What else should be in these sections?

h) Did you find the policy document easy to read and navigate? Do you have any comments on how to improve it?

Key findings

6. Public feedback was highly supportive of the draft Facility Partnerships Policy overall. The responses to all of the specific questions asked were strongly affirmative, and the majority of respondents were positive about the intent and proposed approach of the draft policy.

7. Those providing feedback generally saw the value of having a policy for this activity. Some expressed frustrations with the process of initiating or maintaining a facility partnership in the past. They hoped that the new policy would lead to better investment decisions, and ensure that partnerships work for both partners and council. People also hoped the new approach would make it easier for partners to navigate council, get good support from council staff, and cut down on bureaucracy.

8. Respondents were positive about many specific aspects of the policy, particularly the investment principles, the proposal to enable appropriate commercial activities in facilities, and the establishment of Lead Relationship Brokers. The Track, Type and Scale model was welcomed for its ability to encompass a wide range of facility partnerships, and the intention to ensure processes and expectations are proportionate to the circumstances.

9. Where some respondents expressed criticism or concerns about the policy, it was more often about how it would be applied in practice than about the policy content itself. Some people were uncertain that the policy would be implemented as intended across the council, in a supportive and empowering way. Others questioned if the policy adequately allowed for the messy reality of facility partnerships.

10. Using the Treaty principles to guide partnerships with Māori was welcomed by most, but this was acknowledged as a complex area. Other concerns identified included how the investment principles will be applied and ‘traded off’, and whether some communities will be advantaged by the new approach.

11. Respondents appreciated the effort to make the policy document visually appealing and more accessible. While a number noted the complexity of the document, respondents generally found it easy to navigate and understandable.
Analysis of feedback by question

Do you think the draft policy clearly outlines the purpose and benefits of facility partnerships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Public feedback on this question was strongly positive. Of the 71 respondents 46 thought the policy clearly outlined the purpose and benefits of facility partnerships.

13. Respondents were positive about the clarity of the policy document and felt that it provided clear direction.

14. Three respondents did not agree that the policy clearly outlined purpose and benefits, and 15 thought it did so partially, while five were unsure. Comments included that facility partnerships need to work for both council and partners, but the policy tends to focus mostly on the council’s role.

15. Others recommended that evaluation of success should go both ways, with partners able to evaluate the council’s performance and hold staff accountable, as well as the other way around.

Do you think the Treaty Principles is an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. A majority of the respondents (38) agreed that using the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi was an appropriate way to guide facility partnerships with Māori.

17. Some noted that the Treaty is central to New Zealand and that the principles had the capacity to empower everyone, not just Māori. One noted that the use of these principles ought to extend wider than facility partnerships, and across all council’s relationships with Māori.

18. Twelve respondents disagreed that the principles were an appropriate guide, while 11 had mixed feelings. A number of these respondents objected to what they saw as they prioritisation of one ethnic group over others, and felt all communities in Auckland should be treated the same.

“This is a great way for both council and other organisations to provide well managed facilities effectively in the community.”

“(The policy) covers a broad spectrum of possibilities and defines concepts that have not been published before.”

“I think that upholding Te Ao Māori principles as a guide for partnerships with community organisations is a great idea.”

“Treaty principles are a useful starting point to guide facility partnerships with Māori. However, such principles are affected by multiple interpretations.”
19. One noted that partnerships with Māori will not always be marae or iwi-based. Another pointed out that a Treaty-based partnership would not begin or end with a facility, and that council will need to be responsive to non-facility issues to uphold the relationship.

**Do you think the combination of Track, Type and Scale is a useful way to differentiate partnerships and ensure our processes and requirements are appropriate?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. A significant majority of respondents (43) agreed that the Track, Type and Scale model was a useful way to differentiate partnerships and ensure that our processes and requirements are appropriate.

21. Among the reasons given for their agreement, respondents cited the model’s ability to cover a range of partnerships, the potential flexibility to move between categories over time, and the importance of having processes and expectations that are proportionate to the circumstances.

22. Five respondents disagreed that the dimensions were useful, while 13 considered them partially useful. A typical concern was that partnership arrangements are inherently complex and changeable, and this model may not be practical to implement.

**Do you think these are the right principles to guide our investment in facility partnerships?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. A significant majority of respondents (48) considered that the principles set out in the draft policy were the right ones to guide our investment. The sustainability and equity principles were particularly popular among respondents.

24. Seven respondents disagreed about the appropriateness of the principles, almost all because they considered that the principles would favour particular groups, e.g. areas with higher populations, more established sports or more affluent communities.

25. Thirteen respondents had mixed views on the principles. These included concerns about whether or how the principles would be traded off against each other, whether all parts of the council (including CCOs) would be equally committed to the principles, and how equity would be defined in practice.
Do you agree with the council’s position on commercial activities as part of facility partnerships, as outlined on pp. 31-32? Are there any commercial activities that you think should not be allowed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Forty-one respondents agreed with the council’s position that some appropriate commercial activity is reasonable in facilities.

27. Some noted that commercial activity could be complementary to the purpose of the facility, and in some cases those revenue streams would be necessary for a facility to be sustainable over time.

28. A number of respondents were not supportive of commercial activities that are potentially harmful to healthy living. Alcohol sales, gambling activities, loan sharks and sex work were specifically mentioned as activities that should not be supported in our facilities.

29. Some respondents pointed out that commercial operators would need to be willing to align their activities with the principles set out in the policy.

30. Six respondents disagreed with commercial activities in facilities. Some felt businesses had no place in community settings, and felt facilities ought to stick to ‘core services’. Others saw the proposal as council shifting responsibility for funding facilities to their partners and the community, or privatising community assets.

31. Seventeen respondents were in partial agreement, reinforcing the need for controls around the types of commercial activities to ensure that they would enhance and sustain the community purpose of the facility, and noting the importance of council doing proper due diligence in these cases. Some respondents felt community facilities shouldn’t be competing with the private sector.

32. A number of respondents pointed out the complexity of the planning rules affecting some sites, which may work against commercial activities in these facilities.

Do you think a Lead Relationship Broker is the best approach to ensuring the council can support quality partnership relationships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The idea of appointing a lead relationship broker for each partnership was popular, with 41 respondents expressing agreement.

“It is going to be essential to have some commercial activity to allow [our] new facility to break even and encourage people through the doors... the days of single purpose fully volunteer run organisations are numbered.”

“My initial reaction was “no” but I think it’s articulated quite sensibly.”

“I am fully supportive of the position on commercial activity. However, I worry that [this] policy on its own will not effect the changes required. Layers of intersecting rules and regulations remain which restrict the financial viability of community owned facilities. I think council needs to review this whole landscape.”

“Having one person who understands your facility and the community that uses it is key.”
34. Many respondents agreed that establishing a broker position would make the council much easier for partners to navigate, given its size and complexity. Many saw the role as critical to the success of ongoing partnership relationships, helping to ensure consistency of advice across departments, and streamlining communications and paperwork.

35. Nine respondents didn’t feel that the role would be useful. The most commonly expressed concern was that creating these roles meant more council staff would need to be hired, which was a waste of money, and/or that it would create additional layers of bureaucracy.

36. Sixteen respondents saw the potential of the role, but had some reservations. The most common reservation was uncertainty that the role would work in practice, and in particular if it would be properly resourced. Some respondents expressed a lack of trust in the council and questioned whether it could deliver on the intent of the role, and work in a way that genuinely supports community.

37. A number of respondents emphasised that the broker would need to have particular skills to be useful to partners, and ideally be supported by a wider team to ensure a partnership wasn’t reliant on the support and abilities of a single person. This would also help to manage transitions if council staff leave, maintaining relationship continuity.

Do you think the ‘Agreement’ and ‘Facility’ sections provide a helpful overview of the technical aspects of facility partnerships? What else should be in these sections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. These sections of the policy were intended to provide an overview of some of the considerations relating to the partnership agreement or the facility itself that will have to be considered as part of a partnership.

39. Thirty-nine of the respondents agreed that it succeeded in doing this, while six disagreed.

40. Fifteen respondents partially agreed but had some reservations. Comments included that although these sections were an improvement they still failed to reflect the messy reality, that they were too complicated, and that council decisions always took too long.

41. One respondent felt the policy ought to further clarify the difference between owning and operating a facility, and give further attention to professionalising facility management.

“[A lead broker is an] absolutely fantastic idea. We find that staff changes and a lack of knowledge of who to go to for help a HUGE CHALLENGE.”

“The proposed broker role needs to be resourced to do it well. Depending on the type and scale of the partnership [this] could be a significant amount of work. There WILL be a temptation to just add the workload on top of existing staff responsibilities.”

“Community groups have to go to extraordinary lengths to demonstrate a need for a facility. This process is resource-intensive. Most groups do not have access to such resources, even those that appear well-funded.”
Do you find the policy easy to navigate? Do you have any comments on how to improve it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Quite easy</th>
<th>Neither easy nor difficult</th>
<th>Quite difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. A majority of respondents (35) who expressed an opinion on the ease of the policy found it either easy or very easy to navigate.

43. For a significant number of respondents (19) the policy was neither easy nor difficult to navigate.

44. Those who found the policy difficult noted its complexity, and suggested there were areas where language could be simplified. While some specifically commended the font size and style, others found the size of the font too small.

45. There was a suggestion that more examples of current partnerships could make the policy easier to navigate and understand.

“We appreciate the efforts to make the document visually appealing, less intense and more accessible. The frequent use of images and tables rather than plain text aids understanding.”
Outline of public consultation activities

46. Information about the policy and the public consultation activities were distributed through the council’s email databases of existing and prospective facility partners, community group networks and other interested parties, with encouragement to disseminate more widely.

47. The regional sports body Aktive Auckland distributed the consultation information to sports organisations and clubs on our behalf.

48. Staff attended meetings with the Ethnic People’s, Rainbow Communities and Pacific Peoples advisory panels at their request, to provide a briefing on the policy and answer questions. Panels were also provided with the consultation information to circulate to their networks.

49. A story about the policy and the public consultation was published in Our Auckland in July.

Online submissions invited via ‘Have Your Say’

50. Online submissions were invited on the draft policy on Auckland Council’s Have Your Say website between 29 June and 17 August 2018.

51. We also received a small number of submissions via email.

Public drop-in sessions for face-to-face enquiries

52. The team offered six public drop-in sessions during July and August in community venues across south, central west, and north Auckland.

53. The public drop-in sessions provided people with an opportunity to come and view the policy in large format, take printed copies away and fill in feedback forms by hand if they wished.

54. Public consultation sessions were held as drop-ins rather than presentations to make it easier for people to get across the large amount of information, while zeroing in on the parts of the policy most of interest to them.

55. More importantly, the walkthroughs gave community organisations the chance to speak to one of the team about their individual situations, and what the policy might mean for them. This was definitely the main reason most attendees chose to come and visit, and people really valued the chance to have a chat with us in person.

56. Public drop-in sessions were held in:

- Manukau
- Pukekohe
- Three Kings
- Central Auckland
- Kelston
- Takapuna
- Warkworth

57. Staff also ran a stall at the Diversity Forum in Manukau on July 24.
Characteristics of online respondents

58. Feedback was received from the majority of local board areas and was fairly evenly distributed across the city. The most responses were received from the Rodney (9), Franklin (8), Devonport-Takapuna (7), Waitakaruru (5) and Albert Eden (5) local board areas. No responses were received from the Great Barrier, Papakura, Puketapapa and Whau local board areas.

59. We received 32 responses to the policy from men, 28 from women and two from gender diverse people. Nine respondents declined to give their gender.

60. Respondents to the draft policy were largely European. 50 of the 71 total responses were from people who identified as European. The next largest ethnic group who provided responses was Māori, at seven responses.

61. As a result, this feedback may not fully express the views of Māori, who the policy acknowledges have particular views and needs when it comes to partnering with the council, and it may also not give a complete picture of the views of other ethnic groups.

62. Feedback was received from a wide range of age groups (see table below). Those between the ages of 35 and 74 were the most likely to submit on the draft policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>