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BRIEFING

Digital technology in elections
Efficiency versus credibility?

SUMMARY

Digital technology brings greater efficiency in many walks of life, and elections are no exception. Online databases hugely facilitate the task of creating and managing accurate and up-to-date electoral rolls. In less developed countries, whose citizens often lack reliable identity documents, biometric technology can help to identify voters, thus preventing fraud in the form of multiple voting.

However, for some aspects of election management, digitalisation is more controversial. Electronic voting machines count votes quickly and accurately. First used in the United States, they have spread to several Latin American and Asian countries. However, the intangible nature of digital processes makes detecting tampering more difficult; as a result, most European countries are sticking to tried-and-trusted conventional paper ballots.

Even more controversial is the idea of internet voting. On the one hand, allowing citizens the convenience of casting their vote online without the need to visit polling stations could help to reverse a worrying decline in voter turnout across the world. On the other hand, current technology does not allow internet voting systems to be fully secured against hackers, a major concern given the growing sophistication of cyber-attacks (for example, from Russia). To date, only Estonia gives all voters the option of online voting in national elections.

In many countries, voting machines have replaced the traditional paper ballot.
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Benefits of digital technology in elections

Compared to traditional paper-based procedures, digital technology offers multiple benefits at all stages of elections, from registering voters to counting ballots. 

**Voter registration**: accurate voter registers are vital to enabling all eligible persons to exercise their right to vote and eliminating fraud. Digital technology considerably facilitates the process of creating registers. Most **EU countries** extract data from population registers to generate an electoral roll. In countries where electoral rolls are created from scratch, technology can also help; for example, voters register in Australia via an **online form**, whereas Tanzanians fill out a machine-readable paper form that is then fed into a scanner.

The difficulty of updating and cross-checking paper-based electoral rolls heightens the risk of including deceased voters or multiple records of the same person, creating opportunities for electoral fraud. By contrast, digital registers are more manageable.

Creating accurate voter registers is particularly difficult in countries where citizens lack identification documents — as many as 40% of those eligible to vote in **low-income countries**. The lack of a reliable method of checking identity allows many people to register more than once — in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), over 700,000 persons (1% of the total population) were found to have done so ahead of the 2011 elections. To prevent this, **45 countries** (mostly in Africa) use fingerprint scanning. Paradoxically, some of the least developed countries in the world have become leaders in the use of biometric technology in elections, precisely because of the lack of reliable identity documents and population registers; Somaliland (see box) has even used iris scanning.

**Voter identity verification**: on the day of the vote, election workers need to check voter identity against the electoral roll. This becomes much easier if polling stations have access to accurate and up-to-date voter information in an online register, used in Norway, Mongolia and 17 other countries.

In many African countries, a lack of reliable identity documents is a problem not only at voter registration but on election day itself. Guinea, the DRC and Liberia are among several countries which deal with this issue by issuing voters with a special card when they register, which they can use to identify themselves at polling stations (a side benefit is that the cards can also be used as an **identity document** (ID) in other administrative procedures). In Kenya, Ghana or Nigeria, the card includes a fingerprint that is scanned at the polling station to check that the identity of the voter matches that of the cardholder. Altogether, **45 countries** use biometric data for identification purposes, which can include fingerprints, facial photographs (in India) and signatures.

Multiple voting is a serious problem in many countries (for example Russia, where the practice is known as **carousel voting**). To prevent this, many countries (such as Malaysia) mark voters’ fingers with **ink**, which is not however completely indelible. Inking also makes abstainers conspicuous — a problem in countries where they may come under pressure from authorities keen to legitimise rigged elections by maximising turnout (as in Cambodia’s 2018 parliamentary election). Conversely, in 2014, some Afghan voters had their fingers chopped off for failing to comply with a Taliban call to boycott elections. Compared to inking, biometric identification provides a secure and discreet means of preventing multiple voting.

**Vote casting**: illiteracy increases the frequency of invalid votes, as voters cannot read ballot papers or instructions on how to mark them. For example, in **India** (where 31% of adults are illiterate), large
numbers of ballots were previously discarded, due to mistakes such as not marking the ballot in the right place or in more than one place; in many elections the number of discarded votes was higher than the margin of victory, casting doubt on the validity of the result. User-friendly electronic voting machines introduced in 2003 have eliminated this problem; voters now only need to activate a button next to the relevant party logo, widely publicised during election campaigns. In systems where voters fill in and scan paper ballots rather than pressing a button on a machine, the scanner can be programmed to accept only correctly completed ballots.

Electronic voting systems can include safeguards against ballot box stuffing, formerly a common practice in remote parts of India, where criminals or political activists seized control of polling stations to stuff boxes with ballots for a favoured candidate. Voting machines, which are programmed to record a maximum of five votes per minute, have made such practices much harder, as stuffing takes an impractically long time, even if the machines fall into the wrong hands.

Electronic voting machines are often more accessible for disabled voters. In the United States, visually impaired voters can use an audio interface, while those with paralysed limbs can select candidates from a screen using head movements.

**Vote counting** technology enables faster vote counting. In India, counting the results from voting machines takes between two and three hours per constituency, including the time needed for checks, which previously took days for paper votes. It also reduces the scope for human error and saves money through recruiting fewer poll workers.

**Results transmission and tabulation** are the processes of sending the results of the vote count from polling stations to a central polling office and aggregating them to give total results (at constituency or national level). With paper-based processes, collecting and calculating results from thousands of polling stations country-wide is often the slowest part of the process; with digital technology, results can be transmitted electronically (for example, over the internet or by mobile phone) and aggregated by computer, allowing at least preliminary results to be announced quickly (most countries also carry out paper checks before the final outcome is confirmed).

**Standards for digital technology in elections**

Like any other election, polls carried out with the help of digital technologies must comply with the general principles set out in Article 25 of the UN’s 1966 *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*: universal and equal suffrage and secrecy of the ballot. International standards addressing the specific characteristics of electronic voting and other voting technology do not yet exist. However, the Council of Europe's *Recommendation on standards for e-voting* (adopted in 2004, updated in 2017) is a useful reference. Among other things, it recommends that:

- voters should be reliably identified;
- voter interfaces should be easy to understand and use for all voters;
- voters should have the chance to confirm their vote before casting it;
- after casting their vote, voters should be able to check that it has been correctly cast;
- voting should be anonymous;
- all aspects of the vote must be fully transparent;
- electronic voting systems must be tested and certified by an independent body.

With regard to personal data held in voter registers, standards vary from one country to another; US and Canadian standards are more liberal, enabling political parties to conduct targeted campaigns based on data, whereas most European countries have greater restrictions on access to voter data.

**Problems and solutions for electoral technology**

Nearly all countries now use digital technology for at least some aspects of election management. Creating and managing voter registers, as well as transmitting and tabulating results have been digitalised in nearly all countries.
Conversely, electronic vote-casting has been less universally adopted; in developing democracies, where elections have often been marred by fraud, it is – rightly or wrongly – often seen as a means of ensuring a more credible poll. As a result, voting machines and other electronic voting systems are becoming increasingly widespread in Latin America, as well as in the Middle and Far East. In contrast, European countries are more reticent, preferring tried-and-trusted traditional methods, with a manual count of paper ballots to experimenting with potentially unreliable new technologies.

Main concerns

Reliability

Although it reduces the scope for human error, digital technology is not infallible. Biometric voter identification is a case in point. Venezuela uses digital fingerprint checking, in addition to photo ID cards, to authenticate voters; in 11% of cases, the system was unable to match voters’ fingerprints with those recorded in the electoral roll. After experiencing a similar failure rate in trials, Pakistan decided not to use fingerprint scanning in the 2018 general elections, despite its success in identifying thousands of fraudulent multiple votes. Iris scanning is a more reliable biometric identification method, but it is also more expensive, and to date has only been used in Somaliland.

Technology can also fail at other stages of the process. For example, in Kenya’s August 2017 poll, electronic transmission software malfunctioned in many parts of the country, delaying results and raising suspicions of fraud that ultimately led to elections being annulled.

Protection from electoral fraud

When electoral authorities are corrupt or negligent, digital technology does not provide an instant fix against fraud. In Venezuela’s 2017 election, for example, turnout was allegedly overstated by at least one million votes (out of a population of 32 million). In the DRC in 2011, over 700,000 voters were able to register twice (see above); when election authorities’ failure to carry out a timely audit meant that the electoral roll could not be amended in time for elections in the same year.

Far from preventing electoral fraud, digitalisation could even facilitate it in some cases. This particularly applies to electronic voting machines. Critics of such devices point out that, with paper ballots, large-scale physical tampering can easily be spotted by election observers, provided they have reasonably unrestricted access to polling stations. In Russia’s 2011 parliamentary elections, election officials were caught on camera apparently stuffing ballot boxes in an effort to swing the vote in favour of the ruling United Russia party. In contrast, electronic manipulation of invisible digital processes inside voting machines can be much harder to detect, especially when there is no back-up system recording the vote on paper. For this reason, opposition politicians in the DRC are suspicious of the country’s plan to introduce electronic voting machines for the December 2018 presidential election.

Electronic voting systems are also vulnerable to external attacks: attempts by Kremlin-linked hackers to break into electoral computers from over 20 US states during the 2016 presidential election have raised awareness of this problem. Admittedly, proven cases of electronic tampering are rare, but the fact that they are seldom detected does not mean that they do not occur.

Civil society activists have repeatedly demonstrated the vulnerability of electronic voting systems. In 2006, the Dutch We do not trust voting computers’ movement refuted manufacturer’s claims that voting machines were tamper-proof by reprogramming them to play chess. The following year, studies carried out in California and Ohio on machines from a range of manufacturers found serious security flaws. In Indian voting machines, vote-recording and vote-counting functions are hard-wired into circuits, instead of being run on software, thereby preventing reprogramming; nevertheless, in 2010, hackers were able to illicitly obtain and physically modify an Indian machine to be controlled from a mobile phone. Such experiments show that, once hackers understand how voting machines work, they can develop compromising procedures, requiring a few minutes of
physical access, perhaps where machines are stored between elections, or even in the privacy of the voting booth. Attacks of this nature may be virtually undetectable, even by election staff or observers with specialist training; for example, software installed by hackers on voting machines can be programmed to erase itself after modifying the vote.

Computer scientists have criticised the poor quality of electronic voting software on many machines, which makes them vulnerable to such attacks. However, they also acknowledge that the complexity of such programs, which typically contain hundreds of thousands of lines of code, make elimination of all security flaws virtually impossible. Physical safeguards (such as tamper-proof seals on voting machines) are also not infallible.

Unaddressed security concerns have led several countries to abandon electronic voting. In 2007, the Netherlands decided to return to paper ballots after a decade of using voting machines, one year after the Irish government dropped its electronic voting project, despite having spent over €50 million on equipment.

Voting machines are not the only vulnerability. Tabulation processes have also been targeted by hackers, for example in South Africa’s 1994 election. Election officials had to tabulate results manually after it was found that, in an apparent attempt to thwart an electoral victory by Nelson Mandela’s African National Congress, the computer processing the votes had been set to transfer votes to three right-wing parties.

Auditable electronic voting

When the only record of a vote is digital, there is a risk of it being lost irretrievably, due to hacking, as explained in the previous section, or malfunction (for example, in a 2008 California election where a software bug deleted 200 votes). For this reason, back-up systems providing a physical record that can be checked whenever there are doubts as to the digitally recorded result are useful.

Paper voting records can take the form of a printout generated by voting machines after the vote has been cast (known as a voter-verifiable paper audit trail, VVPAT), or a paper ballot completed by the voter and read by a scanner. Arguably, combined electronic and paper-based vote recording is more secure than purely paper-based or electronic recording, as both systems would have to be compromised simultaneously. For this reason, VVPATs in electronic voting systems are recommended by the Council of Europe, and compulsory in 32 US states and the District of Columbia.

However, despite the obvious security benefits of electronic systems generating an auditable paper trail, they are far from being a universal standard. Paperless systems are still used by a quarter of US voters, in Brazil, Namibia and India, among other reasons, due to their lower cost (however, in 2017 India announced plans to add a VVPAT to its voting machines).

Verifiability

Related to auditability is the concept of verifiability, meaning that voting processes can be checked not only by election workers and monitors, but also by voters themselves. Traditional voting procedures are partially verifiable; voters can easily see that they have correctly marked their ballot papers and fed them into the ballot box. Given that boxes are typically locked, they can also feel reasonably confident that their ballots are secure until boxes are emptied for counting. In contrast, voting computers are ‘black boxes’; ordinary voters do not understand how they work, and therefore have no way of knowing whether their vote has been correctly recorded. On this basis, Germany’s constitutional court ruled in 2009 that the type of voting machine in use at the time was not sufficiently transparent; since then, the country has returned to using paper ballots.

Electronic systems ensuring a paper trail offer more verifiability than purely paperless systems; although the primary means of recording the vote is still electronic, voters at least know that election workers will check paper records in the event results are challenged. However, for developers of new electronic voting technology, the ultimate goal is an end-to-end verifiable voting (E2EV) system.
Such systems would eliminate electoral fraud by enabling voters to verify not only that their vote is cast as intended, but also correctly recorded and counted – something that neither traditional paper ballots nor electronic systems are currently capable of delivering. In theory, the simplest way to achieve such a goal would be to publish voters’ names and their choices, but this would contradict the principle of ballot secrecy. Scantegrity, developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is one of several systems developed to avoid this problem; it replaces voter names and choices with randomly allocated codes, which voters are allowed to take home if they wish. Once all votes are counted, voters can use their codes to check online that their vote was recorded correctly; moreover, anyone can check the complete tally to ensure that it is mathematically correct. Developers of the system calculate that even if only 2% of voters take advantage of the opportunity to verify the vote that is enough to foil attempted electoral fraud.

Scantegrity has been used in binding political elections (in 2009 and 2011, municipal elections in the Maryland city of Takoma Park; however, a study found that the complexity of this and other E2E systems makes them difficult for voters to use, and adoption is slow.

Testing and certification

Given their vulnerability to electoral fraud, new technology should be thoroughly tested before being certified for use. The Council of Europe recommends that tests be carried out not only by manufacturers but also by an independent and competent body. In the United States, such tests are run by independent laboratories accredited by the election assistance commission. Unfortunately, the effectiveness and impartiality of such tests have often been questioned by researchers, who found serious security flaws in equipment that had been certified for use.

Tests can be more effective when they bring in outside persons, such as activists who are keen to highlight flaws overlooked by official testing bodies. In 2010, the US District of Columbia invited the public to test its proposed internet voting system; the system was abandoned after being infiltrated by hackers. India’s electoral authorities were less receptive to criticism, repeatedly and categorically rejecting claims of flaws in voting machines; in 2010, an activist who proved otherwise was arrested for theft. In an attempt at more openness, in June 2017, India’s electoral commission invited computer experts to attempt to break into its machines; however, sceptics complained that conditions at the ‘hackathon’ were too restrictive to allow real testing.

Trust

Digital technology often meets resistance when it fails to win voter and political party trust. In Venezuela, one-quarter of voters suspected that fingerprinting checking devices could be used by authorities to trace how they had voted; similar concerns were expressed in Armenia.

In many countries, electronic voting machines’ failure to win trust has led to civil society resistance and the abandonment of electronic voting – particularly in European countries such as Ireland, the Netherlands and Germany, but also in Paraguay.

Claims of technological malfunction are often politically motivated – for example in India, where losing parties have a tendency to blame voting machines for poor results. Whether or not such accusations are unfounded, they can seriously undermine voters’ trust in democratic processes. Kenya’s August 2017 elections had to be annulled after delayed results led to suspicions of fraud.

For digital technology to win essential voter trust, the conditions outlined in the preceding paragraphs – adequate security, transparent checks and testing – should be met. Election monitors should be given access to technical systems used at all stages of the electoral process, from voter registration through to tabulation. In addition, to give voters time to get used to electronic voting, the Council of Europe recommends introduction ‘in a gradual and progressive manner’. Indeed, this was the approach followed in Belgium, which in 1991 tried out voting machines in two constituencies before gradually adding more locations.
Practical considerations

Cost efficiency

Digitalisation entails multiple costs: purchasing equipment, training staff, updating software to deal with evolving cyber-threats, and secure equipment storage between elections. In countries with high labour costs, such expenditure can be offset by personnel savings, but in developing countries, the outlay may never be recovered. For example, in 2006, the DRC spent over US$40 million on biometric registration kits. With such sums at stake, there is significant scope for corrupt practices, for example in the DRC’s procurement of registration equipment. Furthermore, given that funding is limited, heavy IT expenditure diverts resources that could perhaps be better used to deal with fundamental challenges faced by many developing countries, such as election-related violence and vote buying.

Despite the costs, digital technology can be a worthwhile investment for developing countries. By eliminating multiple voting, biometric identification can help to secure acceptance of the results and reduce the risk of post-election violence (for example, in Nigeria’s 2015 elections).

Logistical constraints in developing countries

In developing countries, electoral equipment is transported and used in hot and dusty conditions, by voters who are often illiterate and have limited experience of electronic devices. To deal with such problems, Indian voting machines have a simple and robust design, and an easy-to-use interface; they are also cheap to manufacture, compared to the more sophisticated devices used in Europe and North America. For these reasons, Indian-made machines are also used in Namibia, which became the first African country to adopt electronic voting in 2014.

Given erratic power supplies and internet connections, battery-powered devices which work offline are the norm – for example, India’s voting machines or the authentication equipment used in several African countries (e.g. Nigeria). In the majority of developing countries with digital electoral rolls (for example: India, Brazil, Nigeria), polling stations use an offline list that works without an internet connection, rather than accessing a central online database. Most also have printed lists, in case electronic equipment fails. The value of having a paper back-up was demonstrated in Kenya’s 2013 election, when electronic voter identification devices failed to work in most polling stations.

Technological options for electronic voting

Optical scan

Optical scan technology was first used in 1962, in California. In the USA, over half of voters now fill out their vote by pen on a machine-readable paper ballot and insert them into a secure ballot box. The vote is read by an optical scanner, either before the paper is fed into the ballot box, or afterwards, when the box is opened by election workers.

Optical scanning has several advantages. For voters, the procedure is very similar to the conventional method of filling out a paper ballot and putting it in a secure box; it is therefore easy to use, and may also seem more trustworthy. Paper ballots are kept for possible recounts in case the electronically recorded result is questioned.

Direct recorded electronic

Also pioneered in the USA (where they were first used in 1975), direct recorded electronic (DRE) voting machines have an interface – typically a touch screen, or physical buttons – on which voters record their votes. The absence of paper ballots simplifies electoral organisation, as there is no need to print and transport them in advance. The interface can offer options (such as different languages or font sizes) making it easier to use for certain voters. DRE machines are globally the most widespread option, used in the United States, India, Brazil, France and Belgium among other
countries. However, the lack of an auditable hard-copy record has undermined the credibility of some DRE machines; in the United States, their use has declined from 38% coverage of the electorate in 2006, to around one quarter in 2016.

To remedy this defect, many modern DRE devices also print voter choices (often onto a paper roll, of the type used in cash registers). However, this is not entirely satisfactory: voting information is printed in small letters, making it difficult for voters (and election officials, in the event of a recount) to read; the printed record retains votes in the order in which they were cast, theoretically enabling identification of voters; and few voters bother to check that their vote has been correctly recorded, giving electoral fraud a better chance of passing undetected.

Internet voting

Internet voting (sometimes referred to as i-voting, as distinct from the broader concept of e-voting, which refers to electronic vote counting and recording) is a much more radical departure from traditional procedures than either of the two above options, as it allows electors to vote from home, without having to visit a polling station. For this reason, it presents specific benefits and risks, and remains highly controversial; several countries have piloted online voting, but Estonia is the only country to use it for all categories of voter in national elections.

Online voting potentially improves voter turnout

Since 1980, the average percentage of citizens turning out to vote in national parliamentary elections across the world has declined from 76% to 66%. In EU countries, a similar decline can be seen in turnout for elections to the European Parliament. Insofar as they reflect scepticism towards democratic institutions, these trends are worrying. In this context, internet voting could, at least in theory, help to boost turnout by making voting more convenient for those who find it difficult to get to a polling station. In many countries (for example, the UK), young people are particularly reluctant to vote and online voting might be a more appealing option for them.

Whether this happens in practice is unclear, as limited data are available. In Estonia (see Figure 1), the only country to have used this technology at national level over a longer period, i-voting has certainly proved popular. Since 2005, the first time that the technology was used, when just 2% of votes were cast online, the share of i-votes has steadily increased to reach 32% in the most recent local elections (2017). However, the effect on overall turnout is much less clear; participation in 2009 local and European elections rose considerably, but most of the initial gains have since been lost, perhaps suggesting that the ability of i-voting to draw in new voters declines once the novelty effect wears off.

Results from other countries are equally inconclusive. In 2007, the UK trialled i-voting in municipal elections; the percentage of voters choosing to vote online was mostly quite low (as little as 3.4% in one case). Around one quarter of online voters declared that they would not have voted if online voting channels had not been available. However, with only five
local councils participating in the trial and a lack of comparable data from a longer period, it is impossible to say whether overall turnout benefited. A 2017 study on Switzerland also failed to find any significant impact.

**Saving money**

In countries such as Switzerland and Estonia where internet voting has been trialled, it has been offered as an alternative rather than a replacement for traditional voting. Expenditure on internet voting systems is therefore additional to polling station operating costs. Conversely, these additional costs can easily be offset if enough people vote online, fewer staff are needed at polling stations to receive voters and count ballots. In 2007, Estonia’s national electoral committee put the costs of developing and implementing i-voting over four years at just €400 000; it also estimates that in 2017, i-voting saved 11 000 working days; the net cost savings are therefore considerable. From a financial point of view, i-voting is a particularly attractive option for countries which hold frequent elections or referenda (such as Switzerland).

**A convenient way of voting**

Internet voting is a convenient solution for voters who are physically unable to reach polling stations. Some US states allow armed forces personnel and overseas voters to vote online. The Australian state of New South Wales allows this option for voters who are out of state on polling day, as well as certain categories of disabled person and those who live more than 20 kilometres from the nearest polling station.

**The main argument against i-voting: security risks**

Despite all the potential advantages, i-voting has made very little headway, mainly due to the risk of hacking. Many personal computers or mobile devices used to vote online are poorly defended; in 2014, an estimated one-third were infected with malware, potentially enabling ill-intentioned persons to spy on voters or worse, vote for them. An even bigger risk is that hackers could attack electoral authorities’ servers to manipulate the results. Even very well-defended systems are not invulnerable: hackers have found security flaws in systems belonging to Google and Microsoft, and even the Pentagon. Although there is no evidence that Estonian internet voting has been compromised, it would be an obvious target for Kremlin-linked hackers. In 2014, cybersecurity experts therefore recommended that Estonia discontinue i-voting, arguing that i-voting could not be made safe. Australia’s electoral authorities have ruled out i-voting for federal elections given the risk of ‘catastrophically compromising our electoral integrity’.

Security objections can also be made against postal voting, used by many countries as a solution for voters unable to vote in person (or even, in the US states of Oregon, Washington and Colorado, as the main voting method). However, while there is a risk of individual postal votes falling into the wrong hands, it would be very difficult for election fraudsters to intercept such large numbers as could be possible with votes sent over the Internet.

**Advocates of i-voting** argue that even if it cannot be made fully secure, risks can at least be reduced to an acceptable level, in the same way as online banking and shopping. However, large-scale electoral fraud has the potential to undermine trust in democracy – a more serious consequence than the economic losses caused by financial fraud. Moreover, it is far more difficult to detect: online bank clients are more likely to notice money missing from their accounts, than any direct impact of their vote being hijacked, and in the absence of a paper back-up, election workers cannot audit the results.

To remedy this defect, since 2013, Estonians can check that their votes have been cast as intended, using E2EVV technology (see above). Voter verification cannot prevent fraud, but it can at least help to detect it. However, there are limitations, critics point out the verification software is not fully secure, and in any case only a small minority of voters (4% in 2017 local elections) bother to check.
Other problems with i-voting

1-voting potentially compromises ballot secrecy, as it is impossible to guarantee that nobody is watching voters as they submit their ballots. It therefore opens the door to voter coercion or even vote buying. To exclude this possibility, Estonia allows citizens to re-cast their votes an unlimited number of times during a seven-day period, or, after the expiry of that period, to override their internet choice by voting in person. Internet voting potentially discriminates against persons who are less comfortable with digital technology or lack access to high-quality internet services. It also removes the traditional symbolism of voters heading for polling stations as a public expression of citizenship. However, neither of these arguments applies where i-voting merely complements rather than replaces voting in person – which is still the preferred option, even in Estonia.

EU position: EU electoral monitoring guidelines emphasise the need for observers to assess the use of technologies such as biometric identification and electronic voting machines – but also acknowledge that a full technical analysis is likely to exceed their capacity.

The EU election observation mission reports vary in their assessments of digital electoral technologies. EU observers in Peru praised the country for its ‘largely successful’ partial introduction of electronic voting in 2016; however, at the 2017 Kenya election, they were more critical, noting that technology was ‘extremely controversial’, and emphasising the need for digital systems to be ‘tried and tested, secure and publicly accountable’.

European Parliament resolutions of November 2015 on reforming EU electoral law and of March 2017 on e-democracy in the EU recognise the potential of technology to enhance democracy by enabling certain groups (for examples, expatriates or disabled people) to vote, but also insist on the need to prevent fraud and ensure voter secrecy.

ENDNOTES

1 In almost all countries, voters must be registered to be eligible to vote. Registration can be active (citizens have to apply individually to register), or passive (state authorities compile the voter registers themselves using civil status records or other public sources).
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Digital technology in elections

Figure 2 – Countries that use electronic voting (Use of optical scanning or direct recorded electronic technology to record and/or count votes in politically binding elections)

- **Ireland**: dropped its plans to use voting machines in 2006 after deciding that they were not secure enough.
- **The Netherlands**: stopped using voting machines in 2007 after anti-voting activists demonstrated that they were insecure.
- **Germany**: stopped using voting machines in 2009 after its Constitutional Court ruled they were not sufficiently transparent.
- **Kyrgyzstan**: still counts all votes manually, but uses optical scanners to double check.
- **Russia**: in the 2018 presidential election, around 16% of polling stations were equipped with voting machines.
- **Mongolia**: has used voting machines since 2010.
- **Bangladesh**: plans to use Indian-made voting machines for national elections in 2019.
- **India**: introduced voting machines in 1998 and now uses them in all elections. Cheap and robust, Indian voting technology is also used in several other developing countries.
- **The Philippines**: has used voting machines since 1995.
- **Indonesia**: is trialling voting machines and hopes to use them for national elections in 2019.

**United States**: the US was the first country to pioneer electronic voting technology in the 1960s. Over 90% of votes in federal, state, and local elections are recorded electronically, though manual counting persists in a few counties. A mix of optical scan and DRE technologies is used.

**Brazil**: since 2005, all national elections have been fully automated. Brazil’s success has encouraged several other Latin American countries to follow suit.

**Paraguay**: experimented with voting machines banned from Brazil in the early 2000s, but in 2008 decided to return to paper ballots.

**Argentina**: although most parts of the country use paper ballots, some districts have used machines. A plan to use them across the country for 2019 was dropped as voting machines were not considered sufficiently secure.

**Namibia**: became the first African country to use voting machines in 2014.

**DR Congo**: plans to use voting machines in December 2018 elections, but there are doubts whether the machines will work.

**Ukraine**: introduced voting machines for its 2017 local elections, but did not use them for the presidential election held simultaneously.

**Germany**: still counts all votes manually, but uses optical scanners to double check.

Electronic voting has fallen out of favour in most European countries, but is gaining ground in Latin America, as well as the Middle and Far East.

Several countries have experimented with internet voting, but only Estonia has used it extensively.

Memorandum

To: Devonport Takapuna Local Board Members

cc: Tristan Coulson, Senior Local Board Advisor

Maureen Buchanan, Local Board Advisor

Subject: Supplementary Information Food Scraps Service Report

From: George Fietje, Resource Recovery Manager; Waste Solutions
Sophien Brockbank, Team Leader Strategic Planning; Waste Solutions

Purpose
To provide supplementary information for the proposal to continue food scraps trial collection service and levy targeted rate

Feedback
Organics Collection Service Follow-Up research
A research project was undertaken in December 2016. It included 588 North Shore trial area households and two focus groups of North Shore trial area residents. After two years of using the food scraps service almost four in five respondents indicating that they use the service (78%).

At this time 83% of respondents indicated they would be unhappy if the service stopped however no questions were asked around rates funding of the service.

Waste Management and Minimisation Plan
The introduction of a food scraps collection service was consulted on in 2012 and again in 2018 as part of process.

In the 2018 Waste Management and Minimisation Plan consultation process, 6,758 submissions (including 2,153 pro-forma submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance) were received. There were approximately 1,100 comments made on organic waste, principally around the food scraps collection and composting. Many comments were made about food scrap collections with most submissions giving qualified support for the service. Most people strongly support the concept of diverting food away from landfill.

97 submitters from the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Area submitted feedback to the 2018 Waste Management and Minimisation Plan consultation process.

Long Term Plan Consultation 2018
The 2018 Long Term Plan consultation included rates related feedback on changes to waste service charges, including the targeted rate to fund the food scraps collection service. Approximately 600 submissions received commented on the food waste targeted rate. 40% (or 240 submitters) supported the food waste targeted rate while 60% (or 360 submitters) did not support the food waste targeted rate. Of those who were opposed to the targeted rate the majority (250 Submitters) cited being an existing composter as their reason.

197 submitters from the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area provided feedback on waste related matters. Of these two submitters supported a targeted food scraps charge and 40 submitters did not support a targeted food scraps charge. No feedback specific to the food scraps targeted rate was made by the remaining submitters.
The National Waste Levy

The National Waste Levy was introduced in 2008 via the Waste Minimisation Act. The goal of the levy was to create an economic incentive to divert and recycle and establish a funding pool for waste minimisation projects. The levy is currently set at $10 per tonne of waste disposed to landfill (note that the levy only applies to some categories of landfills).

The National Waste Levy is administered by the Ministry for the Environment who allocate a proportion of this funding to Auckland Council. Funding from the National Waste Levy must be spent on waste minimisation activities.

In addition to providing funds for the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund, Auckland Councils waste levy funding is spent on ongoing implementation and strategic planning of initiatives adopted by the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

This includes waste minimisation programmes such as Waste Free Parenting, Zero Waste Events and the Compost Collective. These are regional programmes and involve a number of local community groups and partners to help promote and deliver them.

Risks

The local board might feel it is difficult for them to give considered feedback to this option without understanding residents' views on the charging proposal. The charging proposal will be formally consulted on through the Annual Plan. The local board will have the opportunity to provide further feedback again, once they have seen residents' feedback received through the Annual Plan consultation process.

Communication

Following the Finance and Performance Committees decision, Auckland Council will communicate directly with the residents of the North Shore Trial area. Although a formal letter is likely to be issued to all households within the trial area staff are also considering other communication methods such as door knocking and a targeted survey.

WMMP Resolutions

Devonport-Takapuna

Resolution number DT/2018/1

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

g) provides the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

i. supports the overarching and strategic objectives outlined in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan;

ii. recommends that there be increased focus on expediting issues between central and local government, such as tip levies and container deposit levies.
1. **Weed Control on Our Streets**:

The issue of weed control along our road reserves, especially in the kerb and channels, has become a real issue with in the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area.

*Figure 1* Weeds growing in the kerb and channel Tristram Avenue, near Raines Avenue Forrest Hill 14 November 2018

*Figure 2* Weeds at intersection Forrest Hill Road and Wairau Road, Milford 10 October 2018
I would ask that we resolve to send the following resolution to Auckland Transport highlighting our concerns about the state of our road reserves being overrun with weed growth at the present time.

**That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:**

a) wishes to see a more positive process and activity by Auckland Transport to control weeds that are rampant at present in the road reserve areas across the DT local board area.

b) That the matter of inaction in relation to weed management be reported to the CEO of Auckland Transport.

c) That photographs of the current problems in relation to weed management in the DT local board area be also forwarded with this correspondence.
2. **Long delay in restoring the Lake Rd/Eversleigh Rd intersection:**

The correspondence from Auckland Transports road opening for utility services refers:

See the attached letter from Auckland Transport advising that it was in fact Watercare Services Ltd who placed barriers and cones at the Lake Road/Eversleigh Road intersection. This intersection was closed for at least two weeks whilst slow progress was made on the remediation of the road surface.

Suggest that the D-T LB send a letter to Auckland Transport indicating that we have concerns where utility operators close off sections of roadway and do not advise the road controlling authority of their action.

**That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:**

d) delegates to the chair to write to Auckland Transport advising that we fully support their actions to advise Watercare Services Limited that in future they must follow the protocols in relation to advertising road works on the Auckland Transport website.

3. **Natural Environment Targeted Rate**

The board received an email and memo provided by the Relationship Advisor, Infrastructure and Environmental Services, seeking feedback from the local board regarding potential community-led conservation projects for inclusion in the programme for expenditure against the natural environment targeted rate, noting that feedback is required from local boards by 5 December 2018.

**That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:**

e) delegates responsibility to Member xxxxx to provide the feedback on behalf of the local board as requested in the attached memo.
# Agenda

**What:** Local Board Chairs Forum  
**Where:** Reception Lounge, Town Hall  
**When:** 12 November, 12:00 – 3:00pm  
**Who:** All local board chairs (or their delegates)  
**Meeting chair:** John Gillon, Kaipatiki Local Board Chair  
**Apologies:** Greg Presland, Shane Henderson, Pippa Coom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome from the chair and previous action points</td>
<td>John Gillon, Chair Kaipatiki Local Board</td>
<td>12:00 – 12:05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. | Auckland Transport update  
  - Approach to allocating road safety funds  
  - Auckland Transport Culture and Effectiveness Survey | Jonathan Anyon, Elected Member Relationship Team Manager, Auckland Transport  
Wally Thomas, Executive General Manager of Stakeholder, Communities and Communications, Auckland Transport | 12.05 – 1.05 |
| 3. | Proposed Plan Change - Special Character Area Residential | John Duguid, GM - Plans & Places  
Phill Reid, Manager Planning-Aucklandwide  
Angela Smith, Principal Planner, Plans and Places | 1.05 – 1.25 |
| 4. | Annual plan – update on consultation | Kenneth Aiilupotea, Head of Citizen Engagement and Insights | 1.25 – 1.45 |
| 5. | Kura Kawana – programme for 2019 | Linda Gifford, Programme Manager Elected Member Development Programme | 1.45 – 2.15 |
| 6. | Community facilities update | Rod Sheridan, General Manager, Community Facilities | 2.15 – 3.00 |
Memo

To: Local Board Chairs
From: Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services

Subject: Action Points from Local Board Chairs Forum on 8 October 2018

Item 1: Welcome from the Chair
David Collings, Howick Local Board, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Report on action points from previous meeting
Louise Mason, General Manager, Local Board Services, gave a status update on the action points from the 10 September 2018 Chairs Forum.

- The breakdown of capex delivery by local board area had not been received. It was noted that Community Facilities would be speaking to this at item six.
- Clarity was sought on the status of local board plans and local board agreements as part of the section 92(2) work.
- A memo will be sent to chairs within the next fortnight seeking expressions of interest to be on the political reference group considering divestment issues. It was agreed that the 10 December Chairs’ Forum meeting slot will be used for the divestment political reference group.
- An update was sought on activity with regards to the number of off licenses permitted and how this has changed over recent time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a memo to local board chairs on activity with regards to the number of off licenses permitted and how this has changed over recent time.</td>
<td>Community and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 2: Update from Auckland Transport

Wally Thomas, Executive General Manager Stakeholder, Communities and Communication was joined by staff in his team to provide a range of updates to the chairs.

Jonathan Anyon, Elected Member Relationship Team Manager briefed the chairs on the revised Auckland Transport (AT) local board engagement plans. Visibility of these had been lost. The revised versions are no longer prescriptive but instead are based on principles of good engagement, they are straight-forward and are able to be adapted across the boards. The principled approach to the local board engagement plans is:

- respecting the local boards’ role
- no surprises
- AT involves local boards in all relevant projects
- good faith and reasonableness will drive AT’s interactions with local boards.

The following points were raised in discussion.
- Would like to see local board plans referenced in the principles.
The principles appear to be the same as those from the 2011 versions of local board engagement plans. The main change is simplifying the plans. AT staff will also be briefed on the plans to raise their visibility across the organisation.

Strong feedback was given about the appropriate use of local board cluster workshops. These are not a mechanism for collecting local board views, the views are those of individuals.

There is variability in reporting to boards on what road works are taking place in their area. It would be good to know about the work of other utility providers taking place on AT’s network. AT has a website that shows what road works are taking place across the region. Some feedback was received that it is not easy to find road works by local board area.

The principle regarding respecting the local board role needs to better reflect the shared governance model.

There are some exceptional staff at AT delivering good work, but there remains a culture that does not support the local boards’ role.

Examples were given of when AT has not listened to the views of the local boards and the project outcomes were subsequently compromised.

It was noted that the AT relationship managers play a critical role for the local boards and it is important that they have the right skills.

Glen Wright, Customer Insights Manager spoke about the initial themes coming through the elected members research AT is undertaking. While AT gets feedback every 18 months through the elected member survey there is an interest in digging into that a bit more to try and understand how the relationships are working. An independent researcher is undertaking this work and will involve interviews with the 21 chairs.

Initial results show that the community doesn’t see the distinction between the different parts of the council. Therefore when there is a lack of communication from AT to local boards this can make the local boards look bad to their community. Other initial findings include that AT is focused on solutions, not outcomes and doesn’t communicate the ‘why’ and parameters behind decisions.

Jo Stansfield, Group Manager Customer Services spoke about improvements being made to how elected members are supported with their queries to AT and how they receive AT customer information for their area. It was recognised that there is still the need for improvements but progress is being made. From September all local boards will now receive customer insights reports which show information such as the number and type of enquiries AT received in the board area and where progress is at for resolving the issues raised.

A pilot is currently running in the Papakura and Manurewa Local Boards to ensure better response to elected member queries to AT. The intent is to roll this out to other boards once the pilot has been tested.

The following points were raised in discussion.

- To help track customer activity it would be helpful to have the customer tracking number or name of complainant in the subject of the email.
- AT has undertaken an operational review of the phone numbers customers have to use to contact them and these have been streamlined.
- Previously elected members received a generic acknowledgment email when sending AT a query. The pilot is testing sending a more informative email to explain how the issue will be resolved.
• Jo was congratulated for recognising the issues and having an honest conversation with the chairs about how her team is seeking to resolve them.
• Local boards are keen to have statistics on how long it takes for AT to resolve issues raised by customers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBS and AT to discuss best approach in seeking local board input on AT regional projects.</td>
<td>AT/LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item 3: Remuneration Authority proposed changes**

Marguerite Delbet, General Manager Democracy Services briefed the chairs on the changes the Remuneration Authority recently decided to the remuneration of Auckland Council elected members.

The Remuneration Authority issued a consultation document in 2017 proposing changes to how it determines remuneration of local government elected members. An Auckland Council submission was prepared in response to this, which included submissions from a number of local boards.

The Remuneration Authority’s decision, as it relates to local boards, is to allocate a pool of funding to each local board and each local board must then make its own decisions regarding the allocation of this fund. This approach was not supported in the Auckland Council submission. It is not clear yet if the Remuneration Authority will set the remuneration for local board chairs, but they have indicated this will be the case.

The Remuneration Authority did respond to the council’s feedback by increasing the remuneration of deputy chairs to 60 per cent of that of the chair. This is in recognition of the fact that the role of deputy chair is larger than other local board members.

The following points were raised in discussion.

• The chairs were unanimous in their view that there should be a single approach across all local boards for how each local board’s pool is allocated. There was support for the Remuneration Authority to set the chair and deputy chair remuneration and for the remainder of the pool to be split evenly across all other members.

• Concern was expressed that remuneration was being pushed back into the political sphere, that it would become an election issue if elected members are making decisions about how remuneration is allocated. It was clarified that the council has to pay elected members their remuneration.

• Advice was sought on what action local boards can take to demonstrate to the Remuneration Authority that they do not support this approach. The chairs were encouraged to provide their feedback directly to the Remuneration Authority and to feed in suggestions for topics of discussion at their session with the Remuneration Authority in November.

• It is important for elected member candidates to have good information about the expectations of the role of elected members, including indicative salary ranges.

**Item 4: Development Contributions Policy**

Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy briefed the chairs on the proposed changes to the Development Contributions Policy and the timeline for this.
The 10-year budget has allocated $26.2 billion for capital investment, of this $7.4 billion is growth related. Development contributions are an important way for the council to recover the cost of growth infrastructure from the growth it enables.

Proposed changes to the policy:
- the cost of contributions updated to reflect the 10-year budget 2018-2018
- unit of demand factors – transport demand factors for non-residential development and differentiate student accommodation
- extend the payment timings for residential house construction.

The timeline for reviewing the policy is tight with local board cluster meetings in October, public consultation and local board formal feedback in October and November with the Governing Body expected to adopt the final policy in December. The new policy is expected to come into effect on 1 January 2019.

The following points were raised in discussion
- It was noted that development contributions are charged only on new homes and depend on how much a property is going to benefit from the development infrastructure.
- Housing New Zealand is charged in the same way as other developers.
- There is no requirement for the Development Contributions Policy to go through the annual plan process, it can be reviewed at any stage. There was a request from the development community for a policy with more detail and this review of the policy is in response to that.
- Consultation material will be pitched to be more digestible to help the community understand how development contributions work.
- It was noted that the approach to engaging with local boards was not sufficient. Opportunities for joint engagement with the governing body should be sought.
- Development contributions can only be charged for projects that are in the 10-year budget, as they are a means to recover the council’s costs of investment.
- A proposed amendment to the Local Government Act if it passes in its current form would allow development contributions to fund pools, libraries and some other community infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities for joint engagement with local boards and the Governing</td>
<td>LBS/Financial Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body through the review of the Development Contributions Policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 5: Community Facilities update

Rod Sheridan, General Manager Community Facilities noted that:
- the move to a three year programme for capital delivery was the key to improving outcomes in capital delivery
- local boards will soon receive reporting regarding how many local suppliers have been used through the full facilities maintenance contracts.

Capital delivery breakdown by local board
John Schembrucker, Head of Project Delivery spoke to the chairs about project delivery. A graph showing the breakdown of capital delivery by local board for 2017-18 was discussed. Key statistics noted were:
- by value of projects 81 per cent of capital delivery was achieved in the last financial year
$30m of deferrals from the last financial year will be delivered in the next financial year.

Community Facilities has put in place a number of measures to improve delivery outcomes on the capital works programme.
- Risk adjusted three year work programming approach.
- One dedicated programme manager for capital delivery per local board.
- Defined project reporting on a monthly basis to include key milestones for every project – much greater visibility for local boards on progress.
- Minor works delivered through the full facilities maintenance contracts.
- Increased capacity and capability of work programming team.
- Improved procurement packaging to achieve efficiency of scale.

Project streetscapes update
- Undertaking final pricing negotiations with suppliers. It is likely further funding for these contracts will be needed and sought from the Finance and Performance Committee.
- Pest plant management is being run as a separate project.

The following points were raised in discussion
- There will be advice to the boards on their asset management plans to inform the local board work programming discussions.
- There seems to be a variance in reporting on capital delivery and the reality perceived of what is being delivered on the ground. Previous reporting has focused on the value of projects delivered, not the number of projects delivered which could account for this difference in perception. It is also important that the reporting is clear about how deferrals are accounted for.
- Community Facilities has a new team to undertake delivery of bigger or politically sensitive projects.
- It was noted that it is useful to have Community Facilities attend Chairs’ Forum regularly and discuss topical issues.
- Following adoption of the work programmes it seems there has been a lull in delivery for a few months and this jeopardises the ability for some initiatives to be undertaken e.g. planting fruit trees and putting up shade sales.

Item 6: LGNZ update

Pippa Coom, Chair Waitemata Local Board provided the chairs with an update on LGNZ work. Key points were:
- current priority areas for LGNZ are the localism project, water, housing and climate change. Transport is being considered as a priority area
- local board members were encouraged to attend the next zone 1 meeting
- there is a robust national discussion taking place on the three waters review. The proposal will be quite different for Auckland so will be good to have a specific briefing for Auckland Council on this
- recent LGNZ research on the perception of local government indicates local government does not have a great reputation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Points</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a briefing to local boards on the three waters review.</td>
<td>LBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Local Board Elected Members Chairs Forum
cc: Councillor Chris Darby - Chair of the Planning Committee; Councillor Richard Hills - Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee
From: Phill Reid – Auckland-wide Planning Manager, Plans and Places Department

Subject: Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP) Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential

The purpose of this memo is to inform you about a proposed plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) (AUP) which is in the early stages of preparation. The proposed plan change relates to the provisions of Chapter D18, the Special Character Areas Overlay – Residential (Special Character overlay).

Background
The Proposed Plan Change forms a policy response to Environment Court Declaration Auckland Council v London Pacific Family Trust regarding the Special Character Area Overlay – Residential, and its relationship with the relevant underlying zone, predominantly the Residential Single House Zone (SHZ). The Court’s decisions on the Declaration proceedings clarified that unless there is a specific rule that allows it, overlay provisions do not replace those within the underlying zones, and that all rules relevant to an activity must be applied under the general rules of the Unitary Plan. The decision required a change in the Council’s approach to the relationship between the Special Character overlay and the underlying SHZ. The Declaration requires that both sets of rules are considered in consent assessments, as it is not specified that the overlay prevails.

As a result of the Declaration, consent applications must be considered against the provisions of both the Special Character overlay and the underlying zone. However, having two standards controlling the same effect (e.g. two different height in relation to boundary standards) is causing difficulty for assessments and for plan users and it is unclear which threshold should be used to determine the appropriate building envelope. More fundamentally, the Special Character overlay provisions do not function as they were intended.

Overview of the proposed plan change
The purpose of the Proposed Plan Change is to clarify that where there are equivalent provisions, the provision in the Special Character overlay will prevail over the underlying zone. Furthermore, as a consequence of the Declaration and the recommendations of the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP), some of the standards within the Special Character overlay are to be refined. These include height in relation to boundary, yards, paved areas and fences.

The SCAR affects properties in the following local board areas:
- Albert - Eden
- Devonport – Takapuna
- Kaipatiki
- Mangere - Otahuhu
- Manurewa
- Maungakiekie - Tamaki
- Orakei
- Otara – Papatoetoe
- Puketapapa
• Rodney
• Waitemata
• Whau

**Next steps**
We reported to the Planning Committee on 6 November 2018. Proceeding with the development of the plan change was endorsed. We are attending the Chairs Forum on 12 November 2018 to present an outline of the proposed plan change, receive feedback and to answer any questions.

Once the proposed plan change is notified, there is likely to be interest from the public. If enquiries are made to the local boards we are happy to assist with responding to them.

Phill Reid
Auckland-wide Planning Manager,
Plans and Places Department
16 November 2018

George Wood
George.Wood@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Auckland Transport – CAS-896335-B5Y4D3 – Eversleigh Road

Dear Mr Wood,

I refer to your correspondence of 30 October 2018, regarding a blockage on Eversleigh Road. I apologise for the delayed response to your enquiry.

We were initially unable to identify who or why Eversleigh Road was closed on 13th & 14th October. However, we have today discovered through investigation that Watercare Services were undertaking works on a burst transmission line. Neither Watercare nor their contractor had informed Auckland Transport of the work.

They have also confirmed that Eversleigh Road was closed but access remained for residents. Unfortunately, there are a proportion of works that occur on the road network without our knowledge and despite our best efforts to encourage the meeting of their legal obligations to do so.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention and we are following up with Watercare and their contractor.

Kind regards,

[Signature]

Tom Kiddle
Manager – Road Corridor Access (Acting)
Memorandum

12 November 2018

To: Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Subject: Natural Environment Targeted Rate

From: Gael Ogilvie – General Manager Environmental Services

Purpose

1. This memorandum provides:
   - information on the regional criteria that will be used to consider natural environment targeted rate funding for new biodiversity conservation projects
   - an opportunity for local boards to provide feedback on potential new community-led conservation projects.

Summary

- Following governing body approval of the natural environment targeted rate in June 2018, Environmental Services held local board workshops to discuss the proposed programme of work. The workshops ran during September and October 2018 and have now concluded.
- Feedback provided by the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board during its 25 September 2018 workshop has been summarised in this memorandum.
- Further suggestions on potential community-led conservation projects for inclusion in the programme are requested from local boards by Tuesday 5 December 2018. This feedback will be considered against regional priority criteria outlined in this memo to identify any projects that could be considered for funding under the natural environment targeted rate.
- A template to guide local board feedback is attached to this memo (Attachment A). Please send any local board feedback on potential projects to Theresa.pearce@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz by Tuesday 5 December 2018.

Context

2. On 25 September 2018, a workshop was held with the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board on the proposed natural environment targeted rate work programme.

3. The natural environment targeted rate programme focuses on new opportunities to reverse biodiversity decline, such as native species extinctions and ongoing degradation of native ecosystems.

4. The natural environment targeted rate will invest $311 million into a range of environmental work programmes over the next ten years. This represents an approximately four-fold increase on current general rates-funded investment in these areas.

5. The natural environment targeted rate will fund 10 programmes as outlined in the workshop (see Attachment B). The fund is intended to grow regionally significant conservation activities and outcomes. The natural environment targeted rate funding is not intended to replace local board investment in environmental projects, however it can be used to amplify local board efforts where initiatives align with regional priorities.

6. The informal feedback provided by your local board during the workshop session included:
   - interest in the community nursery pilot – would like to see something similar in Devonport-Takapuna
   - the need for locally-driven consultation on how the use of the natural environment targeted rate is decided and to make sure there is a robust communications plan in place to explain how it is being used to communities
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
20 November 2018

- Lyford Bush is an area of importance for the board
- the board would like to know the criteria for getting investment into the board area from the targeted rate - for instance in Kilarney Park (which borders onto Lake Pupuke), as water quality in Lake Pupuke is a big priority for the board.

7. In some cases, local boards requested additional information or had queries that will be addressed by their Infrastructure and Environmental Services relationship advisor separately to this memo.

8. This memorandum requests further feedback from local boards on potential projects that could be considered for funding through the natural environment targeted rate.

9. Once suggestions have been received from local boards, staff will consider and prioritise projects against the regional priority criteria outlined in this memo. Local boards will receive an update on projects that have been shortlisted for natural environment targeted rate funding in early 2019.

10. All shortlisted projects will be subject to an internal business case process, consistent with other projects funded by the natural environment targeted rate, before they can be confirmed as future natural environment targeted rate projects.

Discussion

11. One of the core work programmes to be covered by the natural environment targeted rate is the expand work programme. This programme increases support to community-based conservation activities and offers scope for local boards to align projects and regional priorities.

12. The expand programme will support community-led action required to put Auckland on track to be Pest Free by 2050. More specifically, its objectives are to:
- enable community groups, landowners, schools, iwi and individuals to protect and restore Auckland’s biodiversity
- amplify the efforts and benefits delivered by the conservation community
- contribute to the conservation of a range of ecosystems and species and secure them from regional extinction
- support Auckland’s diverse communities to be actively engaged in biodiversity management, protection and restoration
- increase protection and active management of native biodiversity in priority sites on private land
- increase partnerships with external agencies, business and philanthropic organisations to grow the resources available for community conservation.
- deliver social learning, connectivity and increased valuing of the natural environment and biodiversity.

13. A set of regional priorities has been developed to assess potential projects to be supported through the expand programme. Priorities where there is scope to give feedback are outlined in Table 1 below. These are intended to enable local boards to assess potential community-led projects against regional criteria.

Table 1. Regional priorities for expanding community, household and school action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Priority</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Projects which create new or support existing landscape scale ecological corridors or defined defendable pest free areas, for example isthmus or islands.</td>
<td>Identifying, managing and enhancing landscape-scale ecological connections to provide safe, healthy and linked habitats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. New, emerging conservation initiatives in areas or communities where there are currently limited opportunities for active participation.
   Growing and amplifying conservation activity across Auckland’s diverse communities - including those that aren’t currently engaged in conservation action.

3. Projects which foster innovation in conservation management and enable step-change, as we upscale activity to reach our goal of Pest Free Auckland 2050.
   Innovative solutions will be needed to reach Pest Free Auckland goal by 2050.

4. Projects which share conservation learning and best-practice knowledge across the region.
   Sharing knowledge and best-practice guidance across Auckland’s communities is key to removing barriers, growing participation and supporting effective biodiversity management.

5. Projects which enable commercial involvement in delivering Pest Free Auckland at a sector-wide or regional scale.
   We will be working in partnership with business to grow Pest Free Auckland across both community and commercial sectors.

6. Projects with significant positive social and cultural outcomes in addition to ecological outcomes.
   Recognising that there are parts of Auckland where residents have very little access to areas of high biodiversity value. In these cases, there could be significant cultural and social benefits arising from restoring currently degraded natural environments.

14. Staff are engaged in planning the effective management of regional priority indigenous ecosystems and species and will update on how this will occur in public land in local board areas in early 2019.

Local board feedback

15. Some local boards have already provided informal feedback on potential community-led conservation projects, as has been summarised earlier in this memo.

16. This memo requests further feedback from local boards on potential projects that could be funded from the natural environment targeted rate. Please use the feedback form attached (Attachment A) to provide your feedback.

17. To assist with your feedback, please find attached the existing known community groups in your local board area (Map A).

Next steps

18. If you have any questions about the regional criteria or the contents of this memorandum, and to return your feedback form, please contact Theresa.pearce@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz no later than Tuesday 5 December 2018.

19. An update on the projects selected for natural environment targeted rate funding will be provided to local boards once the initial shortlist is confirmed in early 2019. Further updates will be provided to local boards after the business cases have been completed, and future work programme planning has concluded. This update will occur no later than mid-2019.

Attachments

Attachment A – Feedback form
Attachment B – Natural environment targeted rate programme of work
Map A – Existing, known community group presence/activity by local board area
Attachment A - Feedback form for potential projects to be considered for natural environment targeted rate funding

Please email all feedback to your relationship advisor Theresa.pearce@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz by Tuesday 5 December 2018.

Please list any potential projects in your board area you want to be considered for inclusion as part of the natural environment targeted rate work programme (see Map A showing current community activity).

These projects will be considered for natural environment targeted rate funding against the regional priority criteria. All shortlisted projects will also be subject to a business case process in late 2018-early 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed project</th>
<th>Location of activity</th>
<th>Alignment to regional priorities? (provide priority number as per the list below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Regional Priorities where there is scope for local board feedback

1. Projects which create new or support existing landscape scale ecological corridors or defined defendable pest free areas, for example isthmus or islands.
2. New, emerging conservation initiatives in areas or communities where there are currently limited opportunities for active participation.
3. Projects which foster innovation in conservation management and enable step-change, as we upscale activity to reach our goal of Pest Free Auckland 2050.
4. Projects which share conservation learning and best-practice knowledge across the region.
5. Projects which enable commercial involvement in delivering Pest Free Auckland at a sector-wide or regional scale.
6. Projects with significant positive social and cultural outcomes in addition to ecological outcomes.
Attachment A

Item 21

Attachment B. Natural environment targeted rate programme of work
Attachment A - Feedback form for potential projects to be considered for natural environment targeted rate funding

Please email all feedback to your Theresa.pearce@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz by Tuesday 5 December 2018.

Please list any potential projects in your board area you want to be considered for inclusion as part of the natural environment targeted rate work programme (see Map A showing current community activity).

These projects will be considered for natural environment targeted rate funding against the regional priority criteria. All shortlisted projects will also be subject to a business case process in late 2018-early 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed project</th>
<th>Location of activity</th>
<th>Alignment to regional priorities? (provide priority number as per the list below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Regional Priorities where there is scope for local board feedback

1. Projects which create new or support existing landscape scale ecological corridors or defined defendable pest free areas, for example isthmus or islands.
2. New, emerging conservation initiatives in areas or communities where there are currently limited opportunities for active participation.
3. Projects which foster innovation in conservation management and enable step-change, as we upscale activity to reach our goal of Pest Free Auckland 2050.
4. Projects which share conservation learning and best-practice knowledge across the region.
5. Projects which enable commercial involvement in delivering Pest Free Auckland at a sector-wide or regional scale.
6. Projects with significant positive social and cultural outcomes in addition to ecological outcomes.
### Zone One meeting - Agenda

**Friday 16 November 2018**

10.00am – 1.00pm

**Venue** - Council Chamber, Ground Floor, Auckland Town Hall, 301-305 Queen Street, Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10:00-10:05am</td>
<td>Welcome, apologies, confirmation of previous meeting minutes</td>
<td>Cr Penny Hulse, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10:05-10:35am</td>
<td><strong>Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy</strong>&lt;br&gt;From now until December, the Government wants to hear from as many people as possible to help ensure New Zealand is the best place to be a child. The Prime Minister and her Government have made this one of their top priorities. A Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy is being developed and will set out actions the Government will take to improve the wellbeing of all New Zealand children and young people.</td>
<td>Maree Brown, Director Child Wellbeing Unit, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and Kristie Carter, Director Child Poverty Reduction Unit, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10:35-11:30am</td>
<td><strong>LGNZ update covering:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 3 Waters Review&lt;br&gt;• Localism&lt;br&gt;• LGNZ Rule changes</td>
<td>Malcolm Alexander, Chief Executive, LGNZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>11:30-12:00pm</td>
<td><strong>LGNZ National Council members commentary</strong></td>
<td>Cr Penny Hulse, Mayor&lt;br&gt;Hon John Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>12:00-12:30pm</td>
<td><strong>Findings from the Morrison Lowe review of council LTPs (2015 &amp; 2018)</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Department of Internal Affairs' (DIA) Central Local Government Partnership Group will be providing advice to Government on the final Productivity Commission's report into Local Government Costs and Revenues due in November next year. In preparation for this, the Department recently commissioned Morrison Lowe to provide us with advice on the status and outlook of council finances. The review provides an analysis drawn from 2015 and 2018 LTPs on cost pressures and sector challenges. DIA would like to present its key findings.</td>
<td>Michael Lovett, Partnership Director, Central Local Government Partnership Group, Department of Internal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>12:30-12:35pm</td>
<td><strong>Meeting schedule for 2019:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Friday, 1 March – venue TBC&lt;br&gt;• Friday, 24 May – venue TBC&lt;br&gt;• Friday, 23 August – venue TBC&lt;br&gt;• Friday, 15 November – venue TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>12:35pm</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MINUTES

### Zone One meeting

**Date:** Friday 24 August 2018  
**Venue:** Manukau Room, Manukau Civic Annexe Ground Floor, 31-33 Manukau Station Road, Manukau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome, apologies, confirmation of previous meeting minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Chair Mayor John Carter declared the meeting open at 10.12 am in the absence of Chair Councillor Penny Hulse who was delayed on council business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lotu Full, Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Chair welcomed all attendees as the host for the venue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions were made around the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following apologies were noted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) – President Dave Cull, Helen Mexted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Council (AC) – Mayor Phil Goff, Chief Executive Stephen Town, Councillors Efeso Collins, Alf Filipaina, Linda Cooper, Greg Sayers, Josephine Bartley, Sharon Stewart and Local Board members Brenda Steele, Jennifer McKenzie, Uzra Balouch, Angela Dalton, Dawn Tremberth, Margi Watson, Rosalind Rundle, Brent Bailey, Kristina Bettany, Kit Parkinson, Lisa Whyte, Brendan Crompton, John Spiller, Vicki Wetsun, Julie Fairley, Mike Williamson, Malcolm Bell, Lindsay Waugh, Brian Neeson, Mike Turlinsky, Alan Cole, Don Allan, Matt Grey, Adele White, Phelan Pirrie, Tauanu’u Bakuile, Danielle Grant, Colin Davis, Jim Donald, Warren Flaxton, Mike Cohen, Carrol Elliott and Felicity Auva’a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far North District Council (FNDC) – Cr Felicity Foy, Cr Tania McInnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaipara District Council (KDC) – none.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northland Regional Council (NRC) – Chairman Bill Shepherd, Cr Joce Yeoman, Cr John Bain, Cr Penny Smart, Chief Executive Malcolm Nicolson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whangarei District Council (WDC) – Chief Executive Rob Forlong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was moved by Mayor John Carter (FNDC) and seconded by Waimate Local Board Chair Pippa Coom that the minutes of the meeting of Zone One held on Friday, 2 March 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CARRIED</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. | LGNZ report |
|     | Malcolm Alexander, Chief Executive, LGNZ presented an update from Local Government New Zealand broken down into the following parts: |
|     | - LGNZ’s Vision and role |
|     | - Principal policy projects |
|     | - Conference and remits |
|     | - Central Government’s 3 Waters Review |
|     | - Local Boards and the LGNZ Rules Review |
|     | Malcolm answered questions from members. The presentation will be attached to these minutes. |
## Attendance

The attendees in alphabetical order of first name:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Board/Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Fulljames</td>
<td>Franklin Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Currow</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Kaipara District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Court</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Far North District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulu Reee</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astagayva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashraf Choudhary</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Houblouke</td>
<td>Rodney Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Upchurch</td>
<td>Waitakere Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Catchpole</td>
<td>Papakura Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hermon</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Whangarei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bettany</td>
<td>Hibiscus &amp; Bays Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Guilick</td>
<td>Strategic Projects Manager, Local Board Services</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Smith</td>
<td>Rodney Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crichton Christie</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Whangarei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Collings</td>
<td>Howick Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wood</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Easte</td>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Innes</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Whangarei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izy Fordham</td>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Hibiscus &amp; Bays Local Board Deputy Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Smith</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Kaipara District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carter</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Far North District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemsuga Lydia Sosene</td>
<td>Mangere-Central Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotu Fuji</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Alexander</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Local Government New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Giddey</td>
<td>Zone One Secretary</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerissa Henry</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Hulse</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Haynes</td>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wethey</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>Kaipara District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pippe Coem</td>
<td>Waitakere Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Northey</td>
<td>Waitakere Local Board Member</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Robertson</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Deputy Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Morgan</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Whangarei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun Clarke</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Far North District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Mai</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Whangarei District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Crosby</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Local Government New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Mulholland</td>
<td>Whau Local Board Chair</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria J. Varis</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Kaipara District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Walker</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reactions, views, questions, comment
Beyond depreciation there are a range of costs that will likely drive rates increases above forecasts

- Wastewater and stormwater
- Roads in rural areas
- Changing population and demographics
- Tourism
- Climate change
- Seismic strengthening

New Zealand Government  
Te Tari Taiohenua  
Internal Affairs
Depreciation makes up on quarter of local government expenditure

...but renewals expenditure suggests depreciation might be overestimated
LTP’s have underestimated increases in long term rates, expenses and - for rapidly growing councils - debts
This trend is projected to increase through to 2025.
Attachment A

Average Rates and Wage Growth have decoupled

---

Minute Attachments
Rates are projected to increase

What is driving rates increases?

- Increased costs to replace new and existing assets
- Inflation (LGO)
- Increased levels of service and compliance costs
- Existing services

Time

$
Methodology

- A sample of 15 representative councils
- 2015 LTP data, compared against actual financial results and draft 2018 LTP data
- Key metrics analysed include the level of investment in infrastructure and expenditure per rate-payer
- The report also considers the affordability of rates using measures such as rates as a percentage of household income and living expenses.

New Zealand Government
What were we interested in?

What are the primary cost pressures within local government, how is the sector responding to these pressures?
What is the trajectory of rate increases and borrowing?
How can affordability questions be framed?

New Zealand Government

To Tari Takihoua
Internal Affairs
Costs and funding of local government

Findings of the Morrison Low review of Local Government Long Term Plans, strategic documents and council surveys

New Zealand Government

Te Tari Taiwhenua Internal Affairs
Questions and Answers

1. Is the water system broken?
No. With respect to drinking water, most of New Zealand’s water supplies could be considered conventional and functional.

2. Does this mean that there aren’t problems with the drinking water system, or related challenges with waste and stormwater?
No. The New Zealand Waterfront project showed there were critical weaknesses in the drinking water system that need to be addressed. Just like every other asset in our urban infrastructure, the drinking water system needs to be maintained to deliver the desired level of service to our communities.

3. What will the cost be to upgrade plants to achieve compliance?
The OECD report also estimated that it would cost between $1 and $2 billion per year for those plants to become compliant, and between $500 million and $1 billion per year to make all plants compliant. From a local government perspective, where we don’t have ten-year plans, these costs are very real.

4. Are the policy changes being put forward likely to address the problems with New Zealand’s water systems?
Mostly yes, and mostly.

The New Zealand waterways and their associated wastewater systems are complex and challenging to manage, and there is a need for new thinking and innovative solutions. Increasingly, water systems are being recognized as critical infrastructure, and there is a need for new approaches to ensure they are resilient and sustainable.

5. Are LGNZ and local government against change?
Local government is not arguing against change. However, many councils are faced with significant challenges in meeting new regulations. There is a need for greater collaboration and a willingness to find innovative solutions.

We are LGNZ.
Te Kāhui Kaimihia o Aotearoa.
Introduction

Local government knows that high quality drinking water, wastewater and stormwater services and infrastructure are critical to the ongoing health and success of our communities and the environment they live in.

As developers of the three waters, local government has long known that population decreases - particularly ageing and shrinking populations - pose significant challenges to its ability to provide water services in the future. To redress these charges are necessary, local government is committed to maintaining the quality of freshwater and stormwater services and infrastructure, using a range of means to achieve increased resilience in the system, which we can build a regulatory framework to meet these challenges and deliver the high quality of service our communities demand.

This position paper explores the evidence and the sector's deep experience to set out the key principles that we, as owners and providers of these three water infrastructure and services, see as critical and necessary to build resilience in the three waters regulatory framework.

It is not the case that we get these principles right from the start as central government seeks to undertake a programme of work to reform the sector in the context of the national context agenda. We welcome the ongoing review, but also recognise that the developer-based schemes can be toxic for drinking water services.

Principle 1: Fix drinking water first

Of the three waters, drinking water regulation is most in need of reform. Organisations reported that health complaints and policy work is a top issue on their radar. The recent framework incident identified two key weak points within the current drinking water regulations. The first was weak drinking water quality standards, with the lack of a clear regulatory plan to meet those standards, and the other on standards themselves. This regulatory design flaw was identified by the Ministry of Health in 2017, and will result in a review of the Ministry of Health and Environment's compliance enforcement.

To fix these problems with the regulation, local government supports reforms that, while retaining the drinking water standards, and the regulations required for all councils to meet these standards, focus on infrastructure resilience. The new standards should be outcome based to encourage innovation and avoid, as far as possible, prescriptive rules, such as determinations. We also advocate for a strong role for the drinking water regulator in ensuring more new minimum quality standards, be the Ministry of Health or as an independent regulator.

Local government is definitely not against change.

Principle 2: Let existing regulations run their course

Wastewater and stormwater infrastructure can directly influence the health of our natural environment, particularly where they discharge into freshwater and stormwater environments. These assets, along with local assets, is a high priority for planning and investment to meet new quality standards.

The current environmental impact statement for Freshwater Management (Bawley) introduced new requirements and local councils are required to give effect to the EQF by 2022. This has a clear role in enforcing regulations and much of the planning and investment work is already underway and needed to meet these higher standards in regional context.

Local government accepted the council’s work and has an ability to engage in the development of the new regulations by local authorities, and the technical insights of planners and developers to improve over time genuine delivery to customers.

Local government recognises that under the principles outlined above, there may be a number of issues where councils will be unable to meet the standards or structure their operations to meet them, particularly among smaller rural councils. We believe the principles in the case 2: targeted financial support from central government, which partially occurred under the drinking water assistance programme which was abolished in 2017, and the action going forward to actually achieve this (although some projects were still following their course after this date).

Conclusion

Local government still sees the interface between central government and local government for good to deliver all services required to enjoy quality infrastructure, and communities have the ability to pay for this infrastructure. By adopting the principles above as a common platform for the three waters reform processes we ensure a return to an era where we have the framework that satisfies both consumer and user needs.

We accept the need to continue change in the face of increasing population pressures, and see the opportunity to central government to work together with local government to establish a regulatory framework that is cost-effective delivers the quality of the three water infrastructure and services that our communities deserve.
child & youth wellbeing

Tamariki Tū, Tamariki Ora

DEPARTMENT OF THE
PRIME MINISTER AND CABINET
TE TARI O TE PIRIMIA ME TE KOMITI MATUA

Presentation to LGNZ Zone 1 meeting, 16 November 2018
Maree Brown and Kristie Carter
What are kids telling us?

Environment  Material Wellbeing  Employment  Disadvantage

Food  Housing

Loved & Cared for  Family / Whānau

Safe Homes  Sport / Activities

Mental Health  Health services

Drug use  Attitude / Positivity

Family Violence  Ethnic Minorities

Play / Fun  Disabilities

Physical Health  Community led

Education  Social Services

Language learning  Safety

Life skills  Quality Time

Benefits  Self esteem

Bullying  Discrimination

Belonging  Self worth

Autonomy  Voice heard

Contributing  Personal Identity
Child Poverty Reduction Bill

The Bill requires the government of the day to:

- set 3 and 10-year targets on a defined set of child poverty measures
- Report each Budget day on how the Budget will reduce child poverty, and how the Government is progressing towards its targets
- develop and report on a strategy to improve wellbeing of all children – having consulted with children and young people, Māori and iwi.
Child & Youth Wellbeing Strategy

- Commits Government to set outcomes and actions to improve *all* children’s wellbeing, with a focus on:
  - children with greater needs,
  - poverty & socioeconomic disadvantage
  - children of interest/concern to Oranga Tamariki

- Minister must report annually on progress – including on outcomes for Māori children and any groups with greater needs.
Why is this different?

- It is being led by Prime Minister and DPMC
- Requirements are set in legislation
- Opportunity to take long-term view and make system wide changes
- Enduring commitment to successive strategies

child & youth wellbeing
child & youth wellbeing

Key Principles

• The inherent dignity and value of children and young people
• The wellbeing of children and young people is interwoven with the wellbeing of the family and whānau
• That networks of loving, trusting, caring relationships are at the heart of children’s and young people’s wellbeing
• The foundational role of the Treaty of Waitangi and the importance of the Crown-Māori partnership in work to promote the wellbeing of New Zealand’s children and young people
• That children’s and young people’s voices and views should be taken into account in developing and implementing the Strategy and in important decisions affecting them
• The rights contained in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which New Zealand has ratified
• We have collective responsibility to nurture the children and young people in our communities, and to support and value the adults who are caring for them
Child & Youth Wellbeing

New Zealand is the best place in the world for children and young people

- are loved, nurtured & safe
- have what they need
- belong, contribute & are valued
- are happy & healthy
- are learning & developing
Families, whānau and homes are safe and nurturing

Children and their parents, caregivers, families and whānau are able to spend quality time together

Children and young people are kept safe from accidental injury at home, in the community, on the road and when taking part in sport and recreational activities

Communities, including at school and online, are safe and supportive, with children protected from victimisation
New Zealand is the best place in the world for children and young people have what they need.

Children and young people and the adults caring for them have a good standard of material wellbeing, including food and housing.

Parents and caregivers, and young people transitioning to adulthood, enjoy quality employment.

Young people who are not in education, training or employment receive additional support to gain education and skills and to obtain and maintain employment.

Children and young people live in sustainable communities and environments.
child & youth wellbeing

Children and young people know who they are, their heritage, their whakapapa and their connection to family, whānau, community, culture, place (tūrangawaewae) and beliefs.

Children and young people feel connected to their family, whānau and communities, and are actively included in schools, communities and society.

Children and young people are valued and respected for who they are and are supported to have their voices heard.

Children and young people are empowered to make age appropriate decisions, and are supported to exercise increasing autonomy as they move to adulthood.

Children and young people care about and recognise their responsibilities to others and contribute positively at home and school and in their communities.

Children and young people are empowered to engage on matters of civic and environmental importance.

belong, contribute & are valued
New Zealand is the best place in the world for children and young people are happy & healthy

Children and young people have the best possible physical health and health status is not a barrier to living a good life.

Children and young people experience mental wellbeing, are supported to cope with life's challenges and to heal and recover from trauma.

Children and young people have strong networks of trusting, caring relationships with family, whānau, peers, communities and school.

Children and young people can play, express themselves creatively, and have fun and have opportunities for down time.

Young people take a positive approach to relationships, sexual health and reproductive choices.
New Zealand is the best place in the world for children and young people

are learning & developing

Children have positive development starting before birth, including through the wellbeing of mothers, families and whānau.

Children and young people develop resilience, and emotional, behavioural and communication skills at home and in education, and are equipped to make successful transitions, including to primary school, secondary school, and into adulthood.

Children and young people are positively engaged with and achieving in education and building skills and knowledge for life and learning.

Children and young people have developmentally appropriate opportunities outside the classroom that build confidence and important life skills.

Young people make positive choices about alcohol, drugs and sexual relationships, and avoid criminal offending.
CHILD AND YOUTH WELLBEING STRATEGY: PROPOSED FOCUS AREAS

Sixteen potential focus areas for the Child Wellbeing Strategy have been identified:

1. Children and young people are safe and supported in their families, homes, and homes.
2. Children and young people are engaged in safe, healthy, and meaningful social activities.
3. Children and young people are supported to learn and achieve.
4. Children and young people are supported to make healthy decisions.
5. Children and young people are supported to be physically active.
6. Children and young people are supported to be mentally and socially active.
7. Children and young people are supported to be economically active.
8. Children and young people are supported to be culturally active.
9. Children and young people are supported to be creatively active.
10. Children and young people are supported to be spiritually active.
11. Children and young people are supported to be environmentally active.
12. Children and young people are supported to be physically active.
13. Children and young people are supported to be mentally active.
14. Children and young people are supported to be socially active.
15. Children and young people are supported to be economically active.
16. Children and young people are supported to be culturally active.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER AND CABINET
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Engagement on the Strategy

- Nationwide engagement – with children and young people, Māori and iwi groups, sector groups, local government, those whose voices are less often heard.
  
  dpmc.govt.nz/child-youth-wellbeing

- Findings from engagement shared and the initial Strategy published in 2019
Survey, Submission, Postcards to the PM

New Zealand is the best place in the world for children and young people when they... The Government wants to improve the wellbeing of all New Zealand children and young people. We need your ideas.

Use this postcard to tell us what you think is important.

www.dpmc.govt.nz
Questions for discussion

- What would make this **real** for you?
- What system level and local level changes would you like to see?
- Who needs to be involved?
- What will it take to mobilise large scale change?
Mike Cohen Devonport-Takapuna Board Member’s Report
To The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board on Item 14
Meeting 20th November 2018

Health and Safety Missing when it comes to Protecting our Children by a lack of Requirement By Council To Provide Sun Shade at Our Council Playgrounds

Given Auckland Council’s risk aversion to health and safety which can make it extremely difficult for a community organisation to put on a local event. Its not just the compliance issues faced by volunteers but the significant cost that’s added to put on the event.

This could be mitigated by the availability of using the purchasing power of Council to reduce costs such as required Transport Management Plans.

Therefore it is disturbing when it comes to protecting our young children from the dangers caused by exposure to UV radiation in sunlight by playing on Council Playgrounds there is a blind spot.

Ministry of Health informs us:

- Most melanomas are caused by exposure to UV radiation in sunlight.

- Sun exposure in childhood gives a greater risk of melanoma than sun exposure in later life. There is also a greater risk of melanoma with high doses of sun exposure occasionally (eg, during holiday and recreational activities), than with more continuous sun exposure (eg, daily work outdoors).

Statistics:
Over 4,000 people. are diagnosed with either melanoma in situ or invasive melanoma every year in New Zealand – that’s around 13 every day.
New Zealand’s melanoma incidence rate is the world’s highest.
Auckland Council does not rate it a priority to compel any renewed or new public Council playground to provide sun shade protection.

In a renewal Council replaces the functionality of the playground to the same level. No allowance has been made for the current very high melanoma risks that children could potentially face in later life from their sun exposure while young playing at a playground.

By Auckland Council not requiring consideration of and funding of sun shade protection in any renewal of a Council playground currently the only way it can be address is if our Local Board utilises our scarce discretionary funding to contribute towards this one issue at the expense of other unfunded initiatives.

The bottom line is that Devonport-Takapuna Local Board on the current funding model does not have the ability to respond in a meaningful way to this health and safety issue of sun protection for our young children using most of our Council playgrounds.

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

1. Requests that Auckland Council (Governing Body) recognise with urgency that the lack of sun shade protection in our Council Playgrounds presents a health and safety issue especially for our very young using the said playgrounds.

2. That the Governing Body compel, and fund sufficiently any renewed or new public Council playground project, to identify and address the need for sun protection for the short and long term.

3. That while the short term solution to address sun shade is being put in place that concurrently the planting of deciduous trees are undertaken which long term will provide shade from September to April and a warmer environment from May to late August.

Mike Cohen
On Monday 12th November together with the Chair, the Deputy & Member Cohen I attended the meeting of the Devonport Business Association so that I could be updated on the future of the Devonport Information Centre which until May 31st of this year had been successfully operated out of 3 Victoria Rd. It has since moved to a nearby Arcade and as a result few people access the service which is operated 7 days a week by a group of volunteers under the auspices of the Devonport Business Association.

I refer Members to the Minutes of the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board of Tuesday 14 June 2016 and remind them that at that meeting it was granted $30,000 in order to set up a Visitor Information Centre at 3 Victoria Road.

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) Receive the report

b) Advise Panuku Development Auckland that the board’s preferred activity for 3 Victoria Road is the establishment of a visitor information centre on its ground floor, and ask staff to assist the new legal entity under the working name of “Shore Coast Tourism” to establish its activity at that site.

c) Provide a grant of $30,000 to the Shore Coast Tourism or a nominated businesses association from its Locally Driven Initiatives (LDI) planning and development budget as an establishment grant to assist in setting up a Visitor Information Centre at 3 Victoria Road, Devonport

I MOVE

(1). THAT the $30,000 grant remain with the Devonport Business Association to be used for the purposes for which it was granted

(2). THAT the Board request that the Devonport Business Association negotiate with officers from Panuku to allow the Devonport Information Centre to be relocated to 3 Victoria Road and that it operate from there on an informal basis until the long term future of that building is resolved

Jan O’Connor