

Attachment C

**Table 1: Comparative overview of funding models**

| Description                          | Current model   | Council staff model  | New model from joint working group   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Date                                 | 2013-current  | 2018   | 2019   |
| Basis of allocation and data sources | <b>100% population</b><br>(Census 2013)   | <b>70% population</b><br>(Annual population estimates – Statistics NZ)<br><b>25% client usage</b><br>(Bureau statistics report)<br><b>5% deprivation</b><br>(Dep13 Deprivation index)  | <b>90% population</b><br>(Annual population estimates – Statistics New Zealand)<br><b>10% deprivation</b><br>(Dep13 Deprivation index Dep. 8-10, targets 30% highest relative deprivation)   |
| Model coverage                       | Excludes Franklin and Great Barrier Island  | Excludes Great Barrier Island  | Excludes Great Barrier Island  |
| Local board boundaries               | Local board boundaries to cluster level<br><br>Hibiscus and Bays split between north bureaux and CAB North Shore<br><br>Upper Harbour in CAB North Shore<br><br>ACABx maintains historic funding relativities between individual bureaux in the north and south | Local board boundaries to cluster level<br><br>Hibiscus and Bays split between north bureaux and CAB North Shore<br><br>Upper Harbour equal split between CAB North Shore and WaiCAB<br><br>Franklin included in south bureaux funding | Local board boundaries and board subdivisions where applicable to individual bureau level<br><br>Hibiscus and Bays split between north bureaux and CAB North Shore<br><br>Upper Harbour split at Greenhithe bridge between CAB North Shore and WaiCAB<br><br>Howick Southwest area to Ōtara; balance to Pakuranga<br><br>Franklin Northeast area to Pakuranga; balance to Papakura |

**Table 2: Funding model assessment**

| Criteria<br>X does not meet<br>✓ partially meets<br>✓✓fully meets | Current model   | Council staff model  | New model from joint working group (preferred model)  |
|---|---|--|---|
| Equity  | X   | ✓  | ✓✓  |
| Population growth   | X   | ✓✓   | ✓✓  |
| Community need  | X   | ✓✓   | ✓✓  |
| Advantages  | ACABx used the current funding model to transition to regional funding from legacy arrangements   | <p>Uses latest population estimates to reflect future growth</p> <p>Deprivation factor supports equity for populations with complex issues and access constraints</p> <p>Client usage as a proxy indicator of community need which takes into consideration that service users do not necessarily just access services in the area they live</p> | <p>More equitable across Auckland with population-based funding covering all the region except Great Barrier Island</p> <p>Uses latest population estimates to reflect future growth</p> <p>Targeted deprivation factor supports equity for populations with complex issues and access constraints</p> <p>Provides platform for Auckland Council and ACABx to work together to develop a regional network provision framework</p> |
| Disadvantages   | <p>The legacy cluster funding arrangements do not provide for service development</p> <p>Relies on 2013 census data</p> <p>Does not target funding for populations with complex issues and access constraints</p> | <p>Not supported by CAB</p> <p>Redistribution of bureaux funding within current funding envelope could lead to service reduction unless alternative funding is sourced</p>   | <p>Redistribution of bureaux funding within current funding envelope could lead to service reduction unless alternative funding is sourced</p>  |