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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities
This committee deals with all strategy and policy decision-making that is not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body. Key responsibilities include:

- Development and monitoring of strategy, policy and action plans associated with environmental, social, economic and cultural activities
- Natural heritage
- Parks and reserves
- Economic development
- Protection and restoration of Auckland’s ecological health
- Climate change
- The Southern Initiative
- Waste minimisation
- Libraries
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Performing the delegations made by the Governing Body to the former Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum and Regional Development and Operations Committee, under resolution GB/2012/157 in relation to dogs
- Activities of the following CCOs:
  - ATEED
  - RFA

Powers
(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.
(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.
(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2)
**Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting**

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

**Those who are not members of the public**

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

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

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

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

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

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

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

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

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 10 July 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

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

5 Public Input

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

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

6 Local Board Input

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

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

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

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

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

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and
(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and
(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

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

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

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

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

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

File No.: CP2019/08056

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To provide the Environment and Community Committee with information on and seek support for the Marae Infrastructure Programme.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Auckland Plan recognises marae as important hubs for Māori and their wider communities. The Marae Infrastructure Programme seeks to deliver safe, healthy and warm marae as part of the wider Auckland Plan, and council’s focus area of marae being self-sustaining and prosperous.

3. Auckland Council commissioned a marae needs assessment in 2014. The assessment highlighted significant challenges for marae to resource capital infrastructure works and ongoing asset management.

4. The programme is a collaborative approach between marae and Auckland Council, with Community Facilities responsible for managing the delivery of the marae projects. The delivery will be tested through a piloting project, with the programme rolled out across the eligible existing 18 mana whenua and 14 mataawaka marae.

5. Piloting will enable testing of the effectiveness of the approach, understanding interdependencies between various stakeholders, the capacity of internal providers to deliver the programme and the likely delivery timeframes.

6. The overall programme has budget of $60 million over a ten-year period, as part of the 2018 Long-term Plan (LTP) consolidated Māori Outcomes budget. The programme target is to progress four marae each financial year.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the Marae Infrastructure Programme.

b) support consideration being given during the next Long-term Plan planning process for the provision of specific support for Marae, post any infrastructure delivery.

Horopaki
Context

Marae Infrastructure Programme - Background

7. ‘Māori Identity and Wellbeing – A thriving Māori identity is Auckland’s point of difference in the world. It advances prosperity for Māori and benefits all Aucklanders’ is a priority outcome within the Auckland Plan 2050. The Auckland Plan seeks to realise this outcome through seven focus areas including ‘Investing in marae to be Self-sustaining and Prosperous’.
8. The Auckland Plan recognises marae as important hubs for Māori and their wider communities. They physically and spiritually anchor Māori identity, and function as focal points for Māori social, economic and cultural leadership.

9. Marae provide for hui and tangihanga, and provide wider support such as kōhanga reo early childhood education through to a range of health, education and social services. Marae are valued as cultural and community hubs and the responsibility of the haukāinga to manaaki manuhiri and foster whanaungatanga are often extended to the wider community in times of need.

10. The significant role marae have in enabling better outcomes for Māori and the wider community continues to evolve, and appropriate resources and support for marae is needed. The recent funding in the 2018 LTP was strong recognition of the importance of marae to both Māori and the wider community.

11. In 2014 Auckland Council commissioned Boffa Miskell, assisted by Maynard Marks, to conduct a needs assessment of 31 mana whenua and mataawaka mare in the Auckland region. The report highlighted:

- 20 marae (65%) are managed entirely by volunteers
- 11 marae (35%) have some paid staff for basic administrative services
- Five of those with paid staff have fewer than two staff mostly part time cleaners or administrators
- Six marae provide social services and their staff numbers relate to the range and scale of social services provided – from four to more than 10 staff.
- Rural marae may require water, waste water and access infrastructure.

Across marae the major challenges are:

- Buildings requiring significant work to ensure safety and compliance
- Costs related to capital infrastructure maintenance and renewals cannot be met internally, nor can be depreciation funded
- Asset management can require specialised skills which are not available within their internal marae networks.

12. Several marae buildings and associated infrastructure are showing signs of aging and wear and tear. Significant work is required to ensure marae continue to be healthy and safe cultural spaces for whanau, the community and future generations, and meet minimum Building Warrant of Fitness obligations. Staff will undertake an assessment to inform the next LTP of any requirement for ongoing support and its level, post-marae infrastructure upgrade works.

13. Following completion of the marae condition assessments, the 2015 LTP included additional budget for capital expenditure (capex) marae work commencing in FY19. This budget of $60m was subsequently included in the 2018 LTP consolidated Māori Outcomes budget of $150m.

14. A Marae Infrastructure Programme has been developed as a significant opportunity for council to collaborate with marae on how best to support investment in the marae physical infrastructure. This is a direct response to the Auckland Plan focus on investing in marae, and the Independent Māori Statutory Board’s position on Empowering Marae as Our Cultural Markers.

**Purpose and Scope**

15. The primary purpose of the Marae Infrastructure Programme is to deliver safe, healthy and warm marae. This is further refined to supporting marae achieve Building Warrant of Fitness requirements and increase Code of Compliance where possible.
16. The programme is targeted at existing mana whenua and mataawaka marae within Tāmaki Makaurau. It focuses on physical works related to the wharenui (meeting house), wharekai (dining hall), wharepaku (ablution block), and associated infrastructure such as water and waste water systems.

17. In addition to the primary purpose of the Marae Infrastructure Programme, there are several significant outcomes which the programme promotes:
   - Whānau connections to marae are maintained and enhanced
   - Marae continue as hubs for Māori and the wider community
   - Marae function as focal points for Māori social, economic and cultural leadership
   - Marae can extend whanaungatanga to the wider community in times of need
   - Value for money and leverage is achieved through a delivery approach focused on working with internal service providers and external funding partners (Central Government, philanthropic, businesses).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Delivery Approach

18. Council’s Community Facilities Department within the Customer and Community Services Directorate is responsible for delivering the programme. They work in close collaboration with the Operations Māori Responsiveness Hub as the programme requires other parts of the Operations Directorates (Infrastructure and Environmental Services and Regulatory Services) to support the delivery of the programme. A major component of the delivery approach involves Community Facilities managing the infrastructure development in collaboration with marae, rather than the programme being based on a funding agreement approach with marae.

19. The broad delivery approach has five main steps which operate on an annual basis. The steps and key outputs are detailed below.

20. The programme is unique in nature and has a high level of complexity. A pilot phase has been included in the programme to test the approach and to understand:
   - how the assumptions can inform a funding policy
   - if the prioritisation approach is robust and acceptable to stakeholders
   - if the budget and long-term funding assumptions are correct
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- the capacity of internal teams to deliver the work, and what effort may be required to procure external providers
- the constraints and issues around working in partnership with marae committees
- the risks and issues facing the programme
- how all the moving parts best fit together and if the programme and projects are best structured and managed to reflect this
- opportunities to coordinate with other funders and establish formal relationships with them where appropriate.

21. The delivery target is to progress four marae each financial year. For 2019/2020 and beyond, marae will be prioritised based on strategic and practical considerations:
   - will the project meet the council’s strategic intent to enable thriving and self-sustainable marae, and the role of marae for Māori and the wider community
   - Council’s ability to provide a coordinated and strategic approach to resolution of the issues identified in the 2014 needs assessment
   - are there opportunities for support from other funders for the project.

The practical issues which will influence prioritisation are:
   - immediate health and safety issues
   - any public health issues
   - outstanding building warrant of fitness and code of compliance issues
   - the urgency of any maintenance or renewals
   - the willingness of marae to engage with the programme and pilot.

22. The programme is based on council working with a third-party asset owner, and significant work has been required to understand the liability and risk to both parties. This will ensure council and the marae are fully informed of the most appropriate mitigation measures implemented.

23. As noted earlier, further consideration will be necessary to understand how best to support the ongoing maintenance of the developed assets, including leveraging council procurement opportunities (for example) with insurance. This work will inform the next LTP.

Progress

24. Two marae are currently fully involved in the programme and moving to the delivery phase of the programme. A third marae has confirmed their participation in the condition assessment, with assessment of the waste water system underway. A fourth marae is working with council on their waste water system. A further 8 marae condition assessment are expected to be completed this financial year, with physical works for four of these marae to commence before June 2020.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpu Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

25. The programme contributes towards the Auckland Plan outcome of Māori Identity and Wellbeing and the focus area of investing in marae to be self-sustaining and prosperous. Successful delivery of the programme requires an across-council approach and external relationships with other key funders and partners.
**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

26. A communication plan for the Marae Infrastructure Programme has been developed and includes how the programme and marae involved will be communicated to the local boards. As an outcome from the programme, it is anticipated that relationships between marae and council, including local boards, will be strengthened.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

27. The Auckland Plan details a focus area to: *Invest in marae to be self-sustaining and prosperous.* To achieve this, marae development is included as one of the nine corporate strategic priorities established for achieving Māori outcomes. This programme addresses funding and resourcing barriers for marae facilities and infrastructure in Auckland.

28. The Marae Infrastructure Programme responds to the Independent Māori Statutory Board’s ‘Empowered Marae and Sustainable Papakainga’ business case, which outlines the need for council to invest substantial capex to focus on, among other priorities:

- addressing the requirements identified in the marae needs analysis through infrastructure development
- capital investment mechanisms for marae improvement and longer-term maintenance programmes.

29. Marae engaged in the programme to date have been very supportive of council’s involvement, and the opportunities available to support marae infrastructure.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

30. The Marae Infrastructure Programme has an allocated budget of $60m across 10 years as part of the 2018 LTP consolidated Māori Outcomes budget of $150m.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

31. The programme team has been working with council’s Risk and Legal teams to understand the wider implications and mitigation mechanisms.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

32. The programme does require a funding policy to be developed which will clearly articulate the purpose, scope, priority and how funding will be allocated through the programme. The pilot phase will inform the development of the policy. The policy will be reported to the Environment and Community Committee for approval by mid-2020.

33. A programme communications plan has been developed and will be initiated following the committee meeting.

34. Engagement with marae will be undertaken to share information on the programme and to respond to questions on the approach and prioritisation.

35. Further consideration will be necessary to understand how best to support the ongoing maintenance of the developed assets, including leveraging council procurement opportunities (for example) with insurance. This work will inform the next LTP.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
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Submission to the Ministry of Transport on the proposed Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount policies

File No.: CP2019/13601

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To seek the Environment and Community Committee’s approval of Auckland Council’s submission to the Ministry of Transport on its proposal to introduce a Clean Car Standard (vehicle fuel efficiency standard) and Clean Car Discount (feebate scheme).

Whakarāpopotanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Ministry of Transport is consulting on two proposed initiatives to reduce emissions from New Zealand’s light vehicle fleet. The initiatives are a vehicle fuel efficiency standard (“Clean Car Standard”) and a feebate scheme (“Clean Car Discount”) that would provide marketable discounts on fuel efficient vehicles while incurring fees for high emission vehicles. Both initiatives would only apply to new and used light vehicles entering the fleet.

3. The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is a priority for Auckland Council. Auckland Council has declared a climate emergency and is committed to playing its part in limiting temperature rise to no more than 1.5°C (1.5°C). The transport sector is Auckland’s largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and a significant reduction in these emissions is required to meet these commitments and achieve the objectives of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework.

4. Despite foreseeable benefits of the proposals, the consultation documents show that it is unlikely that the proposals will deliver the degree of change required to achieve both the Government’s and Auckland Council’s climate commitments. Given the need for urgent action and the vital role that vehicle emission reductions must play in Auckland to achieving its climate targets, the Ministry’s proposals are not ambitious enough.

5. A draft submission from Auckland Council (Attachment A) was prepared in response to the proposals. While it supports the Ministry’s proposals and emphasises their importance to Auckland Council in terms of meeting its climate commitments, it also seeks that they go further to ensure vehicle emissions reduce to the level required to meet New Zealand’s and Auckland’s climate commitments. Alternatively, if the Government does not believe they can meet these targets through these proposals alone, the submission requests the urgent introduction of other initiatives to reduce vehicle emissions.

6. The significant changes required to meet our emissions targets may disproportionately affect certain groups, including our poorest and most vulnerable people and communities who have the least ability to respond and adapt. The Government should not automatically discount these changes, if they are required to meet our climate goals, but include support mechanisms or protections as part of a holistic package of interventions.

7. The draft submission also recommends some further changes and additional initiatives that directly incentivise electric and zero emission vehicles, as well as the expansion of the approach to include support for other zero emission modes. Additional sub-regional social impact assessments are recommended to improve understanding of the scheme’s potential impacts on Māori, rural households and lower income households in Auckland.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the Auckland Council submission to the Ministry of Transport on its proposal to introduce a Clean Car Standard (vehicle fuel efficiency standard) and Clean Car Discount (feebate scheme).

Horopaki
Context
The proposed initiatives
8. On 9 July 2019 the Ministry of Transport (the Ministry) released for consultation two proposed initiatives (the proposals) to reduce emissions from New Zealand’s light vehicle fleet. These are the:

a) **Clean Car Standard** (technically referred to as a vehicle fuel efficiency standard) for new and used light vehicles entering the fleet. This standard would require vehicle suppliers to lower the average CO2 emissions of the vehicles they are importing to 105gCO2 /km. It would be gradually phased in from 2021 to 2025.

b) **Clean Car Discount** (technically referred to as a feebate scheme) for new and used light vehicles sold for the first time in New Zealand. Feebates would complement an efficiency standard by providing a marketable discount on fuel efficient vehicles and by putting a fee on high emission vehicles.

9. Both policies are aimed exclusively at lowering the level of emissions from new vehicles entering New Zealand. The buying and selling of vehicles in the existing vehicle fleet will be unaffected. Consultation on the proposals closes on 20 August 2019.

10. Some of the consultation documents released refer to complementary initiatives under investigation that “are necessary compliments to the two policies proposed”. These are:

- expanding public charging infrastructure for electric vehicles
- a voluntary vehicle scrappage scheme in Auckland
- a second-hand electric vehicle leasing scheme aimed at reducing transport costs for low income households and supporting electric vehicle uptake
- introducing Euro 6 exhaust emissions standards for imported vehicles to mitigate the risk of an increase in diesel vehicles and a resultant deterioration in air quality.

11. These further initiatives are not part of the consultation but are considered worth noting.

The council’s climate position
12. Auckland Council declared a climate emergency on 11 June 2019. Through its membership of C40, and in line with New Zealand’s commitment to the Paris Agreement, Auckland Council has committed to play its part in limiting temperature rise to no more than 1.5° Celsius. New Zealand’s target under the Paris Agreement is to reduce greenhouse gases by 30 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. Significant and widespread emission reductions are required to achieve these climate commitments.

13. Consideration of the proposals must therefore be undertaken from the perspective of whether they are likely to achieve these goals, rather than from a perspective of whether they are likely to be an improvement from the status quo.
Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework

14. The release of the proposals came the week before the draft of Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF) was released for public consultation. There are clear links between the Government’s proposals, and the key moves and specific actions identified in ACAF to rapidly reduce emissions and deliver a climate resilient Auckland.

15. On-road transport related emissions make up 37.6 percent of Auckland’s total emissions with private cars and light commercial vehicles being responsible for most of these. Changes to the way people travel are therefore particularly critical to meet the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. This is recognised through ACAF “Key Move 5: Deliver clean, safe and equitable transport options” with a specific action to “Encourage large-scale uptake of zero and low emissions vehicles”.

16. Delivery of ACAF requires close partnership with a broad range of stakeholders including central government. This is especially true in regard to vehicle emissions, as responsibility for the setting of vehicle emission standards and the ability to offer financial incentives to purchase more efficient or zero emissions vehicles rests with central government.

17. Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are working together to provide greater transport choices and alternatives to the private vehicle. This includes public transport and active modes, which can play a part in reducing transport related emissions, and have significant co-benefits including improved health, equity and productivity outcomes.

18. Greenhouse gas modelling completed to support the development of ACAF indicates that a significant proportion of the reduction in Auckland’s transport emissions will need to come from switching to electric and zero emission vehicles. The modelling outlines that 20 percent of all private and light commercial vehicles will need to be electric or zero emissions by 2030 and 80 percent by 2050. To achieve this 2030 target, it is likely that 50 to 60 percent of sales of new (to New Zealand) light vehicles in Auckland will need to be electric or zero emissions within the next ten years.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Potential benefits and risks

19. The work undertaken by the Ministry estimates that the proposals will reduce emissions over the life time of the vehicles bought under the schemes by over 5,000 kilotonnes for the Clean Car Standard and 1,553 kilotonnes for the Clean Car Discount. The Ministry also estimates that both schemes have high positive benefits to cost ratios.

20. There are a range of risks and challenges with the proposals, including the practical implications of implementing the system (such as the IT, monitoring and enforcement requirements), and ensuring there are enough low emission and electric vehicles.

21. The Ministry undertook national-level social impact assessments for the proposals, with plans for finer-grained sub-regional analyses to be undertaken at a later stage, without any specific deadlines. The assessments suggest that there are short-term impacts to low income households in terms of vehicle price and choice:

a) Choice impact: If low-income families require large vehicles that are new to the fleet, and there are no low emissions alternatives in the short-term, then they will have to pay a fee under the Clean Car Discount scheme.

b) Price impact: The Clean Car Standard is expected to increase the average price of vehicles coming into the fleet due to improvements in engine technology. This could impact more on low income households as it would consume a greater proportion of their income.
22. The Ministry suggests that low income households could avoid these impacts by buying vehicles from the domestic second-hand market or buying low emissions vehicles, to benefit from the Clean Car Discount. The Ministry’s analysis suggests that currently low-income households that buy vehicles new to the fleet tend to buy lower emissions vehicles.

23. There is a lack of information on the likely behavioral responses of vehicle buyers and importers, and the flow-on impacts onto the domestic used cars market, especially at the regional and sub-regional levels. Better understanding of both schemes’ impacts on Auckland’s communities is required, particularly for lower income households, rural households, and Māori. Council staff recommend that a sub-regional, Auckland-focused social impact assessment is undertaken as soon as possible. It may be possible for the council’s Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) to assist with the analysis.

24. While this assessment can help identify impacts on particularly vulnerable groups and ensure any actions taken are designed as much as possible to avoid or mitigate them, it may not be possible to do so completely. To achieve our climate targets will require substantial changes in the way we live and certain actions may need to be taken which have some negative impacts. These should not be automatically discounted, as to do so may mean we as a society cannot make the changes required to meet our climate goals. In these cases, other support mechanisms or protections need to be considered as part of a wider package of actions. These mechanisms are available to the Government and we encourage them to use them if necessary.

25. Potential impacts also exist for those who require specific vehicles for work, such as utes. For this type of vehicle there may be no affordable low emission model with the required functionality on the market at present. Manufacturers are investing in the development of electric utes, however it is uncertain when these will be available on the New Zealand market. While the proposals must be designed to achieve their objective of emissions reductions in line with New Zealand’s commitments, the Ministry needs to remain cognisant of this situation and its potential impact.

Alignment of the proposed initiatives with the council’s climate position

26. The introduction of the proposals is encouraging and necessary given, as noted by the consultation document, “New Zealand is not on track to meet the Electric Vehicle (EV) target for 2021”. As such, even the best case projections for EV uptake do not result in the reduction of light vehicle emissions in line with the Government’s climate targets for 2030 and 2050.

27. Government regulations requiring improvements in vehicle efficiency and monetary incentives for the public to purchase more efficient vehicles are essential to achieving the council’s climate change objectives. So, to the extent that the proposals reduce vehicle emissions and increase the uptake of electric and zero emissions vehicles, the proposals do support these.

Extent of change expected

28. Achieving the council’s goal of reducing our emissions to net zero by 2050, and to play our part in limiting temperature rise to 1.5°C, requires near immediate, substantial change. Despite the benefits of the proposals outlined above it is unlikely that the proposals will deliver the degree of change required to support limiting temperature rise to 1.5°C or even 2°C.

29. The proposed average emissions target of 105 gCO₂/km is behind that set by most other developed countries including Japan, Canada and the European Union. In fact, the cabinet paper and Regulatory Impact Statement acknowledge that “an emissions reduction equivalent to the 2030 Paris target could be achieved in 2037”. As a result, the proposals need to be viewed at best as a step to achieve central government’s and Auckland Council’s climate change goals.
30. Given the vital role vehicle emission reductions must play in Auckland achieving its climate change goals and the need for urgent action, the proposals are not ambitious enough. Changes should be made to the proposals to ensure vehicle emissions reduce to the level required to meet New Zealand’s and Auckland’s climate commitments. A shortening of the timeframes for the introduction of the proposals should also be considered.

31. If the Government does not believe they can meet these targets through a strengthening of these proposals alone, then they need to urgently introduce other initiatives to reduce vehicle emissions to the extent required to meet these emission reduction targets.

**Support for electric and zero emissions vehicles**

32. Both proposals are focussed on reducing the fleet wide level of emissions rather than increasing the number or proportion of zero emissions vehicles themselves. While this may be the most pragmatic approach in the short-term, this will not be sufficient for Auckland or New Zealand to meet their climate commitments. An increased direct monetary incentive should be introduced for electric and zero emission vehicles.

33. As one of the background reports prepared for the Ministry noted: “substantial early adoption of EVs in other countries has been particularly associated with subsidies that have reduced initial purchase price to the extent that EVs have a price advantage over [Internal Combustion Engine Vehicles (ICEVs)]”. Examples of this include Norway and the Netherlands, which had subsidy levels sufficient to give electric vehicles a price advantage over ICEVs and were also the two countries with the highest market shares for electric vehicles internationally.

34. The cabinet paper released as part of the consultation refers to a subsidy for electric vehicles that was an unsuccessful bid for budget 2019. Such a subsidy should be implemented to further incentivise the purchase of electric and zero emission vehicles.

**Other zero emissions modes**

35. The proposals are limited to changing the composition of the light vehicle fleet. While there is justification for some of the exclusions proposed, there are also some cases where this justification is not compelling, specifically for:

a) **Buses:** The proposals are limited to light vehicles as the Ministry does not consider that there are enough low or zero emission heavy vehicles available at this time. This is correct for trucks; however considerable progress has been made on the development of electric buses in recent years and there will be enough options to allow a transition to electric buses soon. Some form of subsidy or rebate should be introduced for new electric buses paid for by an additional fee on new diesel buses.

b) **Bikes and e-bikes:** Many short vehicle trips could be done by walking or cycling. Currently, 40 percent of trips in New Zealand are less than two kilometers in distance and 68 percent are less than five kilometers. One of the key themes adopted by the Ministry in the preparation of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport was ‘mode neutrality’. Taking this approach, financial incentives should not be limited to motor vehicles given the impact bikes and e-bikes could make to reducing emissions.

**Other complementary initiatives**

36. The four complementary initiatives referred to in paragraph 9, are required to support the proposals to meet the Government’s emission reduction targets. The submission recommends that the investigation and implementation of these initiatives are accelerated.

37. We also recommend that central government monitor vehicle emissions levels and consider the introduction of vehicle emissions limits on the existing New Zealand fleet if emissions targets are not being met. This would help accelerate the turnover of higher emitting vehicles and their replacement with lower emitting counterparts.
Item 9

Proposed submission
38. Based on the analysis set out above the proposed submission (Attachment A) makes the following points:
   a) It emphasises the importance of these proposals to Auckland Council in terms of meeting its climate change commitments
   b) It supports the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount that improves average vehicle fuel efficiency and encourages the purchase of electric and zero emission vehicles
   c) It seeks changes to strengthen the proposals to allow the transition of the light vehicle fleet at a rate that delivers emissions reductions that are in line with the 2030 Paris target or, if this is not possible, urgently introduce other initiatives to meet these targets
   d) It acknowledges that the significant changes required to achieve emissions targets may negatively affect vulnerable people or groups and encourages the Government to use the support mechanisms or protections available to it
   e) It recommends a scheme that directly incentivises the purchase of electric and zero emission vehicles
   f) It recommends expanding the approach to include support for other zero emission modes of transport, in particular:
      i) electric buses; and
      ii) bikes and electric bikes
   g) It recommends the continued investigation of the complementary initiatives described in the cabinet paper
   h) It recommends that additional sub-regional social impact assessments be undertaken to understand the scheme’s potential impacts on Māori, rural households and lower income households in Auckland.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
39. The draft submission was prepared by the council’s Transport Strategy team and Chief Sustainability Office. It has been reviewed and is supported by Auckland Transport.
40. For the reasons set out above, the position set out in the draft submission supports the strategic and operational objectives of both the council and Auckland Transport.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
41. The reporting timeline is insufficient to enable local boards to provide formal feedback to inform this paper. Local boards were notified of the proposed submission and the key themes likely to be included in the submission with a memo on 30 July 2019 and were provided with a draft of the submission on 2 August 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
42. Reduced transport emissions will impact positively on Māori. Māori are over-represented in areas most vulnerable and least adaptable to the impacts of climate change. Additionally, Māori have higher exposure to air pollutants than other ethnic groups due to pre-existing social inequities, resulting in higher rates of chronic respiratory and cardiovascular disease.
43. In the short-term, there may be negative impacts to lower income Māori households around increased vehicle prices and reduced vehicle choices. It is critical to ensure that the proposals are supported by complementary initiatives that can mitigate these short-term impacts and enable all Māori to benefit fully from the proposed discounts. This includes a second-hand electric vehicle leasing scheme and expanding the discounts to cover other modes, such as e-bikes.

44. Council staff recommend that a sub-regional social impact assessment is undertaken as soon as possible to understand the implications (and risks) of the proposals to different iwi/hapū/whanau, before further decision-making is undertaken.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

45. There are no financial implications arising from approving the submission.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk that the proposed policies will not be able to meet Auckland’s greenhouse gas emission reduction targets</td>
<td>Approve submission and continue engagement with the Ministry on the effectiveness of the proposals to meet climate commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown risks around the practical implications of implementing the system</td>
<td>Further analysis to understand the implementation risks, including sub-regional social impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of disadvantaging lower income households that require higher emission vehicles</td>
<td>Support complementary initiatives to the proposals that aim to reduce costs for lower income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk that strengthened proposals or new initiatives required to meet emissions targets will have increased impacts on groups including lower income households</td>
<td>Social impact assessments prepared before strengthened proposals or new initiatives are introduced. Support mitigation measures such as complementary initiatives, and welfare support or protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

46. The approved submission will be submitted to the Ministry of Transport by 20 August 2019.

47. Council staff will continue to work with central government and others to deliver the key moves identified in ACAF.
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Submission to the Ministry of Transport
In the matter of the Clean Car Standard and the Clean Car Discount
Auckland Council, August 2019
**Mihimihi**

| Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,       | I greet the mountains, repository of all that       |
| ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,                    | has been said of this place,                        |
| ki ngā awa tuku kiri o āna manawhenua,         | there I greet the cliffs that have heard the       |
| āna mana a-iwi taketake mai, tauiwi atu.       | ebb and flow of the tides of time,                 |
| Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,     | and the rivers that cleansed the forebears          |
| wenerau a te mano.                             | of all who came those born of this land            |
| Kāhore tō rite i te ao.                        | and the newcomers among us all.                    |
|                                                | Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed              |
|                                                | among the multitude, envy of thousands.            |
|                                                | You are unique in the world.                       |
Submission to the Ministry of Transport on the proposed Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount policies

Item 9

Title: Auckland Council Submission on the discussion paper on the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

Submission to the Ministry of Transport

Key Points

1. Auckland Council strongly supports the intent of the proposed Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount set out in the discussion paper. Proposals such as these are integral for Auckland Council to achieve the emission reductions required for a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit.

2. Achieving this target will not be easy and will require fundamental changes to how we move around and how we live our day-to-day lives. This must also happen soon. To meet our goals our emissions must decrease rapidly in the next decade. Auckland Council is concerned that the proposals do not go far enough to meet Auckland and New Zealand’s 2030 emissions reduction targets. The council seeks that:
   - the proposals be amended to the extent required to meet these emission reduction targets; and/or
   - the Government urgently introduce other initiatives to reduce vehicle emissions to the extent required to meet these emission reduction targets.

3. Auckland Council acknowledges that the significant changes required to meet our emissions targets may disproportionately affect certain groups, including our poorest and most vulnerable people and communities who have the least ability to respond and adapt. The council recommends that the Government not automatically discount these changes, if they are required to meet our climate goals, but consider support mechanisms, such as increased welfare support or protections, as part of a holistic package of interventions.

4. Because the changes needed to achieve emission targets may affect the most vulnerable the most cannot be a reason to not do what is needed. The approach must be one that meets emission targets and addresses the impacts on the most vulnerable.
5. Auckland Council also recommends:
   • additional initiatives that directly incentivise the purchase of zero emission vehicles.
   • an expansion of the approach to other zero emission modes of transport, in particular electric buses and bicycles.
   • continued investigation of the complementary initiatives.
   • additional sub-regional social impact assessments to understand potential impacts on Māori, rural households and lower income households in Auckland.

Introduction

6. Auckland Council would like to thank the Ministry of Transport for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Clear Car Standard and Clean Car Discount to address light vehicle emissions. Auckland Council’s submission is based on the strategic goals and commitments of the Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft of Te Tārūka-ā-Tawhiri: Auckland’s Climate Action Framework (ACAF), which is currently out for public consultation.

7. In November 2018, Auckland Council recommitted to its membership of C40 and joined 94 international cities taking bold action against climate change. This committed the Auckland region to progress towards limiting the increase in temperature from climate change to within 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. This commitment, and the council’s recent declaration of a Climate Emergency, highlights the urgency required to transition Auckland towards a net zero carbon future. We recognise the importance of the proposal for a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount for achieving Auckland’s greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

8. ACAF was endorsed for public consultation (ENV/2019/71) in June 2019. This document outlines a pathway to align with the C40 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit while ensuring Auckland is prepared for future climate challenges.

9. ACAF has been developed with collaboration and partnerships across sectors, including central government. For central government this has included a collaboration agreement, a seat at the working group table throughout framework development and refinement, agreed workstream alignment, key involvement in major events like the Auckland Climate Symposium and co-resourcing like secondments.

10. The framework has 11 key moves, including one that focuses on the delivery of clean, safe and equitable transport options. This key move emphasises the importance of both a shift towards public transport and active modes, and an increase in the percentage of electric and zero emission vehicles on Auckland’s roads.
11. Transport related emissions make up 43.6\% per cent of Auckland’s total emissions. This makes the transport sector the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the Auckland region. On-road transport accounts for 86.1 per cent of transport emissions (37.6 per cent of total emissions), with private cars and light commercial vehicles responsible for the majority. As a proportion of total emissions, Auckland’s transport related emissions are more than double that of New Zealand, where transport accounts for 20 per cent of total emissions.

12. Low and zero emission technologies already exist to reduce emissions in the transport sector. This is not the case for all sectors and some sectors may need to rely on future advancements in technology and innovation to significantly reduce emissions. It is therefore important that the transport sector rapidly adopts low and zero emission technologies to support the delivery of our climate commitments.

13. While large-scale uptake of zero emission vehicles is an important part of a future climate-compatible transport system, ACAF acknowledges that the price of electric cars is currently too high to be affordable for everyone. In the July 2019 submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill, Auckland Council advocated for a stronger emphasis to be placed on a just transition to a net zero future. It is essential that all Aucklanders are supported and able to participate in this transition. To this end we welcome the proposals set out in the discussion document to incentivise the uptake of electric vehicles (EVs) through discounting and other financial mechanisms.

14. Auckland Council strongly supports the intent of the proposals set out in the discussion paper. However, we are concerned that the proposals do not sufficiently support central and local government obligations in respect of emissions reductions and global warming limits. Bold action is required if we are to reverse recent increases in transport related emissions\(^2\) and achieve the kinds of reductions necessary to keep global warming to a 1.5 degrees Celsius limit.

15. Below, we expand on our concerns and outline improvements we believe should be made to ensure the proposals delivery of emission reductions in line with the 2030 target under the Paris Agreement. We also encourage the Government to urgently consider what other initiatives may be required to meet these targets. Our response also addresses the social impacts, impacts on Māori and additional considerations.

---


\(^2\) Xie, S (2019). Auckland’s greenhouse gas inventory to 2016, Figure 2-5. Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/002
Our response to the Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

Auckland Council supports the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount

16. Auckland Council supports these and any other proposals which will improve average vehicle fuel efficiency and encourage the purchase of electric and zero emission vehicles. These moves are essential to achieving Auckland’s and New Zealand’s climate change objectives.

17. With our declaration of a climate emergency and our commitment to reducing our emissions to net zero by 2050, Auckland Council has been clear on the urgency for action on climate change and the need to affect significant change now or risk widespread social, cultural, environmental and economic catastrophe.

18. As the transport sector is the largest contributor of emissions in the Auckland region, changes to the level of vehicle emissions are critical to reducing Auckland’s overall greenhouse gas emissions.

19. The council and Auckland Transport are working together to provide cleaner modes of transport as an attractive and realistic alternative to the private vehicle and are in the longer-term process of creating a more compact urban form to reduce the need to travel. However, any reduction in emissions as a result of this mode shift will likely constitute a small portion of overall emissions reductions.

20. Most of the reductions in Auckland’s vehicle emissions will need to come from a massive increase in the number of electric and zero emissions vehicles combined with an increase in the fuel efficiency of the remainder of the fleet.

21. While Auckland Council has taken a leadership role in the development of ACAF, the goal of net zero is not its sole responsibility and cannot be achieved by it acting alone. This is especially true regarding vehicle emissions, as responsibility for the setting of vehicle emission standards and the ability to offer financial incentives to purchase more efficient or zero emissions vehicles rests with central government.

22. The council therefore supports the introduction of a Clean Car Standard and Clean Car Discount as integral to achieving the emissions reduction required for a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming limit.
Auckland Council seeks that the proposals be amended to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction or, if this is not possible, urgently introduce other initiatives to meet these targets

23. While Auckland Council strongly supports the introduction of methods to reduce light vehicle emissions we are concerned that the proposed policies do not go far enough and will not deliver the emission reductions required to achieve the 2030 target under the Paris Agreement.

24. To achieve Auckland Council’s goal of reducing our emissions and limiting temperature rise requires near immediate, substantial change. Despite the benefits of the proposals outlined in the consultation material it is unlikely that the proposals will deliver sufficient change to adequately support limiting temperature rise change to 1.5 or even 2 degrees Celsius.

25. As admitted in both the cabinet paper and regulatory impact statement, released as part of the consultation, the proposals will not achieve the 2030 target level of emissions reduction until 2037.

26. This would be of less concern if there was more time to implement further changes following the introduction of the initial schemes. Yet, with these schemes not being planned to be implemented until 2022 at the earliest, there is little ability to make further, later changes in time to achieve Auckland’s and New Zealand’s 2030 targets.

27. As noted in the consultation material, decisions made now in relation to motor vehicles will have implications for the next 20 years. Failing to generate enough change in the next decade will make the challenge of achieving our 2050 target’s much harder, more disruptive and more expensive.

28. Auckland Council therefore request that amendments be made to the proposals to the extent required to meet New Zealand’s 2030 target level of emissions reduction.

29. Auckland Council also requests that if the Government does not believe they can meet these targets through these proposals alone, they urgently introduce other initiatives to reduce vehicle emissions to the extent required to meet these emission reduction targets. The council is aware that changes to the proposals or the introduction of new initiatives may increase the scale of impacts on certain groups, but believes the Government has the mechanisms available to mitigate these impacts (a point expanded on in paragraph 48 below).

---

3 Cabinet Paper: Moving the Light Vehicle Fleet to Low-Emissions: Agreement to consult on a vehicle fuel efficiency standard and a feebate scheme, and Regulatory Impact Statement: Moving to a low emissions light vehicle fleet
Clean Car Standard (fuel efficiency standard)

30. Auckland Council supports the introduction of a light emissions vehicle standard but advocates for a more ambitious response, as outlined below.

31. Auckland Council is concerned that the average emissions target of 105 gCO₂/km is not low enough to meet the region’s and New Zealand’s climate commitments. We understand that the 105 gCO₂/km limit is aligned to the Australian Government report “Improving the efficiency of new light vehicles” findings; however, this is a weaker limit than the European Union, Canada, and Japan. The Australian Government’s report analysed three different limits, 105 gCO₂/km, 119 gCO₂/km and 135 gCO₂/km, indicating that the lowest limit investigated was adopted. There are standards in approximately 80 per cent of the global light vehicle market to incentivise manufacturers to supply low emission vehicles, and it is likely that the global supply of new vehicles will become increasingly compliant with these international targets. New Zealand is currently behind most international countries with an average of 180 gCO₂/km, and bold action is required to rapidly improve this. As the Ministry has identified, even with the successful implementation of this proposal New Zealand will overshoot it’s 2030 emissions reduction target by 7 years. This is clearly of considerable concern. Auckland Council seeks that the government set lower emissions limits which will achieve it’s 2030 Paris Agreement target.

32. Auckland Council is concerned that the exemption of people who import three or less vehicles from the clean car standard can lead to loopholes that could still allow for high cumulative numbers of higher emission vehicle imports. The total number of vehicles in New Zealand that are sold by suppliers who currently import three or less cars per year is unclear. If this number accounts for a significant share of imports, it is important that all loopholes that could be created by the exemption are removed.

33. Auckland Council encourages the Government to adopt as short a phase in timeframe as possible and opposes any increase to the phase in period. As outlined above the council is concerned that the proposals will not achieve New Zealand’s emissions reduction targets. One way to improve emissions reductions from the proposals would be to introduce them as quickly as possible. All possible efforts should be made to bring the introduction date forward and shorten the phase in period.

---

34. **Auckland Council supports a penalty scheme for non-compliance with the emissions target and for misreporting data.** In order to ensure compliance, we recommend that the rate of penalties should be higher than the potential revenues that suppliers could make by not complying with the emission target.

35. **Auckland Council has concerns about the flexibility given to suppliers in meeting their emission targets.** We understand that a degree of flexibility can be beneficial for the transition stage. However, we believe that too much flexibility is given in the banking mechanism that allows over-achievement of an annual emission target to be used to cover under-achievement in the three years to follow. Auckland Council is concerned that this timeframe may not drive commercial behaviour in line with the vehicle emission target. We recommend that flexibility of the mechanism should be limited to allow banking of emission savings only possibly within one year following the year of over-achievement, instead of the following three years.

36. **Auckland Council is strongly supportive of the alignment of this proposal with the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill.** We support the inclusion of future light vehicle emissions targets within the Climate Change Commission’s role, and for this advice to be implemented by the Ministry of Transport.

37. **We support the sanction of disqualification from being a registered motor vehicle dealer if a supplier deliberately attempts to evade meeting annual targets.** Compliance of suppliers is critical to ensure the success of the proposed emissions standard. Auckland Council believes that the sanction of disqualification from being a registered motor vehicle dealer will be effective in driving behaviours in line with the vehicle emissions standard.

38. **Auckland Council supports the amendment of the Fuel Consumption Information Rule** that limit vehicle import to those vehicles tested to the Worldwide Harmonised Light Vehicles Test Procedure (WLTP), the New European Drive Cycle (NEDC) and the Japanese JC08 standard. We also support the adoption of the WLTP as an international unified measure for the assessment of new imported vehicles to ensure valid comparison of vehicles. The adoption of WLTP will also simplify the comparison between vehicles as administration and training for vehicle analyses can be condensed for one single testing method.

39. **We support setting stronger future emissions targets beyond 2025.** While we are aware that the effects of technological changes and market uptake in the future are uncertain, we strongly recommend that minimum targets are set for each of the periods beyond 2025 in line with the commitments under the Paris agreement. We support
the alignment of the 5-yearly emission targets for the clean vehicle standard with the timeframes of the emissions budgets set by the Climate Change Commission.

**Clean Car Discount (Feebate scheme)**

40. As outlined in paragraph 13, Auckland Council is concerned that the average 105 gCO\textsubscript{2}/km is not in line with limiting climate change to 1.5 degrees Celsius temperature rise. To deliver this target, the average emissions target for light vehicles needs to be significantly lower, in line with other countries.

41. Auckland Council supports the feebate scheme, however it is concerned that there is financial compensation for purchase of vehicles above the 105 gCO\textsubscript{2}/km target. We acknowledge the top 10 preferred models from 2017 mainly fall within the zero-band width, and that it is important to incentivise on the lower emission versions of these models. However, we would like for the zero-band width to be extended out to the 106 to 120 gCO\textsubscript{2}/km range and use the money that would have been used for incentivisation of the higher emitting cars to further subsidise low emission vehicles. It is important to acknowledge that the cars purchased under this scheme are likely to be on the roads for around 19 years, and we need to reduce our reliance on a high emitting fleet as urgently as possible.

42. Emissions modelling completed to inform the development of ACAF indicates that within a decade 50 to 60 per cent of new car sales in Auckland are likely to need to be zero emission to align with a 1.5 degrees Celsius warming pathway. Auckland Council will utilise its position to support this transition, however this specific action is outside of local government’s mandate. Bold leadership is critical for successful implementation of ACAF. Auckland Council recommends additional initiatives that directly incentivise the purchase of zero emission vehicles to ensure substantial reduction of vehicle emissions.

43. We encourage a transparent, long-term forecasting on the price shift of the Clean Car Feebate Scheme. We understand that it is likely for the Climate Change Commission to include future progress of the feebate scheme in the release of the five-year emissions budget. It is important that there is open communication around the future of the scheme. This would enable several benefits, including early adoption of low emission vehicles to maximise the incentivisation pay-off, while also acting as a deterrent to purchase high-emission vehicles for future increased penalties. Long-term price forecasting will enable people to account for the lifetime of their vehicle (depending on how long they intend to own the car). It also could act as a motivator for people to upgrade to a more sustainable vehicle early, when the incentivisation is higher.
44. **We support the discount at car sale, and the mechanisms in place to prevent people from cheating the system.** We support the emphasise on ensuring that the prices and discounts are separated to reduce the hiking of prices and would like to see additional method to ensure that the buyer gets the benefits of the scheme.

45. As mentioned earlier, the cars that are purchased now will likely be on the roads for the next 19 years. In response to this, is very important to **prioritise the investments into zero emission vehicles.** While the scheme does provide larger benefits for the purchase of zero emission vehicles, it would be good for there to be additional direct incentives to zero emission vehicles.

**Additional considerations**

**Social impacts**

46. The Ministry undertook national-level social impact assessments for both proposals to understand their impacts on lower income households. The assessments note that there are **short-term impacts to low income households in terms of vehicle price and choice,** but that these impacts could be mitigated by buying vehicles from the domestic second-hand market or buying low emissions vehicles. The assessments also note that there are plans for finer-grained sub-regional social impact assessments to be undertaken at a later stage, without any specific deadlines.

47. There is a lack of information on the likely behavioural responses of vehicle buyers and importers, and the flow-on impacts onto the domestic used cars market, especially at the regional and sub-regional levels. Better understanding of both proposals’ impacts on Auckland communities is required, particularly for lower income households, rural households and Maori. **Auckland Council recommends that a sub-regional, Auckland-focused social impact assessment is undertaken as soon as possible to inform decision-making.** It may be possible for Auckland Council to assist the Ministry with the analysis if required.

48. **While this assessment can help identify impacts on particularly vulnerable groups and ensure any actions taken are designed as much as possible to avoid or mitigate them, the council recognises that it may not be possible to do so completely.** To achieve our climate targets will require substantial changes in the way we live and certain actions may need to be taken which are regressive or have some negative impacts on particular groups. These actions should not be automatically discounted, as to do so may mean we cannot make the changes as a society required to meet our climate goals. In these cases, other support mechanisms, such as increased welfare support, or protections need to be considered as
part of a wider package of actions. These support mechanisms are available to the Government and we encourage them to use them if necessary.

49. The council also recognises the potential impacts on those who require specific vehicles for work, such as utes. For this type of vehicle there may be no affordable low emission model with the required functionality on the market at present. Manufacturers are investing in the development of electric utes, however it is uncertain when these will be available on the New Zealand market. While the proposals must be designed to achieve their objective of emissions reductions in line with New Zealand’s commitments, we encourage the Ministry to remain cognisant of this situation and its potential impact.

50. Auckland Council supports the use of complementary initiatives to mitigate against the negative impacts of the proposals on communities, and to enable all Aucklanders to benefit fully from the proposed discounts. This includes second-hand electric vehicle leasing schemes and expanding the discounts to cover other modes, such as e-bikes.

Complementary initiatives

51. The four complementary initiatives proposed by the Ministry of Transport are necessary to support the implementation of this proposal. This includes a focus on ensuring that there is sufficient charging infrastructure to support a fleet of zero emission vehicles. To ensure that the proposals are successfully implemented, Auckland Council recommends that progress of the complementary initiatives is prioritised.

52. The council also recommends that central government monitor vehicle emissions levels and consider the introduction of vehicle emissions limits on the existing New Zealand fleet if emissions targets are not being met. Given the average 19-year lifespan of vehicles in New Zealand, further initiatives may be required to help accelerate the turnover and replacement of higher emitting vehicles.

Other low emissions vehicles

53. Auckland Council would like to emphasise that low emission light vehicles are only part of the solution to a net zero future and recommend development of a scheme or schemes that includes incentivisation for low emission buses, bikes and e-bikes.

54. The proposals are limited to changing the composition of the light vehicle fleet, however additional legislation could provide a focus on electrifying public transport and increasing active alternatives. The proposal was limited to light vehicles due to lack of technology advancement in the heavy vehicle space, however there has been considerable progress in the development and use of electric buses in recent years and it is the view of Auckland Council that this constraint does not apply to buses. Similar to the light vehicle scheme, we
recommend the introduction of a subsidy for low emission buses, which would enable a closer price parity.

55. Another important area of focus is on active modes, which could remove vehicles from the roads for short trips. In New Zealand, 40 per cent of trips are less than 2 km and 68 per cent are less than 5 km, highlighting that many trips could be replaced with clean, active modes. These modes have additional benefits for Aucklanders, such as improving health levels and reducing traffic congestion, and should be considered in parallel to low emission light vehicle incentivisation.

56. One of the key themes adopted by the Ministry in the preparation of the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport was ‘mode neutrality’, which suggests that all transport options are considered when identifying the best value-for-money transport solution to deliver transport outcomes. The Ministry should apply this ‘mode neutral’ approach to achieving the desired climate outcomes and should not limit these financial incentives to motor vehicles. Recent research released in the United Kingdom showed that the cost of saving a kilogram of CO2 via schemes to boost e-bikes was less than half than the cost of existing UK grants for electric cars7. For these reasons, as well as the significant health benefits, some form of subsidy of bikes and e-bikes, as a clean mode of transport, should be introduced.

Consultation information

57. The Government has committed to greenhouse gas emission targets under the Paris Agreement. Consideration of climate change related proposals should not therefore be benchmarked solely against the business as usual position but also more importantly the emissions targets that the Government has committed to.

58. No analysis has been released comparing the proposals to the change required to meet the Government’s climate goals. Likewise, no acknowledgement is made in any of the cost benefit assessments to the costs from climate change of not transitioning and meeting the country’s climate targets in time.

59. There is no analysis or explanation in the primary consultation document (the LEV discussion document) as to how far the proposals will go towards meeting the Governments climate change commitments. No information has been released on possible alternative versions of proposals which go further. The only analysis of the proposals in relation to the government’s climate commitments is an acknowledgment in the background documents.

(the cabinet paper and Regulatory Impact Statement) that “an emissions reduction equivalent to the 2030 Paris target could be achieved in 2037”.

60. As a result of this lack of information it is difficult for the council to form a fully informed position or provide as complete or high-quality feedback as we would like.

61. It is also concerning that by focussing the discussion on the proposals relative to business as usual the Government is anchoring the discussion to these points. This will have the likely result of skewing feedback to positions between or near these points rather than generating a fully informed discussion cognisant of what is required to achieve the Government’s climate commitments.

62. Auckland Council is concerned by the lack of regard paid to the necessity of achieving New Zealand’s greenhouse gas emission targets in the consultation and background material. The council requests that future consultation documents for climate change related policies are clear on the extent to which they will help meet, or not, the countries climate change commitments and consider the costs of not meeting these commitments.

On-going involvement

63. As transport is a significant source of Auckland’s greenhouse gas emissions and a critical section in ACAF, we stress the importance for a strong ongoing partnership with Government. We would like to see participation of local government in the development of the proposal and the further initiatives, such as building local charging infrastructure.
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To note the end of year report for 2018/2019 on delivery of the natural environment and water quality targeted rate work programmes.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland Council is investing in protecting our natural environment and cleaning up our waterways through two targeted rates, with a total value of $763 million over ten years.

3. Key highlights from the first year of delivery of the natural environment and water quality targeted rate work programmes are summarised in the end of year report in Attachment A.

4. All 10 natural environment work programmes are on track, with key achievements including:
   - An estimated 88 per cent of kauri forest on council land is now under active management. 26 km of track has been made kauri-safe and eight tracks have now been reopened in the Waitākere Ranges, including the popular Kitekite Falls Track.
   - We have significantly increased pest plant and pest animal control in priority ecosystems. This includes increased possum, feral pig, deer and goat control in areas such as the Hunua Ranges and Āwhitu. We have also delivered a 100 per cent increase in the control of weeds like climbing asparagus and moth plant across 21 regional parks.
   - Approximately 299,000 hectares (60 per cent of the Auckland region) is under community stewardship. The council is engaging with over 600 conservation groups and has provided almost $1.45 million of funding to 110 community entities for coordination work, tools and resources.

5. All five water quality work programmes are on track, with key achievements including:
   - The Daldy Street and Freemans Bay stormwater upgrade projects have started construction. These major infrastructure projects, with a combined budget of over $50 million, will significantly reduce overflows into the Wynyard Basin
   - The safe networks programme has carried out investigations and sampling to identify sources of water pollution at 215 outlets on 28 popular swimming beaches
   - $360,000 in grants has been given to 26 community groups to restore waterways.

6. Expenditure on the two rates for 2018/2019 was largely aligned to forecast budgets. Full financial results are being audited and will be published as part of council’s annual report.

7. In summary, work in 2018/2019 has laid the foundations for successful delivery of the 10-year targeted rate work programmes. The next update will be provided in February 2020.
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Natural environment targeted rate

- 26km of tracks made kauri-safe in the Waitākere and Hunua Ranges and other regional parks
- Eight new dogs and their handlers joined the biosecurity dog squad, to help keep the Hauraki Gulf Islands pest free.
- 7,019 kauri trees treated with phosphate
- 610 boat hulls surveyed to encourage cleaning to reduce the risk of spread of marine pests.
- 116 breeding pairs of kōkako in and around the Hunua Ranges Regional Park, up from 55 in 2014.
- 3-fold increase in deer, goat and possum control on mainland
- 3-fold increase in support to community groups and landowners providing tools for biodiversity management and restoration
- $1.4 million provided to support 110 community initiatives
- $1 million increase for possum control in regional parks
- 1040+ rat traps set by the Eastern Bays Songbird Project to protect birds and native wildlife
- $200,000 top-up to the Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant to fund priority projects
- $740,000+ awarded to 34 successful applicants through the new Community Coordination and Facilitation Grant
- 120+ local parks and ‘buffer’ zones prioritised for expanded weed and pest animal control
- 299,000 ha – about 60% of the region – is under community conservation stewardship
Water quality targeted rate

$50 million in capital works has been procured by:

The western isthmus project in Daldy Street and Freemans Bay projects in Auckland Central. This will reduce contamination and overflows into the harbour.

$360,000 in grants have been given to:

26 community groups and landowners who protect and restore urban and rural waterways.

215 outlets screened by safe networks on...

28 beaches for further investigations and...

90ha of storm and wastewater networks inspected to help make beaches cleaner and safer for swimming.

43,000 properties with private onsite wastewater systems have been identified by the contaminant reduction programme from legacy council documents.

A regional compliance programme has been set up with targeted investigations running in four high-risk catchments.

25km of fenceline was delivered by the Wairose Waterways Protection Fund Extension project, protecting:

4.8ha of land from stock entering waterways.

Design work is underway to retrofit treatment devices into the existing stormwater network within the Glen Innes town centre.

40% of contaminants (sediment & metals) to be reduced from those treated catchments.

98% litter capture from the Glen Innes town centre by end of 2020.
Contaminant reduction
Preventing litter and road pollutants from entering waterways in urban areas, and in rural areas the focus is on reducing stream bank erosion.

Western isthmus water quality improvement
A major infrastructure programme that will significantly reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitemata Harbour and reduce stormwater volumes going into the Manukau Harbour.

Onsite wastewater system compliance
We are introducing a regional inspection and maintenance regime for properties with onsite wastewater systems.

Marine biosecurity
Boosting protection of marine ecosystems from pests, with a focus on advocacy and engagement of waterbody users.

Island biosecurity
Protecting the Hauraki Gulf Islands by reducing the risk of plant and animal pests being transported there.

Marine ecology
Increasing protection of marine habitats and seabird populations.

Enabling tools
Improving data management and developing digital tools for connecting Aucklanders with conservation activities.

Expanding community action
Supporting community conservation, environmental innovation and Māori-led projects.
Natural environment targeted rate

A summary of the programme of work

The natural environment targeted rate provides a four-fold additional investment over 10 years, along with ‘business as usual’ funding from general rates, to help protect our natural environment.

This funding enables us to:

- Significantly increased weed and pest animal control in and around local and regional parks to enable indigenous species to thrive
- Reduce the spread of kauri dieback disease and other plant pathogens
- Provide greater protection for ecosystems and species in the islands and marine and freshwater environments
- Develop better systems and support to empower community conservation.

Significant gains have been made against these priorities and are outlined in this report.

In year one, the council’s largest natural environment work programmes have focused on kauri dieback management; protecting our parks and expanding community action. Significant projects have also been delivered to protect our regional, island and marine biosecurity. A Māori responsiveness approach has been developed to ensure we are working in partnership and aligning and integrating with Māori outcomes.

The programme will scale up to reach peak delivery capacity in year three. Natural environment projects are being delivered alongside water quality projects to make the most of opportunities to collaborate, particularly in working with mana whenua partners, and communities.
“The natural environment targeted rate is a huge and unique opportunity for Tamaki Makaurau. The value of the work we do today for the enduring well-being of our environment and the people who live here cannot be over-stated. I want to acknowledge the support of Auckland ratepayers as well as the large cast of hands on, dedicated individuals and groups, in and out of council, helping ensure that our native species and ecosystems survive these significant threats from urban growth and pests and pathogens.”
- Paul O’Givere, Environmental Services general manager
Fighting kauri dieback and other pathogens

Programme:

Pathogen pest management

The fight against kauri dieback disease has received a boost, with a rolling track closure and upgrade programme underway across Auckland Council parks.

The programme aims to prevent disease spread by upgrading tracks to a ‘kauri safe’ standard, to allow them to be re-opened. It includes regional park tracks in Áwhitu, Hunua Ranges, northern regional parks and Waitākere Ranges, as well as tracks in local parks in Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Howick, Karapiti, Ōrākei, Papakura, Rodney, Upper Harbour, Waiheke and Waitākere Ranges local board areas.

Since May 2018 maintenance or upgrades have been completed on 20 open tracks in regional parks. Eight closed tracks have also been re-opened following upgrade works in Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, with more to come.

Investment has enabled 26 kilometres of tracks in regional parks to be re-opened in 2018/2019.

Case study: Kauri dieback track upgrades

Upgrade work was completed to protect kauri on Kitekite track in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park. The popular track was re-opened to the public on Boxing Day, 26 December, 2018.

The targeted rate provided $382,000 for the upgrade, which includes:
- 270m of boardwalk
- 110m of stairs
- 225 tonnes of compacted gravel

• This required 3,500 hours of labour and more than 100 volunteer hours. Visitor numbers are higher now than before the upgrade.

“This additional investment has allowed us to upgrade more tracks, more quickly, for the public to enjoy again while still protecting kauri.”

- Lisa Tolich, Biosecurity Team Manager for Kauri dieback disease
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Work happening in and around our parks

Programme:

Protecting our parks

Regional and local parks across Auckland face threats from pest plants and animals. The targeted rate is providing extra protection for those parks and the native biodiversity within them.

Highlights include:

- Greater control of feral pigs in the Waitakere Ranges, through increased hunting hours. These pests are destructive in the forest and a proven vector for kauri dieback disease.
- Increased control of mustelids and rats on some sites in the Hunua Ranges.
- Pest plant control across regional parks, with a 100 per cent increase in the budget to fight weeds like climbing asparagus and moth plant across 21 regional parks.
- Project Hunua expansion – the targeted rate expanded the ‘buffer zone’ of land around the regional park that could be protected during the 1080 operation at Hunua.
- On local parks, expanded pest plant and animal control occurred at 114 high value sites and on some buffer land around park land.
Work happening in and around our parks

Programme:
Regionwide biosecurity

The targeted rate enables increased control of priority pest plants and animals in priority ecosystems across the region.

Case study: Possum control
More than $1 million has been put into possum control and monitoring in the region. This includes delivery of the 21,500ha Hunua Project via aerial 080, and protecting this investment with 10,500ha of ground-based possum control in the Hunua Halo.

This work will support the successful kōkako breeding programme running in the regional park. Possum control and monitoring has also been undertaken in the Waitākere Ranges with a view to create a Waitākere Halo project in the future.

The feral deer control programme now covers approximately 50,000ha across Auckland, focusing on high value ecological areas such as South Head and Awhitu peninsulas. Hunua and Waitākere Ranges regional parks continue to be deer-free.

A monitoring programme for low incidence pest plants is being developed, including a large number on Aotea/Great Barrier to contain possible threats before they become widespread. A national collective is reviewing biocontrols that may be appropriate for our region.
Marine and Islands

Programme:

Marine biosecurity

This programme aims to boost protection for native marine ecosystems and species from pests, our focus is on advocacy and engagement of waterbody users, monitoring and surveillance of areas and species, incursion response and policy planning.

A targeted marine pest presence/absence survey of the Kaipara and Manukau harbours has been completed, with results expected by the end of September 2019. This is a joint-agency initiative between Auckland Council, Northland Regional Council and the Ministry for Primary Industries.

An annual regional hull surveillance programme surveyed more than 600 boat hulls to check for fouling and marine pest incidence. Funding was provided to upscale the response to the Mediterranean fanworm incursion on Aotea/Great Barrier Island and surveillance of high-risk marine sites.

Development of an Inter-Regional Marine Pest Pathway Management Plan is underway. The targeted rate funded informal public consultation on the discussion document in 2019, with nearly 400 submissions received. This is a joint initiative between Auckland Council, Northland Regional Council, Bay of Plenty Toi Moana and Waikato Regional Council.
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Marine and islands

Programme:
Marine ecology

Case study: Seabird and shorebird monitoring and restoration

The Hauraki Gulf is a seabird stronghold, but there are many threatened species. We need to know more about what is causing the decline and set baseline understanding of how species are faring. The first seabird restoration site has been installed on Otaba Island (Noises Group). We have set up an acoustic system to attract a variety of seabirds and are using 3D-printed replica bird models to lure birds to create a new seabird colony. We are working with Department of Conservation, iwi and others at locations on the mainland and in the Hauraki Gulf.

A "fake" collar has been set up on Otaba Island in the hope of re-establishing plane-koreka (spotted shag).

The new marine ecology programme aims to increase protection of marine habitats and seabird populations.

The first year of the programme has focused on research to identify knowledge gaps and prioritise areas for sampling. The programme also contributed funding to the "Pulse of the Gulf" research programme lead by the University of Auckland. This is investigating the spatial and seasonal use of habitat and foraging areas by whales and dolphins in the Hauraki Gulf.
**Marine and islands**

**Programme:**

**Island biosecurity**

This programme protects our Hauraki Gulf Islands by reducing the risk of plant and animal pests being transported to the islands by the public, and commercial operators.

**Year one highlights included:**

- Expanding our pest dog programme (see case study)
- Nine summer ambassadors provided public education to ferry passengers on how to reduce the risk of spreading pests and pathogens. Signage was also provided at access points and digital messaging included on the MetService marine forecast website.
- Work is underway on the islands to target specific pests. On Aotea, Great Barrier, Argentine and Darwin’s ant treatment and monitoring has doubled. We funded research into control methodologies for plague skinks. *Rhamnus* has been a target on Rakino, with the hope of eventual eradication.
- On Waiheke, $2.7 million of funding support over seven years has been provided to Te Korowai o Waiheke (towards Predator Free Waiheke) and to the community to help eradicate or control rats, stoats, feral pigs, and for a feasibility study into eradicating *Rhamnus* on the island.
Case study:
Pest detection dog programme

The biosecurity team now boasts an expanded pest detection dog squad for the Hauraki Gulf Islands, with more dogs and dedicated dog handlers, and a new day facility where dogs can rest between jobs.

Three additional dedicated handlers (and their dogs) have been funded via the rate, with two handlers dedicated to monitoring the waterfront, and one dedicated to the Pest Free Warrant programme. Dog handlers and dogs are certified independently by the Conservation Dogs Programme.

This makes a total of 14 dogs in the team, able to sniff out various pests including plague skinks, Argentine ants, rodents, mustelids and possums.

The dog team duties include:

- Inspections at vehicle ferries (the vehicle itself and its cargo) with a focus on high-risk loads like houses being relocated
- Regular island surveillance
- Assisting in incursions or sightings, like this year’s swarm sighting on Great Barrier Island
- Monitoring for eradication, which is underway on Kawau Island for Argentine ants. A new day facility has been built.

“Our dogs are also really popular with the public. People happily open their boot to be inspected at the ferry terminal.”

~ Liz Brooks, senior regional biosecurity advisor
Support for freshwater projects

Programme:

Freshwater biosecurity

Investigation is underway to find out if the decline in lake health and aquatic vegetation is associated with the presence of pest fish in Lake Tomorata and Lake Rototoa in the Kaipara district.

Baseline surveys have been completed to determine what fish species are present in the lakes and where they are, as well as mapping the lake. Fish in the two lakes will also be tagged and monitored.

The baseline survey will inform work to identify how to prevent the spread of freshwater pests through changing the behaviour of high risk audiences, focusing on the two lakes, and Aotea/Great Barrier.

Working with Auckland’s conservation communities

Programme:

Enabling tools

Collecting data is a vital tool for biosecurity and biodiversity work.

This programme supports a bio information team to work on an information and communication technology solution for better management of species and ecosystem data, so we can be more effective and targeted. The team will also develop digital tools for working with community conservation groups, to help connect Aucklanders to conservation activities.

Staff are also working with Innovate Auckland to look at options for tech-enabled pest control solutions.
Programme:

Expanding community action

Community conservation is being given a boost thanks to the natural environment targeted rate.

In the past year:

- A 'tools and resource' project has directly supported 47 community conservation groups, iwi, schools and individuals with supplies worth more than $469,000 for pest animal and weed control, and other equipment.
- A new pilot grant scheme - the Community Coordination and Facilitation Grant - supported recently established or expanding community groups to increase capacity and delivery. Over $740,000 was awarded to 34 successful applicants. Of this, over $120,000 was contributed from the water quality targeted rate.
- We boosted the existing Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant by $200,000 to fund more conservation activity.
- We invested in a new multi-agency innovation fund, 9Wire, to fast-track environmental innovations.
- We increased support for the Toimata Foundation (Enviroschools), for ecological restoration and conservation outcomes in schools.
- The rate has funded two new community activation roles in local parks.
- A regional funding strategy is being developed to increase funding available for groups.
- A learning programme is being developed to upskill volunteers.
- We are working with iwi and Māori communities to support Māori-led projects and to build capacity in biodiversity priority areas.
Water quality targeted rate

A summary of the programme of work

The water quality targeted rate provides increased investment over 10 years for projects that will implement cleaner harbours, beaches and streams. To speed up the delivery of these water quality improvement projects, Watercare’s water and wastewater charges have also contributed to the programme.

Our key priorities are to reduce public health risks from wastewater overflows and to improve the ecology of our waterways.

Over time, the targeted rate work programmes will also reduce Salfeswim non-compliance public health warnings at our recreational beaches across urban Auckland.

These outcomes are being achieved through five key work programmes:

- **Western isthmus water quality improvement**: To upgrade stormwater infrastructure and separate stormwater and wastewater in the western isthmus to reduce overflows into the Waitematā Harbour.
- **Contaminant reduction**: To reduce the amount of litter, sediment and road pollutants entering waterways.
- **Urban and rural stream rehabilitation**: To improve the ecological health of streams, with a particular focus on reducing streambank erosion.
- **Onsite wastewater system compliance**: Introducing a proactive regional septic tank monitoring programme.
- **Safe networks**: To investigate and eliminate sources of harmful overflows at our popular swimming beaches.

Over time, the targeted rate will see significant progress and is on track across these areas.
implementation of the water quality targeted rate has been a massive game changer for Auckland Council. It signifies a united Auckland community that is willing and able to commit and support the council on a leadership role and support the achievement of targeted water quality benefits for the entire region. This can only be achieved by genuine collaboration and partnership involving all key partners and stakeholders.

-Craig McIlroy, Healthy Waters General Manager
Major infrastructure to reduce public health risk

Programme:

Western isthmus water quality improvement

The lion's share of water quality targeted rate funding (>$361.6 million over 10 years) is for a major infrastructure programme that will significantly reduce wastewater overflows into the Waitemata Harbour and reduce stormwater entering the wastewater network. The project will reduce the volume of litter on urban beaches, remove permanent closure of Meola Reef and Cox's Beach and reduce other intermittent beach closures in this area over the next 10 years.

The programme is being led by Watercare and Auckland Council's Healthy Waters team. Watercare's investment supports their annual targets for fewer wastewater overflows, as well as lower volumes, and complements their Central Interceptor programme – a 13 km pipeline costing $1.2 billion expected to be complete in 2025.

The work also contributes to the Unitary Plan's objectives of improving the health of receiving environments, and the SafeSwim and safe networks programme goals to reduce public health risk.

Some of the major projects are underway:

- Construction on the Daldy Street and Freeman's Bay project is underway (see case study).
- The St Mary's Bay and Maasfield Beach improvement project will reduce the frequency of overflows from the combined network at these two beaches from over 200 to approximately 20 times a year.
- Watercare is leading investigations in the St Mary's Bay and Heme Bay catchments to determine the best long-term approach to reducing the wastewater overflows in this area.

Healthy Waters is leading design work in Waterview to extend and upgrade the existing public stormwater network and outfalls to the Waterview Inlet, to separate the currently combined drainage network. Construction is due to start in 2020 and be completed by 2025.
Case study: Wynyard Basin and Freemans Bay

Two major and complementary projects are underway to improve water quality in the Wynyard Basin. The Wynyard Basin is a highly frequented destination for Aucklanders and visitors every day, and at the heart of the planned America’s Cup base.

Currently, combined overflows are spilling into the network approximately over 92 times a year. The sediment in the overflow is causing an unpleasant dark plume. Additionally, there are some flooding issues in Freemans Bay.

Daldy Street outfall extension project

The Daldy Street outfall is an ageing pipe located underneath the south-eastern corner of Wynyard Wharf.

The outfall is a source of pollution during rain events, as a mixture of urban stormwater and untreated wastewater overflows into the Wynyard Basin.

During rain events there are regular complaints about pollution plume and odours. This directly affects North Wharf, a popular location for visitors and the planned site of the America’s Cup base. It also impacts on a recreational swimming site nearby.

To address these issues, the Daldy Street outfall will be moved to Brigham Street. This will stop overflows into the Wynyard Basin and the nearby Safeswim site.

Construction has begun and will cost up to $34 million. Special pipes were manufactured for the project. The ground is being stabilised prior to installing the pipes.

Freemans Bay stormwater network separation

This project will separate the stormwater and wastewater network in Freemans Bay to reduce overflows out to the Daldy Street outfall and into the Waitematā Harbour.

It involves separating the old combined system and upgrading and installing new pipes and catchpits. This will reduce contaminants and overflows in the harbour from approximately 40 to 12 times a year.

The contractor has begun enabling works.

Both the Daldy Street and Freemans Bay projects are expected to be completed in time for the America’s Cup, APEC and Te Matatini in 2020.
Investigating contamination at swimming and recreation spots

Programme:
Safe networks

We’re investing water quality targeted rate funding to investigate sources of faecal contamination, and to identify solutions to make popular Safeswim sites safe for swimming and recreation. The programme also includes sampling at other stormwater outlets and streams where elevated health risks have been identified.

In investigations are undertaken through a variety of methods, including water quality sampling and CCTV. These identify location-specific problems that contribute to faecal contamination of stormwater, enabling staff to develop solutions to improve water quality at recreational swimming sites.
Case study: Safe networks investigations at Takapuna

In the summer of 2017 and 2018, the prevalent SafeSwim rating at Takapuna Beach was red, suggesting faecal contamination was affecting the beach water quality. Staff conducted a series of investigations to determine the causes of the issue.

Initial sampling from stormwater outlets along the length of the beach in February and March 2018 identified that faecal contaminants included human, avian and canine sources.

Detailed investigations followed, including sampling from selected manholes to isolate problematic areas within the sub-catchments. Methods included CCTV, visual inspections, smoke testing and dye testing to investigate drainage assets. These investigations were carried out in stormwater sub-catchments from the boat ramp (north end of Takapuna beach) to Rewiti Avenue (to the south).

Staff concluded both public and private drainage systems are contributing to water quality issues at Takapuna Beach. The issues are primarily related to damaged pipes, sub-standard connections, low gully traps, down pipes discharging directly to the wastewater network and poor management practices on commercial premises.

Many of the private issues have been resolved. Pipes and manholes in the public networks have been identified for maintenance and repairs.

Groundwater quality will require further investigation to quantify the impact of this on beach water quality.
Compliance of onsite wastewater systems to reduce public health risk

Programme:

Onsite wastewater system compliance

The council is developing a new regional compliance system that will require property owners with onsite wastewater systems to provide regular documentation that their systems have been inspected and are in good working condition.

Highlights to date:

- A new database has been created of over 43,000 properties with onsite wastewater systems.
- An online checklist has been developed for contractors inspecting onsite wastewater systems.
- Education materials have been developed for residents in coastal areas, so they know about looking after their systems.
- As a result of compliance investigations of 549 properties in Piha and Little Oneroa, we estimate more than 70 percent of systems are properly maintained. Proper maintenance should reduce contamination in the lagoons. We will continue to run investigations in high-risk areas and monitor changes in water quality.

The council will consult on proposed changes to the legacy Waiakere City Council septic tank pump-out service through the Annual Plan 2020/2021, so that the service complements the compliance programme to deliver better water quality.
Case study: Innovative regionwide onsite wastewater system management

The new regional compliance system for onsite wastewater systems required staff to create a new comprehensive property database.

To do this staff identified multiple sources of data in legacy systems and brought them together, including the building consents and resource consents teams, Watercare data and complaints data. We have now identified over 43,000 properties with onsite wastewater systems to inform database development.

Once complete, the database will enable efficient monitoring of onsite wastewater systems maintenance.

Staff are also collaborating with design, installation and maintenance companies on a new approach to manage onsite wastewater systems. Workshops were held to identify barriers for customers to improve their systems, as well as solutions, which staff are assessing for feasibility.
Programme:

Urban and rural stream rehabilitation

This programme’s key objective is to improve the ecological health of waterways. This involves reducing contaminants entering our harbours and managing streambank erosion.

A tool is being developed to analyse erosion risk and test where sedimentation is occurring and the ability of natural stream beds to cope with this. This tool will be used to predict the best places for urban growth for the least impact on water quality.

$360,000 in grants have been given to 26 community groups and landowners who protect and restore urban and rural waterways.

These projects include:

- **Ngaroto Lakes Groundwater Model:** An investigation is being scoped to understand how water enters the lakes and enable communities to target their interventions. This programme is being delivered in partnership with mana whenua.
- **Community co-ordinator and facilitator grant funding:** Supported community groups who have water quality outcomes in their community-led conservation activities. This complemented the natural environment expanding community action programme.
- **Rodney Healthy Harbours:** Top-up funding has been provided to complement this Rodney Local Board-funded programme to improve water quality by reducing sedimentation, erosion and pollution.
- **Mauku Stream Engagement:** Working with landowners to engage and support them to fence and plant their waterways.
- ** Fonterra Partnership:** Working on a memorandum of understanding with Fonterra to support their 50 Catchments campaign.
- **We are running septic tank educational workshops.**
- **Empowering local community groups to take action to restore waterways in the Whau catchment.**
- **Regional litter programme:** To prevent litter from entering waterways.

New projects are currently being scoped in close association with local boards to assist with delivering stream restoration initiatives across the region.
Improving the ecological health of waterways

Programme:
Contaminant reduction

The contaminant reduction work stream reduces litter, sediment and road pollutants entering waterways.

In rural areas, the primary focus is on reducing the amount of sediment entering the Kaipara Harbour. Approximately $15 million over ten years has been allocated to address sediment in the Kaipara, where water quality is being affected by agriculture and forestry.

In urban areas, the focus is on the capture of gross pollutants such as litter and contaminants from heavily trafficked roads.

The rate helps support employment of regional enforcement officers to visit small building sites, which are a source of sediment in waterways.

Healthy Waters has developed a regional modelling tool to identify contaminated areas across 20,500 km of waterways, across 230 catchments. The first list of hotspots has been completed, although the tool will take several years to develop full capability.

Healthy Waters and Tāmaki Regeneration Company have identified a project to retrofit stormwater treatment devices into the existing Glen Innes town centre stormwater network. This will be delivered as part of a partner funding arrangement, of which $1.8 million will come from the water quality targeted rate.

Healthy Waters will also be reducing contaminants in Ōkahu Bay by way of targeted separation and outfall diversion. Two projects are underway to separate the combined network and to extend the outfall further away from the beach.
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To approve the introduction of new interventions to the Retrofit Your Home programme, including solar energy, energy storage and energy efficiency interventions.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The Retrofit Your Home programme has been operational since 2010 and has provided finance to over 23,700 Auckland homes for insulation or heating retrofits.

3. Since inception, the programme has achieved a carbon emissions saving of approximately 2,915 tonnes of CO2-equivalent, and has resulted in warmer, drier, healthier homes for Auckland residents.

4. A 2014 assessment found that the programme returns $3.10 in social, environmental and economic benefits for every dollar invested (see summary in Attachment A).

5. Retrofit Your Home provides homeowners with a loan of up to $5,000 which is repaid through their rates bill over a nine-year term. Auckland Council is one of ten councils in New Zealand that offers a Retrofit Your Home-type scheme.

6. Staff have reviewed the nine existing interventions provided by Retrofit Your Home to ensure that these are aligned with the programme’s strategic objectives to achieve energy efficiency and energy resilience.

7. Staff also assessed 12 potential new interventions against a range of criteria, such as their ability to achieve energy savings and return on investment.

8. Based on this analysis, staff recommend that the Environment and Community Committee approve:
   - introducing eight out of the 12 potential new interventions, such as solar panels, solar water heating and LED lighting
   - removing one of the nine existing interventions – flued gas.

9. Staff recommend these changes as they are aligned with the council’s commitment to reduce carbon emissions. The new interventions will also make Auckland homes healthier, more energy efficient and resilient to the impacts of climate change.

10. Retrofit Your Home’s budget was approved in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028. It provides up to $9 million of loans per annum with the total amount of loan debt that the Retrofit Your Home programme can hold at any one time capped at $35 million.

11. The introduction of these new interventions will be managed within the existing Retrofit Your Home debt cap. Some of the new interventions cost more than the existing loan cap of $5,000, so this may limit uptake of these home improvements.

12. If the changes recommended above are approved, the council will seek to have suppliers in place for new interventions from early 2020. The procurement plan for Retrofit Your Home will be presented to the Strategic Procurement Committee in September 2019.

13. In parallel, staff are exploring options for financing the Retrofit Your Home programme through external funding sources. This may allow council to raise the existing loan ceiling and increase the number of loans provided. An update on this will be provided to the appropriate committee of council in 2020.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendations
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve making eight new interventions (as listed below) eligible for financing through the Retrofit Your Home programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar panels (roof and ground-mounted)</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar water heating</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat pump water heating</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 Electric Vehicle chargers</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy storage batteries</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-layered curtains</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Pump</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED lighting</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) approve removing one existing intervention from those currently eligible for financing through the Retrofit Your Home programme - Remove flued gas.

c) note that staff are investigating alternative financing models for the Retrofit Your Home programme, which could include partnering with external lenders. An update on this will be provided to the appropriate committee in 2020.

Horopaki
Context
14. The Retrofit Your Home programme was established by Waitākere City Council in 2010 to provide a financing option for homeowners to install insulation and clean heating. It was then adopted by Auckland Council in 2011 and extended across the region.

15. Auckland Council is one of ten councils around New Zealand that currently offers a Retrofit Your home-type scheme (commonly referred to as a voluntary targeted rate scheme).

16. The programme provides homeowners with access to a loan of up to $5,000 finance. This is recovered through a voluntary targeted rate on the property for a maximum period of nine years.

17. Retrofit Your Home is available to all residential ratepayers with either a sound rates payment track record or the ability to pass a credit check.

18. To date Retrofit Your Home has supported over 23,700 homeowners to make energy efficient retrofits. It currently delivers funding support to around 2,800 Auckland homes each year.

19. It delivers an estimated annual carbon emission saving of 345 tonnes of CO2-equivalent and has achieved a carbon emissions saving of approximately 2,915 tonnes of CO2-equivalent since its inception.

20. The immediate benefits of the programme include energy savings and the health benefits associated with warmer, drier homes.
21. A social return on investment assessment completed in 2014 found that the programme returned $3.10 in social, environmental and economic benefits for every dollar invested (see summary in Attachment A). Key outcomes for occupiers of retrofitted homes included:

- an increased feeling of satisfaction with their living situation
- improved quality of life and life expectancy for those who suffered from an illness related to cold and damp housing
- financial savings from reduced electricity consumption
- improved educational achievement (for occupiers of homes who are students) and improved efficiency when working from home (for those in employment).

22. Research carried out by Martin Jenkins for EECA in 2018 found the service provides a strong incentive for retrofitting to improve energy efficiency (see summary in Attachment B).

23. Demographics of those who currently uptake Retrofit your Home loans are shown in Attachment C. The majority of homeowners are based in south and west Auckland.

Budgets and repayment rates for Retrofit Your Home

24. The Retrofit Your Home programme can provide up to $9 million of loans per annum. At a maximum uptake of $5,000, this provides 1,800 loans per annum. The programme’s total debt is capped at $35 million.

25. The current debt is $31.9 million and will reduce over time as the programme concludes in 2026 and repayments from existing loans exceed new loans issued.

26. The current interest rate applied to Retrofit Your Home loans is pegged to Council’s cost of borrowing, plus one percent to cover administration costs ($260,000 per year), inclusive of GST.

27. This means home owners currently pay a variable interest rate of six to seven percent. This is a comparatively higher interest rate than that offered by commercial lenders.

28. The funding cost to Auckland Council is a variable rate of interest of around five percent. At this rate the cost of borrowing is $1.9 million per year.

29. The debt default rate for Retrofit Your Home is negligible as loans are tied to the asset (the homes of those who receive retrofit loans). Loans are recovered through rates bills.

Volume and types of interventions funded through Retrofit Your Home

30. In the financial year 2017/2018 just over 2,700 Retrofit Your Home loan applications were processed, with $6.4 million in financial assistance committed.

31. Figure 1 shows loan application volume and intervention types since 2011.

Figure 1 – Retrofit Your Home applications by type
32. From 2011 to 2014, the majority of loans were for insulation. Since 2015, loan approvals for clean heating options (heat pumps and efficient wood-burners) have increased.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

Analysis and advice

**Recommended change – Add additional solar and energy efficiency interventions**

33. A review of the Retrofit Your Home programme found that it could be made more effective by assessing all existing and potential interventions against energy efficiency and low carbon criteria.

34. As shown in Table 1 and Table 2, the nine existing interventions and 12 potential new interventions were assessed against the five criteria listed below. To be recommended for inclusion, interventions needed to meet at least four of the five criteria or warrant inclusion based on their individual merit.

35. The five criteria were:

   i) **Climate change resilience and energy efficiency** - Supports energy efficiency and/or climate change resilience.

   ii) **Delivers energy efficiency and / or improved living conditions** – Ability to achieve household energy savings greater than 500KWh per year (equivalent to 60 kilograms of CO2-equivalent) and / or to make the home warmer, drier and healthier for occupancy.

   iii) **Supports AC’s low carbon commitments** - Supports Auckland Council’s low carbon and energy resilience strategy and the Low Carbon Auckland Action Plan solar targets.

   iv) **Return on investment ratio per dollar invested** – Provides a return on investment to homeowners above 0.7

   v) **Kilograms of carbon dioxide equivalent saved per dollar spent** of 0.3 kilograms of CO2-equivalent.

**Table 1. How existing interventions ranked against Retrofit Your Home criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Climate change and energy resilience</th>
<th>Energy efficiency and / or warm dry home (meets healthy homes standards)</th>
<th>Supports AC’s Low carbon targets</th>
<th>Return on investment (per $ invested – target &gt; 0.7)</th>
<th>Kilograms CO2 saved per dollar spent (target &gt; 0.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing interventions to be retained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation (underfloor and ceiling)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat pump</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient wood burner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Carbon Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water cylinder wrap</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground barrier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical extraction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 1. Comparison of existing interventions against Retrofit Your Home criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Climate change and energy resilience</th>
<th>Energy efficiency and/or warm dry home (meets healthy homes standards)</th>
<th>Supports AC’s Low carbon targets</th>
<th>Return on investment (per $ invested - target &gt; 0.7)</th>
<th>Kilograms CO2 saved per dollar invested (target &gt; 0.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low flow device</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater harvester</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing intervention to remove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flued gas</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Retain
- Remove

36. As shown above in Table 1, eight out of nine existing interventions performed well against the criteria and will be retained in the programme.

37. Flued gas is the only existing intervention that does not meet the criteria of delivering a low carbon outcome. Staff recommend that it be removed.

### Table 2. How potential new interventions ranked against Retrofit Your Home criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Climate change and energy resilience</th>
<th>Energy efficiency and/or warm dry home (meets healthy homes standards)</th>
<th>Supports AC’s Low carbon targets</th>
<th>Return on investment (per $ invested – target &gt; 0.7)</th>
<th>Kilograms CO2 saved per dollar invested (target &gt; 0.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solar photovoltaics/panels (roof and ground-mounted)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar pump (for rainwater harvesting)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar water heating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat pump water heating</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 electric vehicle chargers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy storage batteries</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Emitting Diode (LED lighting)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-layered curtains</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential new interventions - include**

- Solar photovoltaics/panels (roof and ground-mounted)
- Solar pump (for rainwater harvesting)
- Solar water heating
- Heat pump water heating
- Type 2 electric vehicle chargers
- Energy storage batteries
- Light Emitting Diode (LED lighting)
- Double-layered curtains
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38. As shown in Table 2, out of the 12 potential new interventions assessed, eight are recommended for inclusion in the scheme, including: solar panels, energy storage batteries, Type 2 electric vehicle chargers, solar pumps for water tanks, solar water heaters, heat pump water heating, doubled-layered curtains and Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting.

39. Two interventions - energy storage and EV chargers - do not meet the energy savings criteria but do support four of the 11 ‘key moves’ in the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework. They also represent a proactive measure to support the council’s recently declared Climate Emergency, by supporting energy resilience and a shift to clean transport. Staff recommend these for inclusion in the Retrofit your Home programme.

40. Four new interventions, including hot water controller timers and heat transfer systems were considered but are not recommended for inclusion in the scheme as they do not meet the criteria. While external wall insulation met the criteria, it is more suited to new building projects than retrofits, given the scale and cost of the work involved. It is therefore not recommended for inclusion as a retrofit option.

41. If these changes are approved, staff will procure suppliers for the new interventions with the aim of introducing these from early 2020.

Explore alternative financing options for the programme

42. Currently the Retrofit Your Home loan amount for an individual property is capped at $5,000. Several of the proposed new interventions would cost more than $5,000 (for example, solar hot water, solar panels, home energy storage). Keeping the loan limit at $5,000 may reduce uptake of these interventions.

43. The possibility of raising the value of the loan cap to higher amounts such as $7,500 or $10,000 has been assessed (see Attachment D). However, this would significantly reduce the number of loans that the council can provide. With a loan cap of $7,500 council could only provide 1,200 loans per year, and with a loan cap of $10,000 only 900 per year.

44. The constraints presented by the existing loan ceiling, debt cap and interest rate mean that there may be limited uptake of some new interventions, preventing the Retrofit Your Home programme from reaching its full potential.

---

### Table: Potential new interventions – not recommended for inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Climate change and energy resilience</th>
<th>Energy efficiency and / or warm dry home (meets healthy homes standards)</th>
<th>Supports AC’s Low carbon targets</th>
<th>Return on investment (per $ invested – target &gt; 0.7)</th>
<th>Kilograms CO2 saved per dollar invested (target &gt; 0.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/double glazing</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat transfer systems</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior wall insulation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water controller timers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- Recommended for inclusion
- Not recommended for inclusion
45. Staff will explore alternative financing models for the scheme. Removing the current funding constraints and expanding the scheme to include larger commercial assets could increase the carbon savings from the current level of 345 tonnes of CO2-equivalent per annum to over 10,000 tonnes.

46. If external parties are willing to support Retrofit Your Home with financing, this would also mean that the Retrofit Your Home debt can be removed from the council’s balance sheet.

47. When alternative financing options are confirmed, staff will update the relevant committee on these in 2020.

Climate impact assessment

48. The Retrofit Your Home Programme currently generates an estimated annual carbon emission savings of 345 tonnes of CO2-equivalent. The recommended changes in this report will contribute to climate change mitigation by increasing carbon emissions savings, particularly if the scheme can be expanded via an alternative financing model in order to include larger commercial assets. As noted above, this could increase the potential savings to over 10,000 tonnes per year.

49. The introduction of new interventions such as energy storage batteries, solar panels and solar water pumps, will support climate change adaptation by improving the energy resilience of Auckland’s built environment during extreme weather events and power outages.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

50. There are no expected impacts on Council Controlled Organisations.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe

Local impacts and local board views

51. While local boards have not been consulted on the specific changes recommended in this report, local boards have provided feedback in support of climate change mitigation and adaptation through engagement on council’s Auckland Climate Action Framework.

52. Nine local boards are also currently funding programmes to promote energy efficiency and healthy homes in their areas. These include Albert Eden, Great Barrier, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Puketāpapa, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Waitematā and Whau.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori

Māori impact statement

53. The recommended changes in this report are not expected to have significant impacts on Māori compared to other Aucklanders. Around 10 percent of those participating in the Retrofit Your Home programme are Māori – a similar proportion to the percentage of Aucklanders who identified as Maori in the 2013 census (11 per cent).

54. However, the changes are well aligned with feedback from Māori submitters on the draft Auckland Climate Action Framework. During this consultation process, Māori submitters expressed strong support for initiatives that address climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience.

55. Retrofit Your Home also partners with the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Agency (EECA) to top up the Warmer Kiwi Homes grant, which targets low-income earners, to cover the full product and installation costs of insulation and clean heating.
**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

56. Retrofit Your Home provides up to $9 million of loans per annum. The programme has a total debt allowance capped at $35 million.

57. The number of loans granted for the new interventions recommended in this report will be managed to ensure that the programme stays within both its annual loan amount of $9 million and total debt cap of $35 million.

58. Some of the new interventions that are recommended for inclusion in the programme, such as solar panels, cost more than $5,000. The current loan value cap may limit uptake of these interventions. The debt cap for the programme also limits the number and value of loans that it can provide.

59. Staff are currently exploring alternative options for financing the programme. Financing options could also allow the council to extend the programme to provide appropriate retrofit finance capacity to encompass large scale commercial and industrial building assets.

60. Staff will provide an update on these changes to the appropriate committee of the council in 2020.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

61. Key risks arising from the changes and proposed mitigations are shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Risks and proposed mitigations arising from changes to Retrofit Your Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood and consequence (L-Low, M-Medium, H-High)</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The expanded suite of interventions could result in a supply constraint as the number and value of loan applications outstrip capacity and the maximum loan value. | Likelihood: H  
Consequence: M | Staff are exploring alternative financing models that remove the constraints presented by the existing loan ceiling, debt cap and interest rate. These may also allow Retrofit Your Home to be extended to large-scale commercial building owners. |
| Low initial uptake of new interventions due to uncertainty around new products and technologies such as EV chargers, battery storage and solar photovoltaics. | Likelihood: M  
Consequence: M | Promotion, awareness and education campaigns will be run to enhance public understanding and acceptance of new low carbon and energy resilience technologies. |
| Low uptake of higher cost interventions due to low loan size. | Likelihood: H  
Consequence: M | Staff are exploring alternative financing models that remove the constraints presented by the existing loan ceiling, debt cap and interest rate. |
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#### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Likelihood and consequence (L-Low, M-Medium, H-High)</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Low uptake of new interventions with a high upfront capital cost. | Likelihood: H  
Consequence: M | Staff are leveraging Council’s scale to negotiate more competitive prices for Aucklanders, which should improve the return on investment for new interventions. |
| Installation of new interventions falls below Council’s standards. | Likelihood: M  
Consequence: H | Council will develop detailed technical specifications for installation and will carry out a thorough risk assessment to inform:  
a) contractual obligations on suppliers and installers;  
b) the post-installation audit procedure; and  
c) the remediation process in the event of a faulty installation. |

### Ngā koringa ā-muri

**Next steps**

62. If the changes recommended in this report are approved, a staged procurement approach will be taken so that the council will have suppliers in place for retrofit interventions from early 2020.

63. A procurement plan for Retrofit Your Home suppliers will be presented to the Strategic Procurement Committee on 4 September 2019.

64. Staff are exploring alternative financing models for Retrofit Your Home.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

This study focuses on the impact of Retrofit Your Home (RYH), a programme delivered by Auckland Council that seeks to improve the quality of housing for all Aucklanders by enabling better access to efficient and effective home heating and insulation.

The evidence presented in this evaluation report is based on a Social Return on Investment (SROI) analysis, an accepted method of measuring the social, environmental and economic impact of activities and programmes by placing a monetary value on them. This SROI covers the impact of the RYH programme for the financial year 2012/2013.

Context

New Zealand’s housing stock is generally poorly insulated and difficult to heat, which is a widely recognised problem across the country. The fuel and energy costs required to heat houses to acceptable temperatures can be particularly high, and difficult for many households to afford.

Auckland Council is the governing body for the whole of the Auckland region. The council is responsible for managing air quality in the region under the Resource Management Act (1991) and the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality. Domestic home heating is one of the three main sources of air pollution in Auckland. Fine particle emissions from domestic (wood-burning) fires are of particular concern as a health risk. A reduction in these emissions and improved home insulation are seen as ways to improve the health of Aucklanders.

The council also recognises that well-designed and well-constructed housing is critical for people’s well-being, not just for environmental reasons. Housing is one of the key determinants of health and there is a strong link between asthma and respiratory and contagious illness, and damp, cold homes.

About Retrofit Your Home

In March 2011 a regional pilot Retrofit Your Home programme was approved in principle by the council. The pilot expanded the initial RYH programme, which had been developed by the legacy Waitakere City Council, shortly before the creation of Auckland Council in November 2010. The council supported a regional programme in recognition that outcomes from the programme align closely with the goal of creating the “world’s most liveable city” by addressing aspects of the Auckland Plan relating to home retrofitting, air quality and climate change mitigation.

Through both the Auckland Plan and the Housing Action Plan, the council recognises the importance of evaluating the effectiveness of its programmes against priority targets and outcomes. This report outlines the result of Social Return on Investment (SROI) evaluation of one year of RYH programme 2012-2013.

About SROI

SROI methodology is a framework for understanding social, economic and environmental value created by a programme, policy or intervention and expressing these values in monetary terms, using economic valuation techniques. The monetary value of the outcomes created by the RYH programme allows the benefit of the
programme to be compared with its investment. The SROI ratio indicates how much value is created for RYH stakeholders for each dollar spent on this programme.

The findings

SROI is an outcomes-based tool. The outcomes or the changes experienced by stakeholders as the result of the RYH programme are identified through the development of a Theory of Change (TOC). This is the core task of the SROI process. The TOC for each stakeholder group is designed as the result of a collaborative engagement process with that group. Figure A illustrates the process of identifying outcomes for RYH stakeholders.

Figure A: RYH programme—a summary of the theory of change
The SROI evaluation showed that the material outcomes for the RYH programme included improved local air quality and a range of outcomes for RYH occupiers.

The natural environment, as a stakeholder, experienced improvement in the local air quality.

Occupiers of the retrofitted homes experienced the following outcomes:

- Increased feeling of satisfaction with their living situation
- Improved quality of life and life expectancy for those occupiers who suffered from an illness related to cold and damp housing
- Improved relationships within the family
- Financial savings from decreased electricity
- Time saved in maintenance and cleaning
- Increased educational achievement (for occupiers of RYH who are students)
- Increased efficiency when working from home (for occupiers of RYH who are engaged in paid work from home)

The outcome of ‘increased feeling of satisfaction with their living situation’, including a range of related intermediate outcomes for occupiers, created the highest impact for stakeholders, valued at $10,238,581. The second main value created by the RYH programme was the positive impact on Auckland residents of ‘improved local air quality’, valued at $7,810,249. Time saved in maintenance, and improved quality of life and life expectancy (for occupiers who suffer from an illness related to cold and damp housing) were the other major outcomes, with more than $2 million value each.

A summary of the aggregated value by each material outcome is shown in Figure B below.

**Figure B: Proportion of aggregated value created by each outcome**

![Diagram showing the proportion of aggregated value created by each outcome](attachment:image)
SROI ratio

The SROI ratio was calculated using the present value of RYH outcomes compared to the inputs, or the total investment. The ratio shows that for every dollar invested in the RYH programme, it returns $3.1 of social, environmental and economic value.

Table A: SROI ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Total value</th>
<th>Present value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupiers of RYH homes</td>
<td>$16,259,188</td>
<td>$15,668,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupiers of RYH homes who are students</td>
<td>$1,765,529</td>
<td>$1,648,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupiers of RYH homes who are in paid employment working from home</td>
<td>$335,946</td>
<td>$313,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland residents</td>
<td>$7,810,249</td>
<td>$7,291,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,509,803</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,921,646</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total value of inputs                           | $8,038,559  |
| Net present value (present value minus inputs)  | $16,883,086 |
| **SROI ratio**                                  | **3.1**     |

Implications

This SROI analysis is one of the first in New Zealand and the first to address the topic of housing quality. The analysis provided strong evidence about changes experienced by RYH customers by engaging them in the evaluation process.

The findings of this SROI analysis are specific for the RYH programme, but also help to highlight Auckland Council’s contribution to achieving the targets and objectives of the Auckland Plan.
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PREFACE

This report has been prepared for the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) by Bryan Field and Donella Bellett from MartinJenkins (Martin, Jenkins & Associates Limited).

MartinJenkins advises clients in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors, providing services in these areas:

- Public policy
- Evaluation and research
- Strategy and investment
- Performance improvement and monitoring
- Organisational improvement
- Employment relations
- Economic development
- Financial and economic analysis.

Our aim is to provide an integrated and comprehensive response to client needs – connecting our skill sets and applying fresh thinking to lift performance.

MartinJenkins is a privately owned New Zealand limited liability company. We have offices in Wellington and Auckland. The company was established in 1993 and is governed by a Board made up of executive directors Kevin Jenkins, Michael Mills, and Nick Davis, plus independent directors Sir John Wells (Chair) and Hilary Poole.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context

EECA engaged Martin Jenkins to evaluate the effectiveness of VTR. They wanted to understand:

- the effectiveness of VTR as a mechanism to enable people to insulate their homes, and if it should continue or not
- if it should continue, whether changes could be made to make it more effective
- its own role in VTR, and if other parties could be better placed to administer the scheme.

The evaluation was designed to give rapid and pragmatic feedback.

The following things were beyond the scope of this evaluation:

- this was not an evaluation of any other insulation programmes (such as Warm Up New Zealand [WUNZ])
- this evaluation did not assess the benefits of insulation (this work has been done already)
- this evaluation did not assess the performance of the insulation industry, nor did it evaluate the performance of individual ISP companies
- estimating the quantity of additional insulation retrofits that VTR has enabled.

About Voluntary Targeted Rates

Voluntary Targeted Rates (VTR) is a scheme whereby home-owners can finance insulation retrofits through adding the cost to their council rates bill over a 9–10 year period. The scheme was initiated by the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) and is implemented by the eight participating councils. EECA’s main role is recruiting councils and auditing the quality of a sample of the installations.

Since 2009/10 almost 28,000 homes have been insulated using VTR, most of which were in Auckland and Wellington. Two-thirds of homes that were insulated using VTR also received a WUNZ grant.

Method

This evaluation was conducted using a mix of methods to ensure that a range of feedback and perspectives were captured to inform the evaluation. The specific methods used included:

- an analysis of EECA-held operational data on VTR

---


2 Including Auckland City Council, Greater Wellington Regional Council, Dunedin City Council, Christchurch District Council, Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, New Plymouth District Council, South Taranaki District Council, and Marlborough District Council. In addition, two councils offer a VTR independent of EECA, these are Invercargill City Council and Bay of Plenty Regional Council (only available in Rotorua).
• in-depth interviews, including:
  – representatives from the owners / management of six insulation service provider (ISP) companies
  – representatives of four councils that offer a VTR insulation scheme – three of which work with EECA and one which offers a scheme independent of EECA
  – five VTR customers
• a survey of the sales staff from ISP companies.

We designed a fit for purpose approach to meet EECA's needs. The scale, scope and timing of the evaluation was designed in response to the available time and budget.

Mixed methods (qualitative interviewing and review of EECA data) were used to incorporate as wide a range of data sources and perspectives as possible. It should be noted that the evidence is strongly informed by the perspectives of key stakeholders — a mix of stakeholder groups (including EECA, ISP company owners and sales staff, and VTR customers) were involved so that qualitative feedback wasn’t dominated by any one group.

It is also important to note the small number of customers who were interviewed. We talked to five customers, all of whom agreed to be involved (ie they self-selected), the customers we talked to do not necessarily represent the perspectives or characteristics of all VTR users.

Findings

How effective is VTR as a mechanism to enable people to insulate their homes?

This research suggests that VTR acts as a behavioural nudge designed to result in additional insulation retrofits, and that it has a positive impact on the number of homes insulated per year in the areas it is offered.

ISP sales people provided clear and strong feedback that they think if councils that don’t currently offer VTR were to start doing so, the number of homes insulated per year would increase markedly. This feedback was supported by the councils and ISP company owners we interviewed.

ISP companies (owners and sales people) said that VTR is an important payment option for their customers. This was supported by the customers themselves — the sample we talked to all reported that they used the VTR because it was convenient. Customers liked:

• the convenience of VTR, particularly that there was only one form to fill in and the ISP sales person sometimes filled it out for them.
• that there was no up-front cost
• that the weekly repayments were small.
Some council stakeholders, and an ISP company owner, mentioned that customers liked that the debt stays with the house. This wasn’t cited by any of the five VTR users that were interviewed. However, this does not mean it is not a motivator for some people.

Four out of the five VTR customers that we interviewed said that they could have paid for their insulation using their savings, but chose to use VTR anyway. This suggests that the VTR is providing a behavioural nudge for customers by making it easy, and overcoming their present bias. This does not preclude the use of VTR to overcome a financial barrier — we must remember that the customer sample size is small and those who are more financially vulnerable may not have had the time to be interviewed. However, it does suggest that the behavioural nudge factor is more significant.

Other forms of finance exist for customers — many of these are interest-free, but are paid back over a much shorter time period than VTR (one to two years versus nine years). VTR seems to be more convenient for customers than other payment options and providers told us that they often choose it over cheaper financing options.

Stakeholders said that VTR worked best with an openly available WUNZ programme (two thirds of users of VTR also received a WUNZ grant, most of these used it before WUNZ was targeted towards low income households). This period also coincided with widespread marketing of insulation by EECA. We can’t tell from the available evidence whether WUNZ, EECA’s marketing (or a combination of both) had the biggest impact on the VTR uptake.

Overall, we think that the VTR has a positive impact on the number of insulation retrofits per year in the areas it is offered, although most VTR insulations over the past nine years have also used a WUNZ grant. EECA’s operational data on VTR suggests that there are about 2,500 VTR insulations per year occurring without a WUNZ grant (and an unknown number of insulations that occur without VTR or a WUNZ grant).

Should it continue?

Assuming that VTR is effective (see above) and EECA can recover much of the operational costs, the only remaining reason to discontinue is risk. If EECA is prepared to accept the risks outlined below there is no reason to stop VTR.

There are three possible reasons to discontinue VTR: it is ineffective; too costly, or too risky.

If we assume, based on the previous section that VTR motivates additional installations then cost and risk are the two factors to consider.

Cost

The marginal cost to EECA of fulfilling its roles in VTR is currently less than $100,000 per year. The most significant cost is the audits for five percent of the installs ($307.50 per install). The remaining

---

3 While this was generally the case, council stakeholders told us that Buyers could compel Vendors to settle the VTR debt prior to the sale of the property.

4 Present bias refers to the tendency of people to give stronger weight to payoffs that are closer to the present time when considering trade-offs between two future moments. See: https://www.behaviouraleconomics.com/mini-encyclopedia-of-the-present-bias.
costs are for relationship management with councils, including travel and accommodation, and a small amount of time for processing claims. However, it does still represent a sum of money that EECA could re-prioritise to other initiatives and this adds up over several years.

If there are 2,500 installations per year this poses a cost to EECA of about $40 per installation. It’s sensible to assume that not all of these installations wouldn’t have happened without VTR. If we assume that 30 percent of them wouldn’t have happened without VTR, the cost per additional installation is $133. This is a reasonable cost compared with a grants scheme. This cost could also be reduced significantly by charging a fee for quality assurance.

Risk

EECA staff have expressed some concerns about EECA’s lack of ability to enforce quality standards. Unlike in WUNZ, EECA cannot select ISPs based on their performance or undertake enforcement activities. Councils are responsible for that.

When an installation is put into the contract management system by an ISP, EECA has knowledge of it and five percent of them are audited for quality and safety. Failed audits are uncommon (94.1 percent pass rate), but some ISPs have worse audit records with more fails and worse defects. Councils require that an ISP remedies the issues when an installation fails an audit. ISPs said that they generally organise to have an ISP company representative present for the audits and issues are resolved on the spot.

The concern of EECA staff is that those ISPs with worse audit records are doing more regular fail-worthy installations that are outside the five percent that are audited (and therefore not remedied). If any of these causes a safety-related incident EECA’s reputation could be damaged (and this also puts people’s property and personal safety at risk). If VTR insulations are not being reported to EECA, then the likelihood of this risk will be very difficult to assess. Our discussions with EECA have clarified that this is potentially an issue with VTR installations that happen together with clean-heating appliances (e.g., heat-pumps) and sometimes the ISP company may neglect to record the job in the Grants Enterprise Management (GEM) tool. We note that EECA could reduce the occurrence of these situations by engaging regularly with ISP companies on the proper use of the GEM tool (reiterating that the ISPs must enter all VTR insulation jobs in GEM), and regularly comparing data with the relevant councils to see if there have been insulation jobs that have not been recorded in GEM.

While it is true that there is not a direct financial incentive for the ISP companies to remedy failed audits (as there is with WUNZ), the ISP companies said that they work hard to protect their reputations as quality service providers. They know that EECA report back to the councils on the outcomes of the audits, and ISPs with high fail rates will not have their VTR contracts renewed by the councils. 7

There are a number of ways that EECA could mitigate this risk — relevant mitigation strategies include:

---

5 Not all VTR insulation installations get put into EECA’s contract management system by the ISPs. Where councils offer other measures through targeted rates (e.g., heating), and insulation is included only as a component of the job, they are sometimes not put into the system.

6 When this happens, EECA has no knowledge of the installations and they are not part of the pool selected for audit.

7 For comparison purposes, WUNZ has an overall average pass rate of 90.2 percent.

Feedback received from ISP companies and some councils.

---
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• providing councils information on ISP companies’ quality performance (ISP companies should receive reports on their own quality performance, and how they relate to the industry average) and giving them guidance on how to procure quality service providers

• fundamentally changing the nature of EECA’s role in the intervention to take more direct responsibility for VTR, this would increase the costs, but it could also increase the effectiveness of VTR

• developing a formal contracting relationship between EECA and councils where services are exchanged, this would probably be difficult to negotiate and administer

• discontinuing EECA’s involvement in VTR altogether, which could result in poorer quality installations overall.

How do stakeholders value VTR?

All stakeholders valued the quality assurance component of VTR despite it not being used to sell it. Customers also highly valued the convenience. Councils valued it as a way to improve housing quality. ISPs saw it as an important payment option for customers. Councils and ISPs expressed frustration with the claims process and this was echoed by EECA delivery staff who also saw reputational risks.

Customers who used VTR said that they value the convenience of VTR and the quality of the work (although the quality was not cited as a core reason for choosing VTR). They did not see that EECA had much involvement in VTR — this probably makes sense as EECA’s role is not customer-facing and it seems like VTR is not sold based on EECA’s involvement.

Councils saw value in the benefits that the scheme posed to their ratepayers (including improved indoor environments and better health outcomes) and to small businesses in the region (ie the ISP companies). They mentioned that Councillors really like VTR, and that it was a way to improve housing quality. VTR is aligned to their energy/low-carbon/clean air objectives.

EECA delivery staff value more households receiving the benefits of insulation and the quality assurance VTR provides. However, some delivery staff were concerned that EECA did not have any direct way to force ISP companies to remedy any quality issues. They felt this represented a reputational risk for EECA.

The ISP company owners that we talked to indicated that VTR was an important payment option for their customers and saw the benefits to them were the same as the benefits to the customer. This implies it is important from a customer service / obtaining more sales perspective. They also valued having a centralised organisation watching out for the quality of installations. However, quality does not seem like something VTR is ‘sold’ on.

Quality assurance is valued by all the stakeholders we interviewed. There are significant impacts on effectiveness and safety if an installation is not done well.

Councils and ISPs expressed frustration with the claims process. They saw it as complex and frustrating with large delays on some occasions. EECA staff are also frustrated by some aspects of
the claims process, particularly address verification which is time-consuming and inefficient for EECA at times.

Are there other parties that could be better placed to take on EECA’s roles?

It is possible for councils to run VTR without EECA but it is unclear how many would. It is also likely to be cheaper to New Zealand for EECA to run the quality assurance.

Council and ISP stakeholders said that the two large VTR councils could sustainably continue to offer the VTR without EECA’s involvement, but they thought that smaller councils would struggle to do so.

There are two councils that offer a VTR scheme for insulation independent of EECA and we included one of them in our interviews for comparison. The council that offers a VTR scheme independent of EECA said that they pay $40,000–50,000 per year for quality assurance — this amount is almost as much as it costs EECA to provide quality assurance for the whole VTR. That feedback suggests that it costs the country less per installation for EECA to do quality assurance for many councils than it does for one council to do its own.

EECA was seen by councils and ISP companies to be doing a good job with running the quality assurance system, they also saw this role as being very important — particularly that a single agency was overseeing quality at a national level. Given that quality assurance was important to the stakeholders, and that they thought EECA was doing a good job of filling this role, we think that it is important for EECA to retain this role in the future.

If it continues, what changes could be made to make it more effective?

Reviewing the VTR application and claims processes

The application process for VTR funding in some council areas were very long (several weeks) compared with other council areas (generally a few days). We would encourage EECA to understand why this is and to work with the councils to improve processing times, since this directly impacts on the customers’ experiences.

ISP companies, councils and EECA delivery staff all gave feedback that indicated that the VTR claims process needs to be reviewed. The complaints these stakeholders had about claims processing warrants further investigation to clarify the issues and identify if there is anything EECA can do to improve efficiency and transparency of the process.

Increased promotion

The biggest drivers of VTR uptake were WUNZ policy settings and marketing. The highest uptake of VTR coincided with the time when grants were most widely available and there was widespread marketing of insulation by EECA.
Many of the stakeholders (including ISP company owners, sales people, councils and VTR customers) mentioned that more promotion was a key way to improve the effectiveness of the VTR at incentivising additional insulation retrofits.

Some ISP company owners and some councils said that promoting the VTR through councils’ rates invoices could be an excellent and low-cost way of promoting the VTR to potential customers. This promotion could be further targeted to customers using data on when properties were built, and whether or not they have already been insulated via WUNZ and / or VTR.

Applying the principles of behavioural economics to the promotion of VTR could have an impact on the programme’s effectiveness. For example, the key messages of promotional material:

- should focus on the benefits of insulation (ie making it attractive) and that these benefits are realised immediately (ie the benefits are timely), and the weekly costs are low (ie the costs are also timely)
- could include a case study about families / people who have insulated and their experiences (ie making it social)
- could include a pre-populated application form and a list of contact details for local ISP companies (ie making it as easy as possible).

We also note that there is scope here for EECA to undertake a quasi-experimental trial to optimise the effectiveness of this messaging (ie taking a range of approaches to the marketing and messaging in each council area to test which approach, or combination of approaches leads to the highest VTR uptake).

Increase in geographic coverage

EECA-associated VTR is available to about 55 percent of New Zealand’s population. In addition to this, VTR schemes that are operated independently from EECA are available to an additional three percent of New Zealand’s population. This means that 42 percent of New Zealanders do not have a VTR scheme available in their council areas to help them insulate their homes.

ISP company owners said that VTR should be offered in more areas. This feedback came from both the company owners we interviewed, and the ISP sales people that we surveyed. We agree that expanding the VTR into more council areas would increase its impact. While EECA has worked extensively with councils to convince them to offer a VTR, they have had limited success in convincing new councils to join the scheme.

Improved access to customers for research and evaluation purposes

EECA is unable to contact VTR users directly despite having a list of them. Issues with the way the information is collected and privacy implications mean that to engage with VTR users they need to be contacted through the councils. An improvement would be ensuring that councils and ISPs include provision for EECA to contact customers directly in their paperwork with customers.

---

* Making it easy, attractive, social and timely.
* Subnational population estimates as at 30 June 2017, Statistics NZ.
Recommendations

Based on the findings of our evaluation, we have developed a set of recommendations for EECA to consider to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of VTR. These fall into two broad categories: operational improvements and lessons for future programmes.

Note that we have also done some thinking about some ideas for the design of future insulation support schemes in case the ambition of the Government for insulation support schemes increases significantly. This advice is presented in Appendix 3.

Operational improvements

We recommend that EECA:

- continue VTR but look into covering EECA costs by charging service providers a small fee (which providers could then pass on to customers)
- decide on criteria for targeting specific council areas
  - where EECA plans to expand into a new council area, attempt to baseline insulation retrofit activity beforehand to assist with further understanding of additioinality in the future
- investigate and resolve potential issues with the VTR application and claims processes
- investigate whether there is a low-cost way to mitigate the quality risks raised by EECA staff — potential mitigation strategies range from soft options (eg providing councils better information and procurement advice) to hard options (eg EECA taking direct responsibility for VTR)
  - we would encourage EECA to pay particular attention to the last two financial years to understand and resolve the recent drop off in pass rate for VTR audits
- work with councils to promote VTR through rates invoices
  - this should include information on the benefits of insulation, and should be targeted at the owners of homes built pre-2000 that have not been insulated through WUNZ or VTR
  - there is an opportunity here to conduct a quasi-experimental trial to test the effectiveness of different variations of the promotion (eg different messages included with the invoice, including pre-populated application forms).

Lessons for future programmes

We recommend that EECA:

- design programmes in the future that ensure there are contractual freedoms for EECA to contact customers directly for research and evaluation purposes.
INTRODUCTION

Context

The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) have engaged MartinJenkins to evaluate the effectiveness of the Voluntary Targeted Rates (VTR) scheme, and give them some advice on future policy settings for the VTR.

The VTR is a scheme whereby home-owners can finance insulation retrofits through their rates in some local council areas. The scheme is administered by the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (EECA) and is implemented by the eight participating councils. It is primarily targeted at people who are not eligible for a Warm Up New Zealand (WUNZ) grant, but who may still have difficulty raising the capital to pay for insulation up front.

VTR is part of EECA’s residential support offering. It is intended to work together with WUNZ to help remove financial barriers to people insulating their homes. The current WUNZ scheme is focussed on insulating the homes of people with low incomes, and is due to cease in mid-2018. An evaluation of VTR will help inform EECA about options for continuing to support people to insulate their homes after WUNZ ceases.

The scheme is designed to be cost neutral for participating councils (who charge users of the VTR interest, and in some cases, an administration fee). The main cost to EECA of administering the VTR is the cost of quality assurance (EECA audit 5% of the jobs to ensure that the insulation has been installed safely, and that it works as intended).

Insulation service providers (ISPs) are key stakeholders of the VTR, as they engage directly with people seeking to insulate their homes. Other stakeholders with a direct interest in VTR include EECA, participating councils, and current and future users of the VTR.

In commissioning this work, EECA are primarily interested in:

- the effectiveness of VTR as a mechanism to ensure people to insulate their homes, and if it should continue or not
- if it should continue, whether changes could be made to make it more effective
- understanding its own role in VTR, and if other parties could be better placed to administer the scheme.

Intervention logic model of VTR

Figure 1 is an intervention logic model for VTR. The intervention logic model captures the purpose and intentions of the policy diagrammatically. It also shows the expected outputs and outcomes of the VTR. The focus for this evaluation is on the activities and outputs layers of the intervention logic model, as well as the key short term outcome\(^{14}\): VTR incentivises earlier and additional insulation retrofits by making funding available immediately.

\(^{14}\) Readers should note that the other outcomes are contingent on achieving this outcome.
Demographic profile: Retrofit Your Home 2018

Current geographic distribution

North 15.2%
- Rodney
- Hibiscus and Bays
- Devonport-Takapuna
- Upper Harbour

Central 11.2%
- Albert-Eden
- Great Barrier Island
- Maungakiekie-Tāmaki
- Ōrākei
- Puketāpapa
- Waitāmatā

West 35.3
- Henderson-Massey
- Waitākere Ranges
- Whau

South 38.3%
- Howick
- Māngere-Ōtāhuhu
- Manurewa
- Ōtara-Papatoetoe
- Papakura
- Franklin
Attachment C

Item 11

Demographic information

Number of occupants in retrofitted homes

Age range of occupants in retrofitted homes

Health conditions impacted by housing quality

Applicant ethnicity

Changes to the Retrofit Your Home programme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retrofit finance limit</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit finance limit held at $5000 per property at 7% interest repaid over nine years</td>
<td>Limited to 1,800 applications supported at maximum assistance level. Weekly repayments at $5,000 approximately $14 per week, total repayments including interest are $6,743 over nine years. Customers wanting to install Thermal Curtains/Blinds, Double/Secondary Glazing, Solar Hot Water, Solar Photovoltaics, Batteries would have to meet part of the cost themselves. The level of additional funding required varies and could be up to $35000 for the largest solar systems and battery installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit finance limit increased to $7500 at 7% interest repaid over nine years</td>
<td>Limited to 1,200 applications supported at maximum assistance level. Weekly repayment at $7,500 approximately $22 per week, total repayments including interest are $10,044 over nine years. Customers wanting to install Double/Secondary Glazing, Solar Hot Water, solar photovoltaic systems larger than 3kW or batteries would need to meet part of the costs themselves. The level of additional homeowner funding required varies and could be up to $34,200 for the largest solar systems and battery installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrofit finance limit increased to $10,000 at 7% interest repaid over nine years</td>
<td>Limited to 900 applications supported at maximum assistance level. Weekly repayment at $10,000 approximately $29 per week, total repayments including interest are $13,485 over nine years. Customers wanting to install solar photovoltaic systems larger than 4kW or solar photovoltaic systems and solar battery would need to meet part of the costs themselves. The level of additional funding required varies and could be up to $31,700 for the largest solar systems and battery installations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve the 2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme (Attachment A).

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The regional Arts and Culture budgets are set and reviewed through the Long-term Plan process. The work programme line items within the budget allocations are set by staff in consultation with stakeholders and in the context of Auckland Council endorsed strategies, policies and plans with a specific focus on the goals of ‘Toi Whītiki Auckland’s Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan’.

3. The Arts and Culture regional budget is $9.17 million per annum which is comprised of operational and capital expenditure (Opex and Capex). The work programme presents the projects to be undertaken in 2019/2020 and aligns these with budget allocations, timelines and staff resource.

4. Table 1 outlines the allocation of the Arts and Culture 2019/2020 Regional Work Programme budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY19/20 OPEX</th>
<th>FY19/20 CAPEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture regional programmes</td>
<td>$3,162,000</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture regional funding</td>
<td>$2,270,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>$894,000</td>
<td>$2,755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,326,000</td>
<td>$2,846,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In addition to the budgeted amounts in Table 1 the 2019/2020 work programme also includes carry forwards, sponsorship, other income and associated expenditure as described in Table 2.

6. Carry forwards from the 2018/2019 work programme are the result of projects that were delayed due to timings of parent projects, delivery and site constraints.

7. Any significant changes affecting the objectives and intent of the approved work programme will be presented to the committee for consideration.

8. Staff recommend the committee delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve minor changes to the work programme.
Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the 2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme (Attachment A to the agenda report).

b) delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve changes to individual items on the work programme provided such changes do not significantly affect the intent of the programme, noting that any significant changes will be presented to the committee for consideration.

Horopaki

Context

9. The regional Arts and Culture budgets are set and reviewed through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process. The work programme line items within the budget allocations are set by staff in consultation with stakeholders and in the context of Auckland Council strategies, policies and plans.

10. The regional Arts and Culture budgets and work programmes align with the Auckland Plan 2050, the Long-term Plan 2018-2028, Toi Whītiki Auckland’s Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan, the council’s Public Art Policy and Events Policy.

11. The work programme responds to the following goals set in Toi Whītiki:

   - **Participation:** All Aucklanders can access and participate in arts and culture
   - **Investment:** Auckland values and invests in arts and culture
   - **Infrastructure:** A network of vibrant arts and culture organisations and facilities
   - **Place-making:** Arts and culture are intrinsic to Auckland’s place making
   - **Identity:** Auckland celebrates a unique cultural identity
   - **Creative economy:** Auckland has a robust and flourishing creative economy.

12. The regional Arts and Culture work programme presents the projects to be undertaken in 2019/2020 and aligns these with budget allocations, timelines and staff resource.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

13. The Arts and Culture regional budget is $9.17 million per annum which is comprised of opex and capex.

14. For 2019/2020, the Arts and Culture work programme includes Arts and Culture regional programmes, Arts and Culture regional funding programmes, as well as public art.

15. Table 2 summarises the 2019/2020 regional programme budget allocations and sources.
Table 2 – 2019/2020 regional programmes and budget allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Category</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Culture regional programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Māori</td>
<td>677,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX, FY19/20 CAPEX, Sponsorship &amp; Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>FY18/19 CAPEX CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and Representation</td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital and Online</td>
<td>257,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>FY18/19 CAPEX CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>1,030,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations and Improvement</td>
<td>399,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Culture regional funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contestable grants</td>
<td>2,208,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
<td>Creative NZ Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,033,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contestable grants</td>
<td>1,095,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hero Initiatives</td>
<td>1,784,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>Panuku Transfer OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>FY18/19 CAPEX CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Panuku Transfer Capex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,452,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Art</td>
<td>786,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 OPEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>578,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>FY19/20 CAPEX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme Category | Total Expenditure | Funding Source
--- | --- | ---
Cultural and Community Markers | 1,368,000 | Sponsorship<br>30,000<br>18,000<br>1,320,000<br>FY18/19 CAPEX CF<br>FY19/20 CAPEX
Platform- Digital Assets | 924,000 | FY19/20 OPEX<br>61,000<br>347,000<br>516,000<br>FY18/19 CAPEX CF<br>FY19/20 CAPEX
Public Art Gift Offers | 425,000 | FY19/20 OPEX<br>25,000<br>400,000<br>FY19/20 CAPEX
Public Art renewals, repairs & maintenance & collection management | 1,211,000 | FY19/20 OPEX<br>724,000<br>172,000<br>315,000<br>FY18/19 CAPEX CF<br>FY19/20 CAPEX
Total | $13,219,000 |

**Arts and Culture regional programmes**

18. Programmes for 2019/2020 continue the signature events and festivals such as *Matariki Festival*, *Stand Up Stand Out* and *Waitangi ki Manukau* from the previous year.

19. *Matariki Festival* is a significant event in the Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme. Each year, a series of stories associated with the celebration of Matariki are communicated through the worldview of a different mana whenua iwi. In 2019 Waikato-Tainui lead the hosting of Matariki Festival. The host iwi for 2020 is currently under negotiation.

20. The Arts and Culture unit also delivers a year-round programme of whakawhanaungatanga to enhance this relationship. *Ahikaaroa* profiles the stories of the host iwi throughout the year and includes *Tuku Mauri*, a ceremonial event where Matariki hosting privileges are passed from iwi to iwi.

21. Programmes such as *Satellites* (aimed at Auckland’s growing Asian and migrant communities), *Stand Up Stand Out* (focused on youth development) and the *Pacific Arts and Culture Programme* build on and strengthen existing initiatives and deliver to the Auckland Plan 2050’s ‘belonging and participation’ outcomes.

22. *Song Hubs* and the *Music Producer Series* are delivered in partnership with music industry bodies such as Australasian Performing Right Association Limited (APRA) and Recorded Music New Zealand; they are aimed at building international song writing and music production capability. These programmes are core programming strands within council’s contribution to Auckland’s recently granted UNESCO City of Music status.

23. The regional Arts and Culture programmes are evaluated each year and learnings applied in the planning for future activities.

24. Based on the learnings of the past year and wider Council research and the following new programmes have been added to the 2019/2020 work programme:

- Inclusion and Representation- Programme Extension: these have been included to enable existing programmes to better reach specific communities by extending the programmes to meet the needs of those communities, for example Seniors, Rainbow and Accessibility across Auckland.
- **Inclusion and Representation - Interculturalism:** to fund or deliver emerging research, audience development or programme opportunities that arise through rapidly shifting demographics; specifically focussing on opportunities that promote inter-cultural exchange, learning and appreciation

- **Digital:** this programme seeks to respond to the changing way in which Aucklanders engage with the world around them and includes a new online platform to access information about the Public Art collection and an increased focus on creating new works specifically for online and digital screens.

25. Minor changes to some of the naming conventions and groupings of programmes have been made to the 2019/2020 work programme that do not substantively change the programme from the previous year.

### Arts and Culture regional funding

26. The Arts and Culture Regional Funding programme budget for 2019/2020 is $2,270,000, which includes:

- $1,142,000 - contestable Regional Arts and Culture grants programme, which includes project grants and strategic relationship grants
- $439,000 - asset-based term grants with Q Theatre
- $581,000 - asset-based term grants with Te Tuhi
- $75,000 - term grant for the Auckland Festival of Photography
- $33,000 - assessment fees and contract administration.

27. Table 3 outlines the Regional Arts and Culture contestable grants programme budget allocation categories.

### Table 3 - Regional Arts and Culture contestable grants programme budget allocation categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Contestable Grants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience development and programming project grants</td>
<td>Supporting the delivery of high-quality arts and cultural experiences that would not otherwise be economically viable or capable of attracting audiences from across the Auckland region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and capacity development project grants</td>
<td>Increasing the professionalism and sustainability of regional arts and culture organisations through the development of strategic, business and marketing plans; feasibility studies; organisational development and digital/web development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic relationship grants</td>
<td>Single or multi-year funding relationships with a small number of strategic organisations operating at the regional level. These organisations are the ‘cornerstones’ of a thriving arts and culture sector in Auckland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Council’s Arts and Culture unit also administer the contestable Creative Communities Scheme on behalf of Creative New Zealand (CNZ) to support community arts projects across the region. This scheme targets community participation, young people and diversity. Decisions are made in accordance with CNZ guidelines by panels consisting of community, iwi, pacific people, gazetted art councils and elected members. The grants are funded entirely by central government.

Public Art

29. The regional Arts and Culture programme includes public art projects and activations that are intrinsic to Auckland’s place-making. Place-making creates safe opportunities for people to meet, connect, participate in and enjoy community and civic life, fosters identity and pride, and increases our sense of belonging and wellbeing.

30. Table 4 outlines the five categories that the Public Art programme is grouped into.

Table 4 - Public Art programme categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hero initiatives</td>
<td>Council’s approach to investment in public art has shifted from a greater number of smaller works to fewer, large-scale ‘hero initiatives’ that aim to have more transformative results. The identification of three large-scale projects in the Wynyard Quarter, and Boy Walking demonstrate this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated artwork initiatives</td>
<td>Integrated artworks transform built infrastructure and create civic landmarks. The City Rail Link project is a significant example of using integrated public art and design to express the unique image of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and community markers</td>
<td>Cultural and community markers respond to suburban surroundings or historical sites and draw on cultural or community narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift offers</td>
<td>Temporary public art responds to emergent opportunities and contributes to the liveliness of Auckland’s public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals, repairs and maintenance and collection management</td>
<td>Council manages both indoor and outdoor art collections and assets that need to be maintained and repaired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. The Long-term Plan does not include a budget for new acquisitions for the indoor art collection.

Changes to the work programme during the year

32. The creative processes involved in producing arts and culture projects, programmes and events are iterative, particularly in public art where projects are often connected to larger parent projects and involve feasibility, developed design and detailed design phases.
33. To accommodate this, staff recommend that the committee delegate authority to the Manager, Arts and Culture to approve changes to individual items on the work programme, provided such changes do not significantly affect the intent of the programme, noting that significant changes proposed affecting the intent of the approved work programme will be presented to the committee for consideration.

34. Items of significant impact would include cancellation of public art projects in ‘build’ phase or addition of new projects in which there is likely to be high public interest.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

35. Council’s Arts and Culture unit is one part of Auckland’s arts and culture sector delivering arts and culture-related programming. The 2019/2020 work programme comprises a small piece of the overall Auckland Council family investment profile in arts and culture but play a critical role in supporting and providing experiences to those Aucklanders currently not participating in or accessing arts and culture.

36. Other parties delivering related programming include; local boards, Creative New Zealand (CNZ), Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED), Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA), Auckland Regional Amenities Funding Act-funded organisations, not-for-profit organisations and the private sector.

37. The Arts and Culture regional programme connects with other areas of council and the community where appropriate to increase impact and value for ratepayer investment.

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

38. Implementing the Arts and Culture Regional work programme for 2019/2020 involves working with individual local boards throughout the year to identify synergies between the regional programme and local work programmes that align to local board plans and priorities.

39. Targeting local board areas that have previously had lower access to and participation in arts and culture has informed the model for delivering regional arts and culture initiatives such as Matariki Festival and Satellites.

40. The inventory of the public art asset collection has identified geographic gaps in some local board areas and this information has been used to prioritise planning for future public art projects. In some cases, local boards contribute budget to projects.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

41. Council’s Arts and Culture unit is committed to working with iwi, Māori creative practitioners and other Māori groups.

42. Some examples of this are:
   - Matariki Festival iwi manaaki model of hosting
   - Contestable funding has a specific priority score for events responding to Māori aspirations
   - Identification of large scale works in Wynyard Quarter which involve mana whenua partnerships and expression of Te Ao Māori worldview.

43. Te Aranga Design principles have been incorporated in public art briefing documents following feedback from iwi cluster group meetings.

44. The Public Art Policy includes a focus on the production of public art that highlights Māori identity as a key point of difference for Auckland.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

45. Regional arts and culture budgets for both operational and capital expenditure are provided for in the Long-term Plan.

46. The Arts and Culture regional budget is $9.17 million per annum which is comprised of operational and capital expenditure (Opex and Capex).

47. The 2019/2020 work programme does not advocate for new or increased funding from 2018/2019.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

48. Table 5 identifies the significant risks associated with the Arts and Culture 2019/2020 work programme, and appropriate mitigations to help manage these risks.

Table 5: Risks and mitigations associated with the Arts and Culture 2019/2020 work programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content or kaupapa duplication</td>
<td>Other arts and culture providers including council bodies create programming with the same or similar content and/or kaupapa</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maintain an outward focus on programming developments in, and strong relationships with the sector so that trends, opportunities and potential duplications are identified early. Adhere to the Arts and Culture Programming Framework so that work is focused on council’s specific areas of responsibility, obligation and/or opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependencies of public art projects with parent projects</td>
<td>The work programme is phased against known timeframes for parent projects (such as bridges, street scape upgrades and housing developments). Delays in parent projects directly impacts public art projects and can cause slippage.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Consistently monitor parent project schedules so any re-phasing can happen in a responsive manner. Ensure strong relationship management with project teams. Ensure division managers are kept informed and updated of progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

49. Staff will ensure the timely delivery of the projects in the Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme and their evaluation. Information and progress updates will be provided to the committee every six months.

50. Recommendations for Arts and Culture regional contestable funding will be presented to committee for approval following the two assessment rounds.

51. The work programme will be implemented within the 2019/2020 budget.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Social Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Economic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Artistic and Cultural Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Creative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Social Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Economic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Artistic and Cultural Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Creative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Social Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Economic Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Artistic and Cultural Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Creative Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Cultural and Social Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Responsiveness</td>
<td>Sector responsiveness to Economic Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Arts and Culture Regional Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Arts and Culture Regional Funding</td>
<td>$1,295,000</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
<td>$1,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Arts and Culture Regional Funding</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Arts and Culture Regional Funding</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
<td>$1,108,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Art Regional Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Public Art Regional Programmes</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Non-consumable Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Regional Non-consumable Funding</td>
<td>$2,248,000</td>
<td>$2,248,000</td>
<td>$2,248,000</td>
<td>$2,248,000</td>
<td>$2,248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Regional Non-consumable Funding</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Non-consumable Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Total Non-consumable Funding</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Arts and Culture Regional Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Local Arts and Culture Regional Programmes</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
<td>$3,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Local Arts and Culture Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 2019/20</th>
<th>Amount 2020/21</th>
<th>Amount 2021/22</th>
<th>Amount 2022/23</th>
<th>Amount 2023/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Total Local Arts and Culture Programmes</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
<td>$6,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>Integrated Arts Initiatives</td>
<td>Integrated Arts Initiatives</td>
<td>Integrated Arts Initiatives</td>
<td>Integrated Arts Initiatives</td>
<td>Total Integrated Arts Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whanganui: (painting title) by Graham Tipene - Meets Barns</td>
<td>Whanganui: (painting title) by Graham Tipene - Meets Barns</td>
<td>Whanganui: (painting title) by Graham Tipene - Meets Barns</td>
<td>Whanganui: (painting title) by Graham Tipene - Meets Barns</td>
<td>Total Source:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taranaki District Council</td>
<td>Taranaki District Council</td>
<td>Taranaki District Council</td>
<td>Taranaki District Council</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural and Community Markets**

- **Item 12**: Source: $4,000.00

**Platform Digital Assets**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Total Cultural and Community Markets**

- Source: $4,000.00

**Public Art Gift Offers**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Total Public Art Gift Offers**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Public Art Initiatives, repairs & maintenance: collection & management**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Total Public Art Initiatives, repairs & maintenance: collection & management**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Attachment A**

- Source: $30,000.00

**2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Programmes**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Page 126**

**Environment and Community Committee**

- Source: $30,000.00

**13 August 2019**

- Source: $30,000.00

**2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Programmes**

- Source: $30,000.00

**Attachment A**

- Source: $30,000.00

**2019/2020 Arts and Culture Regional Programmes**

- Source: $30,000.00
| Public Art Maintenance, Repair and Replacement & Amenities Management | 715,000 | 482,000 | 325,000 | 985,000 | 3,115,000 | 3,694,000 |
| Public Art | 674,000 | 43,000 | 494,000 | 1,156,000 | 2,262,000 | 2,755,000 |
| Total Arts and Culture Regional Work Programme Budget | 2,549,000 | 1,950,000 | 839,000 | 2,202,000 | 5,237,000 | 6,449,000 |
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek adoption of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund was established to support the development of sport and recreation facilities that enable Aucklanders to be more active more often.

3. The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund targets investment to increase the level of community sport and recreation participation in Auckland in three areas:
   a) Enabling participation of low participant communities
   b) Increasing participation in emerging sports with high growth potential
   c) Sustaining or increasing participation in high participation sports.


5. Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039 was adopted by Council in July and outlines Council’s approach to sport investment over the next 20 years [Resolution number ENV/2019/1].

6. The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines are aligned and supported by four key policies: the Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039, Facility Partnership Policy, Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan, as well as and the Community Grants Policy.

7. Staff propose to report to the Committee with recommendations for funding through the 2019/2020 budget in March 2020.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) adopt the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines as set out in Attachment A to this report.

b) delegate authority through the Chief Executive to the General Manager, Parks Sport and Recreation to make minor changes and amendments to the text and design of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines that are required before public release.

c) note staff will report to the Committee with recommendations for funding through the 2019/2020 budget in March 2020.
Horopaki

Context

8. Sport and recreation is one of the key areas Auckland Council invests in to deliver the ‘Belonging and Participation’ outcome in the Auckland Plan 2050:
   - Direction 1: ‘Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs’
   - Direction 2: ‘Improve health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders by reducing disparities in opportunities’
   - Focus Area 7: ‘Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life’.

9. Council invests a significant amount into sport and recreation. Council uses several mechanisms to invest in sport and recreation: the provision and management of sport and recreation facilities and programmes, use of Council land and buildings, direct financial contribution for capital and/or operating cost, and through partnering investments and grants.

10. The Long-term Plan 2018-2028 allocated $120 million to the establishment of a Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund. A total of five million was allocated in May 2019 to support eight facility development projects. The next three years budget includes seven million in 2019/2020, seven million in 2020/2021 and $13 million in 2021/2022.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

Analysis and advice

11. The fund will allow Council to proactively invest in changing sport and recreation preferences, delivering value for money through partnering. It will support the development of regional and sub-regional facilities that address the shortfall in facilities.


13. Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039 outlines Council’s approach to sport investment over the next 20 years.

14. The Facility Partnership Policy sets out how Council will partner with others. Council invests in community facilities owned or operated by others, so Aucklanders can access more of the quality facilities they need, faster and more cost-effectively.

15. The Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan is a sector-based plan to help inform and shape sports code plans and future sport facilities investment in Auckland.

16. The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines, Attachment A, sets out the assessment approach and process for community groups seeking investment.

17. The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund will target investment to increase the level of community sport and recreation participation in Auckland in three areas:
   - Enabling participation of low participant communities
   - Increasing participation in emerging sports with high growth potential
   - Sustaining or increasing participation in high participation sports.

18. The assessment approach will ensure all investment is evidence based and focused on outcome delivery and good practice.

19. The initial assessment will include an Expression of Interest that will be assessed by staff against the fund objectives and criteria, and a prioritised list of proposals recommended to the Committee.
20. Projects to progress will require a detailed application or a business case based on the scale of the project. Detailed applications/business cases will be assessed by staff and funding recommendations made to Committee.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

21. The proposed Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines have no identified impacts on other parts of the Council group. The views of council-controlled organisations were not required for the preparation of this report.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

22. Local Boards had opportunities to provide feedback on the Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039 at different stages of the plan development including earlier this year on the draft plan.

23. Local Boards views have not been specifically sought on the proposed Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines.

24. Following adoption, the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines will be shared with Local Boards.

25. At the Expression of Interest stage of proposals Local Board input and endorsement will be requested.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

26. Sport and recreation participation contributes directly to the ‘Māori Identity and Wellbeing’ outcome in the Auckland Plan 2050:

- Direction 1: Advance Māori wellbeing’
- Focus Area 1: ‘Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamariki and their whanau’

27. Sport New Zealand data (Active NZ survey) shows weekly sport and recreation participation of Māori in Auckland (73.7%) is lower than European (83.0%) and Pasifika (74.0%) but higher than Asian (67.1%)

28. Research shows pockets of sedentary Māori who do not have adequate opportunities to participate in sport and recreation. It also shows Māori have different preferences for sport and recreational activities compared to other ethnic groups.

29. The target areas for investment for the fund will support increased sport and recreation participation for Māori.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

30. The Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 allocated $120 million to the establishment of a Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund. A total of five million was allocated in May 2019 to support eight projects. The next three years budget is seven million in 2019/2020, seven million in 2020/21 and $13 million in 2021/2022.

31. An annual programme cost of up to 1.5% of the annual budget will cover legal, financial, planning, evaluation, monitoring and programme management costs associated with managing the Fund.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
32. Staff will mitigate any reputational and operational risks associated with the implementation of the fund guidelines including communication/promotion, support for community groups and a transparent rigorous assessment approach.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
33. Staff will share and promote the final Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines with Local Boards and the sport and recreation sector.
34. Staff will confirm the timing for the first round of applications and provide the relevant information and templates on the Council website.
35. Staff propose to report to the Committee with recommendations for funding through the 2019/2020 budget in March 2020.
36. A communications approach will be developed to support and promote the fund process.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund Guidelines</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories
Authors
Dave Stewart - Manager Sport & Recreation
Sharon Rimmer - Strategic Partnerships Specialist

Authorisers
Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation
Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer
Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund

Guidelines

About the fund

The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund was established to support the development of sport and recreation facilities to increase the number of Aucklanders who participate in and benefit from sport and recreation. Aucklanders more active more often.

The Long-term Plan 2018-2028 allocated $120 million to the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund over the next ten years. The fund will allow Auckland Council to proactively invest in changing sport and recreation preferences and deliver value for money by leveraging external investment.

The fund will support new and existing facilities that address an identified gap in provision and provide fit for purpose facilities. The fund will focus on community sport and recreation provision, that delivers the best outcomes for Aucklanders and ensures that the best possible value for investment is achieved. The fund will support the development of regional and sub-regional facilities and address the shortfall in facilities.

Outcomes from Council’s Sport and Recreation Investment

*Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039,* sets out Council’s approach to investment in sports facilities, programmes and services for Aucklanders.

The Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund seeks to increase the level of community sport and recreation participation in Auckland.

The participation outcome directly aligns with the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan 2014-2024 to enable ‘more Aucklanders living physically active lives through participation in informal physical activity, recreation and sport.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The fund will target participation in three areas: (as identified in the Sports Investment Plan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enabling participation of low-participant communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increasing participation in emerging sports with high growth potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustaining or increasing participation in high participation sports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available Funding

Council invests a significant amount into sport and recreation. Council uses several mechanisms to invest in sport and recreation; the provision and management of sport facilities and programmes, use of Council land and buildings, direct financial contribution for capital and/or operating costs and through partnering investments and grants.

The Long-term Plan 2018-2028 has allocated $120 million to the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund over the next ten years. The next four years allocation - $7 million in 2019/2020, $7 million in 2020/2021, $13.4 million in 2021/2022 and $13.6 million in 2022/2023.

By partnering with community groups and leveraging other community investment more of the facilities that Auckland needs will be available faster and more effectively. Proposals for facilities targeting the Fund as well as LDIs could consider the Facility Partnerships Policy process.

Who might develop a proposal?
- Community organisations with a formal legal structure eg. Sports clubs
- National or Regional Sport and Recreation organisations
- Schools
- Commercial entities may apply for grants in certain circumstances

Eligibility for the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund will be guided by the Community Grant Policy Guidelines.


Project applications involving partnerships between groups and leveraging other community investment is encouraged.
What can be funded?

The primary focus for the fund is community sport and recreation facilities. The intention is to ensure Auckland Council investment provides for the greatest number of people possible and meets the changing needs of the community. Investment will:

- Provide a basic level of provision of fit-for-purpose sport and recreation facilities to support community sport and recreation.

- Prioritise investment in core infrastructure and ancillary infrastructure required for safe and sanitary public access.

- Not prioritise investment in sport and recreation facilities that are already funded or incidental infrastructure that delivers private benefits to small groups of users. Exceptions will be made if applicants can demonstrate increased sport participation or increased use of a core facility.

The fund will prioritise investment in facility development but may consider operational funded related to facilities where a significant increase in participation can be demonstrated.

Funding allocations can be made towards feasibility, planning, design and development stages of a project.

Definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Core Infrastructure</strong> (courts, fields, playing surfaces/structures, and lighting) that is central to sport and recreation participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancillary infrastructure</strong> (toilets, changing rooms, equipment storage and carparking) that enables safe and sanitary access for participants and spectators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incidental infrastructure</strong> (such as clubrooms and administration facilities) that is not required for sports participation but exist for social and management purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Approach

The Assessment approach will be guided by a number of complementary processes and documents.

The Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan

Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039
https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/draft-sports-investment-plan.PDF

The Auckland Sport Sector: Facilities Priorities Plan – a sector-based plan to help inform and shape sports code plans and future sport facilities investment in Auckland.

Facilities Partnership Policy – outlines Councils rationale for entering partnerships and the approach to selecting, shaping and supporting them, it enables informed and strategic decisions about shared investment in facilities.
https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/facility-partnerships-policy

The proposal and assessment approach will ensure all investment is evidence based and focused on outcome delivery and good practice.

The first stage involves community groups introducing the proposal on a one-page ‘Canvas’. This outline is discussed with council staff and updated.

The one page ‘Canvas’ includes:

A. Need/Opportunity
B. Inputs, Outputs
C. Intermediate and long-term outcomes
D. Composition of partnership, nature of entity
E. Funding projected
F. Partner willing and able to deliver
Those proposals that have sufficient information are encouraged to develop a more detailed Proposal Template (Stage 2).

When Council initiates input from community groups through an Expression of Interest, proposals are sought directly in this more detailed format.

The Proposal Template covers:
- Strategic Alignment
- Links to code plans, and Local Board Plans
- Benefits and Outcomes
- Facility ownership and prospective partners and other groups
- High level Return on Investment analysis
- Achievability – estimated project costs

The Investment Principles outlined in Increasing Aucklanders’ Participation in Sport: Investment Plan 2019-2039, will assist to prioritise across investment proposals.

- Equity (40% of assessment): ensure equity of outcomes across the population regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status or location.
- Outcome-focused (30% of assessment): needs to be a clear ‘line of sight’ between the investment and the outcomes it delivers.
- Financial sustainability (20% of assessment): projects need to be financially sustainable
- Accountability (10% of assessment): investment needs to be in the best interests of Aucklanders.

The breadth and depth of information required for the planning and design stage will be proportional to the overall level of council investment (fund, land and other inputs). For low-level low-complexity investments, a scale-down approach will be taken. As the value and risk profile increases, investment decisions need to be informed by more comprehensive analysis. The Facility Partnership Policy p23 indicates the criteria.
How to develop a proposal

1. **Background**
   - Understand the complementary policies, documents and processes listed in the Investment Fund Guidelines (this document). Review regional and national code plans.
   - Complete self-assessment in *Auckland Sport Sector: Facilities Priorities Plan (Pg 11)*

2. **Stage 1 Introduce proposal**
   - Connect with other community groups, funders, and relevant sporting organisations.
   - Complete the Proposal Canvas (insert link).
   - Contact sportandrecreation@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz to discuss Proposal Canvas with a Sport and Recreation Advisor.

3. **Stage 2 Strategic assessment**
   - Complete the Proposal Template (insert link) with advice and support from a Sport and Recreation Advisor.
   - Council will review alignment with strategies and analysis of community need, and against objectives and criteria for the Investment Fund.

4. **Consider planning/design funding**
   - Local Boards engaged before prioritised list presented to Environment and Community Committee to consider funding for planning and design.

5. **Stage 3-5 Case, design, plan**
   - If proposal is successful, business case, facility design, project plan developed by the parties involved (detail scaled to the size of the project).

6. **Consider build & delivery funding**
   - All parties (community groups, sporting organisations, other funders) confirm the plan.
   - Local Board engaged. Proposals presented to Environment and Community Committee for consideration of funding.

7. **Stage 6-7 Execute, deliver, review**
   - Per funding and timing, project progresses. Facility and services delivered.
   - Parties manage, monitor and review facility and services.

---

1 Stages: Refer to the stages in the proposal development lifecycle p14 of the Facility Partnership Policy. All proposals, whether partnerships or not, follow a similar process.
Open Space acquisition in the 2018/19 financial year

File No.: CP2019/13487

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To provide a summary of parks and open space acquisition in the 2018/19 financial year.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Thirteen new parks and open space, covering a land area of approximately 29.19 hectares, were acquired in the 2018/19 financial year.
3. A total of $44.2 million was spent acquiring these parks and open space. This represented 93 per cent of the available budget of $47.7 million.
4. Land was also acquired, as part of Waitākere Ranges Local Board One Local Initiative, for a future civic space in Glen Eden.
5. The report may help dispel the reputational risk that council is disposing of open space land.
6. The low financial risk of a minor underspend is mitigated by carrying the balance over to the 2019/20 financial year.
7. Staff recommend the development of a series of communication initiatives to highlight the new parks and open spaces acquired.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
  a) approve the development of a series of communication initiatives to highlight the new parks and open spaces acquired in the 2018/19 financial year for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment.

Horopaki
Context
8. Thirteen new parks and open space, covering a land area of approximately 29.19 hectares, were acquired in the 2018/19 financial year.
9. Figure one below highlights the location of these new parks and open spaces.
10. Eight new neighbourhood parks were acquired in four local board areas.
11. A total of 5.19 hectares was acquired at Don Buck Road, Massey, for a new suburb park. This is part of several open spaces planned for the Redhill Precinct.
12. Two land acquisitions totalling 4.88 hectares at Trig Road will help form a 10-hectare sports park indicated in the Whenuapai Structure Plan.
13. All of these acquisitions respond to growth in greenfield areas. They align with the Open Space Provision Policy and ensure that Aucklanders have access to parks and open space for sport and recreation.
14. Over 16.12 hectares was acquired at Brigham Creek Road. The land will be used to form a new sports park. It was acquired to offset the loss of land at Constellation Reserve to the New Zealand Transport Agency Northern Corridor Improvement Project. Partial funding of the acquisition came from the Open Space Acquisition Budget. This will be refunded once additional compensation is provided by the New Zealand Transport Agency.

15. No parks and open spaces were acquired at no capital cost or approved under delegated authority in this period.

Land for a new civic space in Glen Eden was also acquired

16. Land was purchased at 202-208 West Coast Road, Glen Eden for the future development of a civic space.

17. This was acquired using funds from the Waitākere Ranges Local Board ‘One Local Initiative’ budget.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

18. Staff recommend the development of a series of communication initiatives to highlight the new parks and open spaces acquired in the 2018/19 financial year for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment.

19. Existing channels such as Our Auckland and the council website can be used.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

20. This is an information report for reporting purposes only.

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

21. The relevant local boards were consulted on the acquisition of open space.

22. Local boards have decision-making responsibility for the development of new parks and open space. This includes responsibility for maintenance.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

23. This is an information report for reporting purposes only.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

24. A total of $44.2 million was spent acquiring 13 parks and open space.

25. This represented 93 per cent of the available budget of $47.7 million. The open space acquisition budget for the 2018/19 financial period was $39.2 million. An $8.5 million underspend was carried over from the previous year.

26. Development and maintenance costs for new parks and open spaces were provided for in the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 as a percentage of the acquisition cost.
## Item 14

### Figure 1: Location of new parks and open space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Property location</th>
<th>Park type</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Size (m²)</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>157 Grand Drive (Precinct 5)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65 Hibiscus Coast Highway</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>$1,817,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>751&amp;787 Kaipara Coast Highway</td>
<td>Accessway</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92 Trig Road</td>
<td>Sport (part of)</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>40,646</td>
<td>$10,772,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>94 Trig Road</td>
<td>Sport (part of)</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>8212</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>161 &amp; 167 Brigham Creek Road</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>161,223</td>
<td>$3,797,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17 Clarks Lane</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>$2,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>131 Clark Road</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>4278</td>
<td>$5,882,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>490E Don Buck Road</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>51,977</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>202-208 West Coast Road</td>
<td>Civic space</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>$3,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>137 Clarks Beach Road (Park 1)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>$1,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>137 Clarks Beach Road (Park 2)</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>$1,078,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>77 Tahuna Minihinnick Drive</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3671</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>84 Thomas Road</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>3971</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risks and mitigations

27. The report may help dispel the reputational risk that council is disposing of open space land.

28. In 2019/20 Panuku disposed of six properties zoned informal recreation, road reserve or recreation reserve with a total area of 4826m². This represents 1.63 per cent of the open space land acquired.

29. The low financial risk of a minor underspend is mitigated by carrying the balance over to the 2019/20 financial year.

Next steps

30. Each year council receives media enquiries about the sale of open space land. Staff will develop a series of communication initiatives to highlight the new parks and open spaces using channels such as Our Auckland and the council website.

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Signatories
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Kataraina Maki – General Manager - Community &amp; Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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**Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information - updates, memos and briefings - 13 August 2019**

File No.: CP2019/13249

**Te take mō te pūrongo**

**Purpose of the report**

1. To note progress on the forward work programme (Attachment A)
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee's information since 10 July 2019.

**Whakarāpopototanga matua**

**Executive summary**

3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.

4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/07/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum Pestival and Mayoral Conservation Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/2019</td>
<td>International Engagement Activity Update – July 2019 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant Programme – 2019/2020 Funding Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum from Waiheke Local Board to Cr Hulse regarding 5G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/2019</td>
<td>Letter to Minister Faafio regarding 5G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/07/2019</td>
<td>Response from Minister Faafio regarding 5G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2019</td>
<td>Memorandum Interregional Marine Pest Pathway Management Consultation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/08/2019</td>
<td>International Engagement Activity Update – August 2019 Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The following workshops/briefings have taken place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2019</td>
<td>Workshop Sea Change Political Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2019</td>
<td>Workshop Diversity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2019</td>
<td>Climate change legal and risk deep dive – CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2019</td>
<td>Waste Advisory Political Advisory Group - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/07/2019</td>
<td>Auckland Council’s operational greenhouse gas emissions reduction target and approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Note that **staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary**. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

7. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive the summary of the Environment and Community Committee information report – 13 August 2019.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Forward Work Programme</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Memorandum Pestival and Mayoral Conservation Awards (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>International Engagement Activity Update – July 2019 Summary (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant Programme – 2019/2020 Funding Round (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Memorandum from Waiheke Local Board regarding 5G (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Letter to Minister Faaifoi regarding 5G (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Response from Minister Faaifoi regarding 5G (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Memorandum Interregional Marine Pest Pathway Management Consultation results (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Workshop SeaChange Political Advisory Group (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Workshop Diversity and Inclusion (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>International Engagement Activity Update – August 2019 Summary (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Auckland Council’s operational greenhouse gas emissions reduction target and approach (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Suad Allie - Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Koro Dickinson - Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This committee deals with strategy and policy decision-making that relates to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland as well as matters that are not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body.

**Committee Priorities:**

1. Clearly demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
2. Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration
3. Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected
4. Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford
5. Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland

The work of the committee will:

- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic approach to Climate Change</td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td>Strategic direction will be provided in the coming months. Progress to date: A summary of activities to prepare for climate change was given in the presentation on 8/8/17 meeting. Report was considered on 20/2/18, resolution ENV/2018/11 Dec 18 – approval for consultation Feb – Mar 19 - targeted public engagement Apr 19 – feedback presented to elected members Jun 19 – final strategy for adoption – Res ENV/2019/71 Jul 19 – Draft submission Climate Change Response Amendment Bill - Res ENV/2019/109 Progress to date report was considered December 2018 meeting, Res ENV/2018/170 Workshop scheduled 23 May 2019 Report on Auckland’s Climate Action Framework Consultation draft and approach was considered on 6/11/2018, resolution ENV/2019/71</td>
<td>Q4 (June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop draft plan March – May 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft plan to committee for input and adoption June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public consultation of draft plan July-August 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low carbon living</strong></td>
<td>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction and endorse</strong> programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40 Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging. <strong>Climate Plan Workshop:</strong> Risks and vulnerabilities (June)  • Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities  • Communication strategy for broader public engagement  • Local Board workshops  • Mana whenua engagement (integrated throughout)  • Stakeholder workshops Prioritisation criteria and identified actions (Jul/Aug)  • Cost benefit and total value analysis  • Agree prioritisation criteria  • Review all actions  • Draft plan  • Draft plan to committee (Dec 2018)  • Consultation (linking to other plans, approach tbc)  • Updates to action plan  • Adoption of updated plan by council (Proposed December 2018)  • Final Adoption of Climate Plan (Mar 09)</td>
<td><strong>Decision and endorsement</strong> of strategic direction. <strong>Progress to date:</strong>  <em>Report</em> was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec 18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env &amp; Community Ctees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Forest Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on strategic direction and endorsement of strategy. <strong>Progress to date:</strong> A workshop was held on 14/06/17. <em>Report</em> was considered on 12/09/17 ENV/2017/116 a full draft of the strategy was considered 20/02/18, res ENV/2018/12 with a report back on the results of the LIDAR and an implementation plan on costs and benefits in Aug 2018. An update was included in the 14 Aug agenda regarding several workstreams covered by the 18 high level implementation actions. A report on a full progress on implementing the strategy will be in August 2019.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes (Quarter (month if known))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040. Full review of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund will be undertaken. Outcomes provided with the section 17a review report in March 2019.</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17 Progress to date: Report was considered on 4/12/18 to note allocations for the 2018/2019 small to med September funding round, res ENV/2018/176. Item C1 approval of medium to large grants September 2018 round April 2019 - email to committee re: small grants round opening 1 April to 30 April. A copy of the memo is attachment C of the Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information – updates, memos and briefings – 9 April 2019 report. – April agenda.</td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) Q4 Q1</td>
<td>FY18/19 Jan-Mar 2019 12 Feb 12 March 9 April 14 May 11 June FY19/20 Jul-Sep 2019 9 July 13 Aug 10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland’s water strategy</td>
<td>The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction and priorities as part of the Auckland Plan. Consider the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy to be adopted for consultation December 2018. Progress to date: A report was considered on 12/06/18 to approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of the strategy. Res ENV/2018/78 Key milestones:  □ June 2018 – develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes, identify integrated water outcomes, □ July-Oct 2018 – high level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes – consultation with mana whenua Progress to date: A Report was considered December 2018 - discussion document ahead of public consultation Res ENV/2018/168. Key timeframes: □ Public consultation on discussion document 17 Feb – 17 March □ Public engagement feedback to committee, April 2019 □ Draft options for the finalisation of Auckland’s water strategy, and associated work programmes to be present to committee in June 2019 Workshop – April water discussion document, and to</td>
<td>Q4 (June 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental and Community Committee

#### 13 August 2019

**Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information** - updates, memos and briefings - 13 August 2019

#### Attachment A

**Item 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Pest Management Plan review</strong></td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests. To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls. Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid-2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018. Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12 Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17 Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017 Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP. A memo was distributed and is attached to the July agenda. Key milestones: • workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018 • workshops with local boards on public feedback – September - October 2018 • engagement with mana whenua – September – October 2018 • workshop with Environment and Community Committee – October – November 2018 • formal feedback from local boards at business meetings – October – November 2018 • approval of final plan by Environment and Community Committee – March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expected timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter (month if known)</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
<td>9 June</td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A report was considered June 2019 – adopt the Our Water Future ô Tātou Wai Ahu Ake Nei framework [Res ENV/2019/75](#).

- Progress to date:

  - 12 March 2019 report to consider the adoption of the Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2019. Adoption was approved and the motion was put in parts: [ENV/2019/22 – ENV/2019/32](#).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work and work plan</td>
<td>To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s:</td>
<td>Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- proposed Regional Pest Management Plan</td>
<td>A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next steps:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memo to local boards and mana whenua with the final discussion document and plans for informal public consultation February – March 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informal public and key stakeholder consultation March – May 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback and recommended next steps reported back to participating councils, including Environment and Community Committee and the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance July 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant</td>
<td>Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year. Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016, ENV/2016/11 Item 15</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>Report Item 16 to December 2018 committee to approve grant recommendations for the 2018/2019 Regional Environment and Natural Heritage Grant programme funding round. Res ENV/2018/175</td>
<td>Report to 10 July 2019 to approve an increase in the Regional Historic Heritage Fund. Res ENV/2019/123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td>The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.</td>
<td>Progress to date: Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) – a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (June) Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In December 2018 further decisions will be sought under the national policy statement, including: • approve final targets for swim-ability of major rivers in the Auckland region • approve the updated Progressive Implementation Plan for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Next steps:</strong> • public consultation on the Auckland Water Strategy discussion document 17 February to 17 March • public engagement feedback presented to elected members – April 2019 • Draft options for the finalisation of the Auckland Water Strategy, and associated work programmes to be presented to the Environment and Community Committee – June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018. A report was considered on 26/6/18 : Res ENV/2018/78 • June 2018: develop strategy • July to Oct 2018 – High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders. • Dec 2018- Draft Auckland’s waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation • Feb to Apr 2019 - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland’s waters strategy in February to March 2019. • Apr 2019 - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2019 • Jun 2019 - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption ENV/2019/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Report Item 9 to December 2018 committee meeting- To approve the Auckland Water Strategy discussion document, ahead of public consultation from 17 February 2019 to 17 March 2019. Res ENV/2018/168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Policy Alliance</td>
<td>To consider food policy alliance</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on food policy alliance</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Growing Greener</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include endorsing: • a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data • proposed incentives for green growth • recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation</td>
<td>Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation</td>
<td>To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec</td>
<td>Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck &amp; Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.</td>
<td>To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport &amp; Recreation for 2017/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 2019 reporting schedule:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— January 2019 - Interim report from 1 July – 31 December 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— June 2019 - confirm 2019/20 priorities, outcomes and measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>A report was considered on 10 July 2018 to approve the strategic partnership grant of $552,000 per annum for a three-year term (2018-2021) Res ENV/2018/90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— July 2019 – Annual report from 1 January 2019 – 30 June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>A funding agreement will be prepared for Aktive that ensures clear accountability and KPIs for each of the four geographical areas (North, West, Central and Southern) for the investment. (TBA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— September 2019 - Audited Financial Statements from 1 July 2018 – 30 June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)</td>
<td>Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust</td>
<td>To note further update on progress of the governance trust.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on future options for sport and recreation.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>Decision on issues papers</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Next Steps:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— public consultation February to March 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise and adopt investment plan – approval of guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— final approval of plan will be sought June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 13 with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Implementation of the plan will occur in stages over the next three to five years, depending on council budgetary and planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting, Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19 Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY19/20 Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf Investment Plan</strong></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on issues papers Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indoor Courts</strong></td>
<td>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on investment approach</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Springs Community School Partnership</strong></td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Programme</strong></td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on growth funding allocation</td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</strong></td>
<td>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environment and Community Committee
13 August 2019

**Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information**

- **updates, memos and briefings**
- **13 August 2019**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</strong></td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
<td>FY18/19: Jan-Mar 2019 12 Feb 12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</strong></td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on scope and phasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion document</strong></td>
<td>Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval for public release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</strong></td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval to a variation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Southern Initiative (TSI)</strong></td>
<td>Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Reference Notes**
- TOR: Terms of Reference
- TLP: Time Limit for Progress
- Memo: Memo

---

**Report Considered**
ENV/2018/150

---

For more information, contact [contact information].
### Environment and Community Committee

**13 August 2019**

**Summary of Environment and Community Committee Information**

#### - updates, memos and briefings

**13 August 2019**

---

#### Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Engagement Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will presented.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities</td>
<td><strong>FY18/19</strong>&lt;br&gt;12 Feb 12 March&lt;br&gt;9 April 14 May 11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options to expand revenue streams for sport facilities investment</strong></td>
<td>Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft <strong>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>strategic direction</strong> to expand revenue streams to fund future sports facilities investment in the draft <strong>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Facilities Network Plan</strong></td>
<td>Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on indicative business case for central west</td>
<td><strong>Q3 (Mar)</strong> Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</strong></td>
<td>Develop and endorse the Sports Facilities Investment Plan to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan. <strong>Decision</strong> on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td><strong>Q1</strong> Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Homelessness                                     | Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee) | Decision on scope  
Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness  
Progress to date:  
Approved the scope policy 14 Feb [Item 17](#)  
Auckland council’s position and role was considered at the August meeting report item 12. Staff to report back with an implementation plan. Resolution ENV/2017/118 of preferred position and role | Q3  
Q4  
Q1 (Aug)  
Q2 |
| Facilities Partnerships Policy                   | Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps  
Next steps:  
• January – March 2019 policy summary released  
• April – June 2019 implement initial operational guidance and systems  
• July 2019 detailed operational design and testing continues. Benefits realisation plan developed | Decision on facility partnership approach  
Decision to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017  
Update was given at 14 February meeting on Phase 1. Approval was given on the proposed timelines for Phase 2: Minutes 14 February [Item 14](#) preferred option  
A report seeking approval to engage on a draft facility partnerships policy on 12/06/18. Resolution ENV/2018/74  
Progress to date:  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
| Citizens Advice Bureaux Services                 | Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services RSP decision in April 2016 [REG/2016/22](#) | Decision on review results  
Progress to date:  
Report was considered at 20 Feb meeting. Decision: lies on the table. A supplementary report was considered on 10 April 2018, Res ENV/2018/48 and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019  
Report was considered at 14 May meeting. funding model decision Res ENV/2019/58 | Q3 (Feb)  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
| Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives | Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee. |  | Q3  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
| Affordable Housing Intervention                  | Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing | Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions | Q3  
Q4  
Q1  
Q2 |
## Area of work

**Te Kauroa – Library Strategy**

Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)

**Central library strategic review**

A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities

**Libraries**

Work around the integration with customer services

**Intercultural Cities Network**

Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.

**Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)**

Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/32)

## Reason for work

**Te Kauroa – Library Strategy**

Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)

**Central library strategic review**

A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities

**Libraries**

Work around the integration with customer services

**Intercultural Cities Network**

Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.

**Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)**

Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/32)

## Decision or direction

**Te Kauroa – Library Strategy**

**Direction** relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress

**Approve** an expanded and improved regional mobile library service

**Progress to date:**
workshop held on 7 March with local board chairs. Workshop notes were attached to the 10 April agenda

**Central library strategic review**

**Decide direction** and **receive** the strategic review

**Libraries**

**Decision** on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)

**Intercultural Cities Network**

**Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network**

**Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)**

**Strategic direction** on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.

**Progress to date:**
Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018.

A **report** on the Findings was considered on 12/06/18 meeting. Resolution ENV/2018/75 approval for up to five inclusion pilots.

A report back on the advantages and any obstacles to Auckland becoming an Age Friendly City as part of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network.

## Expected timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes (Quarter/month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress</td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central library strategic review</strong></td>
<td>Decide direction and receive the strategic review</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries</strong></td>
<td>Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Cities Network</strong></td>
<td>Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing in Aucklanders (Age Friendly City)</strong></td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city.</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Decision or direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on council’s approach to social enterprise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Policy</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy; what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Development Contribution revenue and expenditure – funding for open space purposes</td>
<td>Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment</td>
<td>Progress to date: The report was considered on 14/08/18. Resolution ENV/2018/103. Report back on implementation within 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation in North-west Community Provision</td>
<td>Investigation to identify any current gaps in services or facilities or in the future</td>
<td>Decision on the investigation findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Feb 12 March</td>
<td>14 May 11 June</td>
<td>13 Aug 13 Sept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Enterprise**
- Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits
  - Strategic direction on council’s approach to social enterprise.

**Youth volunteer programmes**
- Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits
  - Strategic direction on interventions approach

**Events Policy**
- A review of what is working well and what isn’t
  - Decision on audit results

**Grant Policy Monitoring**
- Audit of the application of the Grants Policy
  - Decision on audit results

**Toi Whitiki Strategy**
- Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment
  - Decision on review results

**Public Art Policy**
- Review of the Public Arts Policy; what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts
  - Decision on review results

**Current Development**
- Highlight the new parks and open spaces for Aucklanders’ use and enjoyment
  - A report was considered on 14/08/178 on Open Space acquisition in 2017/18 financial year, resolution ENV/2018/104 to report back on DC revenue and expenditure by funding area for open space purposes based on current based on the current DC policy.

**Investigation in North-west Community Provision**
- Investigation to identify any current gaps in services or facilities or in the future
  - Decision on the investigation findings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Decision or direction</th>
<th>Expected timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-Jun 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following</td>
<td>Decision Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for</td>
<td>Q3 (April 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction</td>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic acquisition issues and</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition for stormwater</td>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee.</td>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as required. Next report</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purposes</td>
<td>To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either</td>
<td>will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in</td>
<td>Q4 (Feb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td>the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Environment and Community Committee

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. | s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities.  
s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations).  
In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes. | s48(1)(a)  
The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7. |