Governance Framework Review

Project execution plan

BE THE HOW.
WHAKAMAUA KIA TINA!

Auckland Council
Te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau

1   Document control

1.1   Document purpose

This project execution plan is the central document by which the project will be formally managed. It aims to:

- provide a description of the major phases and stages undertaken to complete the project
- outline the schedule of the activities, tasks, durations, dependencies, resources and timeframes
- establish the project team, control and governance required to complete the project
- list the assumptions and constraints identified during the planning process.

1.2   Document history

Version	Date	Update by	Update details
1.0	020317	Linda Taylor	Updated following PWP meeting
1.1	020317	Linda Taylor	Updated following the second PWP meeting

1.3   Associated documents

Version	Date	Document name and storage location
1.0	171116	Governance framework review
4.0	080217	Overview of work programme Governance Framework Review "GFR"

Comments: Accepted by political working party 2 March 2017

Contents

2 Background

On 15 December 2016, the Governing Body received the Governance Framework Review (GFR) and agreed to the establishment of a fourteen member political working party (PWP), comprising seven governing body and seven local board members, to further consider and work through the review recommendations. It was agreed that the PWP would:

- receive and consider the recommendations of the GFR;
- provide oversight and direction for the development of a work programme to address the findings and recommendations of the report; and
- report back to local boards and to the governing body for decisions on final recommendations.

Political working party members are:

Local Board members	Governing Body members
Shale Chambers (Deputy Chair)	Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore (Chair)
Angela Dalton	Cr Cathy Casey
Peter Haynes	Cr Efeso Collins
Phelan Pirrie	Cr Christine Fletcher
Greg Presland	Cr Richard Hills
Paul Walden	Cr Penny Hulse
Lisa Whyte	Cr Denise Lee

3 Opportunity

3.1 Overview

Over the last six years Auckland Council (both governors and the organisation) have developed policies, processes, protocols and organisational support structures to put the new governance model into practice. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 (LGACA) did not provide prescription, but its strong principles have guided this work.

In 2015 council commissioned an independent review of the new governance framework. The review reflects on the implementation to date of the new governance model and considers whether it is working optimally in terms of meeting the aims of the 2010 reforms.

The intent of the review was not to recommend wholesale changes to the governance structure, as the scope and scale of governance reform was so significant that it was always going to take time to mature. It was council's view that public and central government appetite for significant further change would be low, and fundamentally six years on is not the time to propose another model. The review focused on making the existing framework work better for Auckland.

The review did not include an evaluation of the use of substantive council controlled organisations (CCOs), as these structures were recently reviewed by the council, with the findings incorporated into the 2015-2025 long-term plan. The role of the Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) was also out of scope.

In looking to address the issues identified in the review, the recommendations mostly involved changes at the organisational level and reflect an opportunity to amend a number of practices based on almost six years' experience with the model.

3.2   Objectives

Contained within the GFR document are thirty six individual recommendations. These have been organised into four workstreams as follows:

- Policy workstream
    - o   Policy development process sub-project
    - o   Roles and relationships sub-project
    - o   Delegations and allocations sub-project
    - o   Transport matters/place making sub-project
- Funding and finance workstream
- Governance and representation workstream
- Organisational support workstream.

The work programme overseen by the steering group and the political working party will consider each of the recommendations and undertake further analysis if necessary. It will develop options and assessment criteria for consideration by the working party and develop final recommendations to the governing body.

The project team will also ensure that elected members outside of the working party are kept informed of the work as it progresses, and that formal feedback is sought as necessary.

3.3   Assumptions

The tasks provided in this project execution plan were made under the following assumptions:

- There will be no legislative, business strategy or policy changes during this project.
- There will be a willingness from governance and management to see this project through to completion.
- There will be sufficient financial and human resource available to support this project.
- The members of the workgroup possess the necessary capability to make decisions.

4 Project outline

The following section outlines the key projects under each workstream and the associated deliverables. Project reporting will identify deliverables as being on track, compromised or at risk. It will also report on mitigations put in place to address at risk deliverables.

4.1 Policy workstream deliverables

The policy workstream will consider a range of issues raised in the review that relate to:

- the process of regional policy development within Auckland Council;

- clarifying the roles and relationships of the two governance arms of the council;

- delegations and allocations; and

- issues relating to the role of local boards in place making activities under the auspices of Auckland Transport.

The recommendations from the review can be summarised into a series of key projects.

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
Improving the process of regional policy development *Recommendations 4 to 7, 25 to 27,35*	Bringing both arms of governance together early in the policy development process to clarify respective roles Increase the use of joint briefings and workshops where relevant Develop a clear policy on the commissioning of contestable advice, including a conflict resolution process Develop a methodology that clearly identifies local boards' role in regional decisions Develop tools to enable local board input earlier into regional policy development Continue to embed the programme for improving the quality of policy advice	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body *By 25 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to the governing body *By 3 August*

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
Clarifying roles and relationships *Recommendations 1 and 2,15 to 17, 33 and 34,*	Develop a core purpose statement for the governing body and local boards Ensure the committee structure minimises risk of role confusion Consider limiting the ability of local boards to advocate on regional policy issues, once due consideration has been given Consider the development of a call in right for the governing body over locally governed sub-regional assets Formalise the role for local board advisors in informing ward councillors of relevant local issues	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body *By 25 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to the governing body *By 3 August*
	Improve staff induction and ongoing training on the governance model Elected member development programme to be strengthened	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body *By 25 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
		to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to GB *By 3 August*
Allocations and delegations *Recommendations 8 to 13, 30*	Ensure current allocations and delegations are consistent with s17 LGACA Consider differential allocations and delegations for different local board areas, and in the first instance trial some extended decision-making allocations or delegations for Waiheke Local Board Consider moving delegation of Reserves Act regulatory decisions to local boards Review the Reserves Act supervisory role allocation Review the role of local boards/governing body in determining specific location of new parks to be clarified Consider moving responsibility for determining time and season rules for dog access to the governing body.	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body *By 25 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to the governing body *By 3 August*
Auckland Transport and local board place shaping *Recommendations 28 to 29*	Develop programme of improvement for AT reporting to local boards Develop a continuum of options for strengthening local boards' role in place shaping activities in the Auckland Transport space, including potential delegations	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
		By 25 May Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP By 6 July Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to the governing body *By 3 August*

4.2 Funding and Finance workstream deliverables

The funding and finance workstream will consider a range of issues raised in the review that relate to:

- the flexibility of procurement processes and the role of local boards in those processes;

- the allocation of funding to local boards and the level of control that local boards can exercise over that funding

- the responsibility for revenue raising to find local board activities.

The recommendations from the review can be summarised into a series of key projects.

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
Reviewing and clarifying procurement processes *Recommendations 22,23 and 24*	Reviewing the work underway in the procurement area and establishing to what extent this addresses the issues raised. Identifying further opportunities for improving and clarifying procurement processes, including the definition of major projects and support of procurement on behalf of a group of local boards Considering the implications for the procurement process on the options considered under the funding and budget allocation work	Report to PWP from procurement on work underway *By 2 March* Develop discussion document on options for procurement process following feedback from 2 March meeting *By 4 May* Input to interim report to governing body *By 25 May* Refine options for procurement process based on feedback from 4 May and options emerging from

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
Allocation of budgets and funding of local board activities (Note: these two elements are being considered together as they are interwoven in terms of decision making) *Recommendations 18 to 21*	Further analysis of the budget allocations to individual local boards to facilitate better understanding of the differences in allocation Development of a strawman to illustrate the regional vs local decision making continuum for the purposes of an informed discussion Modelling of the impact of using local rates including options for mitigating effects	budget allocation and funding discussions *By 6 July* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 3 August* Presentation for PWP on issues, approach and timetable *By 2 March* Develop detailed analysis report of current allocation of budgets at an individual Local Board level identifying key differences Develop discussion document on the regional local options, as a basis for debate and direction for further work *By 4 May* Input into interim report to GB *By 25 May* Develop options based on the direction of 4 May meeting for budget allocation. Develop model for local rate options including transition and/or mitigation options *By 8 June* Develop more refined options from 8 June meeting for budget allocation and local rates Develop report on implications for procurement process based on the budget and funding options *By 6 July* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 3 August*

To allow the LTP budget to be built on the appropriate local board funding policy, any change in the policy would need to be adopted in draft, consulted upon and then adopted as final before the LTP budgets are prepared.

The last time the local board funding policy was changed, this was completed by August in the year preceding the LTP – a similar timing would be required this time. Given the current timeframes the local board funding policy could not be completed in time for the 2018-28 LTP.

An alternative approach is to consult on any change in policy alongside the LTP and implement that change for year 2 of the LTP. This gives more time to complete the funding policy work.

4.3 Governance and representation workstream deliverables

The governance and representation workstream will consider a range of issues raised in the review that relate to:

- titles conferred on elected members of Auckland Council;
- concerns about misalignment of accountabilities between local board members and ward councillors;
- the need for Auckland Council to form a view on the optimal number of local boards.

The recommendations from the review can be summarised into a series of key projects.

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
1. Naming conventions for elected members *Recommendation 3*	Considering the merits and risks of moving to a consistent naming convention for all elected members	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
		GB *By 3 August*
2. Options for changing ward representation *Recommendation 14*	Is there evidence for concern that ward boundaries aligning with local board boundaries causes significant role confusion If so, can it be addressed through greater role definition and better administrative processes Consider alternative options if appropriate e.g. all ward councillors elected at large, fewer wards with more councillors per ward, mixture of at large and ward councillors etc	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to GB *By 3 August*
3. Consider and form a position on the optimal number of local boards *Recommendation 31*	What is an optimal ratio of elected representatives at a local government level Does having twenty one local boards provide a significant impediment to good governance If supporting 21 boards is complex, and/or expensive and inefficient – would reducing the number of boards be a legitimate response to this? Does having 21 local boards provide a fine grained level of localism that contributes to good community representation? Given the complexity of the reorganisation process required to change the number of local boards would any perceived benefits outweigh the risks and costs	Finalise work programme for PWP and steering group *By 2 March* Develop discussion paper and presentation for PWP outlining issues, options, assessment criteria *By 4 May* Complete analysis and assessment against criteria. Develop and present preferred options, including draft recommendations *By 8 June* Final draft for inclusion in paper to PWP *By 6 July* Complete draft omnibus report with all final recommendations to

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
		GB
		By 3 August

4.4   Organisational Support workstream deliverables

The organisational support workstream will consider a range of issues in the review that relate to:

- an inconsistent model across the organisation for supporting local boards, and a lack of clarity about the best support model; and

- ongoing restructuring within the organisation undermining the ability to build relationships;

The recommendations from the review can be summarised into a series of key projects.

Key project	Includes	Deliverables
Carry out a holistic review focused on determining the best end-to-end support model for local boards *Recommendations 32*	[TBC]	[TBC]
Consider how the organisation can better support the leadership role of local boards in community engagement through high-quality advice and support. *Recommendations 36*	[TBC]	[TBC]

This project is on a slower timeframe than the other workstreams as the decisions falling out of the policy, funding and representation workstreams will inform any decisions on the support structure for local boards.

4.5   Stakeholders

A comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan will be developed that encompasses internal and external stakeholder relationships, including staff and elected members. The Chair of the PWP is the agreed spokesperson for the project.

Stakeholder	Current level of knowledge of the project	Likely interests, issues or values	Expected level of engagement
Political Working Party	High	The PWP are highly engaged in the project. Reaching consensus may be a challenge on some issues. Getting sufficient meeting time with them is already a challenge – more workshop time has been scheduled	High
Workstream leads	High	The workstream leads are highly engaged. There may be some challenges in reaching an agreed problem definition in across the council family on some issues, potentially requiring escalation.	High
Governing body and local boards	Medium	The Governing Body is the final decision maker on the GFR recommendations, local boards have a strong interest. Ongoing engagement and briefings of elected members will be needed.	Medium-high
Auckland Council employees	Medium	Some recommendations may clarify employee roles.	Mixed, depending on roles
Government	Low	There may need to be direct engagement if the PWP wishes to progress options with legislative impacts	Low
Media	Low-medium	Suburban print media already have an interest in some of the options in the report.	Medium
The public	Low	The recommendations should empower decision makers to make better decisions to support the public.	Low
Māori impact	Medium	Consideration will need to be given to the impact of options being considered on iwi/mataawaka with appropriate consultation undertaken if required	Medium

4.6   Resources

The organisation has acceptable levels of capacity to deliver this project by August 2017.

Scope item	Resources
Project management and human resource for the workstreams	Minimum 5.2 FTE available for six months
Working environment	A co-located pod of eight computers.

As the workstream leads are seconded from their usual business as usual work, for this project there is a risk that the project leads won't be able to dedicate the time to this project.

4.7   Key meetings

The following meetings are programmed for the PWP, the steering group and various points of feedback to the governing body and local board members that are not on the working party.

Meeting/purpose	Date
Local Board Chairs – decide local board members of PWP	13 February 2017
Political Working Party – agree Terms of Reference and work programme	15 February 2017
Executive Steering Group Meeting	22 February 2017
Political Working Party – issues consideration, guidance to project team, assessment criteria	2 March 2017
Local Board Chairs – project update	13 March 2017
Local Board Chairs/GB forum – update on progress to date	22 March 2017
Executive Steering Group Meeting	24 March 2017
Local board cluster meetings	April-May
Political Working Party meeting – report back on options and analysis	4 May 2017
Local Board Chairs forum	8 May 2017
Executive Steering Group Meeting	22 May 2017
Report to Governing Body – update on progress and options	25 May 2017
Political Working Party meeting – report back on options and analysis	8 June 2017
Attend and present draft recommendations to all local board workshops	Throughout June and July
Governing body workshop	TBC
Executive Steering Group Meeting	29 June 2017
Political Working Party – consider draft recommendations for inclusion in paper to PWP	6 July 2017

Meeting/purpose	Date
Executive Steering Group Meeting	21 July 2017
Run through final recommendations with the Mayor	Late July
GB/LB forum – update on upcoming paper to Governing Body	26 July 2017
Political Working Party – final omnibus report to review	3 August 2017
Executive Steering Group Meeting	18 August
Final report to Governing Body	24 August 2017

4.8   Project governance

The Executive Steering Group will meet six times between 22 February and 18 August. The project sponsor/chair of the steering group and the programme manager will report to the PWP as required.

Refer to appendix 1 to see the project structure.

4.9 Appendix 1 Project Structure

Political working party membership

Councillors	Local Board members
Cr Cathy Casey	Angela Dalton
Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore (Chair)	Greg Presland
Cr Efeso Collins	Lisa Whyte
Cr Christine Fletcher	Paul Walden
Cr Richard Hills	Peter Haynes
Cr Penny Hulse	Phelan Pirrie
Cr Denise Lee	Shale Chambers (Deputy Chair)

Terms of reference

Executive steering group

Phil Wilson

Jim Quinn

Katherine Anderson

Karen Lyons

Sue Tindal

Dean Kimpton

Leigh Auton
Facilitator

Linda Taylor
Programme Manager

| Workstream 1 **Policy development and strategy** Lead: Linda Taylor | Workstream 2 **Funding and finance** Lead: Theresa Stratton | Workstream 3 **Governance and representation** Lead: Warwick McNaughton | Workstream 4 **Organisation Support** Lead: TBC |