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Those powers which cannot legally be delegated:

(a) the power to make a rate
(b) the power to make a bylaw
(c) the power to borrow money, or purchase or dispose of assets, other than in accordance with the Long-Term Plan
(d) the power to adopt a long-term plan, annual plan, or annual report
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(f) the power to adopt policies required to be adopted and consulted on under the Local Government Act 2002 in association with the long-term plan or developed for the purpose of the local governance statement
(g) the power to adopt a remuneration and employment policy

Additional responsibilities retained by the Governing Body:

(h) approval of long-term plan or annual plan consultation documents, supporting information and consultation process prior to consultation
(i) approval of a draft bylaw prior to consultation
(j) resolutions required to be made by a local authority under the Local Electoral Act 2001, including the appointment of electoral officer
(k) adoption of, and amendment to, the Committee Terms of Reference, Standing Orders and Code of Conduct
(l) relationships with the Independent Māori Statutory Board, including the funding agreement and appointments to committees
(m) overview of and decisions relating to any CCO review including the implementation of any resulting changes to CCOs
(n) oversight of work programmes of all committees of the governing body.
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 Affirmation

His Worship the Mayor will read the affirmation.

2 Apologies

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

3 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.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Governing Body:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Friday, 1 November 2019 and the extraordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 12 November 2019, as a true and correct record.

5 Petitions

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

6 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.

7 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.
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."
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To approve the draft terms of reference for an independently led review of Auckland Council’s substantive council-controlled organisations.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. A review of council’s substantive council-controlled organisations (CCOs) is proposed to identify what is working well with our CCO model, what is not working well and how this could be improved. Councillors provided input into the scope of the review at a workshop on 4 November 2019 and by email.

3. Feedback on the scope of review identified three key areas of focus:
   • the effectiveness of the CCO model, roles and responsibilities
   • the accountability mechanisms between CCOs and the council
   • the culture of CCOs.

4. Draft terms of reference (TOR) were developed that set out the context for the review, the objectives, scope of review, governance framework, community and stakeholder engagement requirements, outputs and timeframes.

5. The draft TOR were distributed to the Governing Body, the CCOs and the Independent Māori Statutory Board, asking for feedback. At the time of writing, not all feedback has been received and a verbal update will be provided to this committee.

6. It is proposed that the review will be led by an independent panel. The panel appointment will be the subject of a separate report in December 2019. To assist in the appointment process for the panel, several criteria have been identified that the panel members would ideally possess. Approval of these criteria is sought.

7. The review provides for community and stakeholder engagement. The exact details of this process will be finalised with the independent panel.

8. The timeframe for completing the review (by 30 July 2020) aligns with the decision-making process for the 10-year budget process, and formal consultation, if required, on any proposals to alter the functions or services delivery by a CCO. This timeframe is ambitious and relies on panel availability and resourcing.

9. The proposed review is wide ranging and completing the review within the specified timeframes will be challenging. It may be, that dependent on panel availability and resourcing, the review will need to be phased.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Governing Body:

a) agree the terms of reference for the Council Controlled Organisation review
b) note that the timing and phasing of the Council Controlled Organisation review maybe subject to budget and resource allocation and availability and capacity of panel members
c) agree the criteria for selection of the independent review panel members.

Horopaki
Context

Why the time is right for an externally led CCO review

10. Auckland Council’s CCOs account for 55 percent of the council’s operational budget and have been in operation since the establishment of the Auckland Council. The substantive CCOs were established on amalgamation by the government and Auckland Transition Agency, under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 or via Order in Council, to deliver a range of activities previously delivered by the legacy councils and their associated organisations.

11. During the 2019 Local Body elections, Mayor Phil Goff signaled the need for an independent review of CCOs.

12. The context within which the CCOs operate has changed in the last ten years. Auckland is facing considerable growth and social change. Auckland’s diverse population brings many differences in values and lifestyles, demands for goods and services and expectations of civic engagement and democracy. Climate change and continued competing pressures for resources all impact on council’s decisions and priorities for investment and service delivery. In order to meet these challenges, the council must continue to explore new ways of working.

13. In addition, the government has introduced additional national direction tools, such as the Government Policy Statements on Transport and Urban development, and new agencies like the Kainga Ora.

14. The government has also recently made changes to the Local Government Act 2002 to improve CCO accountability mechanisms.

Previous reviews of the CCO model and accountability framework have resulted in changes to the model

15. A number of reviews and decisions have been made in relation to the CCO model. These are summarised below and in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Timeline of CCO reviews
16. **CCO internally led review (2014-2015)** - focused on ensuring that CCO governance structures were aligned with council’s strategies and provided an efficient and effective model of delivery. The review concluded that:

- the services being delivered through the CCOs were suited to the CCO model of delivery
- when compared with other options, the arrangements of governance and council funding being a council responsibility, and delivery being an Auckland Council CCO responsibility, were a “cost-effective arrangement for meeting the needs of communities within the Auckland region for good quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions” [GB/2014/141].

17. **Panuku Development Auckland Limited (Panuku) established (2015)** - the CCO review proposed a new redevelopment entity to drive the delivery of the development and urban improvement goals of the Auckland Plan. This was consulted on as part of the draft Long-term Plan and resulted in Panuku being established from the merger of Waterfront Auckland and Auckland Council Property Limited.


19. **CCO Accountability review (2017-18)** – resulted in a number of improvements, including:

- improvements to CCO governance structures and engagement with council (e.g. board performance review processes, introduction of council / board workshops)
- amendments to council policies and direction setting to provide create clarity and guidance (e.g. the CCO accountability policy, more detailed financial reporting in the long-term plan, the board appointment and remuneration policy, review of council’s strategic direction and plans)
- new performance reporting templates.

20. **Statement of Intent (SOI) Review (2018)** - the Finance and Performance Committee approved the terms of reference for a review of the Statement of Intent process in February 2019. Due to the local body elections this review has not been reported back to council. The review has concluded that council is reaching the upper limits of what further major improvements can be made to SOI content and process within the current legislative framework. The review has identified an opportunity to streamline the current SOI process (within existing legislative parameters) and to improve engagement between CCO boards and councillors, as well as other minor opportunities to refine process and content. These findings will be incorporated into the proposed CCO review.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

**Development of terms of reference (TOR)**

21. A draft TOR has been developed to provide guidance to an independent review panel (refer Attachment A).

22. The draft TOR sets out the objectives, scope and approach for the proposed review. This has been based on the common themes identified from feedback received from councillors in a workshop, individual conversations and written responses.
Item 9

23. The feedback has been grouped into three areas. The task is to determine what are the current perceived and real issues, and what can be done to address these issues. The proposed areas the review will cover are:
   • the CCO model, roles and responsibilities
   • CCO accountability to council as shareholder and to the community
   • culture of CCOs responsiveness

24. The review, as proposed, is very wide ranging and completing the review within the timeframes specified will be challenging for both the panel and council staff supporting the panel. It maybe that elements of the review are prioritised or phased, depending on budget and panel resourcing requirements. Any decisions in this regard will be decided by the Governing Body.

Engaging with the community and stakeholders

25. The proposed TOR requires community engagement early on in the review to identify their concerns and ideas for improvement. Council staff will assist the independent panel to undertake the work and engage with the community.

26. Workshops will be scheduled for local boards to provide input into the review.

27. The panel will consult with CCO boards and senior executives from the CCOs to ascertain their views on the issues and on any recommendations or proposals for improvement.

Timeframe and outputs

28. The intention is to complete the review and be ready to implement agreed outcomes, if required, by 30 July 2020. This timing aligns the CCO review with the 10-year Budget process (refer Figure 2).

29. The reviewers will provide a draft report to the Governing Body on the key issues and community/stakeholder feedback in April 2020 and a final report with recommendations by July 2020.

Figure 2: Proposed timeline for CCO review
Criteria for independent review panel member appointments

30. Council wishes to appoint an independent panel of experts to lead the review. Recommendations for the panel will be the subject of a separate report in December 2019. In identifying candidates for the panel, staff recommend that panel members will ideally possess some or all of the following:

- governance, senior executive or similar experience (e.g. corporate, elected or community representative)
- ability to think strategically and critically and take a broad perspective on issues
- sound judgement, evaluation and decision-making skills
- stakeholder engagement and management expertise
- knowledge of the local government and/or public sector and the interests of the publicly accountable shareholder
- commercial acumen
- common sense, integrity and a strong sense of ethics
- knowledge of community networks and experience in community engagement
- knowledge of the diverse communities of Auckland
- experience in managing complex multi-stakeholder projects within a short timeframe, which may include sensitive and/or confidential information
- knowledge of the issues of significance for Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau and council’s Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations

31. Other factors relevant to panel selection:

- availability and capacity to undertake the review within the specified timeframes
- any identified actual or potential conflicts of interest
- balance of representation on the panel relative to council’s diversity and inclusion goals.

Tauākī whakaaweawa āhuarangi
Climate impact statement

32. Recommendations arising from the review may have impacts for how the CCOs are aligning with current council policy and commitments relating to climate change.

33. The review will have no direct impact on emissions.

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

34. The draft TOR were circulated to the chair and chief executives of the CCO Boards. Their feedback (if any) will be provided verbally at this meeting.
35. If approved, council staff will engage with the CCO boards and chief executives to develop the work programme and complete the review.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

36. The approved terms of reference will be circulated to all local boards.

37. CCO activities are regional in nature and impact at varying degrees locally. A key requirement of the review will be for the independent panel to seek feedback from local boards on the issues they experience with CCOs and any options for improvement they may identify. Discussions with local boards are expected to take place in February 2020.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

38. CCOs, as delivery agents of council, have the potential to have a significant impact on positive outcomes for Māori. The review of CCOs is therefore an opportunity to ensure that council’s commitments and obligations to Māori are reflected in the arrangements between council and its CCOs.

39. The Independent Māori Statutory Board have contributed to the development of the TOR and will continue to be included in the review process moving forward, as appropriate.

40. Consultation with Māori will form part of the public consultation.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

41. The CCO review is currently unbudgeted. Without confirmation of the panel members and the scope of the review, the financial implications of the review have been estimated at approximately $500,000-$800,000.

42. This does not include any costs that may be associated with implementation outcomes of the review.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

43. The review, as proposed, is very wide ranging and completing the review within the timeframes specified will be challenging. It maybe that elements of the review are prioritised or phased, depending on budget and panel resourcing requirements.

44. Staff resource will be required to support the panel and review process. This may result in the reprioritisation of existing work programmes. The impact of this is difficult to assess at this time, as the work programme of the review is yet to be fully scoped.

45. A review of this nature is also potentially unsettling for staff and creating commercial risk for the CCOs. In order to minimise these impacts it is intended that the review is completed quickly.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

46. If approved, work will commence on developing the work programme and ensuring the public engagement phase is established. This programme will be finalised with independent panel.

47. A report seeking approval of independent panel members to undertake the review will come to the Governing Body in December 2019.
48. The final timeframe for delivering the review will depend on:
   - the appointments and availability of the independent panel
   - budget.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**
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Draft terms of reference: reviewing Auckland’s CCO model to increase efficiency, transparency, accountability and communication

Context
1. Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO) account for 55 percent of the Council’s operational budget and have been in operation since the establishment of the Auckland Council in 2010.

2. The council currently has five substantive CCOs: Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development, Panuku Development Auckland, Regional Facilities Auckland and Watercare Limited. CCOs are managed by boards appointed by Auckland Council and not by elected members. This raises the perception that CCO decision-making and actions lack accountability to the public.

3. The Mayor has stated that 10 years after the new Auckland Council structure was created it is now timely to undertake an independent review of what is working with the CCO model, what is not and what can be improved. The council is seeking a review that also considers the transparency and responsiveness of Auckland’s CCO model to the council and Aucklanders, and how greater political oversight, communication and integration could be achieved.

Objectives
4. The objectives of the review are to:
   - ensure an effective and efficient model of service delivery for Auckland Council and Aucklanders
   - ensure a sufficient level of political oversight, public transparency and accountability of CCOs in their decision making

Governance and approach
5. This work will be led by a panel of 3 independent people, one who will be Chair who have relevant skills and expertise. They will have access to and support from the Auckland Council group. Auckland Council staff will provide secretarial support to the panel.

6. Staff will work with the chair to agree and report back on the review’s work programme.

7. The independent panel will update the Governing Body via workshops (as necessary) and reports to the Governing Body. All decision-making on the review will be the responsibility of the Governing Body.

8. The panel will seek input from local boards and the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

Scope
9. Considering the original aims of the Auckland governance reforms, the changing context within which the Auckland Council is operating and the current practice, the reviewers will consider the following areas.

The CCO model, roles and responsibilities
10. Council is seeking to understand if there is a better way to achieve operational efficiency, transparency and accountability for council services currently being delivered by CCOs. Particular attention should be given, without limitation, to the following matters:
• what are the perceived and real issues with the current model?
• is the council clear about the purpose of each of its CCOs? Is their duplication with in-house council activity?
• is the purpose still current and is there adequate direction provided to the CCOs by the council?
• are the roles and responsibilities of board members, shareholders, the Mayor/council and staff clearly defined?
• what other viable service delivery models are there (including in-house, amalgamation of CCOs) and what benefits and disadvantages would they have?

CCO accountability
11. Council is seeking to understand if the current processes and mechanisms for holding CCO boards to account are adequate and what improvements (including new mechanisms) are available or required. Particular attention should be given, without limitation, to the following matters:
• do the current accountability mechanisms (e.g. Statement of Intent, quarterly reporting, KPIs) enable council to effectively undertake its monitoring role, assess performance and ensure appropriate responses to the concerns of the governing body, local boards and the public?
• do the CCOs understand and act in a manner that reflects that they are accountable to the community and that the council is accountable to the community for their performance?
• are there accountability requirements at the governance and executive levels to ensure that CCOs are meeting their legislative obligations to Māori and have they developed sufficient organisational Māori responsiveness capability?
• are the lines of accountability sufficiently clear, open and transparent for decision-making?
• are there additional accountability mechanisms that could be introduced, such as those provided by the LGA 2002 Amendment Act 2019?
• are there adequate guidelines for when CCOs should be operating as commercial entities and when they should prioritise the public good?
• are the current group policies adequate, and are there additional group policies that should be included (e.g. group remuneration policy)?
• is the CCO board appointment process adequate and the skills criteria used in the appointment process appropriate?
• are there other ways to improve the governance to governance relationship?

Culture of CCOs
12. Council is seeking to understand how the culture of CCOs could be improved with regard to consultation, community engagement and responding to the public and council on issues. Particular attention should be given, without limitation, to the following matters:
• is there an effective governance and working relationship based on trust and respect between the council and the CCO, and between the CCOs themselves?
• does the recruitment and position accountabilities of CCO CEOs and their senior leadership address the requirement to respond to Auckland Council direction and work effectively with council senior executives?
is there a culture of accountability to Aucklanders at the CCO board, executive and staff level?

- whether council funded activities carried out by CCOs are adequately branded and acknowledged as council activities?
- whether the approach for consultation and community engagement is appropriate and what processes could be put in place to ensure greater responsiveness by CCOs to community concerns?
- how well do the CCOs provide advice to the council?

**Engaging with stakeholders and Aucklanders**

13. In undertaking this review, the reviewers should consult with, but not be limited to, the CCO boards and senior executives and council’s executive team.

14. It is expected that early in 2020 the panel should provide a mechanism for the community to provide input into the review, including the issues they perceive with governance and operational performance of Auckland’s CCOs.

15. The reviewers must provide a draft report to the Governing Body incorporating community and stakeholder feedback by April 2020.

16. If required, the Governing Body will carry out public consultation on the reviewers’ findings and proposals as part of the Auckland Council 10-year budget process.

**Timeframe and outputs**

17. A review of this nature creates both commercial risk for the CCOs and uncertainty for their staff. In order to minimise these impacts it is intended that the review is completed without undue delay and that stakeholders, including the community, have a chance to input into the review.

18. The review is expected to provide robust evidence if changes to the model are required. The outputs of this review will guide the process used for any potential CCO restructuring, including proposals for the 10-year budget (refer attached diagram for timeframes). Consultation on any proposals will occur as part of this process.

19. The reviewers will report to the Governing Body as follows:

- Draft report on the key issues, feedback from the community and stakeholders: **May 2020**
- Final report with recommendations: **July 2020**
Feedback to Local Government New Zealand on Localism

File No.: CP2019/18881

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To approve feedback to Local Government New Zealand (LGNZ) on its discussion document “Reinvigorating local democracy: the case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities”.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. Local Government New Zealand has circulated a discussion paper “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities” and has asked for feedback by 15 December 2019. The document is appended as Attachment A.

3. With final meetings being held in September prior to local government elections in October 2019, it has not been practicable to report the discussion document formally to local boards and to the governing body to establish an Auckland Council position. This report recommends providing feedback based on what is already on the record in relation to Auckland Council’s interaction with central government, focusing on collaboration and coordination.

4. The comments made in the feedback provide a background context for any future discussion about localism and devolution of functions from central government and may be useful for Auckland Council representatives on LGNZ when localism is discussed at LGNZ.

5. The draft feedback is appended as Attachment B.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) approve the feedback in Attachment B of the agenda report as Auckland Council’s response to “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities”.

Horopaki

Context

6. The discussion paper:

(i) states that New Zealand’s governmental arrangements are highly centralised compared to overseas countries.

(ii) argues that more decentralisation benefits economic performance, democratic engagement and is better at addressing regional inequalities.

(iii) suggests that potential services for devolution to local government include:

- vocational training
- welfare services for people in need
- mental health services
• social housing  
• public health  
• integration and coordination of social services  
• services to enable older citizens to “age in place”  
• urban development  
• employment  
• services for young people not in employment or training.

(iv) alternatively, suggests that services might be devolved through negotiation and that local discretion might be increased by removing constraints imposed through legislation.

(v) recognises that funding is an issue and discusses ‘buoyant taxes’ (such as GST) and local taxes.

(vi) notes the desire of central government to take a well-being approach and states that local government can inform this approach because it knows about its own communities and their needs.

(vii) notes that localism is more than just shifting some services from central government to local government – it is also about more citizen participation.

(viii) opposes cost-shifting, where local government is asked to take on more but without any additional funding.

7. The discussion about localism is supported by “The New Zealand Initiative”, which has also published papers on localism and in 2017 organised a delegation of more than 30 senior leaders of large New Zealand organisations to Switzerland to study direct democracy. The New Zealand Initiative is a think tank representing business sector interests. It was formed in 2012 with the merger of the New Zealand Business Roundtable and the New Zealand Institute.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu  
Analysis and advice

8. Auckland Council has been in existence for less than 10 years and is New Zealand’s largest local authority. It is likely that its experience of dealing with central government will be different to that of other councils.

9. The feedback contained in Attachment B draws from the expectations of the Royal Commission on Auckland Governance, the government’s “Making Auckland Greater” and the experience of the council since its establishment in 2010.

10. The draft feedback specifically refers to:

(i) the Royal Commission’s proposals for dealing with social issues in partnership with central government

(ii) the Auckland Plan as the strategic plan for Auckland which needs the participation of central government

(iii) the role of the Mayor of Auckland in representing one-third of the country’s population to central government

(iv) the co-ordination of central government policy through an Auckland Policy Office

(v) alignment with the well-being approach of central government

(vi) Auckland central-local government forum

(vii) the Auckland Transport Alignment Project
(viii) the Southern Initiative
(ix) the Western Initiative
(x) housing and urban growth
(xi) the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
Climate impact statement
11. The relationship between local and central government is crucial to addressing climate change issues. The responsibility is neither that of local nor central government alone.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
12. The localism discussion is at an early stage. Future devolution of functions may or may not have impacts on the council group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
13. Because of elections it has not been possible to formally seek local board views on localism. Future participation may occur through meetings with LGNZ and through the Auckland Council representatives on LGNZ.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
14. The feedback notes that the Independent Māori Statutory Board has separate dealings with government.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
15. Financial implications are key to any future discussion about devolution. The discussion document notes the funding issues around additional functions being devolved to local government.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
16. The feedback that is proposed does not create any risk for the council.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
17. Following approval by the Governing Body, the feedback will be forwarded to LGNZ and discussed by its national council. LGNZ will ultimately raise the localism issue with political parties next year. There may be further opportunities for input by the council, either formally or through its LGNZ representatives.
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Foreword

In many respects New Zealand is a great country to live in and visit, but there are a number of dimensions in which our performance is less than desirable. We sit in the bottom half of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) GDP per capita rankings, our level of inequality is amongst the highest in the developed world, and we have entrenched problems with poverty, regional inequality and environmental degradation.

We want to give citizens and communities a greater say about the nature of local public services and how they are delivered. This not in any way to suggest that we want to abolish central government, but rather that we want to establish a governance system that harnesses the respective strengths of both tiers of government to improve the well-being of ordinary people. Our concept of localism has a number of critical elements which involve:

- promoting collaborative partnerships between central and local government that bring together the capacity and resources of the centre with the place-based knowledge and connections of communities, through councils, to address deep seated local issues;
- establishing a legislative framework that enables and incentivises local governments, where there is both capability and local support, to take on additional roles and responsibilities to improve the well-being and quality of life of their citizens;
- promoting a “place based” approach to local decision making that includes councils and government agencies along with the local organisations that are essential for communities to flourish, such as those representing business, iwi/Māori and communities;
- The adoption of new and innovative and mechanisms through which citizens can participate in making decisions about their towns, cities and communities.

In addition, citizens have been losing their trust in our public institutions with voter participation well below the levels of three decades ago.

Addressing these issues requires a new approach to the way public services are commissioned and delivered. One that builds not just on the knowledge and capacity of decision makers in central government, but also on the knowledge and capability of communities and their local governments. It involves a mix of “letting go” power, so that communities and their local governments have the authority and means to properly address issues that are local in nature, and being open to working alongside and with local partners. It is time to re-think the centralised “one size fits all” approach to running the country. It is not working well enough.

LGNZ, with the support of the New Zealand Initiative, is calling for a shift in the way public decisions are made in New Zealand by seeking a commitment to localism. Instead of relying on central government to decide what is good for our communities, it is time to empower councils and communities themselves to make such decisions. This means strengthening local self-governance, putting people back in charge of politics and revitalising our democracy. We are seeking an active programme of devolution and decentralisation.

Localism is underpinned by the principle that power and authority should flow up from citizens and communities, not down from the Government. This is not so much a new idea, but rather a return to a way of governance that was practiced in New Zealand for hundreds of years before Europeans arrived. Localism is strongly aligned with Māori kaupapa, where power and authority strengthens the lower you go within the governing structures, from iwi to Hapu to Whareau. Concepts like Tino Rangatiratanga (Independece) and Māori Mautāhak (self-determination) reinforce the importance of place within Māori society. The philosophy of localism does the same for Aotearoa as a whole.

We are.

LGNZ
Our localism programme is designed to create a more responsive, agile, and accountable system of local government, one that is more responsive to local concerns, empowered to address them, and improves the performance of both tiers of government. Effective government cannot afford silos. By creating the opportunities for more meaningful central-local government partnerships and ensuring that government policies are based on good local information, better outcomes for communities are more likely to be achieved. In other words, it is about leveraging central and local government’s strengths.

Change is vital as our highly centralised and isolated institutional settings are acting as a drag on efficient and effective functioning of our society and economy. We want to know what you think about these issues.

This discussion paper has been prepared to get the views of New Zealanders from all walks of life and I encourage you to seriously consider the arguments made and tell us whether we’ve got it right.

Dave Cull
President
Our process

In publishing this document LGNZ thanks the many people and organisations that have contributed to the development of this discussion document, especially the members of the localism reference group who made their valuable time available to provide advice.

In particular we wish to give special thanks to the 150 people who participated in February's Localism Symposium, who gave up a day of their time to put us on the right track.

LGNZ is the national association of local authorities. Our objectives involve advocating for the national interests of local government and promoting best practice. Our vision is "local democracy powering community and national success" and we have committed to protecting and enhancing our system of local democracy. LGNZ is an incorporated society and all 78 councils constitute our membership.

We frequently make submissions on draft legislation and regulations to ensure that the needs of our diverse communities are adequately addressed. We also provide guidance to elected members and councils through our professional development arm EquiP. In addition we support Council MARK™ that provides an independent assessment of council performance, see www.lgznz.co.nz.

What we will do with your submission

This discussion document is designed to assist LGNZ promote localism during the build up to the 2020 Parliamentary elections. All submissions will be considered and insights taken into account as we prepare our localism manifesto in 2020. Copies of submissions will be made available on the localism page of the LGNZ website.

For more information on LGNZ’s decentralisation and localism project go to www.localism.nz or contact:

Dr Mike Reid
T: 04 934 1204
E: mike.reid@lgznz.co.nz

Dr Jason Krupp
T: 04 934 1211
E: jason.krupp@lgznz.co.nz

How to make a submission

Please send your comments and feedback by 15 December 2019 to mike.reid@lgznz.co.nz or send to:

Dr Mike Reid
Principal Policy Advisor
Local Government New Zealand
PO Box 1214
Wellington 6011
Introduction

New Zealand is a successful democratic nation that is widely respected for the quality of its governance, its record on human rights and its citizens’ quality of life.

Yet we can and must do better. Our well-being is being challenged on a number of fronts and the traditional “top-down” approach is poorly suited to address many of the challenges we will be facing in the future, particularly the need to lift economic performance in a sustainable and inclusive way.

In the face of the most perilous challenges of our time - climate change, terrorism, poverty, and trafficking of drugs, guns and people – the nations of the world seemparalysed. The problems are too big, entrenched, and divisive for the nation state. Is the nation state, once democracy’s best hope, today dysfunctional and obsolete? (Benjamin Barber, if Mayors Ruled the World.)

LGNZ believes that one of the biggest factors holding us back is the failure of politicians and officials in central government to share power with citizens and their communities. As a result, we have a largely centralised approach to policy and decision-making which has stifled diversity and allowed other countries to leapfrog us on a range of measures, from addressing child poverty to educational attainment.

Centralised approaches are essential when governments deal with matters of large-scale national significance, like climate change, macroeconomic policy and health and safety regulations, where uniformity may be needed. But for other matters, where needs and preference vary, uniform solutions are both ineffective and inefficient. The age of mass production, where you can have any colour, Model T Ford as long as it was black, is well past. In today’s modern world, people have become used to differentiation, choice and innovation in the products and services they buy, and they expect the same of their government. In short, governments need to be nimble, responsive to change and innovative. That is why we need to localise.

Responding to diversity

New Zealand’s towns, cities and regions are unique in their own ways and the best people to understand that uniqueness and difference are their citizens, and the people privileged to represent them. Successful policy interventions tend to be ones that build on that uniqueness and take a “place-based” approach when designing and developing local services.

The liberty of the individual, in things wherein the individual is alone concerned, implies a corresponding liberty in any number of individuals to regulate by mutual agreement such things as regard them jointly, and regard no persons but themselves (J S Mill).

Consequently we must find a better way of enabling citizens to be actively involved in shaping their own futures, working together with their governments of all levels to define issues and design appropriate responses, noting the particularities of their own circumstances. Our future prosperity involves public institutions working in partnership with multiple partners, whether in Maori, local businesses or not-for-profits.

Neither should we depend on experts to run our societies. As much as expert advice is necessary, we need to temper it with democratic guidance if we want to avoid a populist backlash. Democracy, not just in Europe and the United States but also in Australia and New Zealand, is increasingly influenced by communities that feel marginalised and disempowered by the current model of politics. Localism, in contrast, is both empowering and inclusive.
Looking back to move forward

Historically government in New Zealand was local. Power and authority resided with whenau, hapu and wha and it was only with colonization that government at a national level became a reality, with central government becoming the larger of the two spheres of government by the early 20th Century. It would be more accurate to say that localism is the norm, and centralism the aberration.

< We are promoting localism because we believe it is not only common sense but is vital for the good government of New Zealand (Dave Cull). >

< It’s time to explore a new model of governance, one based on a re-energised civil society that draws on the strength and resourcefulness of people working together in diverse local and regional communities – a localist response (Future of local government declaration, MAV, 2017) >

Localism, as we envisage it, is designed to restore a level of the autonomy and self-governance that New Zealanders previously took for granted, and which many iwi and hapu are now reclaiming, especially those which are negotiating settlements or are in a post-settlement phase. Within New Zealand’s constitutional and legislative framework, iwi/Māori have a range of rights, kāwhaiwhanga, in relation to land and water within their role, in many respects our localist initiative is designed to give communities similar rights and responsibilities in relation to their own cities, districts or regions – that is, greater autonomy to determine local priorities.

< We are promoting localism because we believe it is not only common sense but is vital for the good government of New Zealand (Dave Cull). >

If adopted LGNZ’s programme will involve significant system change in different areas and overtime, however change will be incremental. On day one councils will continue to interact with communities as they always have, just as central government will continue to play its system stewardship role. Our framework, however, is purposely designed to be flexible, so that central and local government can evolve beyond the strictures of the current roles both play.

In this paper we outline the beginning of a process for gradually moving New Zealand from being one of the most centralised countries in the developed world to one that is prepared to trust its communities to play a meaningful role in our social, economic, and cultural development.

We look forward to your feedback
The problem: Why New Zealand needs to change

Like all countries in the world New Zealand is facing challenges on a broad front, from environmental to social and economic.

Some of these challenges can only be addressed through decisive leadership from central government. While addressing climate change involves local, national and international responses, it is essential that the state use its unique financial and regulatory powers to ensure responses across the spectrum are aligned and fit for purpose.

The concentration of power in the central state is holding our country back, fragmenting our public services and making local leaders too dependent on the whims of central government and its ministers (LGNZ).

Yet many of the challenges modern democracies face cannot be effectively addressed by central government alone – it is too far removed from the communities that directly experience such challenges and which need to be part of developing the solutions. The reason for this is that the rationale for large centralised government institutions, namely access to information and high transaction costs, is breaking down with the advent of digital technology. This selfsame wave of technological change is speeding up the pace of decision-making, which centralised government institutions cannot match. That acts as a drag on society. Today’s problems need to be solved bottom-up rather than top-down (led by districts and regions), multi-sectoral rather than exclusively government (driven by networks), and interdisciplinary rather than specialised (drawing from diverse expertise and experiences) (see Courtney 2019). They also need central and local government to be working together, not as principal and agent, but as partners.

That New Zealand is one of the most centralised countries in the developed world is not widely known by the public at large. However, the share of tax expenditure shows just how stark our centralist tendencies are, with 60 per cent of all public expenditure controlled by central government (see figure 1). As a fiscally centralised nation our responses to emerging problems and challenges tends to be “top down” and “one size fits all” in nature.

The risks to a country of placing the allocation of such a large proportion of its public revenue in the hands of single government are well understood and are similar to the issues created by any monopoly provider, such as:

- Lack of contestability and risk of policy capture;
- Undifferentiated services;
- Diseconomies of scale; and
- Lack of responsiveness and bureaucracy.

In addition centralisation can have negative economic and social outcomes. Recent data from the OECD (2019) shows that decentralised countries tend on the whole to be wealthier than centralised countries (see figure 2). This is partly explained by the way in which localising decisions through decentralisation strengthens allocative efficiency. This is achieved because decentralisation of public services is more likely to result in a better match between communities’ needs and preferences and the provision of public services, that is, over-provision and under-provision are less likely to occur. Where resources are used effectively and efficiently economic growth is more likely to be stronger, and foster inter-municipal competition that leads to innovation and growth.

Figure 2 shows a relatively strong association between fiscal decentralisation and per capita gross domestic product. Reinforcing this trend are two recent research projects from the World Bank, which found that a 10 per cent increase in the level of decentralisation is associated with an average increase in per capita GDP of 3 percent (Hoffinger 2019). In short, decentralised countries tend to be wealthier than centralised ones. They also vote more at the local level.

We are.
LGNZ
Figure 1: Central government expenditure as a % of total government expenditure

Source: OECD 2015

Figure 2: Relationship between fiscal decentralisation and GDP

Source: OECD 2018
Figure 3: Voter turnout in local government

![Figure 3: Voter turnout in local government](image)

Source: OECD 2016

Figure 3 shows the relationship between voter turnout in local government elections and the degree to which a country is fiscally decentralised. The more decentralised a country is, the more citizens are interested in local elections, and the more they vote. Local government systems in centralised countries are generally regarded as having low “salience”, that is councils have a small range of functions and are responsible for a small share of taxation, and as a result they are regarded by citizens as of less importance to their well-being or quality of life. This is highlighted in the following pictograph (The New Zealand Initiative 2015) which illustrates how little New Zealand councils spend on education, health and social welfare.
Figure 4: How local government stacks up

We've compared New Zealand's local government to other countries around the world. The results aren't surprising, with our local government sector being tiny compared to the rest of the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Municipalities</th>
<th>Population (m)</th>
<th>Average Municipality Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.9 million</td>
<td>68,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>24.13 million</td>
<td>42,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>65.64 million</td>
<td>166,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>8.37 million</td>
<td>3,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>46.56 million</td>
<td>5,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>15,573</td>
<td>42.67 million</td>
<td>7,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>35,535</td>
<td>66.9 million</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Local Government Bodies</th>
<th>Sub-National Government Investment as a Percentage of General Government Investment</th>
<th>Sub-National Government Revenue as % of Total Government Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>11,473</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>35,535</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Image: The New Zealand Initiative
Impact of centralism

As a general rule, countries that are centralised tend to be less wealthy and have lower standards of living than countries which are decentralised. Due to local factors there will always be exceptions, but localism does provide incentives to local politicians and their communities to take a more proactive approach to economic and social development. It gives them a real stake in the running of their communities. Centralisation is prone to paternalistic behaviours (we know what is best for you) that leads citizens to believe that the government will necessarily “fix things”, which it is not always well-positioned to do.

< The idea that either a government programme or private contract can solve complex social problems on its own is a false promise. Over reliance on such methods tends to neglect the agency and insights of the people themselves, leaving huge amounts of talent and resources - in all walks of life and in all parts of society - wastefully untapped (IPPR 2014). >

In their recent report on the state of our communities the Salvation Army identified four “meta-themes” that were having a major impact on the quality of community life. There were the local economy (jobs and businesses), housing, crime and safety and children and youth. As the report stated:

People wanted more jobs, particularly for their young people. They want more businesses and revitalization in their public spaces and shopping areas. Our people are facing massive housing challenges ... According to the locals, these housing related issues have led to more problems involving disengaged youth and other anti-social behaviours. The people were particularly concerned about gangs, drugs and begging in their communities (Salvation Army 2017).

These are not new issues. The fact that they have been with us for many generations, despite the attempts of multiple governments to resolve them, is testament to the failure of the current top-down approach. The needs of communities won’t successfully be resolved by more of the same – we need a new approach, one that mobilises multiple actors, such as the local government, communities themselves, tāmoko and others. We can no longer afford the paternalistic central government knows best model of public decision-making.

< New Zealand’s policy landscape is rife with “one-size-fits-all” thinking where, by necessity, central government decision-makers end up simplifying problems they are trying to solve because of the difficulty of managing complexity. >

The model is not only failing many of our communities but we are also failing behind other countries in a number of critical areas, for example:

---

Attachment A Item 10
Economic performance

In the mid-1980s New Zealand’s economy went through a period of major change, including the removal of trade barriers and import restrictions. One of the reasons behind the fourth Labour Government’s decision to initiate reform was the fact that New Zealand’s ranking amongst the members of the OECD, a group of developed countries, had fallen to 21st. More than thirty years on, New Zealand’s standing in the OECD remains at number 21. Unlike many of the countries in the OECD the one change we did make was the decision to decentralise.

Democratic engagement

Internationally there is an increasing concern that democracy is facing a “recession” with a decline in the numbers of people voting and diminishing trust in not only governments but also in the concept of democracy itself. New Zealand is not immune. Voter turnout in both parliamentary and local elections is well below the rates of thirty years ago, even though there has been a slight improvement in recent years. One reason why increasing numbers of people, and young people in particular, are no longer taking part in formal democratic processes is that they are unconvinced that their involvement will make a difference.

< The alternative (to growing bureaucracy and citizen disengagement) is to bring power closer to ordinary people, partly by vesting more of it in local institutions that voters can really influence, but also by engaging citizens themselves more in everything from healthcare to housebuilding (Parker 2015) >

Regional inequality

Since the 1980s we have seen a significant growth in the size of the socio-economic differences between localities and regions in New Zealand. Today, the average per capita GDP of our three poorest regions is currently $40,000; in contrast the average GDP of our three wealthiest regions is $97,500. The difference is significant and some analysts argue that such spatial inequality is directly related to high levels of centralisation, given that poorer regions have less ability to influence central and decision-makers.

< Administration becomes more oppressive in proportion to its increasing distance (Rousseau). >

This is why localism is important – the solution to declining interest in democracy is not less democracy, but more. The solution to disillusionment in our democratic systems is to begin empowering citizens by providing them with a real ability to make a difference in their communities. We are not asking central government to abdicate its responsibilities. New Zealanders elect governments to provide national leadership and implement their manifesto promises. Central governments need to focus on setting national priorities, minimum standards, and being stewards of the legislative framework that encourages communities to work out the best way of achieving them. Sharing power can assist governments by strengthening the ability of local areas to work towards national priorities in a manner that reflects local circumstances. It also enables politicians and officials in the centre to focus on the strategic issues rather than getting bogged down in the detail.

Making NZ the best country we can requires a new approach to how we make public decisions, one that enables citizens to have a greater say about the policies and programmes that impact on their communities.
Our vision
Our vision – giving communities a greater say

It is time to look at how we organise our public services. While central government has a critical role in overseeing the welfare of our nation as a whole, such as decisions about defence and climate change, there are classes of decisions that cannot effectively be made at the centre.

Decisions about local matters need the input of local citizens - the people who have the best understanding of the issues as well as a stake in the solutions.

< Managing water quality requires legislative frameworks that balance the responsibility of central government to set outcomes and local governments, with communities, to set policies and rules to manage our extremely diverse catchments. >

Why make a change?

Change is vital. Because of the distance from communities central government often struggles to design services that address local concerns in a way that is relevant to the needs and circumstances of communities. Reasons for this include:

- The problem of information asymmetry where governments lack information and intelligence about local areas;
- The risk of “silos”, where different departments provide services to the same area but fail to coordinate or share information; and
- The lack of an integrated approach that aligns government services with the services provided and commissioned by councils and organisations.

This can result in rational decision-makers “losing sight” of local issues, such as happened with rural policing. By 2016 police numbers in rural districts had fallen to such a degree that local councils and communities organisations launched a major advocacy effort to highlight the extent of the problem and seek policy change. As a result central government agreed to increase policing numbers and ensure a proportion of new recruits would be placed in rural and isolated communities. It took local action before central government realised that rural policing numbers had fallen to a level where rural communities felt unsafe and change occurred.

It is entirely plausible that the time taken to increase rural police numbers would have been significantly shorter if communities had more say in the policies they receive.

It is not easy for governments to keep a focus on the specific needs of all of our communities as well as the nation as a whole – that’s one of the reasons why we have local government. The policing example is replicated again and again across a range of different policy areas, from rural access to services like driver licensing and fast broadband services to the provision of social housing in low socio-economic neighbourhoods.

< We met local leaders from across the country who argued that they could do much more to tackle worklessness and lack of housebuilding if only they had the powers and resources to do so (The Condition of Britain 2014) >
Next steps

Ministers already have enough on their plate when faced with the needs of the nation as a whole – it is in nobody’s interest for central government to be micro-managing our towns, cities and regions, yet, as local discretion in some policy areas declines, this is occurring at an increasing rate.

Critical to solving many of the challenges communities face is the need to utilise the wisdom, knowledge and input of the citizens and communities affected by those challenges. New Zealand’s future social and economic performance will need our towns, cities and regions to thrive; for this to occur we need to harness the disruptive benefits that come from empowering citizens and communities.

LGNZ and its members have long advocated for greater devolution of decision-making as a means of delivering better outcomes for their communities, but it also has the advantage of remedying the problems with our current central-local government arrangements.

Our plan to address these constraints on New Zealand’s social and economic performance, on which we are seeking your views, is set out in the next section of this paper. It has the following elements:

1. Devolution – where practical decisions about services that benefit local communities should be made at the level of government as close to those communities as possible and with the active participation of those communities in the decision-making process. We envisage a gradual process that begins with the transfer of functions and funding to areas that have both the will and capability to undertake them.

2. A buoyant tax – councils rely on property taxes to pay for public services like amenities and much of their infrastructure. Recent pressures on some councils, such as population growth and visitors, highlights the need for buoyant taxes that grow as the economy grows, as is the case with both income and consumption taxes. Without access to a buoyant tax local decision-makers can lack the incentive to invest in areas that will spur growth, such as, for example, amenities for the visitor industry.

Shaping well-being – central government’s commitment to inter-generational well-being is welcome but raises the question of how local well-being should be defined. It needs to be complemented by a localist approach that enables communities to define their own well-being needs and debate priorities. Local partners, such as iwi/Māori, communities and business organisations, will need to be actively involved in co-designing and co-producing services to ensure they meet identified priorities.

Deepening democracy – our localist vision cannot work without the active engagement of citizens and communities. This is vital for two reasons. In the first place citizen participation goes some way to addressing feelings of disempowerment and marginalisation. In the second place localism only works if local governments are responsive to local needs and preferences.

An end to cost shifting and unfunded mandates – cost shifting and unfunded mandates occur where central government requires councils to take on new responsibilities, or adopt new processes, without the necessary funding. This can have constitutional and democratic risks as it means decision-makers, in this case central government decision-makers, are not required to consider the full cost of their decisions. Enabling decision makers in central government to shift costs in this way undermines their accountability to voters and tax payers, ultimately weakening our democracy.

These elements are described in more detail over the next few pages.

There are many good programmes tackling poverty, but these often apply national tools and measures inappropriate for complex local problems.

The overseas development community accepts that top-down solutions applied by successive governments are significantly less effective in tackling poverty than bottom-up, community driven approaches (Mayor Steve Chadwick 1 February 2017).
Devolving roles and responsibilities

The previous section discussed some of the problems created by “over-centralisation”, many of which reflect the difficulty that governments at the national level have when designing policies and programmes for the increasingly diverse communities that make up modern societies. Addressing the problem requires nothing less than an overall paradigm shift, one that brings decisions about services closer to the citizens and communities who use or benefit from those services. Yet such a paradigm shift cannot happen overnight.

It is important that service quality is not diminished as a result of the transfer of a public service, and that the organisation to which a responsibility has been transferred has the necessary capability and capacity to carry it out, as well as the necessary accountability.

This requires an iterative or incremental approach. Accordingly we recommend the following for consideration:

1. Services, including the appropriate funding, should be transferred to local government (or an appropriately accountable local agency, such as an iwi/Māori organisation), where it can be shown that improvements in efficiency and effectiveness will be achieved.

2. A framework should be established to enable councils to apply to “take over” or run a function that is currently provided by a central government department or agency within their local jurisdiction.

3. All constraints on councils and other providers that limit their ability to draft policies and programmes to address local issues should be systematically and cautiously assessed and removed if they provide unnecessary.

1. Devolving local services

In cases where preferences for services vary between localities and the benefits of those services are experienced locally, then responsibility for determining service levels should also be local. This is already the case with services like sport and recreation, where needs and preferences tend to vary by location, however there are also services that are local in all respects, that currently sit with central government. The need for these services, such as services for young people, older citizens and people with mental illnesses, tends to vary by locality. In addition the benefits are also experienced locally creating a strong argument for transferring responsibility to the local level. To improve this situation we believe:

1. That central government should regularly review whether or not the services they currently provide or commission would result in more efficient and effective outcomes if decentralised.

Such reviews could be the responsibility of the State Services Commission.

2. That any transfer of services should also include the funding necessary to provide the services or the means by which the receiving agency can raise the necessary revenue.

3. That any transfer, for example to local governments, is accompanied with guidance and support for councils to build appropriate competence and capability (see the Productivity Commission’s Report Better Local Regulations 2013 for a model).

This form of devolution should apply to those functions and responsibilities where local capability already exists (or a local council agrees to increase capability) and funding can be provided in a manner that does not compromise local autonomy. However, given different capabilities and interests this approach to devolution and localism will be incremental, perhaps increasing over time as capability and local interest also grows. Examples of services that should be considered for devolution include:

- Vocational training;
- Welfare services for people in need;
- Mental health services;
- Social housing;
- Public health;
- Integration and coordination of social services;
- Services to enable older citizens to “age in place”;
- Urban development;
- Employment; and
- Services for young people not in employment or training.

As noted above, important considerations when determining what services are better placed for devolution include the degree to which preferences vary across communities and the diversity of communities, which means that services may also need to be designed and delivered in different ways. We would also expect that any council involved in a transfer or devolution process would also be under a duty to look at whether or not the responsibility or part of the responsibility, should be further devolved, such as to a community board or local organisation, including iwi/Māori organisations.
2. Negotiated devolution - enabling councils and organisations to apply to run public services

As our cities grow in scale and capacity they become better placed to take on additional responsibilities. In fact bringing together services, for example, education, employment training and programmes for youth, can result in major benefits to an area. These come from being integrated, better targeted and better able to respond quickly to opportunities.

< Local amenities are major driving forces of change. Localities compete for investment, talent and business growth, and the quality of place, particularly for people and firms with choices, has become more and more critical (Katz & Nowak 2017) >

Councils, partnering with citizens and stakeholders, are best placed to decide what functions and powers are best transferred to their areas. Consequently we want councils to have the right to propose the transfer of a service from a government agency to themselves. (There may also be a case to enable transfers to be initiated by community action, for example, by referenda).

We propose a legislative and regulatory mechanism whereby councils and local organisations could request that they be given responsibility for a government service (and the relevant funding) should it be found that the service is failing to achieve its intended outcomes for the relevant community. It is a “case by case” or negotiated approach to devolution and could involve the following:

- councils or organisations would have to show, when applying to take responsibility for a service, that delivery will be cost-effective and result in better outcomes than currently being achieved by the central government agency;

- an independent assessment of the local authority’s capacity would be critical, similar, for example, to LGNZ’s Council Mark assessment programme;

- Ministers should be under a duty to seriously consider proposals for existing services to be devolved as long as the proposal has community support; there are opportunities for citizen participation and the business case indicates improved service effectiveness; and

- Intrinsic to the transfer is funding—where a local government receives a transferred service funding must follow, in the form of a new taxation power, right to levy or general purpose grant.

Any such transfer be accompanied by an agreement setting out mutual obligations for matters like funding, expected outcomes, collaboration and evaluation. Such agreements would be negotiated upfront and be explicit, and would be enforceable through the courts, giving both sides significant assurance in the process.

Negotiated devolution is similar to the City Deal approach implemented in the United Kingdom and elsewhere and recognises the opportunities that are created as urban communities grow. This approach also allows central government to tailor the handover of powers in accordance with the type of council, rather than using a standard template.

< Negotiated devolution at work: the Greater Manchester City Deal. The UK government has sought to drive stronger economic growth by devolving economic development powers to “combined” local authorities, particularly powers and funding related to transport, skills development, economic development and health. >

Example 1: Social housing

In this example a community is experiencing a shortage of social housing, with resulting issues of homelessness, street sleeping and related deprivation. Central government capacity to respond to this has been constrained by the capacity of Housing New Zealand and the capital available to it. Negotiated devolution would allow the council to apply to the Government to take over the social housing function for its jurisdiction, as well as an agreement to build more social housing in an area, along with the relevant share of funding. The transfer would enable the councils to take a place-based
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approach to social housing provision and develop an integrated housing strategy involving the not for profit sector, its own social housing stock and its planning and regulatory functions, as they apply to housing.

Example 2: Fragmented services

District XYY is grappling with the impact of poverty and related issues of family violence, addiction and educational under-achievement — problems that are inter-generational and entrenched. Existing central government policies and programmes have had little to no effect, often because they fail to take into account local circumstances, and tend to be fragmented.

A negotiated approach could involve a council or a number of councils, in partnership with iwi/Māori and local organisations, to develop new and joined-up approaches appropriate to their specific communities, creating a type of “democratisation zone” where such new approaches can be applied, such as “pooling” or bringing together public spending on youth and family services in an area so that it could be re-prioritised and local agencies commissioned in a manner that takes a place-based approach. The underpinning principles of this approach are similar to those underpinning the whānau ora model.

3. Removing constraints to local decision-making

The ability of local services to meet the needs and preferences of communities is not only constrained by the degree to which they are centralised but also, in some cases, by the presence of regulations that limit or distort local decision-making. These can be processes prescribed in statute or regulation, for example:

- Pre-fabricated buildings — one solution to reducing the cost of housing is to use prefabricated homes based on a standard design that in theory should only need one building consent. Under the existing law, however, (which looks set to change) each Building Consent Authority has, by legislation, to provide a building consent for each pre-fabricated design assembled in its own area, thus reducing many of the advantages of using a pre-fabricated approach.

- Public transport — regional councils are responsible for public transport, which includes tendering for service providers. Central government sets the rules that regional councils must follow when tendering; these are known as the Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM). While the model prescribes the tendering process to achieve efficiencies, many regional councils have found that it severely restricts their ability to commission public transport services that meet the needs of communities.

- The Resource Management Act 1992 sets out land use rules for areas. Adopting a plan can be a highly litigious process and the approval of a plan can take up to ten years. In response to claims that councils have failed to make sufficient land available for housing (noting that changing a plan can take many years) central government created special housing areas which, in many cases, were inconsistent with the provisions of the relevant district plans. A localised solution would be to give councils themselves the ability to make exceptions to their district plans — through an accountable process; and

- Transfer of functions — a number of city and regional councils have discussed and in some cases agreed that public transport would be better placed with a city council than with the region. Unfortunately the LGA 2000 makes it unlawful to transfer public transport services.

Legislative or regulatory constraints are not the only ones that councils face. Access to funding and finance can also cause major problems. The funding and finance issue is discussed in the next section.

We are keen to reap the benefits of giving communities the right to have a meaningful say in how their areas develop and grow but we also need to remove the more egregious rules and regulations that limit what councils can do and how things can be done. LGNZ proposes that local government have the opportunity every five years to propose a regulatory reform bill for the purpose of removing or amending legislation and regulations that constrain the ability of councils to act in the best interest of their communities in an efficient and effective way.

Questions

1. Do you agree with the three recommendations in this section, devolution, negotiated devolution and removing constraints?

2. What, if any, functions currently provided by central government should be devolved to councils and other local organisations like iwi Māori and not for profit organisations?

3. What, if any, central government responsibilities would be more effective if your council, or other local organisation, applied to take them over under the negotiated devolution approach?

4. Can you identify legislative and regulatory constraints on councils and other local organisations that limit their ability to be responsive to local needs?

5. Do you agree with the suggestion that local government should be able to propose a regulatory reform bill?
Funding localism

One of the first challenges any move towards localism needs to get right is funding. If we are serious about enabling communities to develop and take ownership for solutions to local problems and challenges then fiscal discretion is essential. Unfortunately, the current way in which councils are funded fails to adequately incentivize them to grow their tax base in order to invest in the services, amenities and infrastructure that will attract new residents and investment.

< What the housing crisis says about council funding and financing options: Constraints on council funding and financing have exacerbated our housing crisis. To meet the demands of new residents for infrastructure and amenities councils must borrow. The lack of financing options has resulted in some “growth” councils having already reached their “prudent” debt levels, limiting their ability to invest in further infrastructure. >

Councils receive most of their revenue from rates, a tax which is levied on property and is set annually to meet spending plans. This is an efficient arrangement, in that it makes these taxes easy to collect and difficult to avoid because property is fixed in place and central government has conferred coercive powers on local government to ensure that they are paid.

But it is a system that suffers because of its inflexibility. In our view there are two fundamental issues: one is the need for councils to have access to what we call a buoyant tax, that is a tax that is sensitive to the state of the economy, while the other is the need for councils to have the power to establish local taxes or levies in order to address locally specific issues. These are discussed below.

Why growth can be seen as a cost

Providing services and infrastructure to support growth benefits many sectors, but not council revenue:

- residents gain from the benefits of increased GDP, household income and house prices;
- the wider region benefits through greater economic growth, employment and new amenities;
- central government gains from the increases in taxation.

While growth provides benefits to residents, investors, the wider region and central government, local government revenue remains static, unless councils vote to increase rates.

A buoyant tax for local government

Central government taxes are buoyant, that is they automatically grow when the economy grows – this is not the case for local authority rates. Should a local or regional economy grow significantly council revenues will remain unchanged, even though the demand for local public infrastructure to enable the economic upswing to continue increases. To meet the additional demand rates will need to be increased at the next annual, plan and budget.

One solution would be to introduce a local tax, as happens in a number of countries whereby citizens pay taxes to their municipality as well as to central or federal government. Alternatively, a share of the GST spent in their districts or cities could be retained or returned to councils.

A second solution, which might help “sell” the idea to central government, would be a “tax swap” whereby the Government agrees to share a proportion of its GST income with councils in exchange for a share of each council’s property taxes. While it might not appear to address councils’ immediate funding needs it would provide a strong incentive to promote local economic growth, as their GST receipts would increase respectively. This may need to be accompanied by a rates cap to ensure that taxes stay low, and councils’ incentives are aligned with growing the local economy.
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Introducing local specific levies or taxes

Some areas face unique pressures that existing funding tools are insufficient to solve and where central government processes are either too slow, or unsupportive, to help adequately. Two examples are Queenstown Lakes District Council (see insert), which faces pressures of visitor demand, and Auckland Council, which faces pressures created by fast population growth.

In both cases reliance on property taxes and limits on the ability to borrow have exacerbated the problems facing the councils and their communities, risking the attractiveness of Queenstown as a holiday destination and economic growth in Auckland due to housing affordability and an infrastructure backlog.

Local pressures

Queenstown Lakes District Council is an example of a council facing locally specific funding pressures. It has to support three million visitors annually off a permanent population base of just over 8,000. The existing revenue sources available to the council make it difficult to charge visitors for the demand on local amenities and infrastructure they create. This limits the local and national benefits that New Zealand receives from tourism.

The council has held a referendum to seek views on the introduction of a visitor levy, which received 70% support. Yet the council will need to get central government approval.

The answer is to allow affected councils to develop locally specific funding tools which are able to be targeted to those sectors creating the pressures and which are more responsive to population changes. These could include, for example:

- allowing councils to develop a local levy or tax to meet “exceptional” demands, such as the impact of visitors on infrastructure. This would need to be supported by a robust regulatory framework to ensure it operates in an efficient and accountable way and also evidence of community support, such as through a local referendum; and

- allowing councils to charge a resource rent tax, or royalty tax. As it stands, central government already charges a royalty tax on certain forms of mining (notably oil and gas). Given that, it is communities who must fund the costs of enabling these activities (through local amenities and infrastructure) a better arrangement would be to share these revenues with local councils.

Questions

1. What additional form of funding or tax should councils have access to in order to meet community expectations and address future challenges?

2. What process should councils go through in order to implement a new levy or tax?
Ensuring well-being investment meets local needs

The Government is changing the way in which it sets budget priorities, shifting from a narrow focus on economic growth to a more holistic approach based on inter-generational well-being. This is to be supported and aligned well with local government's focus on the well-being of their communities. However, communities' needs and their perceptions of well-being will not always be the same and understanding these differences will be a challenge for national decision-makers when determining priorities and budget allocations. Local government, with its ability to take holistic and place-based approaches, is ideally positioned to assist governments better understand and prioritise local investment in well-being.

Why this is important

The Government's decision to develop budgets on a well-being basis, rather than simply a focus on the well-being proxy of gross domestic product, is a positive step but it is essential that it recognises the degree that communities' well-being needs differ. One of the reasons why this is important is that 90 per cent of public revenue is allocated by central government alone and its distance from communities' means that national decision makers are not well placed to:

- Understand local needs and priorities;
- Understand local values and processes; and
- Determine local trade-offs between competing policy trade-offs given that resources are always constrained.

While there are a number of matters where a consistent national, one size fits all, approach is important, such as human rights and health and safety regulations, in many policy areas, from education, employment to housing, more nuanced approaches that reflect local differences should be applied. To achieve this we need processes that enable citizens and organisations "on the ground" to be actively involved in identifying both the priorities and longer-term strategies needed to strengthen local well-being in their localities. In a recent paper on this issue, Grimes (2019) argued that:

For officials, several challenges are highlighted and, again, mind-sets may need the greatest alteration. The ability to engage with local communities in an ongoing fashion to ascertain appropriate well-being objectives will be crucial. This involves skilled engagement processes. Three processes could involve, inter alia, community mapping and modelling, the use of arts and creativity to promote community input, public meetings, forums, web-based engagement, futures exercises, street stalls, community surveys, citizens' panels and citizens' juries (Grimes 2019, p.48).

< A well-being policy approach that is directed by central government is insufficient to address issues relating to the wellbeing of residents across different communities. Significant local involvement in policy-making related to wellbeing – as envisaged with the four well-beings for local government – is required (Grimes 2019). >
While a great deal has been written on well-being to date, the focus has been either on the well-being of the country or on the well-being of the individual. Relatively little attention has been paid to the well-being of individuals living in particular economic and social contexts.

The ability to assess the impact of local context on individual well-being constitutes the theoretical and methodological base upon which to build effective local well-being policy (Morrison 2019 p52).
The problem with trials

In the previous section we noted the tendency for governments to take a "helicopter" approach when faced with emerging and localized problems. The approach involves short term policy and programme trials, such as Strengthening Families and the Social Sector Trials, which bring together local social service agencies and often utilise the mandate, knowledge and capability of local government, including mayors, to provide a "pied-piper" approach. Trialling new policy initiatives is good practice especially when associated with appropriate evaluation and eventual policy learning. Many of these initiatives proved successful and made a measurable impact in the host community. Yet few if any were followed by permanent services or funding. In fact some mayors noted that the social problems, often reduced during the trial, increased markedly after the trial was completed. Unfortunately the frequency with which trials are implemented is more a recognition of the limited knowledge and understanding of local circumstances held by national decision-makers than a commitment to putting place a sustainable service delivery model.

The trials, and similar initiatives, often proved the value of taking a collaborative approach to address a local social issue, however, a more sustainable approach is needed. Meaningful partnerships are required so that good will and any lessons from any trials are not lost. The example of Gore District Council and the Hokorui Huana project (see image) is an example of where a community decided, by itself, to keep the initiative going and have been lucky enough to receive funding through the Provincial Growth Fund. A more sustainable approach, based on inter-sectoral partnerships, is needed to ensure successful initiatives, such as this, are not lost.

The Hokorui Huana project, project, formerly a social sector trial, is designed to provide a platform to address the challenges faced by children and young people in Gore by:

- Improving the well-being and safety of our children and young people and their engagement in education;
- Facilitating cross-sector support for family/whanau;
- Getting young people in jobs.

After the trial was wound up and because of its positive impact Gore District Council and local organisations sought funding to keep the initiative going. Funding has recently been received from the Provincial Growth Fund.

< Collaboration and co-design help to connect people and enable them to uplift each other’s visions and projects. This part of the approach is very important in the South because there are generational gaps that can separate people (Feedback on the Southern Initiative, Auckland). >
The solutions

The Government’s desire to look at its spending through a “wellbeing lens” provides an opportunity to take a localised and place-based approach to improving the lives of citizens and communities that our current model is failing to adequately provide. If we are to improve the well-being of all communities, rather than those that are the most articulate and organised, then resources should be allocated in response to need not just opportunity.

Citizens need the opportunity to identify priorities that are relevant to their communities, as well as some areas needing greater investment in skills and training while others might be more concerned about social housing or care of the elderly. Options for achieving this might include:

- Encouraging councils, working collaboratively with local partners, to prepare local well-being plans setting out well-being priorities (including the necessary trade-offs) for districts and cities and sub-areas within them;
- Ensuring that well-being plans are formally acknowledged as an input when the Government is preparing its annual well-being budget, including the opportunity for local representatives to speak to their plans;
- Strengthening accountability and effectiveness by having councils report on their economic, social, cultural and environment activities, in their annual plans, much the same way that publicly listed companies do in relation to their targets;
- Requiring central government to also complete its own “well-being annual report”, such as that published by the Welsh parliament, to similarly enhance accountability for its actions. Such a report would assist in shifting the public’s focus from just the spending decisions made through the budgetary process to a greater focus on whether governments have delivered on their stated aims. More practically, it will also provide an interface that councils can use to see what functions provided by central government might be better performed, and lead to better well-being outcomes, if undertaken locally.

* The city centre plan aims to drive a fundamental revitalisation of the [Whangarei] city centre. We recognise that for this to be successful, businesses and communities must be able to participate in decision-making and partner in implementation (Whangarei District Council)*

The shift to a public budgeting approach that takes into account well-being information from each of our different communities is a welcome recognition of both New Zealand’s diversity and the need to shift from standardised policy solutions. However, achieving a more accurate understanding and knowledge of local needs is only half the challenge; the second issue, and just as important, concerns how services, intended to address all needs, are designed and delivered. It is here that councils, communities, iwi/Hapū, and others have a large role to play in co-designing and co-producing public services designed to improve inter-generational well-being.

More of the nationally designed and directed contestable model for commissioning local services will not achieve the outcomes sought. New models, that build on councils’ democratic leadership mandate, to mobilise and work with citizens and local organisations to ensure community needs are addressed in an appropriate manner, are required.

**Questions**

1. Do you agree that the government’s annual well-being budget process should be informed by priorities set by each community?
2. What roles could councils play to ensure that government spending on well-being addresses local needs and priorities?
3. Do you agree with the suggestion of local well-being plans and reports?
**Deepening democracy**

Democracy, not just in New Zealand but in much of the world, is under pressure. Fewer people are voting, trust in democratic institutions is declining and we are seeing a growth in populist parties, many of which show little sympathy for the democratic process that put them in power. One reason given for this “democratic recession” is a growth in the number of citizens who feel marginalised and excluded from social and political life.

The best solution to feelings of disempowerment is more democracy, rather than less. And democracy at a grassroots level – where citizens can have a meaningful say in the way in which their town or city develops. As discussed in the previous sections well-being cannot be imposed from the centre and what communities consider to be well-being will vary from place to place. If further public investment in well-being is to make a difference it will need the meaningful involvement of citizens themselves.

< (Disempowerment) gives rise to populism, namely that government serves only the elite that constitutes it and is too remote and uncaring about problems at the grassroots (A C Grayling 2017). >

**The localist solution**

The purpose of local government (p.10, LGA 2002) makes it clear that councils have an obligation to enable democratic decision-making by and on behalf of their communities. Consequently engagement is not simply finding out what people think about the state of their communities; it is also about empowering them to be part of the decision-making process itself. This is intrinsic to our approach to localism. Historically this has not always been the case. Too frequently public institutions have made decisions before asking people for their opinions. Not surprisingly interest in consultation seems to have tailed off.

Real engagement involves citizens and organisations at the start of a decision-making process, at the stage when the problems are being identified and the options for solving them worked out. This allows for meaningful, rather than token, involvement. If councils are given additional roles and functions or seek additional funding, such as the implementation of a local levy, then engagement with citizens and communities will need to be paramount.

< Making our country a fairer, healthier and wealthier place will not be achieved without a democracy in which people can see how decisions are made, and where communities are active participants in that process (Scottish Commission on local democracy). >

Active engagement with local citizens, iwi/Māori, businesses, not for profits and other local interests is vital if localism is to work and deliver better services and outcomes for New Zealand. It requires enhancing the power of communities and helping people up and down the country to define their own priorities. In this way we strengthen local democracy by increasing participation and ensure that governments, local, and central, work to promote the public good.

Engagement is also critical should a council decide to apply for the transfer of a government responsibility. This needs to occur to show that the reasons for the request, as well as any implications, are well understood and supported. This is essential to provide central government with the comfort that the council has standing amongst its own citizens and that an application has been subject to local scrutiny.

To have any confidence in this framework, councils will need to show that their decision-making is guided by their communities to a higher degree than is currently practised, and that they are held to account for decisions made.
Within a localism paradigm, greater decentralisation of power, decision making and resources to local government needs to be accompanied by corresponding increases in community engagement, participation and activation. Inspiring Communities’ experience in community change suggests that localism discussions and debates need to attend to the broader range of factors that support long-term community transformation (Courtney 2019).

Strengthening citizen participation

Localism is not just about shifting decision-making from central government to local government; it also involves giving citizens themselves the ability to be directly involved in the decision-making process. We want to devolve power to communities through a reform of the local government system, not a devolution of power to local government per se. To make this work we need to move away from the pure “representative” model of democracy currently in use, where councillors are ultimately accountable at the ballot box, to one that is inclusive and engages the community in the decision-making process.

The approach has shown the importance of localism in transformational change:

- The need for an integrated framework driven by local community and supported by an integrated organisational culture
- Local ownership of strategic direction and implementation
- Developing partnerships. Central government support and partnership for locally driven approaches (Whangarei District Council).

To work, decision-making needs to be brought as close as possible to the communities it impacts on. Because councils in New Zealand are unusually large (average population is more than 60,000 residents), they consist of multiple communities which may have quite different needs and preferences. This challenge is to deepen democracy within councils to allow our distinct communities to contribute, by, for example:

- Sub-municipal bodies - one important mechanism for doing this is our network of community boards and in Auckland’s case, local boards. There are currently no community boards in New Zealand located in approximately 40 councils. Auckland contains 21 local boards. These sub-municipal bodies offer a relatively unique approach (similar to parish councils in England) for putting localism into practice because of their proximity to neighbourhoods. They are well positioned to identify local needs and facilitate community discussions about well-being priorities.

- Participatory budgeting - our localism can only work if citizens have a meaningful say in the way local budgets are set. Councils will need to look for innovative tools and techniques in order to draw on the knowledge and wisdom of their communities when determining priorities, for themselves and for their communities; for example participatory budgeting. New York City has agreed...
to adopt a participatory budgeting approach, based on wards, for setting a share of its budget. Participatory approaches will need to be designed to ensure that all communities are able to contribute to the priority setting processes.

The evidence suggests the quality of decision-making is improved where government actions more closely match the wishes of their citizens. In this way, empowerment can revive civic society and drive improvements. There are numerous systems that can be used to achieve greater community engagement in council decision-making, including community-led planning and citizen juries etc. LGNZ is agnostic as to which models councils should adopt, after all localism is about choosing bespoke solutions to bespoke challenges.

To build trust in local decision-making councils will need to show that they have listened to communities and put community directives into practice. For localism to be effective councils will need to make use of a wider range of engagement tools than many of them currently use. How, when, and to what degree those tools are applied is at the discretion of their communities, and councils must be held accountable for how they have used them. One way of doing this would be through some form of external assessment.

LGNZ’s localism agenda is designed to deepen democracy in two ways. The first is by increasing salience, making local governments more relevant and enabling citizens to have more influence on council decision-making. The second is by providing opportunities for citizens to be more directly involved in making decisions about their own neighbourhoods and communities. Feelings of disempowerment and distrust are likely to decline as more and more citizens become active participants in the governance of their own areas. Our democracy is enriched by the active participation of our citizens.

Questions

1. What additional approaches could be used to strengthen participation in local government decision-making?
2. What needs to change to strengthen relationships between councils, iwi/Māori, business organisations and the community/voluntary sector?

< There are, and have been, many examples of direct democracy in action. Whanganui’s annual referendum, which ran between 2005 and 2010, was one.

Under that programme the community was asked to vote on the council’s proposed spending objectives, such as whether they preferred a low, medium or high rates increase, with the respective spending implications of each option laid out. >
No more cost shifting and unfunded mandates

LGNZ is calling for an end to cost shifting and unfunded mandates. These occur when central government requires a council to undertake a new service but fails to provide the funding necessary to carry the service out. They can also occur where councils are required by central government to increase service level standards of existing services, again with no funding to pay the additional costs.

The problem

Cost shifting and unfunded mandates are a problem in a democracy as they undermine accountability. In a way they are like a “free lunch” for ministers, letting them take the credit for an improvement in a local service while local politicians get blamed for the resulting increase in property taxes needed to pay for this intervention.

Preventing cost shifting and unfunded mandates is also important to our localism agenda as arbitrary interventions by ministers in decision-making by councils will ultimately diminish the willingness of citizens to contribute to, and the willingness of elected members and officials to endorse, a localist approach.

Giving councils the tools to do the job

In 2012 the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act was amended to give communities the right to adopt local alcohol policies in order to control harm from the sale and consumption of alcohol. Years later many councils are still trying to adopt their policies despite spending significant resources defending legal challenges.

This example highlights a common situation where central government gives councils a duty but fails to provide them with the powers or resources to carry the duty out in a way that will meet the expectations of their communities or the intent of the legislation.

Our proposal

We propose that legislation is drawn up and enacted to either stop cost shifting and unfunded mandates or require that any such measures:

- Require central government officials to tally and disclose the costs new policy interventions would impose on local tax payers, or
- Put an actual funding obligation on policy makers to provide the required funding, or
- Provide a local tax or levy sufficient to enable councils to pay for any newfound or enhanced levels of service.

An example of such a statute is the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, passed by the United States Congress under President Clinton (see box below). Such a statute would significantly raise the level of consideration that central government and its officials give to the costs it imposes on local government as well as alert citizens to the full implications of the policy debate. Whether by political or fiscal pressure, a New Zealand version of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act would end central government’s free lunch.

Constitutional safeguard

Such a statute would, over time, also strengthen the separation of powers, as any law – be it a newly passed law or a modernisation or review of an existing one – would be subject to the unfunded mandate statute’s binding disclosure and/or funding requirements. As far as it relates to the relationship of central and local government, the effect would be to replicate a level of protection usually guaranteed by a constitution. For voters this would, at minimum, increase transparency and accountability, and do so at both tiers of government.

The cost of regulation

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity was introduced by central government in 2016 and requires councils experiencing population growth to assess their capacity to provide for that growth.

The NPS is extremely prescriptive and complex to implement, and based on a flawed economic model.Christchurch City and its two neighbouring councils have so far spent approximately $50 million addressing the policy’s requirements, and overall most councils using it have found it to be unfit for the purpose it was intended.

Many countries around the world preserve the sovereignty of central and subnational governments through a formal constitution. These constitutions lay out a delineation between the various tiers of government and their powers in law. Attempts to change this have met a high democratic threshold, or done through backchannel means that are likely to cause reputational damage if exposed.

This unfortunately is not a channel open to New Zealand at the moment, especially if the aim is to solve the institutional problems with central and local government. While a constitution, depending upon how it is drafted, can provide long-term certainty of role and existence for local government, the complexity involved in its passage means that it is not an immediate option. An unfunded mandates act would operate in a quasi-constitutional way by putting some formality around the central-local government relationship, formality which is not currently present.

Although the power of Parliament is supreme in New Zealand, once passed, it is safe to presume that unfunded mandates legislation would be resistant to change as any government seeking to appeal it would have to justify to the public why it seeks to reinstate its free lunch at the expense of their rates bills. We would also expect such legislation to be entrenched, making it more difficult to amend.

< The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UFMA) was designed to limit the number of unfunded mandates that were being imposed on states by the US federal government. It requires that any proposed transfer must have the costs disclosed and be accompanied with adequate federal funding. >

Questions

1. Do you agree that legislation will solve the unfunded mandates and cost shifting problem?
2. Are there other measures that you would recommend to reduce costs being imposed on councils?
3. What else could be done to protect the constitutional status of local government?
Feedback sheet

We value your feedback on our localism proposal, these questions have been designed to help your response.

1. Do you agree with the three recommendations in this section, devolution, negotiated devolution and removing constraints?
2. If not, what would you change?
3. What, if any, functions currently provided by central government should be devolved to councils and other local organisations like Iwi/Māori and not-for-profit organisations?
4. What, if any, central government responsibilities would be more effective if your council, or other local organisation, applied to take them over under the negotiated devolution approach?
5. Can you identify legislative and regulatory constraints on councils and other local organisations that limit their ability to be responsive to local needs?
6. What additional form of funding or tax should councils have access to in order to meet community expectations and address future challenges?
7. What process should councils go through in order to implement a new levy or tax?
8. Do you agree that the government’s annual well-being budget process should be informed by priorities set by each community?
9. What rules could councils play to ensure that government spending on well-being addresses local needs and priorities?
10. Do you agree with the suggestion of local well-being plans and reports?
11. What additional approaches could be used to strengthen participation in local government decision-making?
12. What needs to change to strengthen relationships between councils, Iwi/Māori, business organisations and the community/voluntary sector?
13. Do you agree that legislation will solve the un-funded mandates and cost-shifting problem?
14. Are there other measures that you would recommend to reduce costs being imposed on councils?
15. What else could be done to protect the constitutional status of local government?

Please send your comments and feedback by 15 December 2019 to mike.raid@gz.govt.nz or send to:

Dr Mike Reid
Principal Policy Advisor
Local Government New Zealand
PO Box 1214
Wellington 6011
References and more information
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Dear Dr Reid

Auckland Council appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Local Government New Zealand discussion document “Reinvigorating local democracy: The case for localising power and decision-making to councils and communities”.

The council’s feedback notes various key aspects of the relationship between Auckland Council and central government since the time that Auckland governance was considered by the Royal Commission. The themes of this relationship have been about collaboration and co-ordination.

It is important to note that the feedback does not comment on the proposals for devolution. Due to the intervention of the local government elections, the governing body and local boards have not had the opportunity to consider a formal position on a future devolution of functions from central government to local government or to consider how any devolution is funded. The council remains open to a continuing discussion. The comments below provide a background for any future discussion.

Auckland Council was established in 2010 following an inquiry conducted by a Royal Commission. Auckland Council is the largest local authority in New Zealand and depends on the involvement of central government in addressing significant matters relating to the well-being of Auckland communities, such as public transport.

Social issues

In 2009 the government’s response to the report of the Royal Commission noted¹:

“The development of mechanisms to achieve alignment between the Government and the Auckland Council on social well-being issues is important to ensure the growth and prosperity of the region and quality of life for Aucklanders.

The Government will explore options, as a matter of urgency, to make sure the efforts of central and local government are properly aligned to achieve positive social outcomes for the people of Auckland.”

The result was a forum which was jointly convened by the Auckland Mayor and the Minister of Social Development. The forum lapsed after a period of time.

¹ Making Auckland Greater", 2009, page 26
There is a question around whether different mechanisms need to be explored to achieve alignment between government and Auckland Council on social well-being issues.

The AUT Policy Observatory in its report titled “The Governance of Auckland: 5 years on” noted:

“...the Royal Commission argued for a governance structure for social wellbeing that would enable local and central government to share decision-making and accountability for improving the effectiveness of resources spent as well as addressing the critical social issues in Auckland. These conclusions were based on the Commission’s concerns regarding significant clusters of deprivation in Auckland typically concentrated around geographical and ethnic communities. With the annual central and local government expenditure on social issues in Auckland estimated to be approximately $12 billion dollars, the Commission described the collaborative efforts between central and local government as ‘inadequate’. Accordingly the key recommendations made by the Commission centred on ‘achieving shared responsibility for decision-making’ (Royal Commission, 2009, p. 15).

The Royal Commission proposed the establishment of a Social Issues Board as a mechanism for advancing collaboration between central and local government. While the Minister of Social Development agreed publicly with this proposal in 2009, (Bennett, 2009) five years on there is still no social issues board and no shared decision-making regarding social policy and the social services of Auckland. While government agencies do consult the councils’ research unit RIMU, there is no formal central government-Auckland partnership on social policy. Given the significance of social policy and the challenges outlined in this report it can be viewed as a failure of the reforms to date.”

Although the proposed social issues board has not eventuated, social issues have been acknowledged in the Auckland Plan 2050, and initiatives undertaken, in conjunction with government, to address these, such as The Southern Initiative.

“The central government-Auckland Council relationship is a two-way street: it depends not only on the council and mayor, but on central government’s genuine goodwill towards addressing Auckland’s problems in a way that has the buy-in of Aucklanders themselves. The single council and mayor has made joint planning with central government easier, most obvious in the realm of the physical infrastructure and utilities, including transport and housing. But there is little evidence that the social deficit referred to in this report has been seriously addressed.

To address the concerns first raised by Treasury in 2001 and cemented in the region by deep-seated inequalities between different socio-economic groups and communities will require the concerted efforts of both central and regional government.”

Auckland Plan

At the time of the formation of Auckland Council, central government Ministers stated they looked forward to there being one plan for all of Auckland and one voice for Auckland that central government could communicate with.

Integrated planning will give Auckland a united voice when working with central government or petitioning for investment in major events such as the Rugby World Cup, and support the investment and changes needed to host such events.

---

2 “The Governance of Auckland: 5 years on”, The Policy Observatory, AUT, page 38
3 “The Governance of Auckland: 5 years on”, The Policy Observatory, AUT, page 41
4 “Making Auckland Greater”, 2009, page 21
The purpose of the Auckland Plan is (LGACA s 79):

...to contribute to Auckland’s social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being through a comprehensive and effective long-term (20- to 30-year) strategy for Auckland’s growth and development.

The Auckland Plan is a high-level, long-term, strategic plan, with a focus on well-being outcomes, to guide Auckland’s development into the future. When describing its implementation, the Auckland Plan notes the need for the involvement of central government and non-government organisations.

As Auckland develops, Auckland Council can play a crucial role in co-ordinating the provision of services provided by central government in a way that achieves the goals of the Auckland Plan.

The current version – Auckland Plan 2050 – looks ahead 30 years to 2050.

Mayor of Auckland

It is important to acknowledge the role of the Mayor of Auckland vis-à-vis central government. Auckland comprises one-third of the country’s population and the Mayor of Auckland as the spokesperson for Auckland can expect a hearing when the mayor calls on ministers.

"Auckland needs strong regional leadership to help it realise its potential and provide a united voice. Creating a single Auckland Council with one mayor will enable simpler and stronger management of council services throughout the region. It will also simplify the relationship with central government and ensure Auckland’s voice is heard by central government."  

"From a governance viewpoint, the new leadership role of the mayor of Auckland, and the statutory provision for an Office of the Mayor, are appropriate for the unitary structure. Given its physical and demographic size, its diversity and the problems inherent in rapid growth, Auckland needs to have one publicly accountable figurehead who can speak for Auckland, deal with central government at the highest levels, and lead the council’s deliberations in respect of planning and budgeting."  

Auckland Policy Office (APO)

The Auckland Policy Office represents the presence of policy staff of central government agencies in Auckland.

"Their aim is to:

- provide an Auckland perspective in the development of central government policy
- identify and develop Auckland-specific policies that will promote Auckland and national economic growth
- promote the involvement of central government in major regional development projects
- be a source of information about Auckland.

The agencies represented in the APO currently include:

- State Services Commission

5 "Making Auckland Greater", 2009, page 16
6 "The Governance of Auckland: 5 years on", The Policy Observatory, AUT, page 25
Well-being approach of government

This just notes that the purpose of local government includes promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities and that Treasury’s Living Standards Framework is based on measuring well-being, so that central government policy options can be evaluated. Central government is concerned about the well-being of all New Zealanders in terms of matters such as health and education, whereas local government is concerned about the well-being of the communities within local government boundaries. There are areas of strong overlap such as environmental well-being, sustainable development goals, housing and transport.

“There is a shared role for central and local government when it comes to wellbeing. Local government plays a key and important role in community development. The four wellbeing domains – social, economic, environmental and cultural- have recently been reintroduced into the Purpose clause of the Local Government Act.

Alignment between the living standards framework and the role of Local Government to contribute towards the four well beings is a significant opportunity. Central government by its very nature is limited in its ability to have impact on peoples’ everyday lives and the way people and place connect at a local level.

Aggregate indicators disguise where there is significant disparity within regions – a concern raised with me by local government. Local government are in a position to recognise and capture the sub-regional profiles and disparities within single regions, giving us a richer set of data and a more accurate picture of our communities.

Integrating the two frameworks will need to go deeper than a superficial mapping exercise across the central government and local government-led spheres of wellbeing.

There are already examples of local government leaning into the social issues that cause distress in our communities and rethinking their role in their community’s wellbeing. For example, Hutt City Council is working alongside central government on integrated social housing proposals. The Southern Initiative in South Auckland creates and supports innovative social change. It identifies local change-makers, encourages social enterprise, builds community capability and amplifies community-driven initiatives.

There is scope to work in partnership with local government to find a way to utilise our respective wellbeing frameworks to deliver better outcomes for our people. Recognising our distinct identify and values by embedding Te Ao Māori into the Living Standards Framework is key. So is understanding what ‘wellbeing’ is and means to all of our communities our whānau and hapū. And bringing together the respective strengths of central government, local government and iwi/Māori to intergenerational wellbeing. 

7  https://www.govt.nz/organisations/auckland-policy-office/
8  Hon Nanaia Mahuta, Minister of Local Government, Minister of Māori Development. https://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/wellbeing
Auckland central-local government forum

Soon after Auckland Council was established, regular meetings between the mayor and councillors, with key central government ministers, were initiated. These were initially important in order to formulate understandings between the Auckland Council and central government but have become less frequent with fewer ministers attending (there was only one held this year, with Ministers Mahuta and Sage).

Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)

ATAP was established in 2015 to improve alignment between Auckland Council and central government on the future of Auckland’s transport system. In late 2017 the new government requested an update to ATAP to ensure it reflected their transport priorities, which place greater weight on public transport (especially rapid transit), walking and cycling, improving safety, and broad environmental, health and growth outcomes.

Around the same time Auckland Council approved the draft Auckland Plan, which reflected the long-term strategic approach of the original ATAP, but with a greater focus on improving travel choices (public transport, walking and cycling) and reducing harm to people and the environment.

The terms of reference established a governance group jointly chaired by the chief executives of the Auckland Council and the Ministry of Transport. The governance group was charged with delivering a final report to the Ministers of Finance and Transport; and the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chair of the Planning Committee (the “Parties”).

The investment package is around $28 billion over ten years.9

The Southern Initiative (TSI)

TSI is a major place-based regeneration programme established in the Auckland Plan. It covers the local board areas of Māngere-Ōtahuhu, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Manurewa and Papakura.

The purpose of TSI is to plan and deliver a long-term programme of co-ordinated investment and actions to bring about transformational social, economic and physical change in this area. It was set up with six priorities:

- early childhood intervention and strong family attachment
- education, training or employment for all young people leaving school
- an outstanding international gateway and destination area
- economic development and jobs for local people
- increased public transport services
- housing development.

The Co-design Lab is an integral part of the project’s innovation capability. It is funded by Auckland Council and sponsored by eight central government departments. The Lab was established to provide a neutral space to explore the use of co-design and other innovative approaches to address complex social issues.

A key focus is to provide space for multi-agency teams to collaborate, work alongside citizens and to support and broker innovative ideas and solutions. It also focuses on unlocking people’s capability to participate in designing their future, while advocating for system-level change.10

---

9 “Auckland Transport Alignment Project Update”, Extraordinary meeting of Governing Body, 30 April 2018
10 Auckland Plan 2050, pages 69 - 71
The Western Initiative

Provision has been made in the LTP for funding for a Western Initiative. This is in its early days.

Auckland housing and urban growth

Improving housing affordability in Auckland by increasing the supply of housing is a key strategic priority of both the Crown’s Urban Growth Agenda and the Auckland Plan 2050. A joint Auckland Council / central government programme has been agreed to deliver outcomes under both the Crown’s Urban Growth Agenda and the Auckland Plan 2050.

On 8 May 2019 Cabinet’s Economic Development Committee agreed to sign the terms of reference. Its resolutions were:

- **noted** that signing the Terms of Reference will create an obligation for Ministers and agencies to engage with Auckland Council in a spirit of collaboration;
- **agreed** that the Minister of Housing and Urban Development, the Minister for the Environment, the Minister for Building and Construction and the Minister of Local Government will represent the government on the Political Working Group.

The joint work programme has seven main workstreams:

- Auckland Development Programme – focussing on Drury: City Centre to Mangere urban growth areas; Manukau; CRL development opportunities
- Affordable housing
- Infrastructure funding and financing
- Urban planning – focussing on quality intensification and costs and benefits of growth
- Spatial planning
- Urban Development Agency
- Removing barriers to the efficient delivery of houses – focussing on Building Act and Building Code improvements, efficient consenting and optimal utilisation of zoning and related infrastructure capacity.

A recent report noted the key activities that have been undertaken since the previous report:

- Crown endorsement of the joint work programme, and signing of the terms of reference in May
- workshops on the social infrastructure required in Drury to service future growth
- clarification of the extent of deficiencies in the transport network and what needs to occur to address those deficiencies (both projects and funding) at Drury and a programme adopted to find a way forward
- review of whether the intended outcomes of the Terrace House and Apartment Building zone are being achieved – in conjunction with developers and Ministry for the Environment
- working with Treasury, Department of Internal Affairs and Crown Infrastructure Partners on alternative financing and funding tools to pay for infrastructure in both brownfield and greenfield locations – using 4 areas as case studies – Mt Roskill, Tamaki, Redhills and Drury

---

- Auckland Council lodged a submission on the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Bill, informed by feedback from WSL, Panuku and Auckland Transport as well as a number of local boards and staff from the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
- Auckland Council provided feedback on the Building System Legislative Reform discussion document released by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.

The governance arrangements comprise:

- Political Governance Group
- Executive Steering Group
- Programme Steering Group

Local boards

It is important to include local boards in any further discussion about devolution. Local boards are responsible for the local non-regulatory decisions of Auckland Council. Any additional devolution of functions from central to local government that results in further non-regulatory activities of Auckland Council being exercised at the local board level will impact on local board decision-making.

Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB)

The IMSB is independent to the Auckland Council and has a role of promoting matters of significance to Māori. It liaises with central government independently.

The IMSB recently welcomed the announcement of an Urban Development Authority. In a statement, the IMSB chair referred to the IMSB’s Housing Summit, the Kāinga Strategic Action Plan and engagement with central government:

“The Board’s key housing related work programmes in 2018 (the Auckland Māori Housing Summit in April, and the Kāinga Strategic Action Plan) had both created robust and structured engagement with government and new engagement with Auckland Council.”

Conclusion

The comments above outline what is currently on record as demonstrating succinctly some of the key aspects of the relationship of the council with central government. The dynamics at play in that relationship have tended to be about collaboration and co-ordination to meet common goals, with a lot of these dynamics taking place under the umbrella of the Auckland Plan – the strategic document for the Auckland region.

There may be a case for central government functions to be transferred to local government, however there has not been the opportunity for the council to formally consider that and form a view on it.

---

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To agree recommendations for submission to the Remuneration Authority regarding the allocation of the remuneration pool for the Governing Body.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. The Remuneration Authority (the Authority) sets the remuneration for elected positions in individual local authorities, in accordance with the Remuneration Authority Act 1977 and clauses 6 and 7A(1) and (5) of Schedule 7 of the Local Government Act 2002.

3. In 2018 the Authority undertook a comprehensive review of its approach to determine the remuneration and allowances for local government elected members. The Authority considered how a local government pay scale could fairly compare with other roles. It concluded that the only similar occupation is a member of Parliament, and now uses the parliamentary salary scale as a comparator.

4. The pay scale considers three factors – the size of the governance role of each council, the average time required by a councillor on a council of a particular size and a general comparison with parliamentary salaries.

5. As a result of the 2018 review, the Authority created a ‘governance remuneration pool’ (the pool) for the Auckland Council Governing Body to allocate, following the 2019 local government elections, between the different roles and responsibilities taken up by councillors. The pool provides the total amount that can be paid in remuneration to councillors. The pool does not include remuneration for the mayor and local boards members, which is set directly by the Remuneration Authority.

6. Auckland Council is required to make recommendations to the Authority on how the pool should be allocated between the councillors. The recommendations must include a rate for base councillor remuneration and rates for positions of additional responsibility that the governing body wishes to recognise. The Authority will then consider the council’s recommendations before determining the remuneration payable to members.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Governing Body:

a) approve the proposed allocation of the Auckland Council governance remuneration pool as per the schedule in Attachment A of the agenda report:
   i) deputy mayor - $165,582
   ii) chair of the committee of the whole - $138,912
   iii) chair of the Regulatory Committee - $138,912
   iv) deputy chair of a committee of the whole - $125,483
   v) chair of other committee - $123,245
vi) council-controlled organisation liaison councillor - $123,245  

vii) deputy chair of other committee - $117,650  

viii) portfolio lead - $113,174  

b) note that staff will forward this allocation to the Remuneration Authority for approval  
c) note that:  
i) Auckland Council will need to wait until the Remuneration Authority’s amending determination is gazetted before it can pay the new base councillor rate and the new remuneration rates for positions of responsibility  

ii) the new base councillor rate will take effect from 22 October (the day after the date on which the official results for the council were declared by public notice)  

iii) the remuneration rates for positions of responsibility will take effect from the day after the Governing Body has made these resolutions

Horopaki
Context

7. The Remuneration Authority is the independent body set up by Parliament to handle the remuneration of key office holders such as Judges, members of Parliament, local government representatives, and some individual office holders and board members of independent statutory bodies.  

8. Following a comprehensive review of local government sector remuneration in 2018, the Authority created three new size indices – one each for territorial authorities, regional authorities and unitary authorities – and established a new local government pay scale. The size indices are based on population, total operating expenditure, total assets and the socio-economic deprivation index. Because of its size, Auckland Council is considered an outlier and does not fit within the size index, so each year the Authority will make an informed judgement on the size of the pool.  

9. After constructing new size indices, the Authority then considered a local government pay scale that maintains fair relativity with remuneration received elsewhere. After exploring various occupational groups that might have some relativity with local government elected members, the Authority concluded that the only similar occupation was that of a member of Parliament. The Authority will therefore be using the parliamentary salary scale as a comparator, but based on the position of each council on the size index and the pro rata time required for an average local government member to undertake the role on a council of any particular size.  

10. The pay scale takes into account three factors - the size of the governance role of each council, the average time required by a councillor on a council of a particular size, and a general comparison with parliamentary salaries.  

11. As a result of the 2018 review, a governance remuneration pool was established reflecting the size of the actual total governance roles of councillors rather than the number of councillors. The pool is the total amount that must be paid in remuneration to councillors. The council can decide how it wants to allocate its pool according to its priorities and circumstances, but must use the totality of the pool.  

12. This new approach requires Auckland Council to make recommendations to the Authority on how the pool should be allocated. The recommendations must include a rate for base councillor remuneration and remuneration for all positions of additional responsibility.
13. Roles to which additional remuneration can be allocated may include internal council roles such as the deputy mayor, committee chairs or portfolio holders, as well as other roles representing the council on outside organisations or groups. The pool does not apply to the remuneration of the mayor, which has been set by the Authority at $296,000.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Allocation of the governance remuneration pool

14. There are four requirements concerning the allocation of the pool:
   - the whole pool must be used but cannot be exceeded
   - Auckland Council must decide a base remuneration for councillors who have no additional responsibilities
   - for any roles which attract additional remuneration above the base rate, the council must have a formal vote which includes the following:
     - a title and short description of each role (i.e. what are the requirements for the councillor who undertakes it)
     - the proposed annual dollar value of remuneration attached to the role
   - following the Governing Body’s formal decision, Auckland Council will forward the proposal for additional remuneration to the Authority for consideration and inclusion in the determination.

15. The pool allocated to Auckland Council for the period following the 2019 local government elections to 30 June 2020 is $2,556,478. The minimum remuneration allocated to a councillor is set at $106,306.

16. A comparison of Part 1 and Part 2 of the 2019/2020 Determination is set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1: comparison between terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/20 Determination Part 1 (July-Oct)</th>
<th>2019/20 Determination Part 2 (This term)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor - $285,041</td>
<td>Mayor - $296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy mayor - $160,606</td>
<td>Deputy mayor – not set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of committee of the whole - $132,579</td>
<td>Chair of committee of the whole – not set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor - $111,901</td>
<td>Councillor - $106,306 (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised Remuneration Authority provision - $2,461,822</td>
<td>Governance Pool - $2,556,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Staff propose that:
   a) the pool is allocated to maintain last term’s base remuneration rate of $111,901 for councillors
   b) the deputy mayor receives remuneration of $165,582 per annum, an increase of 3%, which is commensurate with the increase of deputy chairs of local boards
c) additional remuneration is graduated to reflect the varying level of additional responsibilities and workload involved in particular roles

d) while acknowledging that many councillors will have several positions of responsibility, for simplicity purposes councillors will only be remunerated for the highest position of responsibility.

18. The minimum rate payable to all councillors and the rate payable to the deputy mayor leave a remaining balance of $264,935 for allocation.

Allocation of remaining funds

19. To distribute the remaining funds in the pool, staff analysed councillor workload and time requirements for roles of additional responsibility from last term. This analysis resulted in the calculation that a chair of a ‘committee of the whole’ has an additional workload of up to 30 per cent compared with a councillor with no additional responsibilities. This role requires strong leadership, the ability to build and maintain relationships, timely decision-making and chairing meetings in accordance with legislation and standing orders.

20. Based upon this analysis, a ratio of 1.24 (with 1 being the workload of a councillor with no additional responsibilities) was applied to the role of chair of a committee of the whole. Staff also considered that the role of chair of the Regulatory Committee should be weighted as 1.24, as this role demands a similar level of expertise and time.

21. Once the ratio of 1.24 for a chair of a committee of the whole and the Regulatory Committee was established, staff used it as a benchmark to allocate the remaining funds for additional roles of responsibility. These are ranked in order and set out in Table 2 below, with the allocated ratio reflecting assessed workload and level of responsibility.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role title</th>
<th>Role description</th>
<th>Base remuneration</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy mayor</td>
<td>The deputy mayor acts in support of the Mayor in carrying out his statutory and leadership role.</td>
<td>$160,606</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$165,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of a committee of the whole and chair of Regulatory Committee</td>
<td>Provide the committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$138,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy chair of a committee of the whole</td>
<td>Provide support to the committee chair, assuming the role of chair in their absence.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$125,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of other committee and council-controlled organisation liaison councillor</td>
<td>Provide the committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>$123,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Allocation of the Governing Body Remuneration Pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role title</th>
<th>Role description</th>
<th>Base remuneration</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy chair of other committee</td>
<td>Provide support to the committee chair, assuming the role of chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio lead</td>
<td>Lead on specific portfolio to offer ongoing support and feedback on issues.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>$113,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total allocation:** $ 2,556,478

*Some of these ratios have been adjusted to more than two decimals to ensure the totality of the pool is allocated.

---

### Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi
**Climate impact statement**

22. This decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of climate change will not impact the decision’s implementation.

---

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

23. This decision does not impact upon the wider council group.

---

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

24. This proposal does not affect local board elected members. The Authority has set local board elected member remuneration rates in the 2019/2020 Determination. The Authority has developed a separate size index for Auckland local boards that takes into account their singular characteristics and accountabilities, including their representational responsibilities for large populations.

---

### Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
**Māori impact statement**

25. The proposals to the Remuneration Authority relate to all councillors and do not impact Māori differently to others.

---

### Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
**Financial implications**

26. The whole pool set by the Remuneration Authority must be allocated. The Council cannot exceed the allocated pool.

---

### Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
**Risks and mitigations**

27. If councillors wish to change the proposal after submission to the Authority, there is a window of three months following the election to do so. The proposed changes must be submitted to the Authority for incorporation into a determination that will be backdated to the date the council made its formal decision on roles and appointments.

---

### Ngā koringa ā-muri
**Next steps**

28. Once the proposal is approved, staff will submit it to the Remuneration Authority.
**Ngā tāpirihanga**  
**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Proposed allocation of the governance remuneration pool to submit to the Remuneration Authority</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**  
**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kieran O'Callaghan - Privacy Programme Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marguerite Delbet - General Manager Democracy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment A:

Proposed allocation of the governance remuneration pool to submit to the Remuneration Authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role title</th>
<th>Role description</th>
<th>Base remuneration</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
<th>Total governance remuneration pool allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>The deputy mayor acts in support of the Mayor in carrying out statutory and leadership role.</td>
<td>$160,606</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$165,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr Bill Cashmore</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$138,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr Desley Simpson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Planning Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$138,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr Chris Darby</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Environment and Climate Change Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$138,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr Richard Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Community Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>$138,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr Alf Filipaina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Regulatory Committee</td>
<td>Cr Linda Cooper</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Finance and Performance Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Cr Shane Henderson</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Planning Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Cr Josephine Bartley</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Environment and Climate Change Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Cr Pippa Coom</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Community Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Cr Cathy Casey</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Strategic Procurement Committee</td>
<td>Cr Greg Sayers</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Civil Defence Committee</td>
<td>Cr Sharon Stewart</td>
<td>Provide the Committee with leadership, build and maintain relationships, ensure effective and timely decision-making facilitating meetings in accordance with standing orders.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO Liaison Councillor – ATEED</td>
<td>Act as Council oversight for Council Controlled Organisation</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>$123,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr John Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO Liaison Councillor – Panuku</td>
<td>Act as Council oversight for Council Controlled Organisation</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>$123,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Efeso Collins</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Angela Dalton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of APR Committee</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Christine Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Audit and Risk Committee</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Daniel Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of Civil Defence Committee</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Wayne Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chair of VFM Committee</td>
<td>Provide support to the Committee Chair, assuming the role of Chair in their absence</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$117,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Tracey Mulholland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Lead – Ethnic Communities</td>
<td>Lead on specific portfolio to offer ongoing support and feedback on issues.</td>
<td>$111,901</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>$113,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Paul Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,556,478</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some of these ratios have been adjusted to more than two decimals to ensure the totality of the pool is allocated.*
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. At its meeting on 12 November 2019 the Governing Body adopted the Terms of Reference for its committees, noting that the details for the Joint Governance Working Party and Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party would be added at a later date.

3. The proposed Terms of Reference for these working parties are to be inserted into the Governing Body Terms of Reference and are included in Attachment A to this agenda report.

4. Proposed membership of both working parties are outlined Attachment A to this agenda report. Two positions on the Joint Governance Working Party and two positions on Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party are still available.

5. Nominations for the four positions (and confirmation of proposed membership), plus the positions of chair and deputy chair of Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party will be called for at the meeting.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) amend its Terms of Reference for committees by adding the terms of reference for the Joint Governance Working Party and Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party as contained in Attachment A of the agenda report.

b) confirm membership of the listed members of the working parties as contained in Attachment A of the agenda report.

c) appoint two additional members to the Joint Governance Working Party.

d) appoint two additional members to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party.

e) appoint a chair and deputy chair from the membership of the Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party.
Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Terms of Reference - Working Parties</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Authors | Warwick McNaughton - Principal Advisor - Democracy Services  
Steve Van Kampen - Governance Support Manager |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Authorisers | Marguerite Delbet - General Manager Democracy Services  
Phil Wilson - Governance Director  
Stephen Town - Chief Executive |
Terms of Reference
Additions to be inserted where appropriate

6 WORKING PARTIES

6.1 JOINT GOVERNANCE WORKING PARTY

Purpose
The governance of Auckland Council comprises the mayor and councillors together with twenty-one local boards.
The Joint Governance Working Party meets as necessary to consider governance matters of mutual interest to the Governing Body and local boards and to report its findings.

Powers
The Joint Governance Working Party does not have delegated decision-making powers but reports its findings to local boards and the Governing Body for final decisions.
The Joint Governance Working Party will generally determine its findings by consensus, but where there is division of opinion, this will be noted in its findings and it will be acceptable to record minority views.

Matters are referred to the Joint Governance Working Party by resolution of the Governing Body, or, if the matter is urgent, by the chairperson together with the Chief Executive (or nominee).

Members and meeting procedure
The Joint Governance Working Party comprises six members appointed by the Governing Body and six members appointed by local boards.
The Joint Governance Working Party may co-opt, or liaise, as it deems necessary on an issue basis. For example, if it is dealing with a rural issue and does not have rural representation, it may invite a rural elected member to participate in order to provide advice.
Meetings will not generally be advertised or open to the public. All elected members who are not members of the working party have the right to attend and listen. They may participate if invited to by the chairperson.
It may liaise with representatives of CCOs and co-governance entities.

Chair and deputy chair
The chairperson and deputy chairperson will be elected by the members of the Joint Governance Working Party. They will not both be Governing Body members nor both local board members. If both the chairperson and deputy chairperson are absent for a meeting, the meeting will appoint a chairperson for that meeting.
Quorum: If the total membership is even, one-half of Governing Body members and one-half of local board members otherwise a majority of each.

Frequency of meetings: Bi-monthly

Membership:

Chairperson: TBC (appointed from membership by the working party)
Deputy chairperson: TBC (appointed from membership by the working party)

Members (6 GB + 6 LB including chair and deputy chair):
- Deputy Mayor Bill Cashmore
- Cr Angela Dalton
- Cr Shane Henderson
- TBC (LB member)
- TBC (LB member)
- TBC (LB member)

All other elected members: May attend and listen.
May participate at the invitation of the chairperson.
6.2 TE TIRITI O WAITANGI / TREATY OF WAITANGI SETTLEMENT WORKING PARTY

**Reporting**

The Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party is accountable and reports its findings to the Governing Body.

**Purpose**

The Crown negotiates settlements with iwi on a confidential basis and from time to time invites the council to express its views.

The Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party will:

- consider and make recommendations on the Council's position in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi settlements and related matters

- consider and make recommendations on matters relating to the establishment and on-going implementation of co-managements and other governance arrangements

- liaise with local boards in whose areas Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi settlement arrangements are being implemented, or being considered

- liaise with Mana Whenua representatives

- liaise with the Independent Moana Board

- liaise with CCOs on Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi settlement matters

- liaise with relevant Mana Whenua and Iwi Authorities affected by each Treaty settlement

The Te Tiriti o Waitangi / Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Working Party will have the discretion to invite Councillors, CCO representatives and local board representatives of affected areas to participate in its deliberations.

**Frequency of meetings:** Bi-monthly (on the understanding a meeting will be cancelled if not needed and additional meetings will be called if required)

**Membership:**

| Chairperson: | TBC from membership |
| Deputy chairperson: | TBC from membership |
| Members (5): |
| Cr Linda Cooper | TBC |
| Cr Angela Dalton | TBC |
| Cr Daniel Newman | |
| Ex officio: | Mayor, Deputy Mayor |
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. To adopt a schedule of meeting dates and times for the governing body and its committees from January 2020 until the 2022 local body election.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Governing Body is required to adopt a meeting schedule and give advance notice to members and to the public of when it will meet.

3. The Governing Body adopted a meeting schedule for November and December 2019 at its meeting of 12 November 2019, and ordinary meetings of the governing body and its committees were able to commence from 22 November 2019.

4. A schedule of meetings has now been created for the period from January 2020 through to the 2022 election in October 2022. Taking into account feedback, meetings and workshops will be scheduled between 10.00am and 5.00pm. The schedule is appended as Attachment A.

5. This report outlines the approach used to create the governing body meeting schedule.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) agree that meetings and workshops will be scheduled between 10.00am and 5.00pm

b) adopt the meeting schedule for January 2020 through to the local body election in October 2022, appended as Attachment A of the agenda report

c) authorise the General Manager Democracy Services to amend the schedule if required, in consultation with the chair of the relevant committee, and subject to the Mayor’s or Deputy Mayor’s approval if a formal meeting or workshop has to be held on a Monday or Friday

d) note that the meeting schedule can be amended if the Governing Body agrees to committee scheduling changes between January 2020 and the 2022 local body election in October 2022

Horopaki

Context

6. The requirements to give notice of meetings to members are contained in the Local Government Act 2002. Notice must not be less than 14 days prior to the meeting, or if a schedule is adopted, not less than 14 days prior to the first meeting on the schedule. Where this notice cannot be given, meetings are called under the provisions for extraordinary meetings.
7. The requirements around giving notice of a meeting to the public are contained in the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). A schedule of meetings to be held in a month may be notified not more than 14 days and not less than five days before the end of the prior month. Alternatively, a meeting falling on or after the 21st of a month may be notified not more than 10 working days and not less than five working days prior to the meeting.

8. At its meeting of 12 November 2019, the Governing Body adopted a meeting schedule for the remainder of November and for December 2019 and noted that a three-year schedule would be presented to its meeting on 26 November 2019.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

9. Following comments received at the Governing Body meeting of 5 November 2019, an opportunity was provided for councillors to put forward their views on the meeting schedule.

10. A number of councillors replied with a range of views on how the meeting schedule should be structured.

Recess Weeks

11. There were varying requests around recess weeks.

12. Recess weeks are difficult during April/May and October because of the Annual Budget and 10-year Budget (Long-term Plan) consultation. July is the natural hiatus during the year.

13. There is often a long weekend associated with Waitangi Day and long weekends for Queen’s Birthday weekend (June) and Labour weekend (October).

14. Easter is a four-day weekend (usually in April). At the request of some councillors the week after Easter Monday has also been kept free of meetings, creating a recess at that time.

15. It should be noted that Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) board meetings will continue during any council recess weeks.

16. Four options have been considered to establish recesses:

17. Option One - as per past schedules:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Recess</th>
<th>Length of Recess (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (December to February)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April (usually around Easter)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 weeks</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Option Two accommodates different requests for a recess at mid-year only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Recess</th>
<th>Length of Recess (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (December to February)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July (timing to be agreed)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 weeks</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Some councillors requested a further two-week recess with Option Two. However, the month of May needs to be avoided for recess due to Annual Budget considerations, and a two-week recess in October is impractical due to the 10-year Budget (Long-term Plan) activities occurring at that time. Furthermore, the total recess time would then be 11 weeks, which could compromise the delivery of the governing body’s programme of work.

20. Option Three schedules an additional recess week in October (noting the constraints of the Long-term Plan at this time), and earlier return from the Christmas break:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Recess</th>
<th>Length of Recess (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (December to late January)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess incorporating Easter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July (during school holidays)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October (Labour Weekend)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Option Four excludes a recess week in October and maintains the six-week Christmas break:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Recess</th>
<th>Length of Recess (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (December to late January)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess incorporating Easter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July (during school holidays)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Given the preference for a longer recess in July and over Christmas, staff consider that Option Four is the best fit and the one that can most easily accommodate the work constraints related to the annual and long-term plans. The schedule has therefore been developed using this option.

**Meeting Schedule**

23. To ensure the most workable meeting schedule given the number and frequency of meetings required, the following principles have been applied across the term:

i) formal business of the Governing Body and its committee has been confined to Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays each week. Some meetings will need to be scheduled on Mondays but these will be kept to a minimum. Any other meetings or workshops proposed for Mondays will need approval of the Mayor or Deputy Mayor

ii) Governing Body meetings will be held on the fourth Thursday of every month. There are some exceptions to this to accommodate public holidays, recess week and Annual Budget/10-year Budget consultation processes

iii) Tuesdays are reserved for minor committees

iv) Wednesdays will be used for workshop time each week
v) Thursdays are reserved for Governing Body meetings, Committee of the Whole meetings and Value for Money Committee meetings, which alternate with the Finance and Performance Committee meetings

vi) Fridays will be kept free of meetings

vii) dates for joint quarterly meetings of the Governing Body and the Independent Māori Statutory Board, and the Governing Body and Local Board chairs are being discussed and will be set once agreement has been reached

viii) Meetings will commence at 10.00am and conclude at 5.00pm.

24. The frequency of committee meetings has already been agreed and is outlined in the Governing Body Terms of Reference.

25. Some meetings have yet to be included in the schedule, such as Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Workshop Party and the Joint Governance Working Party. This is because the membership of these groups is yet to be confirmed. Demographic and Sector Advisory Panel meetings will also be added once their membership is confirmed.

26. Hauraki Gulf Forum meetings dates for 2020 have been agreed and are included in the schedule.

27. Other events scheduled include the Annual Budget and 10-year Budget consultation and decision-making events throughout the first half of 2020 for the Annual Budget and latter part of 2020 for the 10-year Budget. These dates are subject to change depending on future decisions on the consultation process.

Workshops

28. Workshops are informal meetings that support decision-making by:
   • providing a mechanism for staff to seek informal guidance from elected members and improve advice requiring a future decision
   • enabling elected members to seek further clarification on major issues/items prior to making a formal decision at some point in the future.

29. Decisions are not made at workshops. Part 7 Section 45(2) of LGOIMA states that any meeting of a local authority or its committees at which no resolutions or decisions are made is not a meeting as defined by LGOIMA. As such there is no requirement for the local authority to undertake the following activities as outlined in sections 45 to 54 of LGOIMA for such meetings:
   i) to publicly notify the meetings;
   ii) to publicly provide agendas and reports at least two working days in advance;
   iii) to provide for public and / or media access; and
   iv) to provide publicly available minutes after the meeting.

30. Standing Order 5.1.4 states that the proceedings of a workshop, briefing or working party must record:
   a) the names of members attending
   b) a summary of the nature of the information received.

The notes and presentations from the workshops (except confidential workshops) are published in the relevant governing body or committee agenda the following month.

31. Workshop days will be scheduled every Wednesday, starting in January 2020. The day will be structured into four 90-minute sessions and will be more structured with heightened expectations around purpose and outcomes, in order to improve the efficiency of the sessions.
32. At the Governing Body meeting on 12 November 2019 there was discussion amongst members regarding workshops being open to the public.

33. Some local boards in the past have held their workshops as open meetings, however there is little evidence about the value of this practice and whether it has resulted in more people attending meetings.

34. One advantage of opening workshops to the public is that it would reflect the council’s commitment to open and transparent decision-making, and may help improve trust. It may also enable more participation in early stages of decision-making.

35. However, the key disadvantages and limitations of opening workshops to the public are listed below:

- Workshops enable staff to explore options with the mayor and councilors before ideas are fully developed, and to receive feedback and guidance on policy development or project design. They need to be a safe place for staff to provide free and frank advice and for elected members to test ideas and have open discussions. Workshops work best when they are informal.

- Workshops are not places for formal debate or to challenge policy decisions that have not yet been made, and this needs to be well-understood by the public.

- Many workshops present confidential information and could not be open to the public.

36. There is little information to suggest that the current practice of workshops being closed to the public is causing any concern and staff recommend the status quo. However, the Governing Body could decide to further discuss options.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

37. This decision for the Governing Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to the local body election 2022 is procedural in nature and any climate impacts will be negligible. The decision is unlikely to result in any identifiable changes to greenhouse gas emissions. The effects of climate change will not impact the decision’s implementation.

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

**Council group impacts and views**

38. In the last term the Governing Body and each CCO held a series of workshops called “Scanning the Horizon”. It is anticipated that these meetings will continue. The Council’s Controlled Organisations Oversight Committee will also hear from CCOs on a formal basis throughout the year.

39. The dates of each CCO board meeting have been included in the schedule as CCO liaison councillors will attend them.

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

**Local impacts and local board views**

40. Consultation with Local Board Services has taken place and dates for quarterly joint meetings between the Governing Body and the Local Board chairs have been agreed.

41. The Joint Governance Working Party will be made up of six governing body members and six local board members and will continue to consider matters of both regional and local interest. Meeting dates will be set once the membership has been confirmed.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

42. Consultation with the Independent Māori Statutory Board has taken place and dates for quarterly joint meetings with the Governing Body have been agreed.
43. Many of the meetings listed in the schedule will be of relevance to Māori, are co-governance bodies or otherwise involve Māori representatives. Examples include the Independent Māori Statutory Board, the Hauraki Gulf Forum and the Tūpuna Maunga o Tāmaki Makaurau Authority.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

44. There is a budget to conduct political meetings. Any additional meetings will require an adjustment of that budget.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

45. Past experience has shown that amendments to the meeting schedule are inevitable. The Governing Body is therefore asked to authorise the General Manager Democracy Services to amend the schedule, in consultation with the chair or any affected committee, and subject to the Mayor’s or Deputy Mayor’s approval if any formal meeting or workshop has to be held on a Monday or Friday.

46. Some meetings in the schedule are not council committee meetings, but are included because they involve councillors or other committee members.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

47. It is important to get certainty around future meetings so that these can be communicated to the organisation and the public.

48. A three-year schedule means that the Mayor and councillors have some certainty around meeting dates and have a long-term view of the meeting calendar.

49. The Mayor has signalled that the committee structure will be reviewed in 12 months. This may mean some adjustments will need to be made to the meeting schedule. Any changes required will be made according to the principles outlined in paragraph 23 of this report.

50. If major changes are necessary, a new meeting schedule will be submitted to the Governing Body for approval.

**Ngā tāpirihanga**

**Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
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<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Draft Meeting Schedule - November 2019 to election October 2022</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina**

**Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarandra O'Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Marguerite Delbet - General Manager Democracy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Wilson - Governance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Governing Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022

#### JANUARY 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>2 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>8 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>9 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>10 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>14 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>16 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>17 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>21 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>22 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>23 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AUCKLAND ANNIVERSARY</td>
<td>28 ATRED Board Meeting</td>
<td>29 Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ATRED Board Meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- NEW YEARS DAY HOLIDAY: events scheduled on New Year's Day are marked with a holiday note.
- NO MEETINGS: days with no scheduled meetings.

**Event Notes:**
- AUCKLAND ANNIVERSARY: reference to a significant event in Auckland's history.
- ATRED Board Meeting: scheduled meeting of the ATRED committee.
- Watercare Board Meeting: scheduled meeting of the Watercare committee.
- RFA Board Meeting: scheduled meeting of the RFA committee.
## Attachment A

### Governing Body, Committees, Panels

#### FEBRUARY 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: Annual Budget Consultation Document and Supporting Information (All Day)</td>
<td>WAITANGI DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Extraordinary Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Extraordinary Finance &amp; Performance Followed by Extraordinary Governing Body Annual Budget: Adopt Consultation Document and Supporting Information</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td>12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00pm</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Forum</td>
<td>Pasuku Board Meeting</td>
<td>Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Value for Money (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCŌ Oversight Regulatory</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>ATEKO Board Meeting</td>
<td>RPA Board Meeting</td>
<td>9.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Civic Defence &amp; Emergency Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021-2031 (2pm)</td>
<td>Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland Domain</td>
<td>1.00pm Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00pm Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: Annual Budget Regional Stakeholders HYS (2hrs)</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Panuku Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>GB/MSB Joint Mtg 2.00pm</td>
<td>AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00pm</td>
<td>CCO Oversight</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland City Centre Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATEG Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>RFA Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland City Centre Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022 is provided in this attachment.
# Attachment A

## Governing Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022

### APRIL 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00am Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Potential Annual Budget Hearings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement Committee meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>EASTER MONDAY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Regulatory Committee meeting</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.00am ATV Board Meeting Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ANZAC DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>AT Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; Performance Workshop; Annual Budget Discussions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Civil Defence &amp; Emergency</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>(All Day)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Committee meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environment &amp; Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Procurement</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>(All Day)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Committee meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; Performance Workshop; Annual Budget, Mayoral Proposal and other decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regulatory</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>(All Day)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>RFA Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hauraki Gulf Forum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>COO Oversight</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extraordinary Finance &amp; Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Audit and Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Followed by</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.00 pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extraordinary Governing Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>Auckland City Centre Advisory Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual Budget, Mayoral Proposal and Decision-making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.00 pm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Watercare Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Watercare Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.00 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Governing Body</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>(All Day)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.30 am</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Government New Zealand Zone 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2020</td>
<td>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>QUEENS BIRTHDAY</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00am Audit &amp; Risk (LTP Amendment)</td>
<td>10.00am Workshop Day</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00am AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>11.00am Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>GB/MSB Joint Mtg</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB &amp; LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Workshop: Adoption of Annual Budget (All Day)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.00am CCO Oversight</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Workshop: Adoption of Annual Budget (All Day)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Including Adoption of Annual Budget (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RFA Board Meeting</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.00pm Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ATEED Board Meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Including Adoption of Annual Budget (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.00pm Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Including Adoption of Annual Budget (All Day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### JULY 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 School Holidays</td>
<td>7 RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>8 RECESS WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 School Holidays</td>
<td>14 RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>16 RECESS WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>22 Workshop Day</td>
<td>23 10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 ATEED Board Meeting</td>
<td>29 Workshop Day</td>
<td>30 Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goveme Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022**

*Governing Body* 26 November 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST 2020</th>
<th>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEPTEMBER 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Governing Body: 10-year Budget 2021/20231 (Half Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00pm Workshop Afternoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CCO Oversight</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Full Council</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ANCC Board Meeting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Governing Body Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/20231 (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Holidays**

22

25

28

29

30

30

Auckland City Centre Advisory Board
**OCTOBER 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>12.30pm Rural Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00am (All Day)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>Regulatory Workshop</td>
<td>6-year Budget 2024/2031</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>Pasaka Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Value for Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour Day Holiday</td>
<td>ATEED Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 6-year Budget 2024/2031</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watercare Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am CGO Oversight</td>
<td>10.00am (All Day)</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td>Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00pm Auckland City Centre Advisory Board Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00am Appointments &amp; Performance Review 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement 2.00pm Civic Defence &amp; Emergency</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Environment &amp; Climate Change (All Day)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory 2.00pm Auckland Domain</td>
<td>Parnell Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance (All Day)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ATEED Board Meeting Watercare Board Meeting 10.00am CCC Oversight 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>RFA Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.00pm Hauraki Gulf Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment A**  
**Item 13**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop; 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Agree Consultation Items (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Planning</td>
<td>12.30pm Rural Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00am GB/IMSB Joint Mtg 2.00pm GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am Audit and Risk 2.00pm CCO Oversight</td>
<td>10.00am Extraordinary Finance &amp; Performance Followed by Extraordinary Governing Body 10-year Budget 2021/2031: Agree Consultation Items</td>
<td>10.00am Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.00am Value for Money (All Day)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Panmure Board Meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BOXING DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YEARS DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AUCKLAND ANNIVERSARY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WAITANGI DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extraordinary Governing Body</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Full Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MARCH 2021

**GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00am Auckland Domain Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Workshop 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Mana Whenua Kaiiwi Forum and Mana Whenua HYS (Half Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>2.00pm Workshop Afternoon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Regional Stakeholder Sessions (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00am GB/IMS Joint Mtg</td>
<td>10.00am GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>10.00am Value for Money (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory Committee meeting</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.00am Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOVERNMENT BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS

**APRIL 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
<td>2 GOOD FRIDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 EASTER MONDAY</td>
<td>6 RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>7 RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Regional Feedback (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Environment &amp; Climate Change (All Day)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Budget Discussions (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance (All Day)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 School Holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 School Holidays</td>
<td>ANZAC DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 10.00am</td>
<td>CCO Oversight</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance Workshop: 10-year Budget 2021/2031 Budget Discussions (All Day)</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Committee/Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Governance, for the Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-Year Budget Workshops, 2021-2031 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (Half Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00PM</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crisis, Defence &amp; Emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MAY 2021</td>
<td>5:00PM</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2031 Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2031 Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MAY 2021</td>
<td>5:00PM</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2031 Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Jobs, Community &amp; Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2031 Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 MAY 2021</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Governance, 10-Year Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2031 Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 10.00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>2 10.00am</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>3 Workshop Day</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 QUEENS BIRTHDAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 10.00am</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>9 10.00am</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland Domain</td>
<td>9 Workshop Day</td>
<td>Change (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 10.00am</td>
<td>Regulatory Domain</td>
<td>14 10.00am</td>
<td>Governing Body Workshop:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>15 10-year Budget 2021/2031</td>
<td>Adoption of final 10-year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 10.00am</td>
<td>GB/MGB Joint Mtg</td>
<td>22 10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 2.00pm</td>
<td>GB/ILB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>22 Extraordinary Committee of the Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Followed by Extraordinary Governing Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 10-year Budget 2021/2031</td>
<td>Mayoral Proposal and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 10.00am</td>
<td>CGO Oversight</td>
<td>23 10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>23 Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</td>
<td>JULY 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Audit and Risk Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00pm Audit and Risk</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00am Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Audit and Risk</td>
<td>2.00pm Auckland Domain</td>
<td>10.00pm</td>
<td>10.00am Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.00pm Audit and Risk</td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00am Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Audit and Risk</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00am Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.00am GB/LSB Joint Mtg</td>
<td>10.00am CCO Oversight</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm GB/LSB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Item 13

#### Governing Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>2.00pm Community meeting</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Environment &amp; Climate Change (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00am Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.00am CCO Oversight</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment A

### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOVEMBER 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governing Body Meeting Schedule for January 2020 to Election 2022
## Governing Body, Committees, Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB/IMSB Joint Mtg</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>Auckland Domain</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>CCO Oversight</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTMAS DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>BOXING DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NEW YEARS DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>4 NEW YEARS DAY HOLIDAY</td>
<td>5 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>6 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>7 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>11 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>12 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>13 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>14 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>18 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>19 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>20 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>21 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>25 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>26 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>27 NO MEETINGS</td>
<td>28 NO MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 AUCKLAND ANNIVERSARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00pm Audit and Risk Committee meeting</td>
<td>21:00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>7:00am Waiting Day Holiday</td>
<td>10:00am Audit and Risk Committee meeting</td>
<td>10:00am Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>10:00am Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
<td>14:00pm Waitemata and District Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOVERNMENT COUNCIL, COMMITTEES, PANELS**

**February 2022**

**Item 13**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>CBO/JHB Joint Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>CBO/JHB Joint Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>Value for Money (All Day)</td>
<td>GOOD FRIDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTER MONDAY</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>ANZAC DAY</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td>Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APRIL 2022**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY 2022</th>
<th>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3 | 2.00pm | Appointments & Performance Review | | |
| 10 | 2.00pm | Regulatory | 12 | Environment & Climate Change (All Day) |
| 17 | 2.00pm | Auckland Domain | 19 | Finance & Performance (All Day) |
| 24 | 2.00pm | Committee meeting | 25 | Governing Body Full Council (All Day) |
| 31 | 2.00pm | Committee meeting | | |
## JUNE 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 QUEENS BIRTHDAY</td>
<td>7 10.00am Strategic Procurement 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>8 Workshop Day</td>
<td>9 10.00am Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14 10.00am Regulatory 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>15 Workshop Day</td>
<td>16 10.00am Value for Money (All Day)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 10.00am GB/MSB Joint Mtg 2.00pm GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>21 10.00am CCO Oversight 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>22 Workshop Day</td>
<td>23 10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28 10.00am Committee meeting 2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>29 Workshop Day</td>
<td>30 10.00am Planning (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Regulatory Strategic Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Environment &amp; Climate Change (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>RECESS WEEK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Finance &amp; Performance (All Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AUGUST 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>CCO Oversight</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Planning (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Parks, Arts, Community &amp; Events (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Civic Defence &amp; Emergency</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Appointments &amp; Performance Review</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Auckland Domain</td>
<td>Value for Money (All Day)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Audit and Risk</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Council (All Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Committee meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SEPTEMBER 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00am Strategic Procurement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm Audit and Risk</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Environment &amp; Climate Change</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.00am GB/MSB Joint Mtg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Workshop Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm GB/LB Chairs Mtg</td>
<td>2.00pm Committee meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Performance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00am Governing Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(All Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCTOBER 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31 LABOUR DAY HOLIDAY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOVEMBER 2022</th>
<th>GOVERNING BODY, COMMITTEES, PANELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DECEMBER 2022**

- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33

**NO MEETINGS**

**CHRISTMAS DAY HOLIDAY**

**BOXING DAY**
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memoranda or briefing papers that may have been held or been distributed to Governing Body members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to Governing Body members via memoranda/briefings or other means, where no decisions are required.

3. The following memos were circulated to members of the Governing Body:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/11/19</td>
<td>Ports of Auckland location study and statement of corporate intent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop/Briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/11/19</td>
<td>Remuneration and Expenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. These documents can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link:
http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
- at the top left of the page, select meeting/Te hui “Governing Body” from the drop-down tab and click “View”;
- under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.

6. Note that, unlike an agenda report, **staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary.** Governing Body members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ports of Auckland location study and statement of corporate intent <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Remuneration and Expenses Workshop <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sarndra O’Toole - Team Leader Governance Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Stephen Town - Chief Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>