

Resolutions of local boards on the draft submission to the Remuneration Authority's proposal for a childcare allowance

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Albert-Eden Local Board | That the Albert-Eden Local Board: a) endorse and support the draft Auckland Council submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Devonport-Takapuna Local Board | That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board: a) endorses the draft Auckland Council submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. b) applauds the Young Elected Members Network for their leadership in developing this policy in supporting parents within Local Government New Zealand. |
| Franklin Local Board | That the Franklin Local Board a) endorse Auckland Council's draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances for elected members of local government. |
| Great Barrier Local Board | That the Aotea Great Barrier Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances noting the need to broaden the scope for Great Barrier Island as there is no existing registered child care provider nor child care facilities on the island. |
| Henderson-Massey Local Board | That the Henderson-Massey Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Hibiscus and Bays Local Board | That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Howick Local Board | That the Howick Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Kaipātiki Local Board | That the Kaipātiki Local Board: a) endorse the draft Auckland Council submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Manurewa Local Board | That the Manurewa Local Board: a) receive the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board | That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board | That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Ōrākei Local Board | That the Ōrākei Local Board note the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board | That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Papakura Local Board | That the Papakura Local Board: a) receive the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances. |
| Puketāpapa Local Board | That the Puketāpapa Local Board: a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on allowances. b) request the Remuneration Authority to develop a policy on paid parental leave for elected members c) seek a legislative change to the Citizens Regulations Act 2002 to also enable deputy chairs to take the oath of allegiance/affirmation at Citizenship Ceremonies. |
| Rodney Local Board | That the Rodney Local Board: a) do not endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances, and provide the following feedback to the Remuneration Authority: i) The elected members fee is an honorarium, not a salary, and elected members are expected to meet their own costs while serving on a local board ii) The elected member honorarium does not include provision for any leave entitlements or other benefits, save for mileage travel expenses which are universally claimable in the course of business, so singling out childcare allowances is arbitrary and not in keeping with an honorarium iii) Standing for local government is a community service, not a career path, and all elected members incur hardship of one sort or another; a better focus would be amending the current policies which negatively impact elected members in rural areas who travel vast distances but have a capped sum on the amount of mileage that can be claimed annually iv) if the Remuneration Authority considers that additional benefits should be payable to elected members to encourage more people to stand for election they would be better off increasing the honorarium for all, not allowances for some v) There are other methods available to elected members who wish to recover childcare costs, including tax deductions or other mechanisms through IRD which will not unfairly burden the Auckland ratepayer like the Remuneration Authority proposal will. |

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Upper Harbour Local Board | <p>That the Upper Harbour Local Board:</p> <p>a) receive the draft Auckland Council submission and report on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances.</p> |
| Waiheke Local Board | <p>That the Waiheke Local Board:</p> <p>a) supports the proposed policy on childcare allowances and provides the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provision of the allowance may encourage greater diversity in those standing for election in Auckland. Currently the remuneration provided is not adequate to cover childcare costs for council work time required. • the policy cap of \$6,000 would be a cost to Auckland Council of \$60,000, based on approximately 6 per cent of elected members being 40 years of age or below. However, it is noted that currently young candidates are predominantly under 25 and tend not to have children, and there are fewer aged between 25-50, possibly due to the need for childcare. • the wording should indicate more clearly that the payment is for childcare costs that are necessary for the member to undertake council duties • the following conditions are commented on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the subsidy should pay a living wage if that that is what is being paid but should not be greater than the actual expense. (ii) childcare should be based on the hours required per day for council business, rather than an 8-hour limit in any 24-hour period. Business meetings together with workshops on the same day can be more than 8 hours per day. • the following conditions are supported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (iii) the child is under 14 years • the purpose should more clearly reflect that the expense is a necessary expense for the member to attend council duties • the subsidy should be linked to the work expectation of the role. If the expectation of a board member is 20-25 hours/week, that is what should be subsidised. • It is easier to subsidise a fixed amount of time in a childcare facility, than to pay someone on an hourly rate for childcare. Paying only for meeting hours is probably counter-productive. |
| Waitakere Ranges Local Board | <p>That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:</p> <p>a) delegate to Deputy Chairperson S Toms and member S Coney to prepare the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances.</p> |
| Waitematā Local Board | <p>That the Waitematā Local Board:</p> <p>a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances subject to an amendment that the local board supports reimbursement of the actual child care payment up to a maximum of the hourly living wage with the \$6,000 annual limit increased proportionately.</p> |
| Whau Local Board | <p>That the Whau Local Board:</p> <p>a) endorse the draft submission on the Remuneration Authority's proposed policy on childcare allowances.</p> |