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File No.: CP2020/08974

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek feedback on the proposed regional topics in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

3. The Annual Budget 2020/2021 was first consulted on in February/March 2020 (Consultation part 1). Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted significant pressure on the council’s financial position. This will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. The council has considered what those impacts are likely to be and have asked Aucklanders for their views on aspects of the proposed budget, now referred to as Emergency Budget 2020/2021, through a second round of consultation (Consultation part 2).

4. During the second round of consultation, Aucklanders were asked for their views on three key proposals:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
   - suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

5. The council received feedback through telephone interviews, written forms, including online and hard copy forms, emails and letters.

6. This report summarises the public feedback received through Consultation part 2 on the proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

7. Local board views on these regional matters will be considered by the Governing Body (or relevant committee) before making final decisions on the Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

8. Out of the 34,915 submissions received on the regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021, 550 submissions were from people living in the Puketāpapa local board area.

9. 538 local submitters provided their view on the proposal to increase general rates for 2020/2021. Of these, 42 per cent supported a 3.5 percent increase, 31 per cent supported a 2.5 per cent increase and 22 per cent supported a 0 per cent increase or a rates decrease.

10. 410 local submitters provided their view on the proposal to introduce a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme. Of these, 68 per cent supported the proposal, 22 per cent did not support the proposal and 10 per cent did not know.

11. 406 local submitters provided their view on suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers. Of these, 74 per cent supported the proposal, 13 per cent did not support the proposal and 12 per cent did not know.

12. Comments from local submissions were further analysed, identifying commonly mentioned sub-topics and key areas for consideration in the allocation of the emergency budget.
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) receive consultation feedback on regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Puketāpapa local board area.

b) provide feedback on the proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

Horopaki
Context
13. Auckland Council publicly consulted from 21 February to 22 March 2020 to seek community views on the proposed Annual Budget 2020/2021 (Consultation part 1).

14. Since this consultation was undertaken, the COVID-19 pandemic has exerted considerable pressure on the council's financial position, which will have flow on effects for the proposed budget for the 2020/2021 financial year. Given the new financial realities facing Auckland, work has been undertaken to adjust the proposed budget, now referred to as Emergency Budget 2020/2021.

15. The council has undertaken further public consultation with Aucklanders for their views on Auckland Council’s proposed ‘Emergency Budget’ in response to the financial impacts of COVID-19 (Consultation part 2) which included considering whether to adopt a 2.5 per cent rather than 3.5 per cent general rates increase for the 2020/2021 financial year, among a suite of other measures aimed at offering support to all ratepayers, including businesses, facing hardship. This was carried out from 29 May to 19 June 2020.

16. The Emergency Budget consultation asked Aucklanders for their view on three main proposals:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
   - suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

17. This report includes analysis of the consultation feedback on the regional proposals in the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 from people or organisations based in the Puketāpapa local board area.

Local board input on regional plans
18. Local boards have a statutory responsibility for identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in their local board area in relation to the context of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of Auckland Council. This report provides an opportunity for the local board to provide input on the proposed Emergency Budget.

19. Local Board Plans reflect community priorities and preferences and are key documents that guide both the development of local board agreements, which are adopted every year as part of the Annual Budget, and input into regional plans.

Types of feedback
20. Overall Auckland Council received feedback from 34,915 submitters in the consultation period. This feedback was received through:
   - Written feedback – hard copy and online forms, emails and letters
   - Over the phone
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

21. The proposed Emergency Budget 2020/2021 sets out priorities and how they will be paid for. The regional consultation on the proposed Emergency Budget focused on changes to rates and fees; the key proposals were:
   - general rates increase for 2020/2021 of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent
   - rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19
   - suspending the targeted rate by accommodation providers.

22. The submissions received from the Puketāpapa Local Board area on these key issues is summarised below, along with an overview of any other areas of feedback on regional proposals with a local impact.

23. Sometimes the council receives submissions that have come via a platform created by an external organisation – these are referred to by the council as pro forma submissions. The council has received an unusually large number of pro forma submissions in this consultation process – a total of 9793. These have primarily come from two organisations – the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance (9002) and Generation Zero (371).

24. When people submit via the council’s official consultation platform (either the hardcopy feedback form or the digital form), they are directed to the council’s consultation document and supporting information which are the statutory basis for the consultation process. People who submit via pro forma submissions often will not have had this same information presented to them when they submit, although each pro forma submission is different in its approach.

25. For example, the submission form set up by the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance did not refer to the council’s consultation material and did not ask the same questions that were included on the council’s feedback form. Generation Zero’s submission form also did not ask the same questions as the council’s feedback form. However, Generation Zero did include links to the council’s consultation material in the information supporting their submission form.

26. As with all feedback, pro forma submissions must be given due consideration with an open mind, and it is up to elected members to determine the weight that is given to this feedback.

General rates increase for 2020/2021

27. Aucklanders were asked about a proposed general rates increase of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent for 2020/2021.

Question 1: We are proposing an average general rates increase of either 2.5 per cent or 3.5 per cent for 2020/2021. We looked at, but could not responsibly propose rates increases below 2.5 per cent because of the severe impacts that would have on council services, new infrastructure, our debt levels and employment and business activity in Auckland.

The scale of the financial challenge that we face for next year with a revenue loss of over half a billion dollars due to COVID-19 means that spending on some council services will need to be reduced and many capital projects will be delayed even with the 3.5 per cent increase we had previously planned.

With a lower rate increase of 2.5 per cent, we would need to further reduce spending on council services and further delay investment in transport, parks and community and town centre projects.
28. There were 538 responses to this question from the Puketāpapa Local Board area. On the council’s official consultation material, submitters could respond to Question 1 with a response of “2.5 per cent average general rates increase”, “3.5 per cent average general rates increase” or “Don’t know”. To provide a fuller picture of submitters preferences, “Don’t know” or blank responses were reclassified based on comments into a full range of responses seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Local support for various general rates increase levels.

29. A plurality of submitters supported a 3.5 per cent rates increase. Many submitters expressed a willingness to pay a minor increase per household in order to maintain a higher level of service levels for their own benefit and the benefit of the community. Some were concerned about the long-term impacts of major deferrals and rising debt levels, particularly with Auckland’s growing population.

30. Among the 31 per cent of local submitters who supported the 2.5 per cent rates increase, many referred to current financial hardships due to the impacts of COVID-19. They expressed a need for providing homeowners and businesses relief, and some willingness to see council’s activities reduced to “core services” in the short-term to meet the savings requirements. Several submitters expressed a call for council to economise alongside the rest of the community, while some indicated their choice for a 2.5 per cent increase reflected an understanding that an increase was necessary for the council to continue basic services.

31. The 18 per cent of local submitters who supported a 0 per cent rates increase were made up of 68 submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma and 27 other submitters. These other submitters either left this question blank or answered, “Don’t know”, and provided comments indicating a preference for a 0 per cent increase. They echoed much of the sentiment of those supporting a 2.5 per cent rates increase, with additional comments about low household incomes, job losses and council’s underperformance in the past. 20 of the 22 submissions for a rates decrease were also received through the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma.

32. Further analysis of submitters views on how the emergency budget should be allocated can be found in paragraphs 41 to 61.
Rates postponement for ratepayers impacted by COVID-19

33. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to introduce a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme.

Question 2: We are proposing a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme. This will allow ratepayers who are struggling financially as a result of COVID-19 to defer up to $20,000 of their rates for the 2020/2021 year. At the end of the postponement period ratepayers would have to 30 June 2022 to pay off the balance (including interest and administration fees). What do you think of our proposal?

34. There were 410 responses to this question from the Puketapapa Local Board area. Figure 2 gives an overview these.

Figure 2: Local support for a COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme.

35. Local submissions reflected generally positive sentiment toward supporting people through hardship brought about by COVID-19. Many respondents expressed support for a rates postponement to provide relief for individuals, while they return to stable employment, and businesses, to retain employees in the short-term. Several submitters also acknowledged that the postponement scheme would allow for a higher rating increase while reducing strain for those who cannot afford the increase.

36. Conversely, there was significant concern (from both those who support and those who do not support the proposal) that the interest and administration fees could lead to longer-term debt challenges for people who choose to postpone payment. Many submitters suggested that the COVID-19 Rates Postponement Scheme should be interest- and fee-free. Others supported the interest and fees as a cost neutral approach and emphasised the need for ongoing cost recovery, with some suggesting financial relief should be received through support from other agencies rather than the council.

Suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers

37. Aucklanders were asked about a proposal to suspend the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers.

Question 3: Suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers. Restrictions on travel and mass gatherings due to COVID-19 have resulted in us reducing our spending on visitor attraction and major events. We are proposing to suspend the Accommodation Provider Targeted Rate (APTR) which helps fund these activities until 31 March 2021. The APTR will only be charged for the last three months of the next financial year (2020/2021) as we increase our spending in this area. This proposal will assist the accommodation sector who are struggling financially.

Local board input into the Emergency Budget 2020/2021
38. There were 406 responses to this question from the Puketāpapa Local Board area. Figure 3 gives an overview these.

**Figure 3: Local support for suspending the targeted rate paid by accommodation providers**

- 74% support the proposal
- 13% don’t support the proposal
- 12% I don’t know
- 1% I don’t know

39. Most submitters supported the proposed targeted rate suspension. They expressed the need to support the accommodation industry in this time of financial pressure so that it can recover well when overseas tourism returns and maintain Auckland’s image as a destination of choice. They also suggested that there would be less or no need to spend the money on its targeted purpose.

40. The submitters who did not support the proposal suggested the targeted rate should continue as local tourism continues. They also suggested that major events should continue as an opportunity to stimulate the economy and support the city to recover.

**Other feedback**

**Feedback on consultation part one topics**

41. Aucklanders were asked if they had any feedback on any other issues including the in principle decisions made from the first round of consultation.

42. The proposals that we previously consulted on, and that have been agreed in principle, subject to consideration of any further feedback received in the Emergency Budget consultation are:

- Increase to the waste management base service targeted rate
- Increase to the waste management standard refuse rate in former Auckland City and Manukau City areas
- Discontinuation of the Waitākere rural sewerage service and targeted rate for ratepayers in the Upper Harbour Local Board area effective from 1 July 2021
- Introduction of a new targeted rate for Central Park Henderson Business Improvement District.

43. No local feedback was received in direct relation to these topics.

**Sub-topic analysis**

44. Several commonly mentioned sub-topics were identified across the region from all submitter comments. The table below reflects regional and local mentions of each sub-topic and their sentiments.
### Table 1: Regional and local mentions and sentiment toward commonly mentioned sub-topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All boards &amp; Submissions</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive sentiment</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral sentiment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative sentiment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentions</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentions per 1000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional analysis

45. Local submissions were further analysed to identify key themes and areas for consideration in the allocation of the emergency budget.

**Transport**

46. Local submitters expressed general support for prioritising safe, affordable, healthy, and sustainable local transport options. This included strong support for maintaining public transport services at existing fares and concessions. Submitters expressed concerns around the deferral of road safety, walking, cycling, and initiatives, citing carbon reduction and continued momentum as rationale to retain these projects. There were also some general concerns regarding too much reduction or deferral of capital spend on transport.

47. Mixed sentiment was expressed towards footpath maintenance and rail projects (with support for the City Rail Link from the GenZero pro forma), while submitters were generally supportive of deferring major roadworks. As noted in Table 2, the Sky Path project attracted negative sentiment despite strong support for cycleways overall.

**Water**

48. Local submitters would like to see alternative water sources and additional storage options explored, to address Auckland’s current water crisis. Some submitters expressed concern regarding the current management of water services.
49. Support was expressed for continuing to work on storm water and water supply infrastructure, both to keep the economy moving and to manage significant growth in the region.

Libraries and community facilities

50. There was strong support for keeping libraries and other community facilities open for children and older residents, and as a community hub. Some support was expressed for reducing opening hours and programming, with careful consideration of network impacts and maintaining service offerings like devices for children who may not have them at home.

51. Submitters suggested that keeping these services open would offer the public free and accessible activities in difficult financial times. Some also acknowledged council’s role in recovery from COVID-19 and suggested that these facilities have a significant part to play in this process.

Arts, culture and events

52. Community feedback on arts and events were particularly polarised. There was strong support for events, arts and culture as ways to promote recovery and community cohesion, though several acknowledged the reality that some reductions will need to be made. A further minority considered arts and events as “nice to haves” and identified them as a natural avenue to find savings.

53. There was support for continuing to invest in community services and organisations. Several submitters mentioned a desire to see more community-led development.

Parks, sport and recreation

54. There was general support for keeping parks and reserves open and maintained as affordable and local options for exercise and outdoor activity. Minor reductions in lawn maintenance were supported by some submitters, while there was strong support for keeping public toilets open and rubbish bins accessible to keep the community clean.

Environmental Services

55. Responding to climate change continues to be a priority for many community members. Several submitters expressed concern that the budget proposal fails to maintain efforts to reduce Auckland’s carbon footprint.

56. There was also concern that any reduction in environmental and pest control projects could mean losing ground on progress made to date. Some submitters suggested that these projects could be continued through temporary employment or volunteer roles to serve the economy alongside the environment.

Other

57. **Waste**: There was some desire for home compost services to be made across Auckland and for the inorganic waste collection to continue.

58. **Animal Shelters**: Several local submitters (both pro forma and otherwise) strongly oppose the planned reduction in the number of animal shelters across the region.

59. **Equity**: There was significant support for ensuring low-income households have access to services and contractors and staff receive the living wage. Many submitters expressed their willingness to pay increased rates to allow for this.

60. **Placemaking**: Some submitters highlighted the value of local town centres and the need for social infrastructure to support rapid growth.

61. **Tupuna Maunga**: Several submitters expressed concern about the removal of mature trees on maunga.

62. **Economic development**: Many submitters expressed their concern for local businesses and their desire for council to support recovery through postponement of rates and providing relief where possible. Others expressed a need for local initiatives to support collaboration...
among small and local business owners. There was also support for maintain investments in capital projects to keep people employed.

Information on submitters

63. The tables and graphs below indicate what demographic categories people identified with and the channels through which their submissions were received. The demographic information only relates to those submitters who provided these details.

**Table 2: Age and gender of local submitters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Gender Diverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4: Age and gender of local submitters**

**Table 3: Ethnicity of local submitters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Middle Eastern/Latin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total people providing ethnicity</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Ethnicity of local submitters

Table 4: Type of local submitters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitters</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Feedback channels of local submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offline</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenZero</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pro forma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partners</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tauākī whakaaweawe āhuarangi**

**Climate impact statement**

64. The decisions recommended in this report are procedural in nature.

65. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget may have climate impacts. The climate impacts of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

66. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget will be specifically designed to mitigate climate impact, build resilience to climate impacts, and restore the natural environment.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views
67. The Emergency Budget is an Auckland Council Group document and will include budgets at a consolidated group level. Updates to budgets to reflect decisions and new information may include items from across the group.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views
68. Local board decisions and feedback are being sought in this report. Local boards have a statutory role in providing local board feedback on regional plans.
69. Local boards play an important role in the development of the Emergency Budget. Local board nominees have also attended Finance and Performance Committee workshops on the Emergency Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement
70. Many local board decisions are of importance to and impact on Māori. Local board agreements and the Emergency Budget are important tools that enable and can demonstrate council’s responsiveness to Māori.
71. Local board plans, which were developed in 2017 through engagement with the community including Māori, form the basis of local priorities. There is a need to continue to build relationships between local boards and iwi, and the wider Māori community.
72. The analysis included submissions made by mana whenua and the wider Māori community who have interests in the rohe / local board area.
73. Ongoing conversations between local boards and Māori will assist to understand each other’s priorities and issues. This in turn can influence and encourage Māori participation in council’s decision-making processes.
74. Some of the proposed projects in the Emergency Budget may have impacts on Māori. The impacts on Māori of any projects Auckland Council chooses to progress with as a result of this, will be assessed as part of the relevant reporting requirements.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
75. Local board input will be considered by the Governing Body for the Emergency Budget 2020/2021 decision-making.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
76. Local boards are required to make recommendations on these local financial matters for the Emergency Budget by 10 July 2020, to enable the Governing Body to make decisions on them when considering the Emergency Budget in 16 July.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
77. Recommendations and feedback from local boards will be provided to the relevant governing body committees for consideration during decision making at the Governing Body meeting on 16 July.
Attachment A

Item 4

78. Local boards will approve their local board agreements between 20 to 24 July and corresponding work programmes in August.
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