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## COVID-19 Controller Update

**Emergency Committee | Thursday 27 August 2020**

### Attachment A

#### Item 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>[UN-CLASSIFIED]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEM Activation Status</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration Status</td>
<td>National Transition Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 Alert Status</td>
<td>Level 3: Restrict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Context

- The Auckland region moved to Alert Level 3 at 1200hrs 12/08/2020 following four confirmed cases of COVID-19 in South Auckland from an unknown source on 11/08/2020 at 2115hrs. The rest of the country was moved to Alert Level 2. At 1500hrs on 24/08/2020 Prime Minister Ardern announced that Auckland would stay at Alert Level 3 until 23:59hrs 30/08/2020, then move to Level 2. The rest of the Country will remain in Level 2 until a national review 06/09/2020.
- AEM was activated to Red Status at 0900hrs 12/08/2020, with all function desks operating 7 days a week.

### Operations

- Operating under a directive from the National Emergency Management Agency, AEM was tasked with coordinating processes and structures with partner agencies (including Police, the Ministry of Health, MSD and our region’s Lifelines) to ensure an effective and coordinated Auckland response to the resurgence of COVID-19.
- It is important all parts of New Zealand are well prepared to respond to a resurgence of COVID-19 and a local escalation in Alert Levels. Regional leadership groups have been asked to extend their governance and oversight from social and/or economic recovery to also include ‘readiness for response’ planning.
- AEM has coordinated through council entities the provision of venues and sites for new Pop-Up Community Testing Centres in areas with/or potential for community spread.
- Through its Public Information Management Function, AEM has shared key information through its channels. A particular focus has been the need to stay at home and stay local at weekends.
- Visual Mobile Signs are being deployed again this coming weekend at strategic locations (Waimauku, Clevedon, Titirangi, Clevedon) with messaging of, ‘Far from home? Stop the spread; Stay home, stay local.’
- The move to Alert Level 2 in Auckland next week will mean a change in AEM’s operational delivery. It will continue to work in partnership with its key agency partners and to share information but its response status will be downgraded in line with the shift in alert levels.
- The decision on any additional restrictions (e.g. gatherings) under Alert Level 2 will be announced by the Government later in the week.
Welfare

- In line with the NEMA directive, AEM’s role in the welfare space was one of coordination and facilitation, with the Ministry for Social Development leading the response for all food and social support. This included funding for community food banks.
- With new guidance about face coverings issued during the resurgence, AEM connected health agencies with community groups to distribute thousands of face masks across the Auckland region. This included marae and churches, Belong Aotearoa and the Auckland Indian Association.
- A total of 766,200 masks from the Ministry of Health supply were dispatched to community groups identified by the AEM Welfare and Logistics functions. Together, with the Ministry of Social Development, a total of 3 million masks have been distributed to community groups in Auckland.
- AEM worked with the Aotea / Great Barrier Island community to ensure the ongoing supply of air cargo and fast-moving consumer goods. It has also helped to connect Red Cross with community organisations on Waiheke to support foreign nationals living there.
- Support for Pasifika communities includes working with councillors Filipaina, Collins and Bartley to make short videos with important health and wellbeing messages to share on community social media networks and reaching out to a number of Pasifika and ethnic community groups.

Iwi Liaison

A tiered approach for partnering with iwi has been established (26/08/2020). This includes:

- Te Pou Manaaki which sits within the welfare function to understand and contribute-coordinate the welfare needs of Māori (mana whenua-mataawaka)
- Iwi Liaison (Ngā Mātārae) which sits on the IMT and provides advice to the Controller
- Regional Governance which includes Māori representation (Mana Whenua Forum Co Chairs).

Regional Boundaries

- Checkpoints were established and managed by Police at 13 locations on our southern and northern boundaries. This has been one of the more challenging aspects of managing a regional Alert Level 3 lockdown and we continue to work with government agencies, our neighbouring civil defence groups, Police and our local representatives to address issues as they arise.
- As of 4pm on Tuesday, Police had processed 206,602 vehicles through the checkpoints. A total of 9,128 vehicles have been turned around.
General coordination

- Auckland Transport Operations Centre (ATOC) continues to monitor public transport capacity and congregation of passengers on public transport and at key transport stops to maintain safe social distancing. Auckland Transport are in a state of readiness to implement measures requiring the compulsory wearing face coverings on public transport and to have the COVID-19 QR codes on buses, ferries and trains, in anticipation of the requirement by the Ministry of Health. The physical distancing measures instigated at the Auckland Airport Domestic Terminal are being adopted at the International Terminal in anticipation of increased international air travel.

- Auckland Emergency Management continues to monitor the drought and the future forecast conditions. The Lifeline Utilities Coordinator is the key point of liaison with Watercare Services at this time and Healthy Waters is working with Watercare to identify non-potable water sources, which might be used by the construction industry.

Mace Ward
Deputy Group Controller
Auckland Emergency Management

Kate Crawford
Group Controller
Auckland Emergency Management
Local Board Feedback on CCO Review Recommendations
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Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

General comments

- CCOs have the responsibility, budget and power to make a significant difference to local town centres, neighbourhoods and economies. Local boards are therefore heavily invested in the success of the CCO model and the responsiveness of CCOs to local boards and communities.
- It is generally agreed that the relationship between CCOs and local boards needs to be “reset”.
- Most local boards agree that the success of this review lies in its implementation, the ongoing and frequent involvement of local boards, and the review and monitoring of the programme as implementation proceeds.
- Local boards would like to see dates and timeframes set for achieving the changes recommended by the review panel.
- Local boards understand that this is the beginning of a much more detailed process and look forward to seeing more detailed information as the process continues, and to being fully involved.
- All local boards support the notion that recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards.
- There are many instances where local boards would like local board involvement to be specifically mandated and highlighted as part of the renewed approach.
- All local boards agree that significantly more strategic direction is required for CCOs, and several boards suggested bringing the strategy component of Auckland Transport within Auckland Council so that AT is a delivery operation only.
- Many highlighted the importance of the local board plan and wanted to see more emphasis on local planning deriving from the local board plan.
- Local boards agree that local economic recovery and development will be particularly crucial in the context of COVID-19 and are keen to be involved in the design of economic development activities within the council family regardless of whether ATEED is merged with RFA.
- Support the notion that CCOs should be more joined up in their approach to local activities but have a number of suggestions and queries around how this will work.
- Request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.
- Some local boards noted that the recommendations which necessitate new staff (26, 50, 59) are complicated within the context of an overall reduction in staff numbers.
- Feedback was mixed on whether the recommendations should be, or need to be, implemented as a package.
- Many local boards noted that this report did not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members, although views are split on whether this should be the case.
- Some local boards noted the need to establish where BIDs fit in in the context of a merger, and how their role will be enhanced.

Feedback on specific recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec.</th>
<th>Summary of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most local boards – but not all – support the merger of RFA and ATEED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is broad support for recommendation 2 with concerns around the amount of money being spent on Eden Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is broad – but not universal – support for this, with the caveat that local boards are aware that this will prove much more difficult than many of the other recommendations given the legislative situation, so do not see it as a high priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>These recommendations received broad support, although many boards noted changes or additions that they would like to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>These recommendations received broad support, particularly recommendations 11 and 14, and again some boards noted changes or additions that they would like to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>These were broadly supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-43</td>
<td>These were generally supported but with many comments about the need for local boards to be explicitly named and included as part of these processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>This was noted by almost all local boards as being a very positive recommendation, and many requested that work start as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>This was noted by many local boards as being one that they would like more involvement in when it comes to implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Local boards broadly support this recommendation with many additional comments, including the need to avoid the appearance of tokenism, and the need to ensure that a board includes people who have experience with public and community participation as well as other backgrounds such as business or finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-64</td>
<td>This was broadly supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Local boards noted that regular monitoring will be required to ensure recommendation 53 is implemented as imagined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>A number of local boards noted that the term “ratepayers” should be adjusted to include Aucklanders and visitors more broadly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Local boards requested more information about what “shared services” means.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Albert-Eden Local Board

Albert-Eden Local Board Urgent Feedback on the Auckland Council CCO Review Report

25 August 2020

That the Albert-Eden Local Board

a) Note its previous comments at the commencement of the CCO review process, being:
   i) We welcome this opportunity to provide feedback to the review of Auckland Council’s substantive Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs)
   ii) We acknowledge there are problems with the accountability and transparency regarding decision-making for some of the CCOs
   iii) We acknowledge there are inefficiencies and duplication of some services within the wider Council family
   iv) We consider there are opportunities to decrease council expenditure by merging some functions into existing Council structures e.g. permitting for film and events
   v) We consider that there should be more governance controls and increased accountability mechanisms in their Statements of Intent alongside regular reporting to Local Boards
   vi) Watercare appears to function effectively and efficiently and should remain as a CCO.

b) receive the findings and recommendations of the Review of CCOs by the independent panel but note that they do not go far enough to address the issues related to the relationships, composition, and governance of CCOs.

c) agree with the three key proposed improvements.
   i) council should give the CCOs clear strategic direction.
   ii) council should give guidance and specify requirements to strike a balance between commercial and public interests.
   iii) council should amalgamate Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development with Regional Facilities Auckland.

d) Provides this further feedback on specific recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec.</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Support/Not support</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merger of ATEED and RFA</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Removes duplication of services and functions and provides an integrated approach. Further work should be done on other issues that currently sit within the CEU and Community Facilities Departments to consider whether further streamlining could be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Merger of RFA and ATEED</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of a steering committee</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
<td>Seek further discussion on how a merged RFA/ATEED will enhance Local Economic Development. The role of BIDs and Town Centres without BIDS, but Business Associations and groups is crucial in Local Economic Development. Note that the role of Local and Regional Economic Development is an issue for all of Auckland and for local boards. The suggestion to have a virtual group does not go far enough and council should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Albert-Eden Local Board
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The merged CCO entity explores the possible joint management and operations of the city's stadia including Eden Park</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bringing Auckland War Memorial Museum and MOTAT into the merged entity</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Auckland Transport and the council jointly prepare the regional land transport plan, the draft of which the council endorses before going to the CCO's board for approval.</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auckland Transport and the council form a working group to clearly delineate their bylaw making powers and formalise the result in a memorandum of understanding.</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Auckland Transport urgently reviews how it designs, consults on, funds and implements minor capital works, including how it involves local boards</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the design of its annual work programme

### Panuku

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The council identifies a more stable source of funding for Panuku during the preparation of the next long-term plan.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The need for a property strategy is raised</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Watercare

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Watercare and Auckland Transport submit their asset management plans and detailed supporting information to the council every year so it can assess how well the plans give effect to its urban growth strategy</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountability

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20, 25 and 30</td>
<td>Propose new measures and roles to ensure accountability</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Council establishes a strategic planning process in which CCOs and Governing Body holds workshops to discuss work programmes and priorities that feed into Statements of Intent, annual budgeting and planning process</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Council prepares a statement of expectation setting out its expectations of each CCO and of CCOs generally</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The creation of a set of common key performance measures</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The council draws up a protocol governing information requests between the Governing Body and CCO</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>CCOs and local boards reset how they engage</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>CCOs engage directly and at a more senior level with the Independent Māori Statutory Board and the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum to work on joint initiatives that benefit Māori</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Quality of call centres</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Balancing public and commercial interests</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>CCO boards need to become more diverse</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Setting a tone for organizational culture</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request more detailed information on how a culture change will be implemented at Auckland Transport, particularly in the context of emergency budgets and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 50 and 59</td>
<td>Induction and training</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>But note that the suggested induction for Councillors should also be made available to local board elected members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Job descriptions refer to the need to contribute to Māori outcomes</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job descriptions refer to the need to contribute to Māori outcomes and the goals contained within the Auckland Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Consultation with community</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>But extend to institute regular monitoring is set in place to evaluate whether the changes are working effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The council and CCOs explore options to give ratepayers a more effective voice</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend replacing the word “ratepayers” with “residents, businesses and visitors” as all these have a legitimate interest and should have a voice, not just ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 and 58</td>
<td>Support recommendations 57 and 58 to update Council brand guidelines to ensure the pōhutukawa logo is used in a clear, consistent and flexible way on all council funded services, activities and facilities, including when used alongside CCO operational brands</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crucial that ratepayers and the public identify CCO as Council organisations and that the pōhutukawa can be used by CCOs without the need for individual CCO branding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CCOs discuss their proposed collective bargaining strategy with the council</td>
<td>Support in part</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be amended to include that all workers receive a living wage and fair and adequate remuneration and that the salaries of senior executives are not perceived as excessive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64 | The council makes compliance with the procurement policy mandatory on all CCOs to reduce costs and minimise duplication | Support in part | The procurement policy for all CCOs should include being ethical, low carbon, prioritising jobs for locals and disadvantaged groups, and ensuring a living wage for all contract staff.

e) Provide these further comments:
   i) the review stated that all 64 recommendations should be considered as a package and implemented as a package however due to the issues raised above in relation to some recommendations, we do not support this
   ii) we agree that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request the local boards be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme, and its review as we can bring local perspectives on impacts and successes
   iii) the notion of a reduced number of CCOs that local boards and their communities need to interact with is beneficial however, this should go further and benefits could be realised from further merging and bringing back some functions into Auckland Council
   iv) note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members.

END
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

21 Council-controlled organisations review report feedback

Resolution number GBI/2020/88

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Coles:

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel.

b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible.

c) do not support the merger of Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited at this point in time due to unforeseen merger costs and the charitable status of RFA.

d) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.

e) identify the following views and preferences, on the other findings and recommendations in CCO review:

i) Support the recommendations for CCO reporting to be joined up to increase collaboration and accountability

j) Support the recommendations that provide for better oversight and monitoring to allow for transparency and accountability

ii) Support the recommendations that will allow for the liaison between CCO and local boards to be at a more senior level and more resourcing for the monitoring of CCOs

iii) Support the notion that CCOs should be more united in their approach to local activities to allow for collaborative, agile and fit for purpose approaches

iv) Agree that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme

v) Request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs

vi) Request that the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) is broken down into local board areas to assist local boards in providing quality feedback

vii) Request that of the two Auckland Council positions on the Auckland Transport board one position should be allocated to a Local Board Chair alongside a Governing Body member to recognise the co-governance model.

Note: Under Standing Orders 1.9.7 Member S Daly requested that her vote against clause c) be recorded.

CARRIED
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

11 CCO Review report feedback

Resolution number DTCF/2020/1

MOVED by Member R Jackson, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Wood:
That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Community Forum:

General comments

a) acknowledges the excellent Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO) Review Report by the Independent Review Panel published in August 2020. The report and recommendations are clear, concise, and expressed in language that is easy to understand.

b) note this is the first independent review of the Auckland Council and CCO model since its inception in 2010 and recommend that independent reviews be undertaken at more frequent and regular intervals in future.

c) notes the Independent Review Panel’s conclusion that the CCO model is the right one for Auckland, and their view that it is capable of delivering tangible benefits to Auckland.

d) supports the Independent Review Panel’s many comments and recommendations designed to achieve:
   i. clear and effective Council direction, oversight and monitoring of CCOs
   ii. close and effective working relationships between CCOs and local boards, ensuring local boards have meaningful involvement in each CCO’s activities in their area
   iii. effective and timely communication with local boards and the public

e) indicates its genuine desire and willingness to work alongside CCOs in a collaborative and respectful fashion in order to achieve positive outcomes across the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board area.

f) requests clear timeframes on when the recommendations in the Independent Review Panel’s report will be implemented.

g) notes that the scope of this review is limited to CCOs and believes that a similar review of Council would be beneficial and would ensure a holistic approach and consistency across the entire organisation.

CARRIED

Resolution number DTCF/2020/2

MOVED by Member R Jackson, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Wood:
That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Community Forum:

CCO model

h) provides the following feedback in relation to recommendation 1, 2 and 3 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report ('CCO model') relating to ATEED and RFA:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local board view</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The council approves the merger of ATEED and RFA and appoints a steering group to implement change</td>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>ATEED and RFA each already have a wide portfolio of specialised operations, and we are concerned that a merger would create a portfolio which is too wide and diverse and, as a result, be at risk of doing many things badly rather than doing a smaller number of things well. There is a risk that irreplaceable knowledge, skills, and experience in each area will be diluted or lost. While we acknowledge the panel’s comments about economies of scale and other potential efficiencies, we are concerned that these may be outweighed by other considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The merged entity explores, at council’s discretion, the critical need for joint management and operation of the city’s four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust</td>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>RFA should continue with this area instead of a merged RFA/ATEED trying to cope with this activity. Auckland needs a comprehensive stadia strategy with long term goals and budgets put in place. RFA needs to work closely with the Government including looking hard at developing funding from Central Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Council explores with the Auckland War Memorial Museum and MOTAT bringing both institutions into the merged entity and seeks legislative change as is necessary</td>
<td>Do not support</td>
<td>The Auckland War Memorial Museum is New Zealand’s premier war memorial and a great focus for celebrating Pacific and New Zealand’s history. As for MOTAT, there is a need to address the recommendations of the 2018 Auckland Cultural Heritage Sector Review by Stafford Strategy, to get better outcomes from MOTAT without any merger of the AWMM and MOTAT. The Stafford review notes, among numerous concerns, the risk that in merging cultural and heritage institutions one may become predominant, to the detriment of others; and that ‘RFA is heavily focused on commercial endeavours and lacking in culture and heritage strength’. The review did not anticipate any ATEED involvement, but we venture that the same would be true of ATEED. It is outside of the scope of this review, but we would also ask the current status of the proposal to set up a South Auckland satellite branch of Te Papa museum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

**For**
- Member T Deans
- Member R Jackson
- Member J O’Connor

**Against**
- Chairperson A Bennett
- Member T van Tonder

**Abstained**

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
Deputy Chairperson G Wood

The motion was declared CARRIED by 4 votes to 2.

Resolution number DTCF/2020/3
MOVED by Member R Jackson, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Wood:
That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Community Forum:
i) supports recommendations 4, 5, 6 and 7 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report ('CCO model') relating to Auckland Transport.

j) supports recommendations 8-14 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report ('CCO model') relating to Panuku, and provides specific feedback in relation to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local board view</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Council amends the Panuku constitution to make clear its twin purpose of redeveloping urban areas and managing council’s nonservice property</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Local boards should retain decision-making authority over all service assets in their area. There need to be clear criteria defining ‘service’ and ‘non-service’ assets. Local boards should have decision-making power on whether any asset is transferred from service to non-service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Panuku continues to manage the council’s non-service property until the council produces a property strategy and considers whether to combine all property services in one place</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Local boards should retain decision-making authority over all service assets in their area. There need to be clear criteria defining ‘service’ and ‘non-service’ assets. Local boards should have decision-making power on whether any asset is transferred from service to non-service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k) supports recommendations 15-19 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report ('CCO model') relating to Watercare, and provides specific feedback in relation to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local Board View</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Council formulates a three-waters strategy and includes a reference in the strategy to Watercare’s obligation to consult the council about the broad direction of pricing and water services</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We support the panel’s comments about pricing and operational efficiencies, but strongly urge that this go much further than that. Auckland Council needs a Three Waters Planning and Strategy Department to ensure our current and future water needs are met. This department should have key input into the Auckland Plan (Spatial Plan) and assist in the development of the Letters of Expectation for Watercare Services Ltd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
I) supports recommendations 20-43 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report (‘Accountability’) and provides specific feedback in relation to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local board view</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Councillors have a daylong induction at the start of their three-year term on their responsibilities as CCO shareholders, the separation of governance from management, and how to best govern CCOs as arm’s-length organisations.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We would recommend local board members also have a full-day induction at the start of their three-year term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The governing body spends half a day each year visiting each CCO to better understand its business and culture and to informally build relationships.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We recommend that local boards also spend half a day each year visiting each CCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The council updates and clarifies its ‘no surprises’ policy by:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>This action will provide greater guidance and expectations to CCOs when working with local boards. Local boards are at the coalface with the community and must have good two-way communication with CCOs at operational level. The local board should be informed and briefed at the earliest opportunity in the event of unexpected events requiring immediate/urgent attention or action (for instance, sewage overflows).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• including clearer, more current examples of when the policy applies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• giving clearer guidance about precisely when CCOs should pass on information and to whom; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ensuring CCO statements of intent contain a reference to the updated ‘no surprises’ policy so all concerned can be held to account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Governing Body Draws Up a Protocol Governing Information Requests between the Governing Body and CCOs</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We recommend that this protocol be extended to include information requests between local boards and CCOs, and that local boards be actively involved in drawing up the protocol. It is essential that information requests from elected members and local board staff are responded to in a timely manner and materials provided at the earliest opportunity. We recommend that council advocates for a refinement to LGOIMA to enable speedier resolution of these ‘internal’ information requests to ensure good operational efficiency and the highest quality governance decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>CCOs and local boards reset how they engage with one another, by means of:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We strongly support this and include this item in our in specific feedback to highlight the paramount importance of local boards being empowered to perform their full governance role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a workshop to develop a more meaningful way for CCOs and local boards to work together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the preparation of joint CCO engagement plans for each local board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• more initiative by local boards in integrating their own planning with CCO planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• liaison between CCOs and local boards at a more senior level so CCOs can quickly remedy local board concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the preparation of joint six-monthly CCO reports for each local board; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the communication of clear, up-to-date information from CCOs to local boards on projects in their area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. no.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Local board view</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The council, Auckland Transport, and Panuku jointly communicate to the public about urban development and transport infrastructure projects</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>We recommend that the council, Auckland Transport, and Panuku also jointly communicate to the local boards about urban development and transport infrastructure projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 53      | CCOs make more effort to coordinate how they consult the community on and implement local projects | Support | We support this and also recommend that:  
- CCOs involve local boards in the design of consultations  
- There be a focus on how community feedback influences changes  
- CCOs ‘close the loop’ and let the local board and public know how feedback has been incorporated. |

**Culture**

m) supports recommendations 44-64 outlined in Part Two of the independent review panel report (‘Accountability’) and provides specific feedback in relation to the following:

We note that there are numerous phone numbers, emails, websites, online reporting tools, and more, across Council and the CCOs. There is also a poor understanding – both among the public and internally – on the roles and responsibilities of the CCOs and council departments, creating widespread confusion when trying to find the appropriate contact details. We recommend that inductions for all staff and elected members cover the above in greater depth. We recommend that this review also address how the multiplicity of contacts could be effectively streamlined and co-ordinated.

CARRIED
Franklin Local Board

23.1 CCO Review report to local boards

Resolution number FR/2020/84
MOVED by Chairperson A Baker, seconded by Member L Soole:

That the Franklin Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel
b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-Local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible
c) identify any views and preferences on the recommendation to approve a merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited)
d) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation
e) identify views and preferences, if any, on the other findings and recommendations in the CCO review
f) thank the Review Panel for their engagement with local boards and external stakeholder groups in their development of the review.

CARRIED
Henderson-Massey Local Board

Henderson-Massey Local board resolutions on the independent panel’s review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCO’s)

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel and support the implementation of recommendations as a package

b) support the specific resolutions with regards to all CCOs needing to improve in delivering on Treaty of Waitangi legislation and intents.

c) consider that CCO’s need to give greater consideration to the cultural diversity of Auckland and develop and implement more inclusive communication and engagement methodologies

d) support recommendation 43 that CCO boards need to become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass that board members should have experience working with local communities.

e) request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council, local boards and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.

Local Board Specific Recommendations

a) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible

b) support the notion that recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards.

c) request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests

d) support the recommendation for CCOs to develop joint engagement strategies with local boards to streamline their approach to local activities by developing joint engagement strategies

e) support the notion of a reduced number of CCOs that local boards and their communities need to interact with provided that key liaison points of contact have sufficient influence to effect meaningful change

f) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation

g) note recommendation 23 regarding the creation of a set of common key performance measures and request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed.

Merger of ATEED and RFA

h) support the recommendation to approve a merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited)

i) consider that Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development’s role in supporting local economic development must not be compromised but rather strengthened in the new merged structure

j) welcomes discussion on how a merged RFA/ATEED will enhance the role of BIDs

k) support recommendations concerning the development of the stadia strategy and look forward to providing local board input into this

Panuku

Henderson-Massey Local Board
l) confirm the positive role of Panuku Development Auckland with the Unlock Henderson project and seek to ensure that the relationship is progressed and not unsettled by any responsive changes to recommendations.

m) support recommendation 11 that council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock-and-transform areas)

n) support the need for a property strategy as outlined in recommendation 14.

Signed by Chris Carter  
Chairperson, Henderson-Massey Local Board  
Date: 26 August 2020

Signed by Will Flavell  
Deputy Chairperson, Henderson-Massey Local Board  
Date: 26 August 2020
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

Resolution number HB/2020/108

MOVED by Member A Poppelbaum, seconded by Member J Parfitt:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel

b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible

c) supports the recommendation to approve a merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited)

d) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation

e) requests that the Governing Body receive the feedback of the local board on the CCO Review findings and recommendations.

CARRIED

Executive Summary

Thank you for providing the opportunity for Local Boards to provide feedback on the Council Controlled Organisations (CCO) report.

The Hibiscus and Bays Local Board is generally supportive of the report that the Independent Panel has produced and commend them on the range of proposed recommendations. We think that if implemented, they will lead to performance improvements.

Many of the recommendations are very practical and for some, we were quite surprised to know that they were not happening already (e.g. regular joint CCO chief executive meetings).

We would like to suggest that a ‘next steps’ response is produced to detail how they will be implementing recommendations. Some are simple to implement and others slightly more challenging, which will take more time. We suggest that having them set out in sections of timeframes to be completed by would be useful – particularly to demonstrate commitment to all stakeholders. To ensure accountability in achieving all the recommendations that will be taken up, we also suggest that progress reports are produced to show the implementation of recommendations.

The below feedback relates to a few recommendations that we have chosen to provide feedback on, or where we have made suggestions of additional material to consider.

Overall feedback

ATEED and RFA

In our Local Board’s feedback to the Independent Panel in March 2020, we noted our general concerns about Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA) as well as its ability to deliver a stadium strategy. We are pleased to see this is specifically addressed.

Recommendations 1 & 2: We are supportive of a proposed merger of ATEED and RFA, and recommendation relating to improving the management of stadiums. As a result of a merger, we would expect to see some significant improvement in the delivery of outcomes as well as cost savings.

Auckland Transport

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
We believe that consideration should be given to whether Auckland Transport’s (AT) strategy and planning department would be better brought in-house to Auckland Council. We believe that this better sits with Council as the decision-makers who dictate strategy and planning to AT who then execute it.

**Recommendation 4:** We are supportive of the Regional Land Transport Plan being jointly prepared by Council and AT. We would be interested in understanding more this about the mechanisms of how this will work efficiently.

**Recommendation 6:** We think the inclusion of local boards in the design of AT’s work programme will add value. We would like to see that this also includes AT’s renewal programmes, as Local Boards do not currently have oversight in this either.

**Panuku**

**Recommendations 11 & 12:** We support Panuku receiving a more clarified focus and support Council assuming responsibility in deciding which non-service properties to sell.

In addition, as noted in our feedback in March 2020, we believe that Panuku should give greater regard to the governance responsibility that local boards have for their communities by regarding this relationship as a partnership, not merely a stakeholder. We would like to see the partnership between Panuku and Local Boards engrained further to ensure the best outcomes for communities across Auckland.

We believe there is a firm expectation from ratepayers that when Panuku is selling surplus land, that they achieve the best price. Our local board thinks that there is value in the greater emphasis of this in their role.

**Watercare**

**Recommendation 15:** Our Local Board supports the development of a three-waters strategy, particularly to address the security of supply of drinking water. We see this as a matter of urgency and would like to see work underway on the strategy re-start as soon as possible after a two-year hiatus.

We would like to see consideration given to whether Watercare’s legislative obligations are fit for purpose. Watercare’s legislative obligations are to keep water supply and wastewater service costs low and to have a ‘regard for public safety in relation to its structures’. We believe that it is timely for Watercare’s mandate to be revised to include greater regard for public health and safety, water quality (including beach water quality) and to future-proof and maintain high standards of infrastructure.

**Accountability**

We are pleased to see several recommendations relating to improving strategy setting and performance oversight. These are sensible, practical steps that we fully support being implemented.

**Recommendation 21:** We consider that some of the Letters of Expectations we have seen (e.g. Auckland Transport) to be far too broad and we would hope that a review of these would see clearer expectations given to CCO’s each year.

**Recommendation 25:** We support the establishment of this role as we believe it will help to ensure greater oversight of CCOs. We think that this role should sit within the Mayor’s office and have clear and regular reporting lines to the Governing Body.

**Recommendation 26:** We also see value in a session like this including guidance to ensure that Governing Body members focus on good governance and an Auckland-wide region focus (as opposed to local matters relevant to their areas).

**Recommendation 34:** We support this recommendation.

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
**Recommendation 41:** We would like to see this recommendation expanded on to include a wider goal across the Council and CCOs. From a ratepayer point of view, Council and CCOs are not separate – they are one ‘Council-family’. As such, call centre queries to Council relating to any of the CCOs should be able to be handled efficiently and at the time of the call. We appreciate that this is a much larger piece of work and that there are limitations with CCOs having different IT systems to each other. However, we do think that it is a very worthwhile workstream to improve responsiveness to the community.

**Recommendation 43:** We support the desire to improve diversity on CCO Boards (in skillset and ethnicity). We have some reservations about the nature of this recommendation as it stands. We think that all Board appointments should be considered by a set of pre-established desirable skill sets and perspectives that would add value to Board (e.g. these might include the desire to have someone on the Board who can provide input from a Māori world-view, or who has good governance experience). When referring to diversity of ethnicity, we are concerned that this recommendation may unintentionally be perceived as tokenism and we would like to see that it draws from a wider piece of work that identifies the voices that each Board would benefit from having around the table. We also consider that a more meaningful way for CCO Boards to include greater regard for issues of Māori significance might be for CCO Boards to include a member of the Independent Maori Statutory Board.

Relating to Board appointments, we also question how effective Board members can be if they are over-stretched with several other varying governance roles.

**Culture**

**Recommendation 53:** We are pleased to see this recommendation in place. We think this should be expanded on further to detail CCOs sharing consultation plans with local boards ahead of time for feedback. We think that the local knowledge from members would help to ensure engagement plans are appropriate and will, therefore, lead to better outcomes.

**Recommendation 58:** This report tackles some quite serious, long-standing failings in good accountability practices. The majority of issues the report tackles appears to be fair and accurate and the recommendations are sensible steps to address serious gaps. Therefore, it does not feel like the right place for a discussion, or recommendations, around brand guidelines. We perceive the matter of who is or isn’t using the Council’s emblem correctly to be comparatively a non-issue. We perceive that this will not be a matter of importance to ratepayers in the overall package of recommendations that will be taken up as a result of this report.

**Recommendation 60:** We support the suggestion of an elected members survey. We do think that it is important that any survey has a good ‘feedback loop’ whereby elected members are updated with what the survey results were, and if relevant what actions will be taken to address any issues raised.

**Recommendation 62:** We support the notion that shared services across CCOs would benefit from joint, formal supplier/purchaser agreements. We would expect to see savings generated from such activity.
Howick Local Board

the Howick Local Board:

a) support in principle the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel;

b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible;

c) support the merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited);

d) request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs;

e) request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests;

f) request more information with regards to Recommendation 2 and the operation of the city’s four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust and that local boards have the opportunity to provide input into any related strategy;

g) request that any appointments as a consequence of Recommendations 20, 25 and 30 be kept to a minimum and that consideration be given to reallocation of suitable staff who might be facing redundancy;

h) request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned;

i) request that local boards have input into determining key performance measures as identified in Recommendation 23;

j) request that in terms of Recommendation 41, IT systems be regularly updated - in particular, an up to date staff directory must be maintained;

k) request that, in terms of Recommendation 44, Auckland Transport immediately implement an organisational culture change to ensure effective operation and a safe working environment;

l) request more information with regards to Recommendation 62 and what “shared services” refers to - in particular, the Board does not support shared service contracts;

m) note that the success of the review lies in its implementation;

n) note that Recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards and would recommend that CCOs use the same reporting format, and report at the same time, as Council;

o) note that as part of Recommendation 6, Auckland Transport provides increased access to technical experts and emphasizes a partnership approach with local boards;

p) note that monitoring and regular updates need to be a part of any project;

q) note that, legislative issues notwithstanding, there are obvious benefits for marketing and promotional opportunities if the Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stadrome and MOTAT were merged into a single entity;

r) note that whilst supporting Recommendation 11, the process must include dialogue with, and approval from, the local board;

s) note that with regards to Recommendation 43, diversity and experience (including experience working in and with communities) should be part of the skill set of any applicant applying for, and successfully appointed to, these roles;
t) note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members;

u) note that the board is of the opinion that current Auckland Council elected members should not be members of any CCO board;

v) note that there needs to be parity of salaries between Council and CCOs;

w) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.

Adele White
Chairperson, Howick Local Board 25 August 2020

John Spiller
Deputy Chairperson, Howick Local Board 25 August 2020
Kaipātiki Local Board

Ngā mihi nui,

The Kaipātiki Local Board would like to commend Auckland Council for initiating the CCO review and express its thanks to the Independent Panel Members for undertaking this complex but timely task. Broadly, the board believes that the 64 recommendations made by the panel address legitimate concerns and are heading in the right direction, but need to go further.

The Kaipātiki Local Board:

1. Feels that the review does not adequately address the failure of CCOs and Auckland Council to uphold the co-governance model through which local boards should exercise responsibility for local decision making rather than being consulted on (at best) or advised (as noted in paragraph 11 of the Overview) or simply being left to find out about CCO activities in their area through the community and the media.

2. Notes that the role of local boards as publicly elected officials is to oversee and hold to account the management of public resources on behalf of the public whereas, in our experience, the activities and communications of Auckland Council and CCOs tends to emphasise the role as primarily about the representation of both the elected and executive functions of council. We see this as part of the organisational mindset of CCOs and Auckland Council that has contributed to the problems identified here and suggest clearer articulation is required in policy arising from this review.

3. Supports the proposed merger of ATEED and RFA but, noting that the public mandate for ATEED activities is unclear and the duplication of many of ATEED’s operations within council, instead recommends:

   1. the dissolution of ATEED entirely;
   2. the transfer of the ATEED facility portfolio to RFA;
   3. the transfer of ATEED’s economic development operations to an economic development unit within council (that could also include Business Improvement District responsibilities that currently lie within council);
   4. the transfer of ATEED’s events operations to the existing events team within council.

4. Proposes that refined policy and expectations for CCOs should emphasize a shared decision-making kaupapa in which CCOs, local boards and the community approach each other as stakeholders to jointly raise, inform and decide on outcomes and that this approach needs to be articulated through processes arising from recommendations 6 and 34.

5. Proposes that positions are created for governing body members on the boards of all CCOs, (noting that positions were recently re-established on the board of Auckland Transport) and that Council advocate to Government for this to happen if positions are not currently allowed for under legislation.

6. Endorses the recommendation for a single local board engagement plan to be used by all CCOs.

7. Recognises that the CCO model was conceived in order to create aligned Auckland-wide outcomes such as the Regional Land Transport Plan, but that this creates a direct tension in responding to local desires and concerns.

8. Proposes that a better balance can be struck between local and regional priorities which could in particular realise efficiencies by incorporating local boards in CCO decision-
making. Such efficiencies could be realized through better prioritisation of local CCO initiatives and through better use of local knowledge to inform how solutions are implemented.

9. Recommends that this review be adapted as a template to define defining key performance assessment criteria by which CCOs can be held accountable to the Auckland public via the Governing Body and local boards.

10. Request that CCOs work with local boards to align their forward work programmes with local board plans, noting that currently local boards do not often see CCO forward work programmes for their area.

11. Strongly endorse recommendation 6, with the expectation that this will result in the delegation of local decision-making to local boards where they affect roads or assets in the local street network, as allowed for under section 54 “Delegations” of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, in particular clauses (1) and (8). This will enable Local Boards to fulfil their purpose as specified in section 10 “Local Boards” of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, namely to enable decision-making by and on behalf of local communities.

   6. Auckland Transport urgently reviews how it designs, consults on, funds and implements minor capital works, including how it involves local boards in the design of its annual work programme.

12. Strongly endorse recommendation 34, with the expectation of regular workshops with CCOs, including a minimum of monthly workshops with Auckland Transport and six-monthly workshops with the other CCOs, plus monthly electronic updates on planned activity by CCOs in the local board area, for example, such as supplied by the Community Facilities department of Council.

   34. CCOs and local boards reset how they engage with one another, by means of:

   - a workshop to develop a more meaningful way for CCOs and local boards to work together
   - the preparation of joint CCO engagement plans for each local board
   - more initiative by local boards in integrating their own planning with CCO planning
   - liaison between CCOs and local boards at a more senior level so CCOs can quickly remedy local board concerns
   - the preparation of joint CCO six-monthly reports for each local board
   - the communication of clear, up-to-date information from CCOs to local boards on projects in their area.

13. Regarding recommendations 10 and 14, Local Boards should retain decision-making authority over all service assets in their area. There need to be clear criteria defining ‘service’ and ‘non-service’ assets. Local boards should have decision-making power on whether any asset is transferred from service to non-service.

14. Notes that the scope of this review is limited to CCOs and believes that a similar review of Council would be beneficial and would ensure a holistic approach and consistency across the entire organisation.

15. Request that dates/timeframes be set for achieving the changes recommended by the review panel.

Kia ora koutou.

Nau te rourou, naku te rourou, ka ora te manuhiri

With your food basket and my food basket, the people will thrive

Kaiātiki Local Board
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

a) welcomes the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel.

b) welcomes the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO-local board engagement and request that this work be started as soon as possible; and further suggests
   - regular, frequent communication between the Chief Executives of CCOs and local boards in order to build better working relations
   - that there is a focus on greater accountability of CCOs; while the board understands the need for efficiency in the CCO model, alongside is a critical need for transparency and public accountability.
   - that results from this review must lead to a new model that can demonstrate to local communities that the Council family entities that manage huge public resources are delivering with efficiency for them

c) supports the recommendations to establish Māori responsiveness plan at the local board level and better tracking and reporting of progress on actions outlined in these plans.

d) identify any views and preferences on the recommendation to approve a merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited).

e) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.

f) provides views and preferences in the following table on the other findings and recommendations in CCO review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Support/ Not support</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note that the review stated that all 64 recommendations should be considered as a package. Support all the recommendations and the implementation of them as a package.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.</th>
<th>Support and strategic direction for the CCOs to embed transparent practices for public accountability. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board supports revenue mechanisms (levers) being supported by localized direction and strategically applied towards harmonizing economic gain and community need. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board supports better localized engagement plans from CCOs, and these should be implemented as business as usual rather than something additional to engagement plans. In setting the future direction for the investment of significantly large resources managed by CCOs, Auckland Council’s local boards must have a meaningful influence, for example, in areas such as town centre redevelopment, economic recovery, creating employment and improving business environment in the post-COVID scenario.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Local Board Specific Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the notion that recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards.</th>
<th>Support The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board expects that the outcomes of the CCO review will lead to better working relationships which deliver results on the local board plans in meaningful ways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the idea that regular monitoring is in place to evaluate whether the changes resulting from recommendation 53 are working effectively.</td>
<td>Support The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board stresses the need for regular, meaningful communication with local boards. Such communication must be with an intent of gaining local perspectives to deliver better service outcomes in a fair and equitable manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the notion that CCOs should be more joined up in their approach to local activities</td>
<td>Support Supports stronger working relationships between CCO directors and local boards, in particular, Panuku, ATEED and Auckland Transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Support the recommendation that reports from CCOs should be joined up in their reporting | Support The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board supports the idea of a joined-up report, however this can only be meaningful if:  
  - CCOs make a cultural shift in working with local boards to include a local board lens in their thinking.  
  - Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board asks that reports are at least quarterly  
  - reports should include a section showing the forward plan in which the local opportunities are identified and for which boards are able to give inputs.  
  - suggests the idea of a joint workshop of CCOs with local boards. |
**Merger of ATEED and RFA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support the merger of RFA and ATEED</th>
<th>The move to serve better outcomes must include an intent to serve the southern area of Auckland; and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu with its distinct Pasifika and Māori cultural identity, high youth population and unemployment. That actions to develop opportunities for the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board area ensure the area benefits and shares in the prosperity from international and national activities and events hosted in the Auckland region, e.g., Women's World Soccer tournaments, Women’s Rugby, America’s Cup, and Super Rugby. That the small-scale local economy, economic growth in individual neighbourhoods, is critical to serve better outcomes. The adverse impact of COVID-19 in the south of Auckland gives evidence of the gap in focus on coordinated local economic development. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board asks that future actions place a clear responsibility for framing and delivery on local economic development outcomes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the notion of a reduced number of CCOs that local boards and their communities need to interact with.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the notion of bringing Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stardome and MOTAT into the merged entity.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a more joined up approach with Eden Park Trust and look forward to</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board**
### Attachment A

#### Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing input into a Stadia Strategy.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board notes its strong concern that, while it appreciates the need for CCOs to operate at arm’s length, the refined model must address a balance between public and private interests. Once again, it is about establishing transparency and accountability at all levels, as even at arm’s length entities such as CCOs are using public resources. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board urges that the service outcomes of CCOs must address issues of equity in delivery if public accountability is to be addressed through this review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomes discussion on how a merged RFA/ATEED will enhance the role of BIDs</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, an integrated framework to monitor and deliver on local economic development, including the role of Business Associations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Panuku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support recommendation 11 that council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock and-transform areas)</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports the recommendation that council amends the Panuku constitution to make clear its twin purpose of redeveloping urban areas and managing the council’s non-service property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the need for a property strategy as outlined in recommendation 14.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other recommendations – note this is not an exhaustive list of all other recommendations in the report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note recommendation 23 regarding the creation of a set of common key performance measures and request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed.</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board seeks clear accountability of CCOs through their KPIs and connecting these to delivery and performance at the level of local boards. The transparency and accountability of CCOs towards the public demands closer working with local boards, whose members are elected by the local people. The CCOs use a significant portion of public resources and KPIs are a lever to use to demonstrate accountability at the grassroots level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that recommendations 20, 25, and 30 from the review, and recommendation (e) from staff to the Governing Body</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
**Support recommendation 41** and request that IT systems be updated and aligned to ensure that an up to date directory of staff including all CCO staff is available to all.

**Support**

**Support recommendation 43** that CCO boards need to become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass that board members should have experience working with local communities.

**Support**

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board has a strong concern that the CCO boards do not mirror the ethnocultural diversity of Auckland. In delivering outcomes for Māori, Pacific and our many diverse communities, the composition of the CCO boards need to display the experience, insights and perspective of all parts of the community. A diverse membership on CCO boards would be a strength.

**Note recommendation 44** regarding setting a tone for organizational culture and request more detailed information on how a culture change will be implemented at Auckland Transport, particularly in the context of emergency budgets.

**Support**

Elected members, representing the public, have a key role in shaping the strategic direction of CCOs decision making structure.

**Support/endorse the recommendations 28, 50 and 59 regarding induction and training and note the reduced staff/budget of the team that delivers these programmes.**

**Support**

**Request more information about recommendation 62 regarding "shared services" and whether this will include introducing IT and HR systems that are consistent and/or compatible across the council family.**

**Support**

Work towards a more cost effective model if business models have similar outcomes bringing value for money for rate payers.

**Note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body**

**Support**

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board notes its concern that this is a significant gap and needs to be addressed as it is a key lever for public accountability.
members should be Auckland Transport board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Having elected members on CCO boards can further progress localised needs and help CCOs further understand the Auckland Council governance model. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu local board views a CCO with a diverse board or committee as a strength, and these bodies must represent Auckland’s diversity by having different people with different backgrounds, views and skills on the CCO boards.</th>
<th>Request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The management of the planning process needs to be more transparent and with clear connections to the Local Board Plans and Long-term Plan; to be more visible and have a clear local level lens on future planning and delivery priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Governing Body and the Chair Lemauga Lydia Sosene would like to speak to the feedback on 27 August 2020 at the Governing Body meeting.

Lemauga Lydia Sosene
Chairperson, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board 26 August 2020

Togiatolu Walter Togiamua
Deputy Chairperson, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board 26 August 2020
Manurewa Local Board

Manurewa Local Board feedback on the findings and recommendations of the Independent Panel’s review of Auckland Council’s Council Controlled Organisations

The Manurewa Local Board thanks the Governing Body for the opportunity to provide feedback on the findings and recommendations of the Independent Panel on council’s substantive CCOs. This report is an important document for local boards, particularly with regard to improving communications and engagement between boards and CCOs.

However, we note that the board has only had a brief time to consider the report and has not had an opportunity to undertake a workshop or have substantive discussions regarding the panel’s recommendations. The board considers that the short timeframe required to provide this feedback is at odds with the panel’s findings regarding the need for improved consultation with local boards, and is contrary to the general principles of better engagement with boards that the panel recommends for CCOs. Our feedback should be considered in this context, and we reserve the right to amend or modify any of this feedback at a later date, once we have had more time to consider the panel’s findings and recommendations in depth.

Furthermore, this feedback should be read in conjunction with the feedback the board provided in April 2020, which is attached for your reference as Appendix A.

CCOs have the responsibility, budget and power to make a significant difference to local town centres, neighbourhoods and economies. Local boards are therefore heavily invested in the success of the CCO model and the responsiveness of CCOs to local boards and communities. The Manurewa Local Board is pleased with the work of the Independent Panel and agrees with all 64 of its recommendations in principle.

Recommendation: The successful implementation of these recommendations is crucial and should be overseen by a joint governance panel made up of Governing Body, IMSB and Local Board representatives. This supports the recurring theme in the Panel’s report of the need for CCOs to be more responsive and accountable to local boards. Culture change will be an important driver in achieving this, and there must be clear consequences for CCOs that fail to deliver on agreed outcomes.

We believe that CCOs and local boards should endeavour to work towards a partnership model where CCO boards and senior management engage more directly with local boards to better meet the outcomes for our area.

The table below sets out the board’s feedback on specific recommendations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA and ATEED</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed merger and the likely ongoing cost savings to offset the initial cost of the merger. In our previous feedback, the board expressed the view that local economic development would be better delivered through a council department. We are therefore pleased with the panel’s recommendation that consideration should be given to whether this function should lie with the new CCO entity, in-house by council, or virtual group bringing together all the council parts with responsibility in this area. Given the effects of COVID-19 on our local economies, we believe that the decision as to who has responsibility for local economic development is a matter that must be addressed urgently. Wherever this function is ultimately placed, it must be resourced appropriately in order to be effective for local communities. The board will provide further input as part of the Long Term Plan process to define the new entity’s services and objectives, including its responsibilities towards local economic development and regional approach to events. The board supports a council-directed Stadiums Strategy and a reset of RFA-led prior attempts at such a strategy. The board supports discussion with MOTAT and the War Memorial Museum on amalgamating with the new merged entity but expresses no preference at this stage whether the amalgamation is necessary for better strategic planning with all of Auckland’s key cultural institutions. The board notes that residents in our area face significant financial barriers in accessing facilities such as MOTAT, Auckland Art Gallery, Stardome, Auckland Zoo, Auckland War Memorial Museum and the Aotea Centre due to the distances they have to travel. We would like to see the new entity work with local boards to increase access to these facilities for all Aucklanders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Auckland Transport and the need for this CCO to improve its responsiveness to local boards and local communities. These recommendations build upon previous decisions by the Governing Body (GB/2017/117) that directed Auckland Transport to improve engagement with local boards, enhance local board decision-making on local projects and remove barriers to local place-making. A key direction from the Governing Body for Auckland Transport to provide a local work programme for each local board for each financial year remains unfulfilled by Auckland Transport. The board believes that an annual work programme would go a long way in making Auckland Transport more accountable and responsive to local boards. We ask that such a requirement be a key part of the Governing Body direction to Auckland Transport. The board reiterates its previous support for two councillors to be formally appointed to the board of Auckland Transport, as allowed for by legislation, and sees this as a crucial accountability and transparency mechanism. The board does not believe this creates an inherent or insurmountable conflict of interest, as elected members are well aware of their obligations when wearing multiple governance hats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>The board agrees with the recommendations relating to Panuku. The reduction of Panuku's overheads, including staff costs, needs to be addressed immediately and is highly inappropriate in this climate of significant service and staff reductions. The board supports the needs for a comprehensive property strategy and the need to remove responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service property for disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercare</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Watercare and looks forward to providing input into a much overdue Three Waters Strategy for Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>20-43</td>
<td>The board recommends local boards are integrated into CCO accountability mechanisms as much as possible, including setting strategic directions, joint workshops with CCOs, and developing statements of intent. The board also recommends that CCO engagement plans and annual work programmes are required to be adopted by local boards rather than presented to them as a fait accompli. The board is pleased with and supports the recommendation of senior level interaction between local boards and CCOs as the current level of &quot;liaison&quot; is inadequate and frustrating for communities and elected members. The board supports the recommendations to improve CCO accountability to Maori through adopted plans and IMSB oversight. The board believes there are significant efficiencies to be made across the council group through shared back-office services and reiterates its previous feedback that these efficiencies should be a focus of the council group as it recovers from the COVID-19 pandemic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>44-64</td>
<td>The board believes that the success of the CCOs and their credibility with local boards and the community relies on a culture of public service, customer care and democratic accountability. The board has been critical of CCO accountability and culture in the past and recommends that a significant amount of effort and focus be placed on culture change. The board also believes that there is a vast gulf between the level of responsiveness and accountability that CCOs provide to the Governing Body and that which they provide to local boards. Senior CCO staff do not attend local board meetings nor share their strategic direction with local boards. This board has found the need to consistently follow up with CCOs such as Auckland Transport on queries and complaints until it is escalated to senior management. The board therefore recommends a key part of the culture change framework and approach should be developed with local board involvement, and with accountability to local boards and local communities as a central tenet. The board is especially pleased that the panel recommended making CCOs subject to council's quality advice guidelines and for their reports to be subject to NZIER review. The board has been critical of reports by CCOs, especially Auckland Transport, and believes this recommendation will go a long way to improving its performance. The board supports the panel's findings and recommendations regarding CCO remuneration. We are very pleased with the recommendations to align CCO pay rates with council pay rates,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manurewa Local Board
and especially with the recommendation that council exercise greater control over CEO remuneration. We often hear feedback from residents that they are unhappy with the high salaries paid by CCOs, particularly those paid to their CEOs. This was a common theme in feedback we received on the Emergency Budget. When implemented, these recommendations should go some way towards addressing this issue.

Joseph Allan, Chairperson
25 August 2020
On behalf of the Manurewa Local Board
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Resolution number MT/2020/112

MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Deputy Chairperson D Burrows:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) endorse in principle the package of 64 recommendations set out in the Independent Panel’s review;

b) endorse regular monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations to evaluate whether they are being implemented in an effective and timely manner, and request that local boards be regularly updated on the progress and informed about key improvements prior to their implementation;

c) endorse the recommended collaborative approach between CCOs as this will be a more thorough and efficient model particularly the creation of a set of common key performance measures. Request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed;

d) endorse the standardised template for CCO Statement of Intent (SOIs), and recommend that local board input be facilitated into the development and approval of SOIs;

e) endorse in principle the implementation programme looking at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned, and note that this should also emphasise local board planning cycles;

f) request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests;

g) endorse in principle recommendation 34, but recommend that:
   i. further clarity be given on how local boards should integrate their own planning with CCOs;
   ii. CCOs should actively engage in the development of local strategic documents, particularly Local Board Plans;
   iii. local boards have the opportunity to actively engage in the development of CCO strategic documents, particularly for projects in its local board area;

h) endorse the recommendation that CCO boards should become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass experience working with local communities.

Induction and Training

i) endorse in principle the recommendation for a triennium induction on CCOs and request that this is made available for all elected members;

j) endorse the recommendation that CCOs follow council’s quality advice standards;

k) recommend that CCO staff and board members receive governance inductions to create an understanding of Auckland’s shared governance model.

ATEED and Regional Facilities Auckland

l) endorse the recommended amalgamation of ATEED and Regional Facilities Auckland (RFA), which will provide a more collaborative and efficient approach;

m) recommend that the new ATEED/RFA entity have a greater local focus, supporting economic development from the neighbourhood up;

n) endorse the integrated approach of bringing Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stardome and MOTAT into the new ATEED/RFA entity.
o) endorse recommendation 11 that council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock-and-transform areas);

p) endorse recommendation 14, for Panuku to continue managing council’s nonservice property until the council produces a property strategy and considers whether to combine all property services in one place.

CARIED
Governing Body
27 August 2020

Ōrākei Local Board

Feedback

General

1. In principle the Board agrees that the 64 recommendations be considered as a package but does not support all of the recommendations and the implementation of them as a package.

2. While the review panel has recognised the role of local boards under the section Governance Structure, the review report is confusing given the continuous use of the word “council” throughout the document. At times it is not clear if the review panel is referring to the Council collectively (GB and local boards) or referring to just the GB. On few occasions the reference was specifically to the Governing Body.

3. This reflects a fundamental problem that CCOs are also confused about the legal status of local boards and the use by some CCOs of the word “stakeholder” when referring to local boards.

Implementation

4. The Ōrākei Local Board agrees that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and requests to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.

5. The Board requests more detailed information about how local boards will provide input into the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.

6. The Board supports the notion that Recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards, but notes that Recommendations 34 and 53 are not included in the GB’s recommendations for immediate implementation.

7. It reiterates that CCOs need to better understand that local boards are part of the elected Auckland Council by statute.

8. While CCOs do operate in a commercial manner, they are in fact operating in a democratic local government environment. Accordingly, all CCOs must interact positively and proactively with local boards and their communities. “Consultation” must be real and meaningful and CCOs must be prepared to change their approach to a project as the result of considered and reasonable feedback. They must also be flexible in their approach to projects.

9. The Board requests the involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests. The review will have been a waste of time and money if this is not a primary outcome. Even though some activities are commercial in nature, CCOs are community-owned entities that exist to provide services to those who fund or partly them – Aucklanders. As a result, they must be more conscious of community expectations and appropriately balance commercial and public interests.

10. A draft plan of how this can be achieved is required before it can be discussed.

11. In addition, we would like to see all CCOs developing policies on how they will prioritise public interest/commercial interest conflicts and that the effectiveness of these policies will be measured by public survey to the satisfaction of Auckland Council including the local boards.

12. The Board recommends that a conduit between each CCO and local boards be provided to better respond to local issues e.g. Auckland Transport has a local board relationship manager.

13. In addition, Auckland Transport needs to review how it consults with the community and responds to issues and requests in a timely fashion. Consultation should occur early in the process and be genuine with an open mind.
14. The Board requests that the implementation programme look at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.

Accountability, Monitoring and Reporting

15. The Council’s 2018 accountability policy needs strengthening. At the moment the reference at page 48 of the report appears to favour GB members – to actively build relationships with the GB and talk to relevant ward councillors about projects and issues in their ward. This needs to be expanded to include local boards and recognise that wards and local board areas may not be the same.

16. Because members of the CCO boards are not elected they do not have a profile in the wider public community although they may be well known in the business community. They are accountable for expenditure of public rates funds and are charged with the delivery of positive public outcomes (Watercare is a good example) yet they do not front up to the public for their collective decision-making, leaving public accountability and reproach to their appointed staff. This is not healthy or transparent. The Board suggests all CCO Boards should be made to be more visible in their processes and in the greater levels of accountability now required by the community and Auckland Council e.g. open days.

17. The Board supports more regular monitoring of CCO activities to evaluate whether the changes resulting from Recommendation 53 are working effectively. The Ōrākei Local Board asks who should undertake the monitoring so that it is transparent, and how often it should take place.

18. Each CCO individually must report to local boards on their activities in each board area and wherever possible apply the expected high reporting standard now being used in the Auckland Council staff reports. The Board notes that there will also be situations where it is useful to have a co-ordinated approach from CCOs in their reporting for major regional, town centre or infrastructure projects.

19. The Board requests that workshops with CCOs (at least twice yearly) be convened to deal SOLELY with local issues rather than regional updates.

Merger of ATEED and RFAL

20. The Ōrākei Local Board suggests conditional support for the merger of ATEED and RFAL. While the review extols the synergies and benefits of a merger, it is hard to see the significant benefits and cost savings (apart from not duplicating expensive boards and senior staff) of having a mega commercial-oriented CCO. Currently, each performs quite different functions. RFAL is a functional arm looking after assets i.e. the zoo, stadia, art gallery, theatres. ATEED has more of an entrepreneurial focus. There could be benefits in them working more efficiently together, as long as their two quite separate activity outcomes are kept distinct.

21. The Board would like to see a more streamlined approach and recommends a review of the functions of ATEED to identify and remove functions that can and should be delivered by the private sector to avoid duplication, reduce ratepayer funding and to acknowledge that some of the business is commercial in nature.

22. Current stadium management seems siloed and competitive with dysfunctional relationships between event organisers, rugby, cricket and football organisations. Strong governance with initial high engagement from the Governing Body will be necessary to ensure the right balance between community benefit and commercial returns.

23. Further analysis and public input is required to assess the merits of joint management and operation of the city’s stadiums with the Eden Park Trust. The Board is concerned that significant Council revenue has been needed over the years in order to keep Eden Park operating.

24. A stadium strategy for the four venues would be a catalyst for change, enable efficient and cost-effective (share office functions) joint management and ensure good planning of capital investment. We need an efficient, complementary mix of venues to attract world-class events.

Ōrākei Local Board
25. The Board does not agree with bringing the Auckland Museum into the proposed merged CCO. While we are concerned that Auckland Council currently has extremely minimal control over funding demands of these entities, we are also concerned that they will always require funding and are not, nor should be, self-sufficient as much of their value is their social and cultural benefits and part of making a great city.

26. The Board suggests that the St James Theatre should be included as part of RFAL’s assets as this will fulfil and complement the expectation of establishing a performing arts precinct in the CBD including the Civic Theatre, Town Hall and Aotea Centre.

Watercare CCO and Healthy Waters (Council Department)

27. The Ōrākei Local Board notes the Review Panel at pages 44-46 of its report recommends Healthy Waters works more closely with Watercare, with some operational aspects passed to Watercare, but stops short of actually recommending a merger, and not bringing the whole of Healthy Waters’ activities into Watercare at this time.

28. The Board understands the Government, through the Department of Internal Affairs is currently undertaking a review into the three waters services provision and how the three waters are delivered, which may require legislative change. The Board considers it timely that the Governing Body looks closely at this, as part of the CCO review. Merging Healthy Waters and Watercare should be determined on conclusion of DIA’s three waters review.

Panuku

29. The Ōrākei Local Board supports Recommendation 11 that the council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock-and-transform areas). The Board’s experience is that the determination of what constitutes “non-service property” is made by Council staff, not Panuku. The decision should be made by elected representatives in the local board area in the first instance and that this process should also include community consultation.

30. Local boards will always want to retain property (especially community assets) and Panuku is mandated to identify property for sale. We support the establishment of an independent “Divestment Advisory Committee”, the job of which would be to prepare advice for the GB and local boards to help make hard but sensible decisions, based on set criteria including social and economic analysis of the merits and risks of selling property.

31. It is important that the final decision for disposing of public property (community assets) is made by elected members and for identifying non-service properties. Local boards are more likely to have more local knowledge about community needs than Panuku or the GB; the initial decision should therefore be made at local board level.

32. Recommendation 14 suggests Panuku retain management of non-service properties until a strategy is developed. We do not support this and request that all non-service properties be returned to closer council control immediately while the property strategy is being developed.

Other recommendations

33. The Ōrākei Local Board supports Recommendation 23, that the council develops a template CCOs must use when drafting their statements of intent, as well as a set of common key performance measures they must include, to ensure consistency in length, detail, presentation and benchmarks.

34. The Board supports Recommendations 20 and 25 and believe Recommendation 30 should not be required if 20 and 25 fulfill their obligations.

35. The reduction in staff levels has been made as a result of current budgetary restraints. Here the issue is about setting the correct organisational structure and improving in both short and long terms the relationships between CCOs and elected members of the Auckland Council and respective staff. It is therefore important that the appropriate staff in sufficient numbers are engaged in this important task.
36. The Board partially supports Recommendation 43. We do not support mandatory ethnic, gender, age or religious quota for governing boards but would like selection processes to take into account skills and expertise, a diversity of experience, including engagement with local community, and governance experience. The candidates should have strong knowledge about Auckland and an Auckland-centric approach. The board members, particularly those appointed to chair, should be more visible or at the very least their names are publicly known.

37. Recommendation 44 is necessary and should apply to all CCOs. In particular, a culture change is needed at Auckland Transport, but also at Panuku and RFA to dispel the public perception of arrogance and disconnectedness and to provide greater transparency and accountability.

38. Information and transparency are necessary when dealing with community projects, especially in terms of the costs and time it takes to implement small projects, and where the local community can have influence over local design and implementation. Delays for minor works are the cause of much community frustration and criticism.

39. We suggest that Recommendation 26 be implemented in two parts being separation of governance and management with “Part One” occurring very early in the term and the GB member management role as CCO shareholders 6 months later (as “Part Two”) to avoid information overload. This should be compulsory for all new and returning elected representatives.

40. Likewise, it is essential that the CCO boards should have the same induction as outlined above (Recommendation 26).

41. Local boards should also be given the opportunity early in the election cycle to meet with each CCO board and thereafter perhaps annually to improve knowledge and to recognise the inter-dependency of their planning.

42. The Board notes that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members. We do not support the election of any Governing Body members to the boards of any CCOs. Accountability and reporting against Statements of Intent should be a management function and Independent of Councilor representation which by its very nature will always be conflicted.

43. The Board requests more information about Recommendation 62 before decisions on changing IT and HR platforms are universally changed.

44. We do not believe either Council or ANY of the CCO’s are looking pro-actively to make communication more intuitive, easier to access, easier to understand or easier to respond to. We would like to see platform investment in better use of digital technologies (a good example of this is the AT research being done on real-time GPS located maps showing all current and potential planned works accessible by elected members). We consider one way of improving CCO/Local Board engagement is by better digital/technology platform development that allows elected members to track CCO activity in their patch.
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel noting that the independent panel have devised these recommendations to work as a package

b) welcome the findings into the issues faced by local boards and the recommendation that the relationship between CCOs and local boards needs to be reset; and request that this work be started as soon as possible

c) welcome the recommendation that the make-up of CCO boards should be more ethnically diverse

d) support and endorse the CCO Review in its entirety

e) strongly recommend the involvement of local boards in strategic planning discussions including and in the process of setting expectations and clear strategic direction for CCOs

f) support the recommendation to approve a merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited)

g) provide the following feedback on specific recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec#</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>support a more joined up management (but not ownership) approach with Eden Park Trust and look forward to providing input into a stadia strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4-7  | due to the impact of transport in local areas, local boards need to have appropriate involvement in the implementation of all recommendations relating to Auckland Transport  
welcome the recommendation that council plays a more active role in the preparation of and must endorse the regional land transport plan before it goes to the Auckland Transport Board for approval. Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board is of the view that this will enable local board views and input to be properly considered |
| 11   | note the need to provide for local board input into decisions on the sale of non-service property |
| 15   | recommend that the water strategy must address conservation of water and future-proofing and enhancement of natural water sources |
| 21   | Strongly recommend the inclusion of local board representation in the strategic planning process with CCO boards and the Governing Body  
considers that key decisions such as the identification of Transform and Unlock locations are strategic decisions of the council and these affect local communities, as such, local boards need to play an active role in these discussions and give input into the decisions |
| 27   | note that in order to forge and maintain a stronger working relationship between local boards and CCOs, these informal relationship building initiatives should also be extended to local boards or at the very least, to local board chairs. |
| 34   | strongly support this recommendation noting that the implementation of this recommendation requires detailed input from local boards |
| 42   | strongly recommend local board involvement in discussions and decision that will give CCO guidance on how to balance public and commercial interests (recommendation 42) noting that a failure to get this balance right will continue to affect the relationship between local boards and CCO |
note that this is a Governing Body decision that impacts on the wellbeing of communities and local board areas of responsibilities and as such, the Governing Body must consider local board views and preferences before making this decision (Section 15(2) Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009)

43 strongly support the recommendation for more ethnically diverse membership at CCO board level because diversity in representation ensures a breadth of perspective that better serves our diverse, multicultural communities

______________________________________________
Lotu Fuli                                          26 August 2020
Chairperson, Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board          Date

______________________________________________
Dr Ashraf Choudhary                               26 August 2020
Deputy Chairperson, Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board   Date

Incl.
Attachment A: CCO Review report feedback

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
Papakura Local Board

The Papakura Local Board thanks the Governing Body for the opportunity to provide feedback on the recommendations of the Independent Panel on council’s substantive CCOs. This feedback should be read in conjunction with the feedback the board provided in April 2020, which is provided as Appendix B.

CCOs have the responsibility, budget and power to make a significant difference to local town centres, neighbourhoods and economies. Local boards are therefore heavily invested in the success of the CCO model and the responsiveness of CCOs to local boards and communities. The Papakura Local Board is pleased with the work of the Independent Panel and agrees with all 64 of its recommendations in principle.

Recommendation

The successful implementation of these recommendations is crucial and should be overseen by a joint governance panel made up of Governing Body, Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) and local board representatives. This supports the recurring theme in the Panel’s report of the need for CCOs to be more responsive and accountable to local boards.

The Papakura Local Board also provides the following specific feedback on the recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA and ATEED</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed merger and the likely ongoing cost savings to offset the initial cost of the merger. The board will provide further input as part of the Long-term Plan process to define the new entity’s services and objectives, including its responsibilities towards local economic development and regional approach to events. The board supports a council directed Stadiums Strategy and a reset of RFA led prior attempts at such a strategy. The board supports discussion with MOTAT and the War Memorial Museum on amalgamating with the new merged entity but expresses no preference at this stage whether the amalgamation is necessary for better strategic planning with all of Auckland’s key cultural institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Auckland Transport and the need for the CCO to improve its responsiveness to local boards and local communities. These recommendations build upon previous decisions by the Governing Body (GB/2017/117) which directed Auckland Transport to improve engagement with local boards, enhance local board decision-making on local projects and remove barriers to local place-making. A key direction from the Governing body for Auckland Transport to provide a local work programme for each local board for each financial year remains unfulfilled by Auckland Transport. The board believes an annual work programme will go a long way to make AT more accountable and responsive to local boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Papakura Local Board
and ask that such a requirement be a key part of the Governing Body direction to Auckland Transport.

The board reiterates its previous support for two councillors to be formally appointed to the board of Auckland Transport as allowed for by legislation and sees this as a crucial accountability and transparency mechanism. The board does not believe this creates an inherent/insurmountable conflict of interest as elected members are well aware of their obligations when wearing multiple governance hats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>The board agrees with the recommendations relating to Panuku. The reduction of Panuku’s overheads including staff costs and annual underspend of capital budget needs to be addressed immediately. These costs are highly inappropriate in this climate of significant service and staff reductions. The board supports the needs for a comprehensive property strategy and the need to remove responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service property for disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watercare</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Watercare and looks forward to providing input into a much overdue three waters strategy for Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>20-43</td>
<td>The board recommends local boards are integrated into CCO accountability mechanisms as much as possible including setting strategic directions, joint workshops with CCOs and developing statements of intent. A partnership process is the ideal where local boards are engaging with the CCO’s and their boards to better meet the outcomes our local board and the ward. The board would like to see consequences for a CCO failing to deliver on agreed outcomes that would drive a culture change. Local board budgets should not automatically be seen as the answer to any budget shortfalls. The board also recommends CCO engagement plans and annual work programmes have to be adopted by local boards rather than presented to them as a fait accompli. The board is pleased with and supports the recommendation of senior level interaction between the local boards and CCOs as the current level of “liaison” is inadequate and frustrating for communities and elected members. The board supports the recommendations to improve CCO accountability to Māori through adopted plans and IMSB oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>44-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The board believes the success of the CCOs and their credibility with the local boards and the community relies on a culture of public service, customer care and democratic accountability. The board has been critical of CCO accountability and culture in the past and recommends a significant amount of effort and focus be placed on culture change.

The board also believes there is a vast gulf between CCO responsiveness/accountability to the Governing Body and to local boards. Senior CCO staff do not attend local board meetings nor share their strategic direction with local boards. This board has found the need to consistently follow up with CCOs such as Auckland Transport on queries and complaints until it is escalated to senior management. The board therefore recommends a key part of the culture change framework/ approach should be developed with local board involvement and with accountability to local boards and local communities as a central tenet.

The board is especially pleased the panel recommended making CCOs subject to council’s quality advice guidelines and for their reports to be subject to NZIER review. The board has been critical of reports by CCOs, especially Auckland Transport, and believes this recommendation will go a long way to improving its performance.

---

Brent Catchpole  
Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board  
Date: 25 August 2020

Jan Robinson  
Deputy Chairperson  
Papakura Local Board

Papakura Local Board
## Puketapapa Local Board

26 August 2020

**Relating to multiple recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board Resolutions</th>
<th>Local Board Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge the value of this comprehensive review, but note that it fell short of substantive changes that may have required changes to legislation</td>
<td>The board acknowledges that the review highlighted changes that could be implemented relatively easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note that there seems to be a lack of understanding from CCPs that they are public entities and that they are delivering services on behalf of Auckland Council</strong></td>
<td>Accountability to Auckland Council and the public is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the notion that recommendations 6, 34 and 53 will require more detailed input from local boards.</td>
<td>NOTE: more detailed feedback is provided under each recommendation, below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note that recommendations 20, 25, and 30 from the review, and recommendation (e) from staff to the Governing Body will require additional staff at a time when the council is reducing staff numbers and request a commitment from the Chief Executive that staff will be made available for this project.</strong></td>
<td>Noting that, as a result of the Emergency Budget, Council staff numbers are being reduced. This may make the implementation of this more challenging, both in terms of staff numbers and institutional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/endorse the recommendations 26, 50 and 59 regarding induction and training and note the reduced staff/budget of the team that delivers these programmes.</td>
<td>NOTE: more detailed feedback is provided under each recommendation, below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relating to specific recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Local board resolutions</th>
<th>Local Board Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Request that the RLTP is drafted collaboratively between the CCO and Council. It should then be approved in principle by the CCO board, with the final approval by Council.</strong></td>
<td>It is the view of the board that the RLTP should be drafted with input from Council, including local boards, and final approval should sit with Council. However, we acknowledge that this may require legislative change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Seeks a number of clarifications and actions regarding Recommendation 6, as per the comments provided</strong></td>
<td>It is not clear what the definition of a ‘minor capital work’ is. A budget amount could be a useful measure Requests that AT develops a work programme with the board, including a list of projects planned in the next year/3 years. This increases transparency, provides opportunities to collaborate and allows tailoring for local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Agree recommendation 23 regarding the creation of a set of common key performance measures and request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed.</strong></td>
<td>Council should set key performance measures for CCOs but most importantly, each CCO should have a carefully detailed, clear, and strategic direction. Key performance measures for CCOs should align with the approach used for Auckland Council. Key performance measures must be linked to consequences, in order to be effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td><strong>Note that Recommendation 31 is particularly important for local boards</strong></td>
<td>The board fully supports a no-surprises policy, it is essential for the work that the board does for its community. The policy needs to respond to each situation and be relative to the significance of the work. It should be a part of key performance measures and enforced. CCOs should be held to account through a Statement of Intent. Regular CCOs and Governing body meetings should also be organised to build relationship and communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>Seeks that Recommendation 32 include local boards</strong></td>
<td>This currently describes the relationship between governing body and CCOs. Local boards need to be included in this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>Supports Recommendation 34 and seeks a number of clarifications and actions regarding this recommendation, as per the comments provided</strong></td>
<td>The board would like to better understand what meant by &quot;more initiative by local boards in aligning their own planning with CCO planning&quot;. The expectation is that CCOs align with Local Board plans. Section 92 of the LGA requires this. The regularity of CCO reporting to local boards will vary for each CCO, depending on the nature of the work. This should be agreed with each local board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Support recommendation 41 and request that IT systems be updated and aligned to ensure that an up to date directory of staff including all CCO staff is available to all.</strong></td>
<td>Support improved integration between the different call centres and other services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>Support recommendation 43 that CCO boards need to become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass that board members should have experience working with local communities.</strong></td>
<td>The board would like to see consideration given to the merit of individual board directors sitting on a number of boards. Supports CCO boards to become more culturally diverse, with a broad range of experience. There needs to be a clear pipeline for local boards to encourage community members to be considered for these positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Note recommendation 44 regarding setting a tone for organizational culture and request more detailed information on how a culture change will be implemented at Auckland Transport</strong></td>
<td>This will need timeframes and monitoring, in order to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec. No.</td>
<td>Local board Resolutions</td>
<td>Local Board Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Support the merger of RFA and ATEED.</em></td>
<td>ATEED does local business support and tourism promotion well, but has been less than effective with local economic development. The board recognises the synergies between regional facilities with tourism component of ATEED as well as the cost saving benefits from this proposal. However, it is concerned that local economic development will become more confused/diluted in this merger. It is important that the implementation of this review considers which part of Council will be responsible for this. It is essential that the new combined entity is has clear, strategic goals set out for them, particularly not neglecting local economic development. The name chosen for the new entity is well understood by the community. Local board involvement in the selection of a name would assist with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Support the notion of a reduced number of CCOs that local boards and their</em></td>
<td>Support further consolidation and shared services to reduce duplication and improve public access to council services. However, it is important that this will not result in any reduction in transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board Resolutions</th>
<th>Local Board Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong> Request involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests</td>
<td>Support the assertion that CCOs are first and foremost public entities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About Panuku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Local board Resolutions</th>
<th>Local Board Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Support recommendation 11 that council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock-and-transform areas)</td>
<td>Local boards need to be involved in this from an early stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Support the need for a property strategy as outlined in recommendation 14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### About the recommendations more generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Local board Resolutions</th>
<th>Local Board Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note that the review stated that all 64 recommendations should be considered as a package. Support all the recommendations and the implementation of them as a package.</td>
<td>It is not clear why the recommendations need to be considered as a package. The board’s view is that some recommendations are a higher priority than others. The board would like to be involved in the prioritisation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree that success of the review will lie in the implementation of all recommendations, and request to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note that the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members should be Auckland Transport board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the notion that CCOs should be more joined up in their approach to local activities, issues and reporting, where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board is supportive, in principle of a ‘joined up approach’ but would like to better understand what this means, in terms of implementation. It would like input into determining this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would assist to have a threshold for projects which cause disruption where CCO’s have to consult with each other about if they have plans in a similar place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local boards are the natural ‘clearing house’ for these kinds of connections. Any work to do with local projects or issues should come to the Local Board. There could be an agreed ‘trigger list’ for issues that need to come to the Local Board specifically (as opposed to embedded in a report or works lists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCOs can report separately as they deal with very different issues. They might also need to report at different frequencies as mentioned in recommendation 34. To assist with clarity, there could be a common template across CCOs to manage reporting expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request that, once the review recommendations have been implemented, a review of whether or not there could be further improvements of the CCO structure as per Puketāpapa Local Board resolution PKTPP/2020/35, including further consideration of bringing CCO functions in house.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is currently a duplication and confusion of governance structures where CCOs are accountable to both their board of directors as well as Auckland Council governance structures. This makes accountability unclear, especially to the public. Once the review’s recommendations are implemented, we suggest further work to examine bringing functions in-house where concerns about accountability and effective delivery remain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rodney Local Board

That the Rodney Local Board:

1. Agrees that success of the CCO review will lie in its implementation, and requests to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.

2. Reiterates its previous feedback that local board plans need to inform all CCOs’ strategies, plans, policies, projects and reporting. Local board plans are the key strategic documents, required by legislation and informed by consultation with local communities, that local boards produce. The outcomes, objectives and initiatives in local board plans should be woven throughout all the operations and activities of CCOs.

3. Requests more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.

4. Strongly supports recommendations 6, 34 and 53, and requests the opportunity for local boards to provide more detailed input to give effect to these recommendations.

5. Supports the idea that regular monitoring is put in place to evaluate whether the changes resulting from recommendation 53 are working effectively.

6. Supports the notion that CCOs should collaborate and integrate their approaches to local activities amongst all CCOs. There are many examples of CCOs operating in silos and being disconnected from council departments, such as AT and Healthy Waters on flooding and drainage in the road corridor, ATEED, council’s Economic Development unit, and Arts Community and Events (ACE), on local economic development activities; Panuku and council’s Corporate Property team on opportunities to maximise and coordinate transformational development of town centres and future civic space requirements.

7. Supports the recommendation that CCOs should be joined up in their reporting.

8. Supports the notion of a reduced number of CCOs that local boards and their communities need to interact with, which can be achieved through mergers or bringing activities back in house.

9. Supports the merger of RFA and ATEED.

10. Supports discussion and local board involvement on how a merged RFA/ATEED will enhance the role of business improvement districts (BIDs).

11. Supports the notion of bringing the Auckland War Memorial Museum, Stardome and MOTAT into the entity formed by the merger of RFA and ATEED.

12. Requests that local boards be involved in discussions on developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests.

13. Supports recommendation 11 that council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service properties to sell (excluding those in the CCOs’ own unlock-and-transform areas).

14. Supports the need for a property strategy as outlined in recommendation 14.

15. Supports recommendation 23, but with the proviso that the template includes a local board plan impact statement or similar referring to local board objectives for local projects and advocacy. This would be especially important for AT, Watercare and Panuku.

16. Supports recommendation 41 and requests that IT systems be updated and aligned to ensure that an up-to-date directory of staff including all CCO staff is available to all, and notes that a group-wide directory through council’s intranet would also be beneficial to elected members. This is already in place for AT and ATEED staff but not for Watercare.

17. Notes that recommendations 20, 25, and 30 could add bureaucracy and prolonged decision making.

18. Supports better joint communications, strengthened relationships and collaboration between CCOs, more effort to consult on and implement local projects, better reporting of complaints, and the inclusion of key performance indicators on complaint handling within CCOs’ Statements of Intent, particularly for Watercare.
19. Supports recommendations 26, 50 and 59 regarding induction and training and notes the reduced staff/budget of the team that delivers these programmes.

20. Requests that the CCO review implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.

21. Supports AT’s Planning and Strategy team to be moved in-house to Auckland Council which should set the direction and issue the letter of expectation to AT. AT would then become a delivery agency, and notes this is possible under legislation and would return the planning and strategy back to council.

22. Does not support any elected members being appointed to any of the CCO boards. However, if it is decided to reinstate two elected members to the board of AT, then one of those elected members should be a local board member selected from among the local boards themselves.

23. Supports a break-out of spend by local board area in the Regional Land Transport Plan so that the benefits to residents in local board areas are clear and visible.

This decision is authorised by Chairperson P Pirrie and Deputy Chairperson B Houlbrooke, who have delegated authority to make, on behalf of the local board, urgent decisions on matters that cannot wait until the next scheduled ordinary meeting of the local board. Resolution number RD/2019/147.

____________________

Phelan Pirrie
Chairperson

Date: 26 August 2020

____________________

Beth Houlbrooke
Deputy Chairperson

Date: 26 August 2020
Upper Harbour Local Board

Addressing the recommendations 1-64, the Upper Harbour Local Board wishes to make the following comments:

ATEED and Regional Facilities Auckland 1-3
At this time the board has received insufficient information to comment on the proposed merger. We agree with the feedback received, that ATEED provide inadequate local economic development at a local level in Business Improvement Districts.

Auckland Transport 4-7
The Board supports these recommendations relating Auckland Transport in particular the following:

- 4. Auckland Transport and the council jointly prepare the regional land transport plan, the draft of which the council endorses before going to the CCO’s board for approval. We are of the view that Local Boards must also be included in the development of the regional land transport plan.

- 6. Auckland Transport urgently reviews how it designs, consults on, funds, and implements minor capital works, including how it involves local boards in the design of its annual work programme. This in the board’s view is key as at present the Local Board has minimal involvement in the AT annual work programme of minor capital works. The engagement should be genuine engagement and not just AT telling local boards what the program is. Request that AT share with the local board the strategy and plans for the board area.

Panuku 8-14
Support the recommendations in particular the following:

- 11. The council assumes responsibility from Panuku for identifying and deciding which nonservice properties to sell (excluding those in the CCO’s own unlock-and-transform areas).

- 14. Panuku continues to manage the council’s non-service property until the council produces a property strategy and considers whether to combine all property services in one place.

That Panuku work with local boards in developing property strategies such as those for park and rides.

Watercare 15-19
Support the recommendations.

The need for greater collaboration between Council and Watercare is necessary e.g. working together to accept responsibility that water supply is available for all residents in Auckland, not just those connected to the mains.

In particular the level 3 water restrictions published by Watercare stated that they would not be providing refills to those on tank water and the board believes that this is unacceptable. Watercare and the Governing Body should also develop a strategy to allow more non-potable water to be used for situations where potability isn’t needed.

Accountability 20-43
Support the recommendations in particular the following:

Upper Harbour Local Board
• 23. The council develops a template CCOs must use when drafting their statements of intent, as well as a set of common key performance measures they must include, to ensure consistency in length, detail, presentation, and benchmarks. It is essential that Local Boards provide input into the development of the key performance measures.

• 34. CCOs and local boards reset how they engage with one another, by means of:
  1. a workshop to develop a more meaningful way for CCOs and local boards to work together
  2. the preparation of joint CCO engagement plans for each local board
  3. more initiative by local boards in integrating their own planning with CCO planning
  4. liaison between CCOs and local boards at a more senior level so CCOs can quickly remedy local board concerns
  5. the preparation of joint CCO six-monthly reports for each local board
  6. the communication of clear, up-to-date information from CCOs to local boards on projects in their area.

This recommendation is key in determining a successful way forward to establish a more efficient working relationship between CCO’s and Local Boards. CCO discussions with local boards need to be forward looking not backward looking as stated in the review document.

• 41. The council and CCOs review the quality of the service their call centres provide, including by ensuring an up-to-date, group-wide phone directory is on hand containing job descriptions and contact details of all staff. The quality of service provided has been a frequent complaint by our residents.

Culture 44-64
These are generally supported but further information is sought on some e.g.

• 44. The council and CCOs have common values and expectations of staff and management behavior that collectively set the tone for the broader culture of all council organisations.
   It is unclear exactly what is meant by “the tone” and how this will impact on delivery.

• 45. CCOs appoint a lead agency when working jointly on projects.
   The board is supportive of this as an example of greater collaboration between CCO’s, which is essential to achieve appropriate outcomes and results.

• 53. CCOs make more effort to co-ordinate how they consult the community on and implement local projects.
   The Board would like more detail on this recommendation around consulting local community. Local boards are elected representatives of the community so this consultation should include local boards who have a strategic and governance view.

Summary:

• The Upper Harbour Local Board sees improved relationships between CCO’s and Locals Boards as a key priority in achieving outcomes for our communities.
• A greater detailed role in discussions of works programmes at an earlier stage is sought.
• Accountability is another area which has been lacking across all CCO’s and with their interactions with the Governing Body and Local Boards. This needs to be addressed in order to have our CCO’s work more efficiently and collaboratively across the Council family.
• The Board would recommend a review of the implementation of this report in 3 years.
On behalf of the Upper Harbour Local Board we appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the CCO review.

Margaret Miles QSM JP
Chairperson Upper Harbour Local Board
Waiheke Local Board

Formal feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review

The Waiheke Local Board appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Independent Council-Controlled Organisations Review recommendations. This feedback should be read in conjunction with the feedback the board provided in April 2020, which is attached for your reference.

The Independent Panel are commended for the well-rounded review, summation findings and comprehensive recommendations.

The board supports the recommendations and the implementation of them as a package. It is noted that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request to be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme.

The board requests more detailed information about how local boards might provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs.

The Waiheke Local Board provides the following specific feedback on the recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA and ATEED</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>The board supports the proposed merger as it would bring together two entities with more similarities than differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It would produce economies of scale and cost savings and would enable better accountability and monitoring by reducing the number of CCOs from five to four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are other tangible benefits to having a combined entity that would be attracting and delivering events, managing the city’s cultural institutions, venues and stadiums, and attracting visitors, business and investment that foster social, cultural and economic wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of meaningful economic development initiatives at a local board level should be a key objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The joint management and operation of the city’s four stadiums with the Eden Park Trust and the addition of the Auckland War Memorial Museum into the merged entity should be explored further as part of the implementation programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The board requests involvement of local boards in discussions around developing guidance to CCOs on how to balance public and commercial interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>The board supports the recommendations relating to Auckland Transport and the need for the CCO to involve local boards in the design of its annual work programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is noted the recommendations do not address the question of whether Governing Body members should be Auckland Transport board members, and this should be addressed. The board recognises that the Governing Body can direct CCOs through its governance function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and that therefore there should be no need for Governing Body members to sit on CCO boards.

However, should governing body members be appointed to CCO boards then one of the positions should be filled by a local board member given the critical interface that CCOs have with local boards.

**Panuku**  8-14

The board agrees with the recommendations relating to Panuku.

The board supports the needs for a comprehensive property strategy and the need to remove responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service property for disposal.

**Watercare**  15-19

The board supports the recommendations relating to Watercare and looks forward to providing input into a long overdue three waters strategy for Auckland.

**Accountability**  20-43

The board agrees with recommendation 23 regarding the creation of a set of common key performance measures and request that local boards be able to provide input into how these are developed.

The board reiterates its request for CCOs to actively engage at the development stage of local strategic plans which provide the context for local strategic priorities, and to reference these in the development of the statement of intent to facilitate regular, relevant and joined-up reporting and engagement.

Note that recommendations 20, 25, and 30 from the review, and recommendation (e) from staff to the Governing Body will require additional staff at a time when the council is reducing staff numbers and request a commitment from the Chief Executive that staff will be made available for this project. Given the skill base required the senior roles should be recruited competitively in the open market, thus also opening the pathway to CCO applicants.

The board supports the recommendations to improve CCO accountability to Maori through adopted plans and IMSB oversight.

The board supports recommendation 43 that CCO boards need to become more diverse, and request that the recommendation is implemented more broadly to encompass experience of community development.

**Culture**  44-64

The board supports all recommendations. The board requests that the implementation programme looks at the planning cycles for Auckland Council and CCOs and how they can be better aligned.

Waiheke Local Board

26 August 2020
Waitākere Ranges Local Board

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) generally supports the recommendations of the Independent Panel relating to the CCO review.

b) supports the merger of ATEED and Regional Facilities Auckland.

c) supports proposals requiring greater community accountability from AT. In particular:
   i. supports creation of a working group to delineate bylaw making powers and proposes that local board membership of such a group is important.
   ii. supports a review of the designing, funding, consultation on and implementation of minor capital works and especially how local boards are involved in the design of AT’s annual work programme.

d) supports Council formulating a three-waters strategy and integrating this strategy as a core requirement of all of Watercare’s activities.

e) supports the setting of minimum performance levels for all CCOs and the setting of statements of expectation for all CCOs.

f) supports proposals designed to improve CCO engagement with local boards.

g) repeats its earlier comments provided by way of feedback in particular the requirement for all CCOs to comment in their annual reports how they have considered the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 in their decision making in the preceding year.

h) submits that any considerations made about sales or recycling of assets by Panuku or any other Council body be made with clear, robust and accountable local board engagement.

i) notes the short timeframe for getting this feedback into this stage and looks forward to engaging on these matters in more detail.
Waitematā Local Board

The Waitematā Local Board welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the Review of Auckland Council’s council-controlled organisations (CCOs). This feedback should be read in conjunction with the feedback the local board provided in March 2020 (Resolution number WTM/2020/59), provided as Appendix C.

That the Waitematā Local Board

a) receive the findings and recommendations of the Review of CCOs by the independent panel and welcomes and agrees with the three proposed significant improvements:
   i. the council should give the CCOs clear strategic direction.
   ii. the council should give guidance and specify requirements to strike a balance between commercial and public interests.
   iii. the council should amalgamate Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development with Regional Facilities Auckland.

b) delegate to Chair Richard Northey to speak at the Governing Body meeting on 27 August 2020.

c) expresses concern that sufficient time has not been allowed for to enable considered local board input into the Review recommendations

d) request that CCOs be required to adhere to local board strategic documents such as local board plans and other approved local plans

e) request that CCOs be required to adhere to national and international treaty obligations

f) recommend that there should be shared principles across the council-controlled organisations

g) recommend that where there are two or more agencies involved and one is identified as lead agency, there be a memorandum of understanding indicating shared goals, limitations, protocols and how to be most effective and agile.

Regional Facilities Auckland and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development

h) express support for recommendation one in the Review report to approve a merger of the Auckland, Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited

i) recommends that a new appropriate and snappy name be considered for the new CCO entity, such as “Destination Auckland”, which would then no longer be confused with AT.

j) note the suggestion in recommendation two in the Review report that Eden Park be incorporated into the new entity

k) recognise the importance of incorporating Eden Park in regional stadia strategy, planning and delivery, but expresses its doubts about this incorporation proposal given its statutory status under the Eden Park Trust Act 2009 and its complex assets and liabilities.

l) recognise that the desire in recommendation three in the Review report is that the War Memorial Museum and MOTAT become part of the new CCO but believe that this will be very difficult to achieve, particularly as they each have their own Private Act of Parliament and constitutionally such legislation can only be changed with the consent of the entity concerned, so suggest that this is not an immediate priority.

m) reiterate its views from resolution WTM/2020/86, in the Emergency Budget concerning the importance of economic development in light of COVID-19 recovery and suggests one possible solution is to move the function of economic development into Auckland Council to ensure its continued focus.

n) recommends that the council’s economic development role, whether it is led principally by the new merged CCO or, preferably, it is moved in-house, has to give equal importance to
important aspects of economic development beyond tourism, events and venues, particularly: attracting investment, innovation, export growth, job creation, sustainable green industries and ethical living wage employment."

Auckland Transport

o) support recommendations four to seven in the Review report relating to Auckland Transport and the need for Auckland Transport to improve its responsiveness to local boards and local communities.

p) note that these recommendations build upon previous decisions by the Governing Body (GB/2017/117) which directed Auckland Transport to improve engagement with local boards, enhance local board decision-making on local projects and remove barriers to local placemaking.

q) urge that the opportunity should be taken now, to ask the Government to amend the Act which established Auckland Council. These amendments should be done in such a way as to enable Auckland Council to be fully able to change the roles, structure and operation of Auckland Transport and of Watercare in future; in the same way it can change its other council-controlled organisations.

r) identify the following views and preferences on the other findings and recommendations in the CCO Review:

i. recommendation four in the Review report, the local board recommends that Auckland Transport and the council jointly prepare the Regional Land Transport Plan

ii. recommends that Auckland Council legislation should be changed if necessary, to ensure Auckland Council is ultimately responsible for approving the Regional Land Transport Plan.

iii. recommendation five in the Review report, the local board recommends there should be a strong preference for the council being ultimately responsible for the content of all bylaws in the light of AT’s mixed performance in this regard.

iv. recommendation six in the Review report, the local board recommend that this should be actioned urgently. A working group of Auckland Transport and Local Board representatives should co-design how AT designs, consults on, funds and implements minor capital works, including how it involves local boards in the design of its annual work programme.

s) support recommendation seven in the Review report.

l) request that the responsibility for footpaths, berms, road reserves, hoardings, street furniture and placemaking should be transferred to the council with local board governance.

Panuku Development Auckland

u) support the needs for a comprehensive property strategy and the need to remove responsibility from Panuku for identifying non-service property for disposal.

v) support in general recommendations eight to 14 in the Review report regarding Panuku Development Auckland, particularly recommendation 11 for the council to assume responsibility for identifying non-service properties to sell.

Watercare

w) support in general recommendations 15 to 19 in the Review report regarding Watercare but recommends also that the council should require Watercare to demonstrate that it has ensured an adequate and secure supply of clean water and of wastewater disposal system for all predictable eventualities.

x) support the development of a three waters strategy and ensure adequate resourcing of storm water infrastructure.
Council-controlled organisations accountability

y) support in general the accountability recommendations 20 to 43 but noting our comments above on recommendation 34.

z) request that recommendations 21, 23, 32 and 39 also need to include local board involvement.

aa) request that council-controlled organisations board members appointed abide by best practice such as those set down by the Institute of Directors.

bb) believe that recommendation 42 is particularly important and should be made more explicit and involve local boards. The council, in conjunction with local boards, should take effective actions to ensure that council-controlled organisations are required to appropriately prioritise both commercial and public interests, including their responsibilities to businesses and residents, not just “customers” and “ratepayers” as is usually the case at present.

cc) recommends that the council amend council-controlled organisations’ constitutions to make it explicit that how, each council-controlled organisation must meet both objectives.

Council-controlled organisations culture

dd) support in general the Culture recommendations 44 to 62 in the Review report and asks that recommendation 56 should be interpreted to replace the word “ratepayers” with “residents, businesses and visitors” as all these have a legitimate interest and should have a voice, not just ratepayers.

e) request that recommendation 63 in the Review report should be applied in a way that ensures all workers receive a living wage and fair and adequate remuneration and that the salaries of senior executives are not perceived as excessive.

ff) recommend that recommendation 64 in the Review report should be applied in a way that includes the following. The procurement policy for all CCOs should include being ethical, low carbon, prioritising jobs for locals and disadvantaged groups, and ensuring a living wage for all contract staff.

gg) note that local boards need to be able to provide input on the other CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation.
Whau Local Board

Whau Local board CCO review urgent decision resolutions

That the Whau Local Board:

a) welcome the findings and recommendations in the review of CCOs by the independent panel

b) welcome the proposal in recommendation 34 on how to address CCO/local board engagement, with the following amendments to be implemented as soon as possible:
   i. the local board requests a series of workshops to develop a more meaningful way for CCOs and local boards to work together, as genuine understanding and acknowledgement of co-governance and the forming of relationships will not occur with only one workshop
   ii. the local board requests the preparation of joint CCO engagement plans for each local board, with clear guidelines on how these plans will be implemented and specific outcomes so the levels of engagement can be monitored. Engagement plans have been written during the previous years with little impact or success
   iii. the local board requests more initiatives by local boards in integrating their own planning with CCO planning, including a commitment towards a constructive process and positive outcomes from both parties
   iv. the local board requests liaison between CCOs and local boards at a more senior level so CCOs can quickly remedy local board concerns
   v. the local board requests the preparation of CCO quarterly reports for each local board, and monthly reports from Auckland Transport and any CCO which is undertaking major project work in any particular local board’s area
   vi. the local board requests the communication of clear, up-to-date information from CCOs to local boards on projects in their area. Such communication should be transparent with little use of jargon and specialist language.

b) support the merger of two CCOs (namely Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development and Regional Facilities Auckland Limited) and request that the resultant organisation be proactive in improving economic development across the wider Auckland Region

d) note that local boards will be able to provide input on the other relevant CCO review recommendations as they are further developed for implementation

e) request the following amendments to recommendations in the CCO review:
   i. That “in a working group with local board representatives that co-designs” be inserted after urgently reviews in Recommendation 6
   ii. That recommendation 32 be amended to read “The council draws up a protocol governing information requests between the governing body and CCOs and local boards and CCOs’
   iii. That the engagement recommended in Recommendation 39 be extended to include local boards so local boards can assist by aligning projects and funding of some outcomes
   iv. That CCOs work with local boards to implement Recommendation 53 which requires CCOs to make more effort to co-ordinate how they consult with the community on and implement local projects.
   v. That the induction referred to in Recommendations 26, 50 and 59 be available to local board members.

f) request more detailed information about how local boards will provide input to the process of setting expectations and strategic direction for the CCOs, noting Recommendation 21 in which Council establishes a strategic planning process in which CCOs and Governing Body
holds workshops to discuss work programmes and priorities that feed into Statements of Intent, annual budgeting and planning process

\(g\) request that the statement of intent and statement of expectation of each CCO be expanded to include responsibility and obligations for CCOs to engage with the local board and be responsible and accountable for local issues and priorities identified by the local board (Recommendations 21 and 22).

\(h\) notes that success of the review will lie in its implementation, and request the local boards be involved in the full life cycle of the implementation programme, and its review as we can bring local perspectives on impacts and successes.

Signed by Kay Thomas  
Chairperson, Whau Local Board  
Date: 25/8/2020

Signed by Susan Zhu  
Deputy Chairperson, Whau Local Board  
Date: 25/8/2020

Whau Local Board
Appendix A: Manurewa Local Board Feedback March 2020

Our board thinks this is review is timely and appropriate. It has now been a decade since Auckland Council’s current governance model was put in place. In recent years, a great deal of work has been done through the Governance Framework Review to improve the effectiveness of that structure. This is an opportune time to consider whether the use of CCOs to deliver services, as a part of the current structure, has been effective in serving our communities.

CCO model, roles and responsibilities

1. Does the CCO model deliver council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or are there better ways to deliver such services?

Our board would like the Independent Panel to consider the question of whether the CCO model is the best way to deliver services that are expected to be responsive to the needs of the community. We believe that the CCO model can be useful in delivering services efficiently, but question whether the correct balance is currently being struck between efficient delivery and responsiveness to community needs and preferences.

It is part of the nature of CCOs, as arms-length entities, that they are not subject to direct influence from elected member or the public. However, council CCOs are currently the largest provider of council services to residents. As such, they have direct control over large budgets funded by ratepayers. On this basis, our board believes that CCOs still have a responsibility to respond to the views of the community. As part of this responsibility, CCOs need to work alongside local boards, who have the statutory role of representing the views of their community. This can be a point of tension when services are being delivered through the CCO model.

The CCO model can also be a barrier for integration of service delivery. In recent years, there has been a move within council for departments that are delivering local boards’ work programmes to look for opportunities to coordinate and work together. However, the CCOs have not been engaged in this process. It is our board’s view that the current CCO structure contributes towards services delivered by CCOs being siloed.

The CCO model can lead to a duplication of services, which increases costs to ratepayers. For example, CCOs often have their own IT or human resources departments, but if those services were delivered through council departments they would be supported by the council’s IT and human resources staff. We request that the Independent Panel consider the degree to which services can be shared between CCOs, or between the council and CCOs, within the current legal framework. If there is no scope for this, the additional cost imposed in utilising the CCO model would suggest that the number of CCOs should be kept to a minimum.

CCO accountability

2. Could the council’s current approach to holding CCOs to account on behalf of Aucklanders be improved?

Our board believes that there is a need to improve the accountability of CCOs to the council, elected members, and to the community. The main tools that are available to the council to hold CCOs to account are the appointment of directors, the CCO Statements of Intent (SOI), and the council’s annual Letters of Expectation (LOE) to CCOs.

We think that changes should be made to both the process of approving directors to the boards of CCOs, and to the make-up of those boards, in order to ensure that they will be responsive to our local communities. We acknowledge that there are statutory limitations on placing elected representatives on CCO boards. However, where this is provided for, as is the case for Auckland Transport, we believe that elected members should be appointed as directors, since elected members are the representatives of the views and preferences of their community.

Annexures
We acknowledge that there are concerns around conflicts of interest when Governing Body members sit on the board of AT. However, elected members are experienced in managing conflicts of interest in all aspects of their work, and their conduct on both the Governing Body and on the board of AT is subject to public transparency and scrutiny. We also feel that Parliament specifically sought to address concerns about accountability and responsiveness to the public of Auckland through allowing Governing Body members to sit on the board of AT. The council should respect this by using the power given to them by Parliament. There is a vast difference the current situation where members have been appointed as "liaison councillors" and having a role as decision makers around the board table.

For other CCOs where it is not possible to appoint elected members to the board, we would like to see more involvement of elected members in the selection of candidates for CCO director positions. Our preference would be for local board and governing body members to sit together on selection panels for CCO directors.

We would also like to see directors appointed to CCO boards who are community representatives or have experience as part of a community organisation. This may require reviewing the criteria currently used for the appointment of directors, to remove any restrictions that may prevent candidates with relevant community experience being appointed, or to introduce criteria that promote the appointment of such candidates.

Our board also feels that there should be greater input from local boards into both the CCO Statements of Intent and the council’s Letters of Expectation to CCOs. This would enable these documents to be better aligned with local board plans and other relevant local strategies. However, we are concerned that undertakings in the SOI and LOE lack enforceability. The ability of the council to impose consequences on a CCO that fails to meet expectations is effectively limited to making changes to the board of directors. We believe that the best way to make these documents meaningful is to create a culture committed to implementing them within each CCO.

**CCO culture**

3. Do CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the wider community and council?

As previously noted, it is part of the nature of the CCO model to create distancing between CCOs and local communities, and between CCOs and local boards. CCOs need to have a focus on high quality consultation and frequent communication in order to overcome this. The degree to which CCOs undertake consultation and communications at the local level varies considerably. As a general comment, there is a tendency for CCOs to treat local boards as one stakeholder among many for the purposes of consultation, rather than respecting the statutory role of boards in representing the views and preferences of their communities and their unique place in the co-governance structure of Auckland Council.

We believe that CCO boards should have greater understanding of the priorities set out in Local Board Plans. The focus of the majority of CCOs is not on the local level, which contributes to a disconnect between their goals and the aspirations of local communities. There is considerable scope for CCOs to form partnerships with local boards and use their insights into the needs of their local communities to build trust and confidence.

Our board would like to see a stronger working relationship between CCO boards of directors and local boards. Where we have had experience of this kind of governor-to-governor relationship in the past, we have seen much more effective delivery of services to meet local needs. An example of this is the redevelopment of Te Mahia train station, a partnership between our board and Auckland Transport to redevelop a station that would otherwise have been closed. This was the result the chair of our local board speaking directly to the board of Auckland Transport.

We believe that CCO culture should be focused on meeting the needs of customers. Currently, there is a perception among our community that CCOs are more interested in their own priorities.

**Appendices**
than addressing the concerns of the local community. In our experience, communication with the local community is often poor. As a result, there is often little understanding of the purpose and policies of CCOs. In fact, many members of our local community are not aware of the existence of CCOs. They see all delivery of council services as being carried out by “Auckland Council” and do not differentiate between council and CCOs. This can lead to frustration when elected members are put in the position of apologising for or explaining the actions of CCOs to their community, but are unable to effectively address the community’s concerns due to the “arms-length” nature of that relationship.

Feedback on specific CCOs

The following is our board’s feedback on the CCOs that we have most frequent contact with:

Auckland Transport

a) Auckland Transport is the CCO that local boards usually interact with most frequently. Of the CCOs our board regularly interacts with, AT is often the poorest at communicating and working with us.

b) The main point of contact between AT and local boards is the Elected Member Relationship Manager (EMRM). We believe that the role in any CCO that provides the link between the organisation and the local board needs to carry influence or hold decision-making power; be able to broker solutions for the community; and provide high quality advice to the board. Unfortunately, the EMRM role does not have decision-making power and appears to lack the influence within the organisation to be able to effectively progress the priorities of the local board. It has been our experience that advice provided to the board by AT is often poor, and responses to questions raised by the board are incomplete or inadequate.

c) Communications to the board and our local community is inconsistent and frequently poor. One example of this is the installation of a raised pedestrian crossing that neither the board nor the local community requested on Great South Road last year. Consultation for this was buried within a regionwide project and was not highlighted to the board. The speed table was very controversial with the community, and elected members were initially unable to get answers from AT to help them respond to enquiries from the public. A direct approach from the board chair to the chief executive of AT was needed in order to obtain a satisfactory response from the CCO.

d) On the other hand, the board has successfully partnered with AT on projects such as the Te Mahia train station redevelopment, as mentioned above, and the Wordsworth Quadrant Residential Speed Management project. In the latter case, the board asked AT to provide a solution to address problems with speeding and dangerous driving in a residential area that includes several, and where a child had recently been killed in an accident. The board was able to partner with AT to co-fund a residential speed management programme in the area and address the concerns of the local community.

e) Success stories such as Te Mahia and Wordsworth Quadrant should be the norm, not the exception. Our board believes that it is possible for AT to achieve results such as this, and respond to the needs of local communities, if they are willing to make the necessary changes to the way that they operate.

f) On a broader level, we believe that it is questionable whether transport services are best served by being delivered through a CCO. The nature of transport is an intrinsic public good without a profit-making function, and this is not a good match for the CCO model. Our board believes that the council should advocate to central Government for a legislative change that would allow Auckland Council the same freedom as other local authorities to choose whether its transport services should be delivered through a CCO.

Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)

Annexes
g) Our board has regular contact with Panuku Development Auckland as part of our local board area falls within the Transform Manukau project area. In general, our interactions with Panuku have been positive and have resulted in the delivery of several projects of benefit to our local community. Communication and consultation from Panuku is usually timely and proactive. In one case, Panuku has funded the creation of a new playground in Wiri. In another, they provided funding for the board to rubberise netball courts at Netball Manurewa.

h) They have been proven to be flexible in brokering solutions to local issues with the board. We have also worked closely with Panuku as part of the Puhinui Regeneration Project, which will have benefits across our local board area. This positive relationship has been due to the willingness of Panuku management to work directly with the chair to build relations with the board.

i) The main issue our boards sees with Panuku is the policy of funding their projects through the proceeds of asset sales. We would prefer to see them given the ability to take on debt as a way of funding projects and move towards being able to act as a developer in their own right.

_Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)_

j) The relationship of ATEED to our board is principally as a budget holder for projects such as our Town Centre Steering Group. Our experience is that ATEED is not focused on local economic development and does not provide any level of service to our local community. We question the role of ATEED in providing advice on local economic development to boards since they it appears that they are only focused on events in the city centre. If their activities are only of benefit to one board out of 21, we would suggest that it would be better to have local economic development delivered through a council department instead.

_Watercare Services Limited (Watercare)_

k) We appreciate the regular and timely communications from Watercare and believe they are successful in engaging with local communities in the development of projects and activities.

This feedback is authorised in accordance with Manurewa Local Board resolution MR/2020/32–19 March 2020.

Joseph Allan, Chairperson
3 April 2020
On behalf of the Manurewa Local Board
Appendix B: Papakura Local Board Feedback April 2020

CCO model, roles and responsibilities

1. Does the CCO model deliver council services with the maximum of operational efficiency, transparency and accountability, or are there better ways to deliver such services?

   a. The CCO model can be useful in delivering services efficiently if the correct balance is struck between efficient delivery and responsiveness/accountability to the community.

   b. The CCO model can create barriers to the integration of service delivery. When council departments work together to integrate services, the CCO model makes it difficult for them to participate, due to their perceived independence from the council parent.

   c. CCOs duplicate council services to staff, such as IT and HR services. If they were able to share council services, this would reduce costs to ratepayers. CCOs also have their own remuneration policies and guidelines creating unnecessary competition for staff and contractors within the council family.

   d. The CCOs' IT services are not compatible with Auckland Council technology. Having these compatible would make better efficient use of technology and potentially speed up timeframes for responses.

   e. Where positive relationships between local boards, council and CCOs are developed significant achievements can be made. Developing positive relationships is often dependent on individual staff. The board would like to see a change of culture in a number of the CCOs, especially Panuku and Auckland Transport, where there is a perceived lack of understanding of local interests and the effects of their decisions on communities, a poor level of communication and explanation of actions. There seems to be a lack of understanding and/or recognition of the two equal governing parts of Auckland Council i.e. the Governing Body and local boards.

   f. Local board budgets are small when compared with the CCOs and with the wider council balance sheet. Local boards make the best decisions for the future of our community, and much of our funding is based on partnership and community development. Local boards recognise the need to partner with CCOs to fully realise the potential within the local board area.

   g. The CCO strategic and operational plans should have environmental, social and governance goals which are planned down to local board level.

CCO accountability

2. Could the council’s current approach to holding CCOs to account on behalf of Aucklanders be improved?

   a. Appointments to CCO boards should provide for representation of local community views. CCO boards are not reflective of Auckland’s diverse communities.

   b. The Papakura Local Board submits that councillors should be appointed to the board of AT, as elected members are the representatives of their local community’s views. The local board acknowledges the conflict of interest concerns when Governing Body members sit on the board of AT. The Papakura Local Board believes there is a vast difference between members being “liaison councillors” as is currently the case and being decision-makers around the AT board table when it comes to improving the accountability of the CCOs such as AT. Elected members are uniquely aware of their responsibility to manage conflicts of interest in all aspects of their work. Their conduct on both the Governing Body and on the board of AT will also be subject to public

Annexes
transparency and scrutiny. Parliament also specifically sought to allow Governing Body members to sit on the AT board despite concerns around conflict of interest, given the wider concerns about accountability and responsiveness to the public by such an important CCO. The council should therefore respect Parliament's decision-making in this instance and allow Governing Body members to sit on the board of AT.

c. For other CCOs where there are statutory restrictions on appointing elected members to their boards, elected members should be involved in the appointment of directors. Both Governing Body and local board members should sit on the selection panel, so CCO board members understand they serve both co-equal parts of the council. This will also be consistent with the Joint Governance Framework.

d. There needs to be a greater focus on appointing community representatives, or candidates with experience in working for community organisations, to CCO boards.

e. Local boards should have input into CCO Statements of Intent and Letters of Expectation to CCOs to enable greater alignment with local board plans and other relevant local strategies.

**CCO Culture**

3. Do CCOs need to improve how they consult, engage with and respond to the wider community and council?

   a. The quality and frequency of communication and consultation between CCOs and local boards, and between CCOs and local communities, needs to improve.

   b. Most CCOs are not focused on the local level, and there is a disconnect between their priorities and those of local communities.

   c. CCOs would benefit from forming meaningful partnerships with local boards to help them gain insights into the views and preferences of local communities.

   d. CCOs generally treat local boards like an external stakeholder and do not reflect the board’s place in the shared governance structure of Auckland Council.

   e. There should be more governor-to-governor relations between local boards and the boards of CCOs, so they recognise their accountability to both parts of council’s governance system.

   f. Local residents often do not differentiate between CCOs and Auckland Council, so poor engagement by CCOs also reflects badly on the wider council family, and especially elected members.

**Feedback on specific CCOs**

The following is the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the CCOs that we have most frequent contact with:

**Auckland Transport (AT)**

1. The relationship with AT is challenging and they do not seem to be able to respond to local board and the communities' needs in a timely manner.

2. There seems to be a disconnect between the AT representative assigned to the board and the rest of the AT organisation. When a way forward is agreed as part of a consultation/engagement with the board or local community, it doesn’t get communicated back into the AT organisation or gets ignored by the organisation, and things simply progress as originally proposed by staff. If there’s a reason why something can’t be progressed, it doesn’t get communicated back to the board.
3. Timeframes for delivery are not well communicated, which means that expectations are not managed. Elected members are often left to manage missed or false expectations created by AT staff to our stakeholders and public.

4. Communication with the community is poor. For example, safety measures in Takanini were programmed but the timeframe was not communicated to the board or the community.

5. The board does not consider AT responsive to the communities’ needs. Examples include:
   d) The board reflected significant community concern about bus layovers on Opaheke Road to AT as AT contracted buses are parking in public parking spaces rather than bus layover areas further down Opaheke Road. This leaves no parking for the public to access the playground and public toilets at Central Park. The board suggested another location of unused land at the corner of Settlement Road and Great South Road. Initial discussions with AT staff suggested that an alternative location was a great idea which AT agreed to investigate and advised so in a public report. The board eventually heard, after chasing, that the original bus layover plan had been implemented therefore they wouldn’t do anything further with the idea raised by the local board or progress the investigation of alternatives as reported to the public of Papakura. AT also argued that it has no power to make its own bus contractors comply with parking in designated areas, which reflects poorly on AT as a contract manager and the board as local governors. This is a key example of a disconnect between the AT team dealing with the board and the rest of AT, AT’s dismissiveness of the board’s and public’s concerns, and poor communication and expectation management.

   e) In 2012 the Papakura Local Board advocated for more parking at the Papakura park and ride. In 2018 AT recommended including a bus metro in the one local initiative project for the park and ride. In that presentation visuals were presented of a multi-storey 300 car park and ride with a bus metro underneath. The board agreed to support a bus metro and discussed the idea with constituents. The 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan included the Papakura park and ride as a multi-storey 300 car park building. The bus metro was in the unfunded projects. AT undertook a single stage business case (SSBC). The business case identified significant geotechnical issues to overcome for a multi-storey car park. The SSBC did not support a multi-storey park and ride as the cost benefit ratio for a $25million car park would not attract NZTA funding and recommended an at grade proposal of 117 car parks. AT has advised that the bus metro will take 50 car parks of the park and ride although that will be three to five years away. AT has therefore provided advice (including visuals) that raised the board’s expectations of the scale and volume of the park and ride that was going to be delivered. Then AT provided advice based on further investigations that all that could be supported was an at grade extension to the car park. Board members are therefore left explaining the different advice to members of the public.

6. AT must strengthen consultation and accountability to local boards, Governing Body and ratepayers of Auckland in a meaningful way, including:
   a. recognition within the AT organisation that they are a CCO and not a stand-alone business
   b. that the Governing Body holds decision-making authority for AT and all CCOs, including decision-making in relation to bonus and supplementary payments to directors and staff of AT and other CCOs
   c. the inclusion of an improved performance standard for AT to align with the wider local planning and Auckland regional planning and vision documents including The Auckland Plan, Auckland’s Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy etc. and Local Board Plans for local projects of significance
   d. A requirement for AT to provide wider consultation and communication channels for local boards rather than only filtering e-mail communications through the AT local board relationship manager

Annexures
e. Assignment of senior management at the executive level as liaisons for board who have the ability to provide quality advice, co-ordinate action within different parts of AT and exercise proper accountability to local boards.

7. AT funding of safety projects and other initiatives needs to be more transparent.
8. The provision of AT’s decision-making criteria and weighting system for projects to proceed to the Governing Body and local boards so that AT are more accountable to local needs, including the ability for local boards to question the AT prioritisation of certain projects.
9. AT must provide a more rapid response to ratepayer queries.
10. There should be service level agreements established for the 21 local boards with AT – so the local board can decide collaboratively how planning initiatives, public works and projects will be effectively and efficiently delivered for the board’s areas; on a timely basis.

Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)

1. The relationship with the Papakura Local Board and ATEED is largely as a budget holder for work programme lines such as our Commercial Projects Group. As such, we question whether they are playing an active role in driving local economic development.
2. The focus of ATEED on events in the city centre means they are largely irrelevant to 20 of 21 local boards.
3. It is not clear why the local economic development function of ATEED needs to be done through a CCO rather than a council department.
4. The board does not receive any support for local economic development from ATEED.
5. Tourism is another area where there could be more support at the local level. There needs to be an approach where the sum of the parts make the whole rather than just the focus on the central area of Auckland.
6. There is no support to grow regional events at a local level.
7. ATEED functionality should be returned to the Auckland Council group, with the Governing Body sharing decision-making powers with local boards to enable town centre and suburb scale economic development alongside BID support.

Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku)

1. Panuku is the CCO with the greatest local focus, albeit only in the areas where it has a Transform, Unlock or Support projects underway.
2. The board would like Panuku to have the ability to raise debt as a way of funding projects rather than funding them through the proceeds of asset sales. This would allow them to act as a developer in their own right.
3. The board would like to see Panuku work with boards that are zoned for intensification to assist in finding development opportunities.
4. The relationship of Panuku to Kainga Ora, in its role as an urban development authority, will need to be carefully defined going forward.
5. Responsibility for service properties and other properties not planned for development, should be returned to the Auckland Council group.
6. The financial imperative for Panuku to predominantly self-fund its projects through property sales and developer agreements should be re-balanced as it is currently compromising good community outcomes. Currently, the availability of non-service public property is a key criteria of whether an area is a focus for Panuku’s development activity. This could be done through re-focusing the transform/unlock criteria, allowing Panuku to raise debt or the council parent further capitalising Panuku.
Regional Facilities Auckland

1. Community-led events or programmes should not have to pay commercial rates for the use of council facilities, e.g. the Auckland Primary Principals’ Association Music Festival had to pay $50,000 hire fee for the use of the Auckland Town Hall. Commercial rates have been charged for the last three years. It becomes prohibitive for groups to put on such events.

Watercare Services Limited (Watercare)

1. We appreciate the regular and timely communications from Watercare and believe they are successful in engaging with local communities in the development of projects and activities. However, Papakura has a franchised service with Veolia for water and wastewater requirements. It should be noted that Veolia reports through to Watercare.
2. Watercare Services should be retained as a Council Controlled Organisation.
3. Watercare Services should improve their consultation and decision-making relationship with Healthy Waters, as the three waters (potable, wastewater and stormwater) must be recognised as interdependent in order to achieve sustainable outcomes.
4. Watercare should continue to engage with the local boards, council, and community organisations to inform its planning for local projects.
Appendix C: Waitematā Local Board Feedback March 2020

Resolution WTM/2020/59 Local Board feedback - March

MOVED by Chairperson R Northey, seconded by Deputy Chairperson K Leoni:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

a) recommend that Regional Facilities Auckland and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development CCOs be abolished and that their staff and roles be incorporated into Auckland Council and their decision-making responsibilities appropriately divided between the Governing Body and its local boards
b) recommend that Auckland Transport be incorporated into Auckland Council with its existing staff structure
c) endorse Panuku Development Auckland continuing as a property and urban development agency CCO but responsibility for its service and other properties not planned for development be returned to the Council
d) endorse Watercare continuing as a water supply and wastewater disposal CCO provided its current good working relationships with Healthy Waters and other Council agencies are strengthened
e) recommend that Advisory Boards made up of elected members and a majority of appropriately skilled outside people Council appoints be established. Advisory Boards should be considered for: Stadiums; the Art Gallery; the Auckland Zoo; Public Transport; Active Transport; Tourism Promotion and Economic Development
f) request the Governing Body to advocate for legislative change that would remove specific requirements in the Auckland Council legislation not imposed on other local authorities, particularly on the existence and characteristics of Auckland Transport and Watercare and on the composition of the Governing Body
g) request that as many CCO staff be offered comparable positions in Auckland Council as possible
h) request that any change be made carefully and over sufficient time to minimise disruption to staff and to service delivery
i) request that CCOs be required to engage with elected members and communities at an early stage of developing options for projects and policies
j) request that CCO’s be required to engage with elected members and communities at the early stage of projects and policies while options are being developed
k) delegates to Member Northey to finalise any further feedback on behalf of the local board and refer the feedback to the CCO review independent panel for consideration.

CARRIED
25 August 2020

By Email
Attention: Phil Goff
Mayor
Auckland

Email phil.goff@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

By Email
Attention: Bill Cashmore
Deputy Mayor
Auckland

Email bill.cashmore@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Mayor and Deputy Mayor,

Letter of request for approval to enter Project Alliance Agreement Variation Agreement (PAA Variation Agreement) in accordance with Section 3.1(a)(iii)(C) of Schedule 4 of the amended and restated Project Delivery Agreement

The purpose of this letter is to seek formal approval from the shareholders of City Rail Link Limited (CRLL) to execute a PAA Variation Agreement with a consortium comprising:

- Vinci Construction Grands Projets S.A.S;
- Downer New Zealand Limited;
- Soletanche Bachy International (NZ) Limited;
- WSP New Zealand Limited;
- AECOM New Zealand Limited; and
- Tonkin & Taylor Limited,
(together the Link Alliance).

The proposed final form of the PAA Variation Agreement has been circulated to the advisors of the shareholders of the Company, and is attached to this letter as noted below.

The purpose of the PAA Variation Agreement is to extend the existing Project Alliance Agreement for the C3 Package (Stations and Tunnels) to include the C5 Package (Western Line) and C7 Package (Railway Systems Integration, Testing and Commissioning), on the basis of the proposal submitted by the Link Alliance and accepted by CRLL under the Development Agreement for the C5 Package and C7 Package.

Acknowledging that the PAA Variation Agreement constitutes a major transaction, for the purposes of section 129 of the Companies Act 1993, we have prepared, and attach, a draft shareholders’ resolution to that effect.
Further, this letter provides the confirmations required by section 3.1(a)(ii)(C) of Schedule 4 of the amended and restated Project Delivery Agreement on behalf of the Directors of CRLL. Applying the referencing sequence in that section 3.1(a)(ii)(C) of Schedule 4 to the approval for award of the PAA Variation Agreement, I can confirm that:

- **Consents**
  
  AA) All required consents for the Works under the Alliance (as defined in the PAA and the PAA Variation Agreement) are held by CRLL (or are in the process of being obtained by CRLL) or its contractors to the extent required at this time.

- **Budget and Timeline for Completion**
  
  BB) The budget and timeline for completion for the Alliance Works are consistent in all material respects with the approved Forecast Project Costs and approved Project Delivery Schedule. There remains sufficient forecast budget and timeline for completion for the remaining works packages to be procured for the CRL Project within the Forecast Project Costs and Project Delivery Schedule outlined in the Project Delivery Agreement.

- **Scope of Works**
  
  CC) The scope of Works under the Alliance described in the PAA Variation Agreement is consistent in all material respects with project scope for the C3, C5 and C7 Packages.

- **Solvency and capability**
  
  DD) As at the date of this letter, having undertaken a review of publicly available information, to the best of my knowledge and belief that the entities comprising the Link Alliance are currently solvent and capable.

- **Insurance**
  
  EE) All insurance policies required in connection with the Works under the Alliance as defined in the PAA and the PAA Variation Agreement) are in full force and effect in all material respects.

I am also able to confirm that:

- **Total Forecast Cost**

  The total Forecast Cost of $4.419b remains intact subject to (i) realisation of the estimated land values in the amount of $162m in 2025, and (ii) the availability of alternative funding sources in the amount of $36m (as recorded in Schedule 6 of the amended and restated Project Delivery Agreement).

- **Value for Money**

  The PAA Variation Agreement has been procured on a Value-for-Money basis, including a direct cost ratio of 10% self-performed: 90% vendor supply.

- **Revised date for Practical Completion**

  The new Practical Completion date for the CRL Project that forms the basis for this proposal is Friday 20, December 2024. This is in line with the Target Project Completion Date and Practical Completion Milestone stated in the amended and restated Project Delivery Agreement.

- **Participation of AT and KRG**

  Auckland Transport (AT) and KiwiRail (KRG) have been included in vendor procurement, testing and commissioning preparation, block of line planning and design reviews. The development of the PAA Variation Agreement has been monitored by the C3 Project Alliance Board and a Steering Group. Both groups have senior AT/KRG representation.
In December 2018, the Sponsors approved the revised procurement method for the C5 Package and the C7 Package. The conditions contained in the Sponsors’ approval letter have been met and will be confirmed as such throughout the transaction approval workstream with Sponsor representatives.

- **Development Services**

  The Development Services and Development Deliverables were performed by Link Alliance under the Development Agreement for the C5 Package and the C7 Package to CRLL’s satisfaction.

**External Legal Opinion**

The Board has received draft external legal advice that the PAA Variation Agreement is in order for execution, which will be finalised and signed once the PAA Variation Agreement has been finalised. The Board will provide the Sponsors with assurance that the signed external legal advice has been received, together with confirmation that (i) the Board is satisfied with the form of the PAA Variation Agreement (based on that external advice, and advice from CRLL) and (ii) the PAA Variation Agreement is ready for execution.

**PDA Information**

I also acknowledge the information required to be provided to Sponsors pursuant to section 3.1(a)(ii)(A), (B) and (D) – (F) of Schedule 4 of the amended and restated Project Delivery Agreement in respect of approval for award of the PAA Variation Agreement, which is attached, unless otherwise noted in Appendix 1:

- The final form of the PAA Variation Agreement including all attachments;
- A summary of key commercial terms (including final contract price, any provision sum and contingency);
- Confirmation of the level of contingency in the budget for the Alliance Works;
- Confirmation that the risk positions accepted by CRLL are:
  - within the risk allocation matrix as previously approved by Sponsors (as set out in Attachment 3); or
  - to the extent not within the risk allocation previously approved by Sponsors, we consider these commercial terms and the risk allocation in the variation benchmarking register (dated 13 August 2020) to be appropriate for CRLL to accept in the context of the CRL Project; and
- Board reports evidencing consideration of the transaction, including the financial, risk and appropriate mitigations.

**Risks outside CRLL’s Direct Control**

Whilst comfortable with the project risk profile, the CRLL Board records that it is critical for all parties formally to acknowledge that delivery of the CRL Project is subject to a number of key risks that are outside CRLL’s control, including:

- Auckland Transport and Kiwirail’s involvement in supporting the Works under the Alliance,
- Impacts from asset ownership/asset operational characteristics that are yet to be determined;
- Realisation of the estimated residual land values (in the amount of $182m) in 2025 from the sale of land owned by CRLL (at the date of this letter) but controlled by parties other than CRLL who are/may be tasked with the undertaking of transit-oriented developments or other commercial developments at the Mt Eden and Karangahape Road station precincts; and
- Continued and evolving impacts on cost and programme of COVID-19 (as well as the impact of this global pandemic on the viability of the participants in the Link Alliance).
Authorised Representative of CRL Limited

Sir Brian Roche
Chairman - City Rail Link Limited

Cc – Sarah Allen (MoT)
     Barry Potter (Auckland Council)
## APPENDIX 1: List of Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date/Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PAA Variation Agreement</td>
<td>Draft PAA Variation Agreement provided.</td>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shareholder Resolution</td>
<td>Final Draft for Execution</td>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commercial Principles</td>
<td>Draft as of 13 August 2020</td>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cost Plan Summary</td>
<td>From para 23 July 2020 Board Paper (also provided to Sponsor Representatives on 13 August 2020)</td>
<td>Attachment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Changes to the Risk Allocation</td>
<td>13 August 2020 version (referred to in July 2020 Board Paper)</td>
<td>Attachment 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accepted as part of the July 2020 Board Paper</td>
<td>Recorded in Board Minutes for July 2020</td>
<td>Not provided (Attachment 6 will be blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C5 ITC Update Paper</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Attachment 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Approval to enter into Major Transaction</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>Attachment 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CRLL Board’s updated PAA VA Approval Paper</td>
<td>August 2020</td>
<td>Attachment 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>